

THE BLOOD
of the
COVENANT

J. J. ANDREW

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

Twenty years ago the One Body passed through a controversial conflict concerning the nature of Jesus Christ at his first appearing. It was then clearly demonstrated that Christ was, by birth, related to condemnation in Adam to the same extent as the rest of the race, and that He was made of the same fallen, or sinful nature. It was also made clear that His death, as a sacrifice, was necessary to cleanse himself as well as others. But the precise efficacy of His shed blood at the different stages of the cleansing process was not fully elucidated. It is to supply this deficiency that the following pages have been written.

It fell to my lot to take a prominent part in the aforesaid conflict, and as the result of it I wrote the pamphlet entitled "The Doctrine of the Atonement." The scriptural principles embodied therein constitute the basis of what I have here written; and they are consistently applied to the several steps by which men may pass from condemnation in Adam to immortalization in Christ. The subject is presented in various phases, because so dealt with in the Scriptures, and this has necessitated some amount of repetition in order to show the bearing of the several testimonies quoted. Where the wording of the scriptural quotations varies from the Authorized Version, it will be found, unless otherwise stated, in the Revised Version.

26, Douglas Road
Canonbury, London, N.
February, 1894

J. J. ANDREW

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

A second edition of this work was published in 1913 in which the original preface appeared with no additional prefatory remarks.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

Twenty years ago the One Body passed through a controversial conflict concerning the nature of Jesus Christ at his first appearing. It was then clearly demonstrated that Christ was, by birth, related to condemnation in Adam to the same extent as the rest of the race, and that He was made of the same fallen, or sinful nature. It was also made clear that His death, as a sacrifice, was necessary to cleanse Himself as well as others. But the precise efficacy of His shed blood at the different stages of the cleansing process was not fully elucidated. It is to supply this deficiency that the following pages have been written.

We deem it our sacred duty to continue the controversial conflict as stated by the late J. J. Andrew in 1894. The nature of Christ, and the necessity for His sacrificial death is made Scripturally clear in the pages of this book. The true Christadelphians of Arkansas heartily endorse and send it out with the sincere desire of serving "the Truth as it is in Jesus," and that we all may be of one mind in "things surely believed among us" (Luke 1:1).

Blessed is he that readeth ("and understandeth"), yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it (Luke 11:28; Rev. 1:3).

Sincerely I am yours in the gospel bond and its service.

Conway, Arkansas
December 29, 1927

JOHN W. TEAS

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION

This reprinting is issued in the interest of presenting the truths to which the original work was dedicated. Man's relation to the dispensation of death is just as needful of defining today as it was in 1894. And the prospective relation to the dispensation of eternal life is just as needful of definition today as it ever was, perhaps even more so when we consider the signs in the ecclesiastical and the political heavens. Unrestrained immorality and unprecedented preparation for war depict a condition which coincides with what God's holy prophets foretold would precede the establishment of the Kingdom of God in the earth. The importance of the blood of the covenant and the blood-shedding principle decreed by the Omniscient Creator of mankind is frequently misunderstood, and at times dismissed as irrelevant. We commend to your study the pages of this book along with a diligent comparison of Scriptural references given for a richer appreciation of the Saviour's accomplishments.

Whereas some disagree with the author on some points such as Enoch not dying and the last sin being committed on the eighth symbolic day, these are allegorical in nature, and do not, in our opinion, detract from the sound exposition of Christ's sacrifice and its efficacy.

John James Andrew (circa 1840-1907) was immersed in 1865. He contributed to the Truth's literature as early as June, 1871 by articles in "The Christadelphian." About 1872 he wrote "Jesus Christ and Him Crucified," an exposition of the Saviour's life and its meaning. This work has had several editions and is currently in print under the title, "The Real Christ." In the Renunciationist conflict of 1873 mentioned in the first preface, J. J. Andrew, along with Robert Roberts, editor of "The Christadelphian," was a leading figure in opposing the unscriptural views of "free-life" and "clean flesh." He wrote "The Doctrine of the Atonement" in 1882. "The Blood of the Covenant" was published in 1894 although it had been prepared in 1893 as a paper entitled "The Judgment-seat in Relation to Atonement." In July of 1894, J. J. Andrew began publication of "The Sanctuary-Keeper," a quarterly periodical that continued until December of 1902 when declining health forced the editor to suspend publication. Until his death in June, 1907, a paralytic condition prohibited any further contribution to the Truth's writings. Thomas Williams, editor of "The Christadelphian Advocate," in reporting the death of J. J. Andrew in the August, 1907 issue, commented: "For nearly forty years Bro. J. J. Andrew has been a power for good in the work of the Truth, both by pen and by tongue, and especially by example as seen in a life that adorned the doctrines he was so well able to forcefully, yet calmly and logically, set forth. In the battles which "The Christadelphian" fought for years for the purity of the Truth, who did more able and valiant work than Bro. J. J. Andrew?"

The Dorchester Christadelphian Ecclesia

1A Melville Avenue
Dorchester, Massachusetts 02125
April, 1967

PREFACE TO THE FIFTH EDITION

This fifth edition of *THE BLOOD OF THE COVENANT* is issued in the interest of making available the truths presented herein. It is made possible by a publishing fund of the Richmond, Virginia Hall Ecclesia. We hope that Christadelphians who are persuaded of the need for such exposition will recommend this work to others.

In the 1967 publication it was erroneously stated to be the third edition. We were not aware that a 1913 publication had been made. Also included in this edition is an index of Scriptures quoted in the pamphlet arranged in sequence from Genesis to Revelation. This should prove helpful in a study of the material.

October, 1985

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS
2725 Kenmore Road
Richmond, Virginia 23225

CONTENTS

1.	The Blood of the Everlasting Covenant.....	1
2.	Edenic Law	2
3.	Edenic Temptation	3
4.	Edenic Disobedience	3
5.	Edenic Nakedness	4
6.	Edenic Judgment	5
7.	Edenic Mercy	5
8.	Edenic Clothing	6
9.	Edenic Sacrifice	6
10.	Edenic Justification	7
11.	Edenic Allegory	9
12.	Abel to Abraham	9
13.	The Justification of Abraham.....	10
14.	The Covenant of Circumcision	11
15.	The Covenant of Shadows.....	12
16.	Shadow Offerings	16
17.	The Curse of the Law.....	18
18.	Jews and the Abrahamic Covenant.....	20
19.	The Justification of Jesus	21
20.	The Condemnation of Sin.....	23
21.	The Resurrection of Christ.....	25
22.	Justification by Christ's Blood.....	26
23.	The Law of the Spirit of Life.....	28
24.	Out of Adam into Christ.....	30
25.	Walking in the Light.....	32
26.	The Lord of Dead and Living.....	33
27.	"We shall not All Sleep".....	34
28.	The Judgment-seat Summons.....	35
29.	The Second Death	37
30.	Immortalization	39
31.	Recapitulation	40
32.	Objections	41
	A. Historical Raising of the Dead.	
	B. Rejection of Christ.	
	C. Rejection of Apostolic Preaching.	
	D. The Justice of God.	
	E. The Power of God.	
	F. Dr. Thomas's Teaching.	
33.	The Unity of the Truth.....	53

The Blood of the Covenant

1.—“THE BLOOD OF THE EVERLASTING COVENANT.”

This form of words occurs only in Heb. xiii 20; but the truth which it embodies runs through the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation. “The everlasting covenant” is the covenant made with Abraham; and the blood pertaining thereto is the blood of Christ. This blood is an essential part of the covenant, because the promise thereof cannot be fulfilled without it. The covenant, in promising the everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, in effect, promises everlasting life; and, as the promise is made to sinful man, this involves deliverance from sin and death. It is written concerning the Mosaic covenant—and it is of equal force in regard to the Abrahamic covenant—that “without shedding of blood is no remission” (Heb. ix. 22). “It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins” (Heb. x. 4). Therefore, the blood of Christ is the only blood that can deliver from sin and death and give everlasting life. But how, or on what principle is this effected? This is a most important question and is deserving of the fullest consideration.

A covenant in human affairs is another term for an agreement by which two or more persons promise to do certain things. A Divine covenant, while embodying this feature, occupies a much higher position. It is a law to those who enter it. The Mosaic covenant is frequently referred to as “the law,” and occasionally as “the law of Moses;” and of the Abrahamic covenant it is said, that God “confirmed the same unto Jacob for a *law*” (Ps. cv. 9, 10). Hence the Divine utterance that “Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws” (Gen. xxvi. 5). The covenant made with Abraham was not the first Divine law; the first law given by God was to Adam, in Eden, and it was to counteract the effects of its violation that the covenant or law was given to Abraham. To understand, therefore, the precise operation of the Abrahamic law it is necessary to know what was the import of the Edenic law and the breach thereof.

The Edenic law is subsequently termed “the law of sin and death,” and the Abrahamic is called “the law of the spirit of life” (Rom. viii. 2). All men are under the first law, but a comparatively small portion are under the second. In the revelation which elaborate these two laws God has defined His own action and the respective positions of those who are placed under them. Those positions have each their limitations. Thus, he who is under the Edenic law cannot participate in the provisions of the Abrahamic; and he who comes under the second law must be freed from the power of the first. In like manner the consummation of the Abrahamic law cannot be bestowed upon one who never comes under its operation; and the consummation of the Edenic law cannot be escaped by any who continue under it. In giving laws which impose conditions and offer alternative consequences, God, in effect, declares that He voluntarily limits His own action to that which is specified therein. As the supreme lawmaker, He is also the perfect lawkeeper. However much His law may be broken by others, they

are not broken, while in operation, by Himself. The certainty of His action in their fulfillment is stamped in some form, on every page of His inspired word.

The second of his afore-mentioned laws was given to Abraham, in the first instance, accompanied by a promise of blessing (Gen. xii. 1-3). Subsequently when Abraham asked how he was to know that he should inherit the promised land, God performed a miracle by causing "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp" to pass between the halves of slain animals (Gen. xv. 7-17). And when Abraham had demonstrated his faith by offering up Isaac, God added an oath to his promise and miracle; "because he could swear by no greater he swore by himself;" "wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heir of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation" (Heb. vi. 13, 17, 18). In giving the promise and taking the oath, God placed himself under an obligation to His own attributes of truthfulness and faithfulness to fulfill the purpose specified; not only in outline but also in detail—not in the final purpose merely, but in all the preliminary steps which are necessary to its completion.

The laws by which God regulates His dealings with the children of men embody principles which are necessarily righteous, but seldom on the surface; investigation and reflection are required to ascertain them. Some are by this process soon perceived, but others with difficulty. It should be the aim of the Sons of God, if possible, to understand the principles on which all Divine laws are based, and the effort to attain to such an understanding cannot but be pleasing to their Heavenly Father.

2.—EDENIC LAW.

The terms of this law are brief but precise:—"Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. ii. 16, 17). Two consequences are here presented—one expressed and the other implied; viz., die, and not die. For death being the result of disobedience, it is inevitable that continuance of life would be the accompaniment of continued obedience. How long such a conditional state of existence would have been permitted it is impossible to say. The disobedience of Adam has rendered unnecessary any revelation on this point. If such disobedience had not taken place the life of Adam would have been maintained either in the same nature, or by transformation into a higher nature, according to the will of the Creator. No practical benefit could accrue from knowing which course would have been adopted. Adam having failed to keep the law given to him, the important point to consider is, what death did he thereby incur, and what are the consequences to his descendants? In answering the first part of this question two phrases have to be considered, viz: "in the day," and "thou shalt surely die." Various explanations have been given to show in what way Adam died on the day of his disobedience. It has been said, for instance, that it was fulfilled by Adam beginning to die on that day; and, in support, attention is called to the marginal rendering, "dying thou shalt die." But this is open to the reply that the marginal rendering is a Hebrew idiom for *death*; just as the marginal rendering for the last clause of the preceding verse "eating thou

shalt eat," is synonymous with the English *eat*. The reply is reasonable, and therefore the preceding explanation cannot be accepted. Corruption doubtless began immediately after disobedience, but that did not fulfill the threatened death.

The word "day," it has been suggested, is not confined to twenty-four hours, but represents a long and indefinite period. This cannot be considered wholly satisfactory; for the "day" mentioned in the command must have represented a period of time of which Adam had knowledge or experience. Adam and Eve were both created on the sixth day (Gen. i. 27, 31), and the command given to Adam preceded the creation of Eve (Gen. ii. 15-18, 21-22). Therefore, Adam's experience of time was less than twenty-four hours. On the seventh day God rested (Gen. ii. 2), and only one day is subsequently mentioned in connection with the history of Eden. After transgressing, Adam and his wife "heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day" (Gen. iii. 8). What day was this? It may have been the eighth day. Probably it was; for the incidents recorded in Gen. iii. do not require a longer period than one day; and there is no evidence that the abode in Eden extended beyond the eighth day. If this view be in accordance with facts, it is very suggestive in explaining the introduction of the "eighth day" into certain commands of the Mosaic law.

3.—EDENIC TEMPTATION

The arrangements by which a subtle serpent was allowed to entice the first human pair to partake of the forbidden fruit was not a superfluity. Adam and his wife were a part of the creation which was "very good" (Gen. i. 31). They had no "knowledge of good and evil;" they could not distinguish between the one and the other; and they had no desire to do that which was evil. To impart such a desire it was necessary for the serpent to influence by subtle reasoning the mind of "the weaker vessel," and thereby to inflame her imagination with the prospect of their eyes being opened and becoming "as gods, knowing good and evil" (Gen. iii. 5). The device succeeded, and from this time forward the desire to do evil became an integral element of the human mind. It has been transmitted by Adam to all his posterity, in whom it is manifested from earliest life. Hence an outside tempter is not necessary to lead astray any who have been born of woman. "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of *his own lust*, and enticed; then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin" (Jas. i. 14, 15). Lust which leads to sin is necessarily evil, and this is the prevailing characteristic of the human race; for "all that is in the world" consists of "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" (1 Jno. ii. 16). Lust, or the desire to do evil, is the offspring of the first sin and the cause of all subsequent sin. On this account it is denominated "sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3), and, as a consequence, is the subject of divine reprobation. Sin has thus two aspects, moral and physical, and "the blood of the everlasting covenant" is required to take away the one as well as the other.

4.—EDENIC DISOBEDIENCE

The command given to Adam was of the simplest kind; it did not involve his doing anything; it simply imposed a restriction. But this single interdict, in the face of temptation, he was unable to keep. He did not pluck the forbidden fruit; this was the act of his wife, who, after eating herself, "gave also unto her husband

with her; and he did eat" (Gen. iii 6). Apparently no sophistical reasoning was used to persuade him; and he needed none; he partook of that which was offered him, knowing what he was doing "Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression" (1 Tim. ii. 14).

When Adam disobeyed, all his descendants were in his loins, and therefore in a certain sense they "all have sinned" (Rom. v. 12); they sinned in him, even as "Levi paid tithes in Abraham" (Heb. vii. 9). In submitting to be blessed by Melchizedec, Abraham voluntarily acknowledged his inferiority; for "the less is blessed of the better" (ver. 7). But the Levitical priesthood, not being alive, was unable to exhibit any such acknowledgment; nevertheless their inferiority was as real as if they had actually joined Abraham in the payment of tithes. In like manner the descendants of Adam are accounted as having "sinned" in him. They do not possess moral guilt, as he did; for some have "not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. v. 14): nevertheless the result is the same. He *became* a sinner, whereas they are "*made* sinners" (Rom. v. 19) without any exercise of will on their part. That is to say, God, by accounting them to be in Adam when he sinned, and by defining their evil desire to be "sin," has constituted them "sinners;" the object being that none might be delivered from the consequences of sin without the exercise of Divine mercy.

5.—EDENIC NAKEDNESS.

When Adam and his wife were created "they were both naked, and were not ashamed" (Gen. ii. 25). But immediately they had sinned "the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked" (Gen. iii. 7). From that time shame for a naked condition has been a characteristic of human nature—a proof that the evil desire which Adam imbibed by sinning has been inherited by his posterity. Hence the word "naked" is a figurative description for a state of sin. Aaron "made Israel naked unto their shame" by making a golden calf for them to worship (Exod. xxxii. 24, 25). And Ahaz "made Judah naked and transgressed sore against the Lord" (2 Chron. xxviii. 19).

Adam and his wife endeavored to hide their nakedness by garments of "fig leaves." Immediately afterwards "they heard the voice of the Lord God," and they "hid themselves amongst the trees" (Gen. iii. 8). When questioned as to where he was, Adam said, "I was afraid because I was naked; and I hid myself" (ver. 10). Was this the sole cause of his fear? If the fig-leaf garments were sufficient to hide their sense of shame, why should they "hide themselves from the presence of the Lord God?" Was it not an attempt to escape the execution of the Edenic law? Remembering the words, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," would they not expect to be visited with death on that very day? If so, the hiding of their persons after covering their nakedness possesses a significance of its own.

Adam's statement about his nakedness gave rise to two questions:—"Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?" (ver. 11). The purport of these questions is obvious. They imply that the eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil would impart to Adam and his wife the knowledge that they were "naked." Previously they were ignorant of the distinction between nakedness and covering; now they both knew and felt it.

6.—EDENIC JUDGMENT

This process commenced with the questions quoted in the last section. The answers of Adam led to the woman being questioned. Then followed sentence on the deceiver, the deceived, and the enticed, in the order in which they had acted. The serpent was doomed to eat dust and go on its belly; the woman to bring forth children in greater number and with increased sorrow; and the man to obtain food out of cursed ground by the sweat of his face until he returned to the dust (Gen. iii. 14-19). A return to the dust was not a part of Adam's lot prior to his disobeying the Edenic law. A change must, therefore, have taken place in his physical constitution as the result of this decree; "Corruption is in the world through lust" (2 Pet. i. 4). How the change was effected is not revealed, neither is it necessary. But it is all important to recognize that there was such a change, and that the posterity of Adam has inherited his nature after that change was effected. Just as Adam's descendants were in his loins when he partook of the tree, so were they in his loins when he was judged and condemned. Then it was that "many were made sinners by one man's disobedience," and "judgment came upon all men to condemnation" (Rom. v. 18, 19). The descendants of Adam were condemned to death before they were born. But the sentence of condemnation does not specify the mode of death; it admits of death by physical decay or death by violence. Men have returned to the dust in both ways. Millions have died prematurely by accident, war, convulsions of nature, and other Divine judgments. Some have thus suffered for their own sins; but others before they have lived long enough to commit sin, or without being related to a Divine moral law. The only explanation in the latter case is that they had been "made," or constituted "sinners." Owing to this fact, all men are liable as soon as they are born to be cut off by death.

7.—EDENIC MERCY

After questioning Adam and his wife, and before condemning them, the Lord God addressed the Serpent. Why was this? Was it merely because the Serpent had, by beguiling the woman, taken the first step in effecting Edenic disobedience? A consideration of the words addressed to the Serpent suggests another and a higher reason. After condemning the Serpent to go on its belly, the Lord God addressed to it a prediction concerning its own seed and the seed of the woman: these two seeds were to be at enmity, and each was to be bruised in the conflict—the seed of the Serpent in the head and the seed of the woman in the heel (Gen. iii. 15). Why was not this prediction spoken to Adam or his wife? Was it not because they had produced a breach between themselves and their Creator? They had previously been in direct communion with God, but sin deprived them of the privilege; they were in process of judgment for their "offense," and until that process was completed they deserved only to be addressed in words of condemnation. The Serpent had no moral relationship to the Creator, and the words addressed to it forshadowed no favor for itself or its seed; but for the woman and her seed they did. They contained an element of mercy of which there had been no previous intimation. By disobeying the Edenic law they had incurred immediate death, which would necessarily be death by slaying. If this had been inflicted they would have had no seed. Therefore, the promise in which specific mention was made of the woman's seed—addressed to the Serpent in their hearing—was equivalent to informing them that they

should not suffer *immediate* death. By the condemnation immediately addressed to them they learned that this did not mean exemption from all consequences of their disobedience; for the ground was to be cursed for their sake, and, instead of eating freely of fruits made ready for their hands, they were to toil for their subsistence, and then return to the dust. After listening to the Divine promise and sentence the fear which led them to hide themselves amongst the trees would disappear: and of this Adam gave evidence when he "called his wife's name Eve." This name means *living* (see margin), and Adam gave it "because she was the mother of all living" (Gen. iii. 20). By this act Adam showed that he understood the promise to guarantee a posterity and that he believed in its fulfilment. If death had been inflicted on the day of eating the forbidden fruit Eve would never have been a "mother," and there would have been no "living" humanity.

8.—EDENIC CLOTHING

Immediately after Adam had named his wife, "the Lord God made coats of skins and clothed them" (ver. 21). This was obviously to supersede the fig-leaf garments which they had devised. For what reason? The nature of the clothing suggests an answer. Where would the "coats of skins" be obtained? From animals. How? By slaying them. And who would slay them? He who "made the coats." The slaying of the animals would involve shedding of blood, and thus we arrive at the fact that the clothing provided by the Lord God possessed a significance of the greatest importance. As nakedness represents a sinful condition, so clothing based upon blood shedding is used to signify a covering for sin. It is the origin of the expression, "Covered in relation to sin: "Blessed is he whose . . . sin is covered" (Ps. xxxii. 1): "Thou hast covered all their sin" (Ps. lxxxv. 2). It is the foundation for the special garments for priestly functions under the Mosaic law:—"Thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments . . . and thou shalt bring his sons and clothe them with coats" (Exod. xl. 13, 14). And it explains why Christ is spoken of as a garment of righteousness:—"As many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27). "Christ Jesus who, of God, is made unto us wisdom and righteousness" (1 Cor. i. 30).

9.—EDENIC SACRIFICE.

The process of slaying the animals and making the coats of skins would probably be witnessed by Adam and Eve. If so, it is not difficult to imagine the interest with which they would view the same. It would be to them an object lesson in sacrifice for sin. To teach them what? That as they had, by sin, incurred a violent death, a violent death was necessary to take away sin. Whether or not they learned this truth, certain it is that subsequent revelation contains it. And, as sacrifice out of Eden is but a continuation of extension of sacrifice in Eden, the principle on which the one is based is obviously the same as that which underlies the other.

When an Israelite under the Mosaic law offered a burnt offering for oblation he was required to "lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him" (Lev. i. 4). Why was his hand to be laid on the head of the animal? To transfer to it, by a figure, his sins. This is shown by the injunction concerning the scape goat:—"Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins; and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand

of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land" (Lev. xvi. 21, 22). The animal devoted to sacrifice on whose head the hands of a sinner were placed, became, by that act, a sin-bearer; and immediately afterwards it was slain. What does that prove? That this was the death due for the sins transferred to it. Hence the sinner, in effect, acknowledged that for his sins he had incurred a death like that inflicted on the animal; in other words, that he deserved to be slain.

Christ is described as "the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii. 8). How was He slain prior to the Crucifixion? In type, by all the sacrifices prescribed by God from Eden to the abolition of the Mosaic covenant. Christ, like the slain animals, was a sin-bearer:—"He bare the sin of many" (Isa. liii. 12); but he was not made a sin-bearer in the way they were. Animal sacrifice was "a shadow" (Heb. x. 1), but Christ's sacrifice was the substance. Hence sin could not be transferred to him figuratively; it must be imparted to him in reality. Therefore, he was "made sin" (2 Cor. v. 21) by being "made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4); he "took part of the same flesh and blood" as his brethren, and "in all things" was "made like unto" them (Heb. ii. 14, 17). What was necessary to deliver him from the sin-nature of which he was "made?" To be slain; by that event God "condemned sin in the flesh" of His son Jesus (Rom. viii. 3). Therefore, sacrifice is as essential to take away sin in its physical, as in its moral, aspect; a violent death is the punishment due to the one as well as to the other; and physical sin is as powerful to keep closed the gates of the grave as is actual transgression. Christ only possessed sin physically, not morally, but all who are sprinkled with his blood (1 Pet. i. 2) possess sin in both forms. Those who enter Christ in the Apostolic way are able to say, "Our old man was crucified with him" (Rom. vi. 6), or, "I have been crucified with Christ" (Gal. ii. 20). Having been baptized into His death (Rom. vi. 4), they have thereby partaken of His crucifixion, their baptism being a practical confession that they deserved for their "sin in the flesh" and for their "wicked works" (Col. i. 21) a violent death similar to that which was inflicted on Christ. They died symbolically, an event referred to in the following passages: "If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world" (Col. ii. 20); "For ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col. iii. 3); "We thus judge that one died for all, therefore all died" (2 Cor. v. 14).

The act of offering the animal sacrifices which foreshadowed the sacrifice of Christ embodied the same feature as baptism into Christ; the sinner died symbolically in the animal slain. It is on this principle that the fulfillment of "the law of sin and death" in Eden is to be explained. Adam was threatened with death on the day that he sinned, but God, by an exercise of mercy, provided an animal on which was inflicted the literal death incurred by Adam. What effect did this have upon Adam? He died symbolically in the death of the animal, and the Edenic law was thereby fulfilled in its first stage. All subsequent animal sacrifice was based on the same principle as Edenic sacrifice, but to be of any service in the abolition of death, it required to be supplemented by sacrifice of a higher order.

10.—EDENIC JUSTIFICATION.

Justification is the reverse of condemnation. These two conditions cannot co-exist in the same sense and for the same thing.

The Greek word for justify means "to make just or hold guiltless," and the meaning of the English word is "to pardon, and clear from guilt, to absolve, to acquit, to exculpate." Justification is equivalent to reconciliation atonement, purging, cleansing, remission, redemption, purification, and forgiveness. It is typical and atypical, and it has a legal, and a moral, aspect. The legal aspect is represented by the expression "made righteous" (Rom. v. 19); and the moral aspect, by the statement "that by works a man is justified and not by faith only" (Jas. ii. 24). Neither legal, nor moral, justification can exist without blood-shedding; the legal must precede the moral; and both legal and moral must precede the bestowal of eternal life.

As soon as Adam was clothed with animal skins he was justified through the Edenic sacrifice and belief in the Edenic promise. His justification was legal not moral; he was, by a typical sacrifice, "made righteous," but he did not possess a righteous character. From what was he thus justified? The "offence" he had committed and the "sin-in-the-flesh" which it had produced. What was its effect? It averted a violent death; thereby prolonging his life, and giving him a second probation. Did it alter the physical consequences of his offence? No; the ground continued to be cursed, he had to toil for bread, evil desire still dwelt in him, and when his vitality was exhausted he died. The legal justification which God has provided by animal sacrifices and other ceremonies, is not accompanied by the removal of the physical consequences of sin; this is promised as the result of the legal justification being supplemented by moral justification; or, in other words, by imputed righteousness being succeeded by actual righteousness. Adam, after justification, was in the condition described by the Psalmist: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity" (Ps. xxxii. 1, 2). Whether he maintained this blessedness is not recorded; the judgment-seat will reveal it. For this purpose he will be raised from the dead. Would he have been amenable to resurrection and future judgment if he had not entered upon this second probation? No, he would have been slain and the Edenic law would have forever held him in death. What was an essential preliminary to his entrance on a second probation? Justification from his act of disobedience. Could the justification with which he was favoured in Eden take away his sin and destroy its consequences? Not of itself. What was further required? Ratification by the death and resurrection of the seed of the woman. On what basis will he be raised from the dead? On the basis of Edenic justification, a second probation, and the blood of Christ. And if he receive immortality what will be the foundation for it? Edenic justification, faithfulness during his second probation, and the blood of Christ.

Are Adam's descendants, by birth, in the position of their first parents before or subsequent to justification? Before justification; for although condemnation is racial, justification is individual. What follows from this? That if they died without justification from his "offence," they die under the same conditions as he would have done if God had slain him on the day he sinned. He would have returned to the dust never to resume life; and so do they. It is true that the death specified in the Edenic law is not eternal death; if it had been there would have been no scope for Divine mercy. But in the absence of justification from the "offence" which occasioned death there is no escape from the tomb.

11.—EDENIC ALLEGORY.

The events recorded in the first three chapters of Genesis, though literal, contain also allegory. The creation pre-figures those who are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works" (Eph. ii. 10), of which God's son is "the beginning" (Rev. iii. 14). The sun, moon and stars are signs of Royal power, Ecclesiastical organizations, and Princes. Heaven and earth are used as symbols for governments and people, grass for human nature, and trees for men. Light is a figure of truth, and darkness of ignorance. Eden is a type of the Kingdom of God, Adam of Christ, and Eve of the Church. Adam's deep sleep finds a parallel in Christ's death; the Serpent represents wicked men; nakedness, sin; and coats of skins, the righteousness of Christ. The seventh day typifies the millennial rest, and the previous six days the six thousand years of sin's reign. What about the eighth day? Has that no significance? Is it not analogous to the period immediately succeeding the seven thousand years? What will then take place? "The dragon, that old Serpent, which is the Devil and Satan" will "deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth," and they "compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them" (Rev. xx. 2, 8, 9). Thus on the eighth literal day the first sin was committed and thereby a violent death incurred; on the eighth symbolic day the last sin is committed, and all who share it are subjected to a violent death. On the eighth literal day judgment is administered with mercy; but on the eighth symbolic day judgment is executed without mercy.

How does this allegorical aspect affect the case of Adam? Did his symbolic death on the eighth literal day keep him from literal death? No; for "all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died" (Gen. v. 5); he died literally on the first symbolic day of a thousand years.

12.—ABEL TO AERAHAM

Sacrifice in Eden was but the inauguration of sacrifice out of Eden. Its necessity was recognized by Abel but not by Cain (Gen. iv. 4). That it formed an essential part of God's "way" (Gen. vi. 12) of righteousness from Abel to the Deluge is indicated by the distinction, in the Divine instructions about the ark, between the "clean beast" and "beasts that are not clean" (Gen. vii. 2), and also by the fact that Noah, on leaving the ark, "builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl and offered burnt offerings on the altar" (Gen. viii. 20). It is also involved in the statement that "then began men to call upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. iv. 26) when Abraham likewise called upon the name of the Lord, he builded an altar unto the Lord" (Gen. xii. 8). For what purpose? The offering of sacrifice; without which an altar is useless. When Peter, for the first time preached, "remission of sins" in the name Jesus Christ (Acts ii. 38), he announced that "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Acts ii. 21). In explaining how this was to be done, he informed his hearers that they must "*repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus*" (verse 38). This was equivalent to saying that they must by baptism recognize Christ's death to be a sacrifice for sin. Hence this ceremony takes the place of animal sacrifice. Baptism has been a necessity since the Crucifixion, just as animal sacrifice was indispensable previously. In other words, a recognition, in the way appointed by God, of blood-shedding, is absolutely necessary for

justification from sin. To this, Enoch was no exception. He "walked with God and he was not; for God took him" (Gen. v. 24). He was translated that he should not see death" for "he pleased God" (Heb. xi. 5). Like the other righteous men of the antediluvian age he called on the name of the Lord in the offering of sacrifice: and thereby was justified from sin. He subsequently walked in harmony with his justified condition. And on this basis the sacrifice of Christ was prospectively applied to him, just as that sacrifice is now retrospectively applied to those who are baptized into the name of Jesus Christ. The translation of Enoch, although an exception to the ordinary course of things, did not violate any previous Divine decree. It would have been quite consistent with Edenic law if God had likewise translated all others who were justified by a sacrifice for sin and an approved walk. But He did not so act; He allowed them to die. Does this constitute a barrier to the realization of their hopes? No; because their justification requires their restoration to life. Does their death contribute anything towards taking away the condemnation they inherited from Adam? Not in the least; for their death was not sacrificial and they were not free from personal transgression. They went into the grave as a result of Adam's "offence," but after being justified from that "offence" by sacrifices which foreshadowed the sacrifice of Christ; and therefore they died with the certainty—subject to Christ's death and resurrection—or being brought forth from the death-state at God's own appointed time. Enoch, as the "seventh from Adam," (Jude ver. 14) foreshadows the brethren of Christ who "are alive and remain until the coming of the Lord" and who will, without entering the grave, be exalted to "ever be with the Lord" (1 Thess. iv. 15, 17). The principle which explains Enoch's exemption from death is equally applicable to them.

13.—THE JUSTIFICATION OF ABRAHAM.

"Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness" (Rom. iv. 3). How? By belief only? No; by belief and obedience. According to Divine command he left "Ur of the Chaldees to go into the land of Canaan" (Gen. xi. 31; xii. 1). Was this the only practical exhibition of his belief? No; after arriving in the land of promise "he builded an altar unto the Lord" (Gen. xii. 7, 8). Why? Because he was a sinner by birth and by deed, and needed sacrifice to cover his sin. Hence the Apostle, in showing that "faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness," quotes from Ps. xxxii. 1;—"Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered" (Rom. iv. 7). Abraham recognized that he was a sinner, and that to inherit the land his sin must be covered. Therefore, he "called upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. xii. 8) by the erection of an altar and the offering of sacrifice. His recognition of sacrifice as a Divine requirement was repeated after his return from Egypt by a visit to "the altar which he had made at the first" and by again "calling on the name of the Lord" (Gen. xiii. 4); also by acknowledging Melchizedeck to be "Priest of the Most High God" (Gen. xiv. 18); and by slaying, as commanded, a heifer, a goat, a ram, a turtle-dove, and a pigeon, to provide what God required for the purpose of confirming his promise (Gen. xv. 9-17). He believed not only the promise concerning the land, but that its inheritance required the taking away of sin by blood-shedding. *Thus was Abraham justified by faith.* He was subsequently "justified by works, when he had offered Isaac, his son, upon the altar" (Jas. ii. 21).

14.—THE COVENANT OF CIRCUMCISION.

"Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness . . . when he was in uncircumcision . . . and he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised" (Rom. iv. 9-11). Circumcision was a "seal" and a "sign;" as a seal it constituted a Divine assurance of the existing righteousness of Abraham. That "righteousness" included blood-shedding; so did the "seal:" for when Zipporah was compelled to circumcise her son, she said to Moses, "Surely a bloody husband art thou to me" (Exod. iv. 25).

Of what was circumcision a "sign?" Of the Crucifixion, which is described as "the circumcision of Christ" (Col. ii. 11). To "cut off" a piece of human flesh (Exod. iv. 25) signified the future cutting off of the Messiah by death (Dan. ix. 26); and as Christ died to "put away sin" (Heb. ix. 26), circumcision was necessarily related to that object. How? It showed that the circumcised child was a sinner by birth, and that it needed blood-shedding to cleanse it from that condition, independent of its subsequent course of life; for at eight days of age it could not have committed transgression. If a child of Abraham was not circumcised it was said, by Jehovah, to have "broken my covenant," and as a consequence was doomed to be "cut off from his people" (Gen. xvii. 14). The practical effect of this is seen in the case of Moses, who while in Midian, neglected to circumcise his son. Because of this omission "the Lord met him, and sought to kill him" (Exod. iv. 24); and he was only spared from being slain by the action of his wife in angrily complying with the covenant of circumcision. From this incident we learn that every father, descended from Abraham, who omitted to circumcise his son, was liable to lose his life. To what was the uncircumcised son liable? The same; for through his parents he had "broken" Jehovah's "covenant;" and he who fails to comply with a Divine command, from whatever cause, *must die*. There was no injustice in this; for the child was born under condemnation to death for Adam's offense and was therefore liable to that condemnation being put in force any day. Its birth was due to the mercy of God as first expressed in the Edenic promise (Gen. iii. 15); without which there would have been no sons of Adam; and although the promise involves the existence of the Seed of the Serpent until completely defeated by the Seed of the Woman, it is a part of the Divine prerogative to bring death on any who are still under Adamic condemnation, at any time. Hence the premature death of many who have no moral guilt; death reigns "even over them that have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. v. 14). In circumcision God provided a ceremony which warded off premature death, for in decreeing that the uncircumcised son of Abraham should be "cut off from his people," He, in effect, promised that the circumcised one should *not* be so "cut off." The covenant of circumcision was thus a shadow of the Abrahamic covenant; as the latter is intended to destroy death, so the former was designed to avert premature death; in other words, the one gives eternal life, and the other gives a lease of present life, the life in both cases to be enjoyed on the land of Canaan. How long did the lease of life resulting from circumcision last? Until the one on whom the ceremony was performed committed transgression. He then became again liable to premature death, and needed animal bloodshedding to avert it. But does not the decree, "cut off from his people," imply that the child was simply to be separated from the fleshly

seed of Abraham and yet continue to live the full term of his physical vitality? It goes beyond this. The imputation attached to the child of having "broken" God's "covenant" involves death; and the fact that Moses was in danger of losing his life for omitting to circumcise his son, proves that death was the penalty for violation of the command. The mode and time for its execution was not specified, thus leaving it uncertain as to how and when God would "cut off" the lives of both parent and child. The uncircumcised son of Abraham occupied a similar relationship to its disobedient parent that the sons of men occupy towards Adam; both have sinned in their head, and although to this there does not attach moral guilt, the penalty for it is death.

Abraham was circumcised many years after being justified by sacrifice but afterwards circumcision constituted the first stage of justification. The ceremony was required to be performed when the "man child" was "eight days old" (Gen. xvii. 12). What significance attaches to this? It is suggestive of the day on which Adam sinned, the eighth day from the beginning of the creation, and thereby brings to mind the fact that, as an extension of Adam, the child did not deserve to live longer, and that, like Adam, it was the recipient of Divine mercy expressed by a blood-shedding ceremonial. It also points to the eighth day of a thousand years, when "evil doers shall be cut off" (Ps. xxxvii. 9) finally, by fire coming "down from God out of Heaven" and devouring them (Rev. xx. 9).

There is a moral, as well as a physical, aspect to circumcision. It is styled circumcision of the heart (Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6). Circumcision of the flesh was necessary to an entrance into the Abrahamic covenant, but of itself it could not give the blessing of that covenant. It must be followed by circumcision of the heart and ears (Acts vii. 51), namely, the cutting off from the conduct whatever was obnoxious to Jehovah, or a hindrance to faithfulness in his service, even to the extent of a "hand," "foot," or "eye" (Mark ix. 43-47). To circumcise, in all its aspects, is to cut off all round.

Circumcision was incorporated in the Mosaic law, and was as obligatory as it had previously been to the descendants of Abraham; no Jewish or Gentile male if "uncircumcised," being allowed to partake of the Passover (Exod. xii. 48). It was on the basis of circumcision that "the oracles of God were committed" to Jews (Rom. iii. 2). This privilege imposed upon them the duty of preserving and defending those oracles, and of accepting whatever further revelation came from their Author. The brethren of Christ now occupy, in relation to those oracles, the same position; they have been "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, buried with Him in baptism" (Col. ii. 11, 12). And they are, as a consequence, required to "keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ" (Rev. xii. 17; iii. 8).

15.—THE COVENANT OF SHADOWS.

The covenant given to Israel through Moses was "a shadow of good things to come" (Heb. x. 1). A shadow is an outline of something real; it is formed by the contrast between light and darkness, and if anything occur to interfere with that contrast the shadow disappears. The "rudiments" (Gal. iv. 3) composing the Mosaic covenant are styled "patterns" (Heb. ix. 23), and that covenant is described as containing "the form of knowledge and of the truth" (Rom. ii. 20). It embodies, therefore, a series of object lessons concerning sin and its remedy, and constitutes an epitome of

the plan of salvation. It did not supersede the Edenic promise, the sacrifice instituted in Eden, the Abrahamic covenant or the covenant of circumcision; "it was added" to these things "because of transgression" (Gal. iii. 19). For what object? "That sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful" (Rom. vii. 13); that is, to show in a multiplicity of ways the heinousness and power of sin. The Mosaic law was "holy, and just, and good" (Rom. vii. 12), but by its numerous enactments it excited the "sin in the flesh" inherited from Adam. "I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet" (Rom. vii. 7). So exacting were its requirements that no Jew begotten by the flesh could keep it perfectly; it was a "yoke which neither our fathers nor we," said the Apostles and elders, "were able to bear" (Acts xv. 6-10). All were guilty of its violation, and therefore they were, "through fear of death all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. ii. 15). What purpose, then, was effected by it? It demonstrated the inability of unaided flesh and blood to obey God perfectly, and the consequent need for dependence on God's mercy (Rom. iii. 19). "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," accomplished (Rom. viii. 3). That is, He provided one who, though "made under the law" (Gal. iv. 4) and "in all points tempted like as we are" (Heb. iv. 15) did "always those things that pleased" his Father (Jno. viii. 29). In regard to his own conduct he was "without sin" (Heb. iv. 15); an indispensable requisite for his position as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (Jno. i. 29). Hence Christ is the "body" (Col. ii. 17) or "enduring substance" (Heb. x. 34) of which the Mosaic ceremonies were shadows or "patterns." These shadows were designed for instruction, and therefore some of their features must be analogous to those of the substance.

The first and most prominent feature of the Mosaic covenant related to life and land; it was "ordained to life" (Rom. vii. 10). What life? The present life; "I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil," that, by obedience, "thou mayest live and multiply; and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it" (Deut. xxx. 15-16); "It is your life, and through this thing ye shall prolong your days in the land" (Deut. xxxii. 47). This promise involved immunity from the chief cause of death, namely, disease:—"If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God. . . . I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians" (Exod. xv. 26); Deut. xxviii. 60). Hence if Israel had been obedient there would have been no premature deaths among them.

The continuance of life conditional on obedience involves the termination of life in the presence of disobedience. This is specifically stated in the detailed enactments of the Mosaic law. Israel was commanded to "put to death" a blasphemer. (Lev. xxiv. 16), a murderer (ver. 17), the curser of father or mother (Lev. xx. 9), an adulterer (ver. 10), the man or woman with a familiar spirit (ver. 27), a witch (Exod. xxii. 18), a sabbath-breaker (Num. xv. 35), etc. It was enacted that the death be inflicted by stoning, and that "all the congregation" take part in its execution (Num. xv. 35), in order that "all Israel" might "hear and fear and do no more any such wickedness" (Deut. xiii. 11); "so thou shalt," saith the Lord, "put the evil away from among you" (Deut. xvii. 7). Israel was thus to co-operate with God in the extermination of evil-doers, for the purpose of maintaining their holiness as a nation (Exod. xix. 6). If this duty had been rigidly performed Israel

would have consisted only of righteous persons; but it was neglected, and as a consequence evil-doers increased. Therefore God visited the nation with "pestilence" (Deut. xxviii. 21), "consumption" "fever," "inflammation," "the sword, blasting, mildew," (ver. 22), drought (ver. 23), heavy rain (ver. 24), defeat in war (ver. 25), "wonderful plagues," "sore sickness" (ver. 59). "the disease of Egypt" (ver. 60), etc., in order that they might be "destroyed" (ver. 61), and "left few in number" (ver. 62).

While in the wilderness God exhibited His anger against evil-doers on several occasions by the infliction of a violent death. For offering strange fire Nadab and Abihu were destroyed by fire (Lev. x 2); for rebelling against the authority of Moses, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, with their families, were "swallowed up" by the earth (Num. xvi. 32); for charging Moses and Aaron with having killed Korah and his companions "fourteen thousand and seven hundred" died by plague (Num. xvi. 41-50); for complaining, at a place subsequently called Taberah, "the fire of the Lord consumed them that were in the uttermost parts of the camp" (Num. xi. 1-3); for accusing Moses of bringing them "out of Egypt to die in the wilderness" much people "of Israel died" from bites of "fiery serpents" sent by the Lord (Num. xxi. 5-6); for "joining himself unto Baal-peor" Israel lost by plague "twenty and four thousand" (Num. xxv. 1-9); and for listening to the false report of the ten spies about the land and proposing to "return into Egypt" (Num. xiv. 1-4), God threatened to extinguish the whole nation by "pestilence" (ver. 12); but at the intercession of Moses (vers. 13-19), He "pardoned" them (ver. 20), and instead of inflicting immediate death he allowed all above twenty years to die by degrees during their remaining thirty-eight years of wilderness wanderings (vers. 23, 29-35).

For some acts of disobedience the law said that transgressors should be "cut off." If at the Passover feast an Israelite ate "leavened bread from the first day until the seventh, that soul shall be cut off from Israel!" (Exod. xii. 15); if anyone compounded anything like the anointing oil or put any of it "upon a stranger," he "shall be even cut off from his people" (Exod. xxx. 33); he who "doeth ought presumptuously . . . shall be cut off from among his people" (Num. xv. 30) "that soul shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him" (ver 31). In these passages what is the meaning of "cut off." Death. Does not the expression "from Israel", or "from among his people" qualify it so as to admit of life apart from the nation, a kind of excommunication? No; for in prescribing what is to be done with one "that giveth any of his seed unto Moloch" it is first said "he shall surely be *put to death*" (Lev. xx. 2) and then the Lord says, "I will set my face against that man, and will *cut him off from among his people*" (ver. 3). The one phrase explains the other; to be "cut off" is to suffer premature death. This is its invariable meaning when applied to sinners. The antediluvians were "cut off" by water (Gen. ix. 11); the inhabitants of Canaan were "cut off" by Jehovah through Israel (Deut. xii. 29); the Anakims were "cut off" by Jeshua so that he "destroyed them utterly" (Josh. xi. 21); and Jehu was "anointed to cut off the house of Ahab" (2 Chron. xxii. 7).

This evidence, together with that already adduced (Section 14), proves that to "cut off" was to inflict death in a special manner. The Israelites were therefore required to circumcise their sons to prevent such a death. This ceremony introduced them to a

state of justification from the condemnation under which they were born and if no sin had been afterwards committed and Israel had kept God's "statutes" and "judgments," they would have continued to live in the flesh as long as Jehovah thought fit; "which if a man do, he shall live in them" (Lev. xviii. 5; Rom. x. 5).

What was the first obligation imposed upon Jewish children? Obedience to parents:—"Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise" (Eph. vi. 2). What was the "promise?" "That thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (Exod. xx. 12). Continuance of Jewish child-life was thus conditional; if not obedient to father and mother its "days" would not be "long upon the land." When a son became "stubborn and rebellious" and refused to "obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother," his parents were instructed to "bring him out unto the elders of his city" that he might be stoned to death (Deut. xxi. 18-21). *Only faithful parents* would carry out this injunction; unfaithful parents would neglect it. And then God would interpose in such ways as he deemed best to prevent rebellious sons having "long days upon the land."

Did not Jewish children die in infancy to the same extent that Gentile children do? There is no evidence that they did. And if they did so, it was in consequence of unfaithfulness on the part of their parents. If the parents disregarded God's law they would be liable to "disease" and the other "curses" threatened against them (Deut. xxviii. 15-68); and the children of such would necessarily share those curses. Of this an illustration is given in the case of Achan. Because he "sinned against the Lord," not only he, but "his sons and daughters," and his cattle were "stoned" to death (Josh. vii. 20-25). Achan and his children having been justified in shadow, from Adamic condemnation; now suffered, for the iniquity of their head, the Mosaic curse.

When Jewish parents were obedient to the law, and brought up their children in the right way, they ensured to themselves and their families the continuance of life in the land. When the children reached such an age that they could understand the requirements of the Mosaic law, they became individually responsible to its blessings and curses. From birth to circumcision the sons were "dead" in Adam (2 Cor. v. 14); but when they were circumcised they became "alive" (Rom. vii. 9), and so continued until they rebelled against their parents, or disobeyed some other command of the Mosaic law. They then became dead in Moses; for the law given through him was "the ministration of death" (2 Cor. iii. 7). This change of condition is described by the Apostle Paul:—"I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came sin revived, and I died" (Rom. vii. 9). If the sin came within the scope of sacrifice, they averted immediate death by offering the prescribed atonement; in so doing they died symbolically in the death of the animal, and were restored to the "alive" condition into which they were introduced by circumcision. But, if the sin committed was presumptuous—as in the case of Nadab, Abihu, Korah, Dathan and Abiram—no sacrifice was available, Num. 15:30, 31).

Obedience to the Mosaic covenant gave no reward beyond this life, and the punishments for disobedience were confined to this life, with death as the finality. Hence "every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward" (Heb. ii. 2). No provision was made in that covenant for resurrection, but it shadowed the "good things to come" after the resurrection. The existence which it gave in the land of promise during this life was a shadow of the endless life to be enjoyed in the same land through

the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. xii. 3). The Mosaic "commandment was ordained to life" (Rom. vii. 10) in the flesh, but it pointed to life in the spirit. The most holy place of the tabernacle represented that life; for it was the dwelling place of God (Exod. xxv. 22). The ark and mercy-seat (Heb. ix. 4-5) symbolized Christ since his glorification, and the Cherubim "the sons of God" in future spirit "manifestation" (Rom. viii. 19); "Aaron's rod that budded" (Heb. ix. 4) prefigured the resurrection; and the manna, eternal life (Rev. ii. 17).

16.—SHADOW-OFFERING.

The chief offerings under the Mosaic law were "the burnt offerings" (Lev. i. 4), the "sin offering" (Lev. iv. 3) and the "peace offering" (Lev. iii. 1). The "burnt offering" was to be completely burned (Lev. i. 9) with the exception of the skin, which was to be given to the priest (Lev. vii. 8). The first time the people were blessed after the completion of the Tabernacle "there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat" (Lev. ix. 24); a representation of "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ" (Heb. x. 10) and of that event which is described as "mortality" being "swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. v. 4). The swallowing up of mortality is the consuming of the "sinful flesh" of the faithful and is accompanied by "this mortal" putting on "immortality" (1 Cor. xv. 53); a consummation which takes place on the perfect "altar," Christ Jesus (Heb. xiii. 10). From this it follows that the sons of Adam cannot be cleansed from "sinful flesh" without blood-shedding, and that "the burnt offering" comprised justification, in shadow, from the offence in Eden which produced "sinful flesh." And the fact that the "burnt offering" was prescribed for the dedication of the altar (Num. vii. 15), proves that he of whom the altar was a shadow, also required cleansing by blood-shedding. Every "burnt offering" was to be accompanied by a "meat offering" (Num. xv. 3-12), which, if baked, consisted of "unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil" (Lev. ii. 4) and seasoned with salt (ver. 13). The meat offering foreshadowed the uncorrupt character of Christ—an essential feature to his being an acceptable "offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2).

The "sin offering" was for sins of ignorance (Lev. iv. 2); and, when for the priest or for the congregation, it was to be burned "without the camp" (Lev. iv. 12-21). "Wherefore, Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate" (Heb. xiii. 12). Hence justification from individual sins is necessary as well as justification from the "offence" of Adam; this two-fold justification is provided for in the sacrifice of Christ. "His own self bare our sins in his body on the tree" (1 Pet. ii. 24). He "bare our sins" through being made of "sinful flesh" (Rom. viii. 3; Heb. 2-14) and as sin in both forms physical and moral, requires shedding of blood, Christ's sacrifice is equally available, and equally needful, for purification from "sin in the flesh" and from sin in word or deed.

The "peace offering" signified the removal of the alienation between God and man arising from sin. This feature of the Mosaic law has its parallel in Christ. Those who were once "far off" are made nigh by the blood of Christ; for he is our peace" (Eph. ii. 13-14). They who formerly "were enemies" are "reconciled to God by the death of his son" (Rom. v. 10).

At the consecration of priests "a burnt offering" (Exod. xxix.

18), "a sin offering" (ver. 14), and a "peace offering" (ver. 28) were each necessary to enable Aaron and his sons to officiate in the tabernacle. In this they present a shadow of the "holy priesthood" in Christ, who are consecrated "to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. ii. 5). Reconciliation by the sacrifice of substance must not only be higher in degree, but equally as comprehensive as reconciliation by shadow-sacrifices. Aaron and his sons were by the above offerings cleansed from both physical and moral defilement, and in like manner believers are, at baptism into Christ, "justified by his blood" (Rom. v. 9) from "sin in the flesh" as well as from their previous "wicked works" (Col. i. 21). This is necessary to make their reconciliation "complete" (Col. ii. 10). After partaking of this favor they cannot be alienated from God or suffer condemnation by His son except by their own unfaithfulness.

The need for blood-shedding to cleanse from physical, as well as from moral, defilement is proved in a variety of ways. "An atonement" was prescribed for the tabernacle and its contents (Lev. xvi. 16, 20, 33), and at the dedication of the altar, burnt offerings, sin offerings, and peace offerings were required (Num. vii. 10, 15, 16, 17). For this there is a reason; these things were made out of "the ground," which on account of Adams offence, was "cursed" (Gen. iii. 17). Moral guilt could not possibly attach to the tabernacle and its contents; nevertheless they must be purged by blood before they could be used as a means of approach to God. Could they whose nature contained "sin" officiate as priests in an atoned-for tabernacle without their defiled nature having partaken of a similar purgation? Impossible. Hence "the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh" (Heb. ix. 13). What was it that required, and partook of, this purifying? "Sin in-the-flesh;" for sin is the only thing that defiles "the flesh," and blood-shedding is only required to purify from the sin or its consequences. Was the purification of such efficacy as to enable the "offerers" to obtain by it a "perfect" nature? No; for then the sacrifices "would have ceased to be offered" (Heb. x. 1-2). "The blood of bulls and of goats" must be succeeded by the blood of Christ in order to give enduring efficacy to the purification. What then was the immediate benefit? It took away, for the time being, in respect to the purified ones, the alienation between themselves and God arising from "sin-in-the-flesh"; and this enabled them to do those things required by God for attainment to eternal life. Without such a shadow-purification this would have been impossible.

Is "the blood of Christ" of less present efficacy than was "the blood of bulls and of goats?" According to Apostolic reasoning, quite the reverse:—"If the blood of" animals was effective for "the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ . . . purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God?" (Heb. ix. 13-14). The purging of the conscience is, since the crucifixion, an essential preliminary for "serving the living God." Is not the purifying of the flesh also essential? If requisite under the law of shadows, can it be dispensed with under the law of Christ? And does not the expression, "how much more," prove that "the blood of Christ" purifies the flesh of believers at the same time that it purges their "conscience from dead works?"

What is the present effect of purification of the flesh through the blood of Christ? Not a change of nature, but a change in the

relationship of the flesh. By birth it is related only to Adam, sin and death. Of itself it contains "no good thing" (Rom. vii. 18), and even without originating any evil deed it is fit only to be consigned to corruption. But when figuratively sprinkled by the blood of Christ it is the subject of a justification, and thereby becomes "holy" "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. vi. 19); "the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are" (ch. iii. 17). Henceforth the fleshly body is a fit dwelling place for God by His Spirit, either in the form of "Spiritual gifts" (1 Cor. xii. 1), or in the form of the Truth, which is likewise "Spirit" (1 Jno. v. 6).

Can a body thus made holy, afterwards become unholy? Yes. If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy" (1 Cor. iii. 17). How can it be defiled? Among other things, by "adultery, fornication, uncleanness, drunkenness" (Gal. v. 19-21). A "holy" body is not allowed to become "one flesh" (1 Cor. vi. 16) with an unholy body. It is on this basis that the marriage of baptised believers is permitted "only in the Lord" (1 Cor. vii. 39); to marry out of the Lord is to "defile the temple of God."

What is the effect of the body being now made holy? Does it prevent its going to corruption? No; but it prevents corruption retaining a permanent hold of it for its original uncleanness. With what result? That it must come forth from the grave. To be made incorruptible? Not necessarily. It must undergo a scrutiny to decide whether, after being made "holy," it has been so defiled as to deserve destruction (1 Cor. iii. 17). In such a case a "man" is destroyed, not for what he was by nature, but for what he did after his "body" was made "holy;" "if ye LIVE *after the flesh* ye shall die" (Rom. viii. 13).

On what conditions can a "body" now made "holy" ultimately become incorruptible? By compliance with that which is expressed in the following injunction:—"Ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's" (1 Cor. vi. 20). This involves crucifying "the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. v. 24). They who do this are described as sowing "to the spirit", and the promise is, that they "shall of the spirit reap life everlasting" (ch. vi. 8).

17.—"THE CURSE OF THE LAW"

What is that curse? In its finality, death. Hence the law is styled "the ministration of condemnation" and the "ministration of death" (2 Cor. iii. 7-9). No Jew (except Jesus) kept the law perfectly; therefore they all came under its curse. What was necessary to deliver them therefrom? Sacrifice, not in shadow, but in substance. This was provided in the death of Christ; "he is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance" (Heb. ix. 15). How was the death of Christ brought to bear on them so as to produce "the redemption" of their "transgressions?" Through the shadow sacrifices of the law. If offered in a right state of mind they were accepted as atonement for sin in view of the perfect sacrifice then to come; "Whoso offereth the sacrifice of thanksgiving glorifieth me; and to him that ordereth his conversation aright will I shew the salvation of God" (Ps. l. 23). When Christ had died and risen again these shadow sacrifices were ratified by his shed blood, and faithful Jews "sleeping in the dust" (Dan. xii. 2) were thereby placed in the same posi-

tion as faithful baptised Gentiles who "sleep in Jesus" (1 Thess. iv. 14).

Writing of Jews baptised into the death of Christ the Apostle says, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law" (Gal. iii. 13). With what result? That all such Jews did not die under "the curse of the law": according to the Apostolic promise they had received "remission of sins" (Acts ii. 38), and, as a consequence, they were freed from the "condemnation" of the Mosaic law. Were they at the same time freed from the "condemnation" arising out of "the offence" of Adam (Rom. v. 18)? Equally so. They had been justified in shadow by circumcision and animal sacrifice from inherited sin, and Christ's sacrifice was as efficacious for the ratification thereof, as it was for ratifying sacrifices offered for "transgressions" against the law. Therefore baptised Jews were "redeemed" by the blood of Christ from Adamic "condemnation" as well as from Mosaic "condemnation."

To free Jews from "the curse of the law" it was necessary for Christ to be "made a curse" (Gal. iii. 13). How was this effected? By his being nailed to the cross; "for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Gal. iii. 13). He could not "destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil," or sin (Heb. ii. 14), unless made of "the same flesh and blood" as his brethren, which is "sinful flesh" (Rom. viii. 3); and in like manner he could not remove "the curse of the law" without himself coming under that curse. How could this be effected without moral guilt? By the mode of his death being constituted the basis for Mosaic "condemnation." He was "made a curse" by God's providential arrangement, as he had previously been "made sin" (2 Cor. v. 21) by being "made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4). On the false charge of "blasphemy" Jesus Christ was condemned to a violent "death" (Matt. xxvi. 65-66), as prescribed in the law (Lev. xxiv. 16). The Jewish mode of inflicting it was stoning; but before Christ's first appearing the Jews had been deprived of the power of inflicting death without the sanction of the Romans (Jno. xviii. 31); and as the Roman method of putting criminals to death was by crucifixion, Christ, when condemned was hung upon a tree. This brought him under "the curse of the law;" and he could only be freed therefrom by his own shed blood. He shed his blood, redeemed himself from the Mosaic "curse," and thereby laid the foundation for the same "curse" being taken from such Jews, whether dead or living, as have complied with God's sin-cleansing requirements.

Gentiles do not require redeeming from "the curse of the law" because they were never under it; "what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law" (Rom. iii. 19). Nevertheless the mode by which that redemption was effected is of interest to them, because it illustrates the way in which they can be redeemed from Adamic "condemnation." Jews were freed from Mosaic "condemnation" by baptism into Christ; therefore Gentiles can, by the same baptism, be freed from Adamic "condemnation." But is not Adamic "condemnation" solely physical, inherent in sinful flesh? No; it has physical results, but in the first instance it has reference to the Divine attitude towards the breach of the Edenic law; it is another term for Divine disfavour. Physical decay is the result of Divine "condemnation," but not identical with it. The "condemnation" which "came upon all men by one man's offence" (Rom. v. 17-18) consists of the Divine decree, "Thou shalt surely die"; "Unto dust shalt thou return" (Gen. ii. 17; iii. 19). To be redeemed from that "condemnation" is to deprive the

death which it brought of its permanent power; not by preventing a temporary abode in the grave, but by providing a basis on which justice can give release. It does not however, exempt them from a return to the grave for unfaithfulness after being redeemed from Adamic or Mosiac "condemnation," or both. In such cases endless abode in the grave will be due to condemnation solely for their own misconduct.

18.—JEWS AND THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT

All Jews from Sinai to the Crucifixion were in the Mosaic covenant, but they were not all in the Abrahamic. Entrance into both covenants required justification by circumcision; but here the parallel ends. Entrance into the Mosaic covenant arose out of fleshly descent. But to enter the Abrahamic covenant a knowledge of its purport, and faith in its fulfilment were necessary. These conditions were not present in the minds of all Jews; "for they are not all Israel, which are of Israel" (Rom. ix. 6). They who were merely "of Israel" constituted "Israel after the flesh" (1 Cor. x. 18); but they who were Jews "inwardly" (Rom. ii. 29) are described as "the Israel of God" (Gal. vi. 16). Fleshly Israel "attained not to the law of righteousness . . . because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law" (Rom. ix. 31-32); they made the mistake of thinking that shadow sacrifices could take away sin without ratification by a perfect sacrifice. But godly Israel believed in the bruising of the seed of the Serpent on the basis of the woman's seed being bruised. Of this class was Simeon, who "waited for the consolation of Israel" (Luke ii. 25), and who after being permitted to see "the Lord's Christ" (ver. 26), said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace . . . for mine eyes have *seen thy salvation*" (ver. 29-30).

All Israel were invited in a variety of ways, of which the following is an illustration, to enter into the Abrahamic covenant:—"Incline your ear and come unto me: hear and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David" (Isa. lv. 3). How did Jews enter? They "made a covenant with God by sacrifice" (Ps. l. 5). Did all who made this covenant fulfil its terms to the end of their life? Far from it; sometimes "the righteous turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquity" (Ezek. xviii. 24). In such cases was their retribution confined to "the curse of the law?" No; they must suffer the retribution due for unfaithfulness to the Abrahamic covenant. When will that be? When "the Mediator" of that covenant (Heb. ix. 15-28) returns to it into operation. He will then declare who have paid their covenant "vows unto the Most High" (Ps. l. 14) and who have not. The former he "will deliver" from "the day of trouble" (ver. 15); but the latter "shall be destroyed together" (Ps. xxxvii. 38). Thus will "God bring every work" connected with the Abrahamic covenant "into judgment, with every secret thing whether it be good, or whether it be evil" (Eccles. xii. 14); as He has already done in regard to the Mosaic covenant (Heb. ii. 2). The Jews in the Mosaic covenant who were also in the Abrahamic now "sleep in the dust of the earth;" but they "shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. xii. 2). They will be raised, not because they were in the Mosaic covenant, but because they were in the Abrahamic. The Mosaic covenant could not give eternal life (Gal. iii. 21) and all its transgressions have already "received a

just recompense" (Heb. ii. 2). Consequently resurrection for its retributions is unnecessary. Not so with the Abrahamic covenant; its rewards and retributions have yet to be bestowed. Hence the need of resurrection.

19.—THE JUSTIFICATION OF JESUS

Every Jewish child, by its birth, defiled its mother. It could not have produced this result if it had not itself been unclean (Lev. xii.). From this defilement, the mother could not be cleansed without "blood" (verse 4-5); and as blood is the antidote to sin, the uncleanness must have been caused by sin. Whose sin? First, the "offence" of Adam; and second, its consequence: viz., "sin in the flesh" of the child. The uncleanness was inherited; and therefore the blood of the lamb," "pigeon," or "turtledove," denominated "a sin-offering" (Lev. xii. 6), was a justification from inherited sin. The mother was, by "a man child," made "unclean seven days" (verse 2); and on the "eighth day" it was "circumcised" (verse 3). The mother was then to "continue in the blood of her purifying three and thirty days" (verse 4). But for "a maid child" she was "unclean two weeks," and was required to "continue in the blood of her purifying three score and six days" (verse 5). Thus circumcision in the case of "the man child" diminished the uncleanness of the mother by one-half, and was consequently a justification ceremony of the same efficacy as that of "a sin offering."

To this Mosaic enactment, the Son of Mary, "made under the law" (Gal. iv. 4), was no exception. The expression "that holy thing" (Luke i. 35) applied to him before birth, is used in the same sense as the word, "holy," in 1 Cor. vii. 14, to describe legitimacy of origin and also to indicate that he was a "first born son" (Luke ii. 7), all of whom were "called holy to the Lord" (Luke ii. 23). The holiness of first-born sons did not exempt them from circumcision, nor prevent their mother from being defiled by them. Hence at "eight days" of age the child Jesus was circumcised (Luke ii. 21), and subsequently his mother continued in "the days of her purification according to the law of Moses" (ver. 22). This was the first act of justification of which Jesus partook. Its effect was to transfer him from the state of "condemnation" to death, under which he was born, into the condition described as being "alive" (Rom. vii. 9). In that "alive" condition he continued until the close of his career; for when, on arriving at years of discretion, "the commandment came," his "sin in the flesh" did not "revive," and as a consequence he did not "die." That is, he did not by his own act incur death, and therefore he did not require to die symbolically in the death of a sacrificial animal.

As "the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man" (Heb. viii. 2), Jesus, like the Mosaic tabernacle, required "atonement" (Lev. xvi. 33); for a like reason and for the same object. The reason was physical defilement, and the object to provide a fit dwelling place for Jehovah. As "the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle" (Exod. xl. 35), so "the spirit" abode in Jesus Christ without "measure" (Jno. iii. 34). This was no doubt, one of the objects, perhaps the chief one for which circumcision was instituted; that he who was made to "hope" from his "mother's breasts," and was "cast upon" God "from the womb" (Ps. xxii. 9, 10), should have the benefit of a justification from inherited sin from his earliest days.

"Circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law" (Rom. ii. 25). In what way did it profit? It could not give eternal life; "for

if there had been a law which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law" (Gal. iii. 21). What then was the profit? It spared from premature death, and maintained uninterrupted reconciliation with God. Jesus Christ was the only Jew who thus profited through keeping the law. Did he not die a premature death? Yes; but how? In regard to the Mosaic law, by a voluntary surrender of his life. Although he prayed to God, "take me not away in the midst of my days" (Ps. cii. 24), yet he made the announcement, "I lay down my life for the sheep" (Jno. x. 15). Up to the time immediately preceding his being nailed to the cross the Mosaic "ministration of condemnation" (2 Cor. iii. 9) had no hold upon him. But as soon as he was hung upon a tree he came under that "condemnation;" that is, he was "cursed" by the law (Gal. iii. 13), and from that "curse" he could only be cleansed by the shedding of his blood. At the same time and for the same reason "the true tabernacle" (Heb. viii. 2) became unfit for the indwelling of Jehovah; hence, the spirit left Jesus, and he cried out "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt. xxvii. 46). By "the curse of the law" his circumcision was "made uncircumcision" (Rom. ii. 25); but by his death he underwent a higher form of circumcision; "he was cut off out of the land of the living" (Isa. liii. 8). Although nailed to the tree by "wicked hands" (Acts ii. 23) it was the result of providential arrangement; "thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above" (Jno. xix. 11). Jesus Christ died "the death of the cross" (Phil. ii. 8) but not in the same way as others; he did not die simply through physical exhaustion. There was an element in his case which was absent from that of the two thieves, viz., grief for sin. This explains why he died before them (Jno. xix. 31-33). He died of a "broken heart" (Ps. lxxix. 20); and hence when the soldier "pierced his side, forthwith came there out blood and water" (Jno. xix. 34). His heart had literally ruptured, and, the red and white portions of the blood had become separated. The grief which produced this result is evidence of the completeness with which Christ had, during his probation, practised "circumcision of the heart" (Rom. ii. 29), described as "circumcision made without hands" (Col. ii. 11), which, if absent, would have rendered the "circumcision" which ended his life of no avail (Rom. ii. 25). He had "cut off" everything from his affections pertaining to "sinful flesh," and this was consummated by a voluntary cutting off of his life for justification from sin.

The baptism of John was, like the Mosaic law, an addition to the Abrahamic covenant. It was instituted "for the remission of sins" (Mark i. 4). To the surprise of John, Jesus applied "to be baptised of him;" and, in answer to John's objection, said, "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 13-15). Submission to this ceremony, was therefore a necessary part of the "righteousness" of Christ. For what reason? Was it a test of obedience without doctrinal significance? If it was in his case, it was in the case of others. But it was not in their case; for they "were baptised confessing their sins" (Matt. iii. 6), and as a consequence they received "remission of sins." Had Christ any sins requiring "remission?" He had no personal transgressions, but He possessed "sin in the flesh" inherited from Adam; his submission to the baptism of John was a practical confession of this fact, and a recognition of the necessity of his death in order to be cleansed. Being a symbol of his death, it was a justification, by shadow from the sin which required that death. Had he not

been thus justified by circumcision? He had; but inasmuch as a shadow justification is not perfect it will bear repetition to any extent. Previous to baptism by John, Jesus had been hidden from Israel; he was now about to be revealed as the "beloved Son" with whom the Father was "well pleased" (Matt. iii. 17). It was fitting, that before being "manifested to take away our sins" (I Jno. iii. 5), he should publicly acknowledge his own relationship to sin, and also illustrate, symbolically, the impossibility of escaping therefrom without his own death. The ceremony which cleansed the Jews, who were "baptised of John in Jordan" (Matt. iii. 6) from moral defilement, was equally efficacious in cleansing Jesus from his physical defilement. In both cases it was temporary, until ratified by the death of Christ as a sacrifice.

The necessity for the justification of Jesus Christ was foretold by the Psalmist when representing him as saying to Jehovah, "in thy sight shall no man living be justified" (Ps. cxliii. 2). To be justified in God's *sight* is impossible for anyone inheriting the sin-nature; that nature must be covered by blood-shedding before a man can do anything relating to a future life, acceptable to God. There is no disadvantage in this, because God has made ample provision for inherited sin to be covered. In instituting circumcision God placed the Jew in a position whereby, as soon as he knew the Divine requirements, he could perform them. And in the analogous ceremony of baptism He has given the Gentile the opportunity, as soon as he knows what he has received from Adam and what he may obtain through Christ, of becoming justified from inherited and committed sin.

20.—THE CONDEMNATION OF SIN

"It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin" (Heb. x. 4). Why not? Because the animals sacrificed for sin were under no moral law, and contained no "sin in the flesh." The absence of sin rendered its condemnation impossible; it was placed on the heads of the animals representatively, and therefore was only condemned representatively. How was it thus condemned? Not by Divine word only; this was insufficient; it must also be condemned by deed. Sin was condemned representatively when the animal was slain. Why was it slain? Because the man who offered it deserved, on account of sin, to be slain. What does this indicate? That when the shadow gave place to the substance the one in whom sin was condemned must also be slain. Even though he possess "sin in the flesh" only, and have no personal transgression? Yes. Why? Because his "sin-in-the-flesh" was the result of the "offence" of Adam, who deserved to be slain on "the day" he disobeyed. Does not this put Christ in the position of a substitute? No; because Christ was a continuation, as regards nature, of Adam; and "sin-in-the-flesh" deserves the same penalty as personal transgression. Adam did not suffer the violent death which he incurred; but it was inflicted on the animals slain in Eden. Their death was the result of the promise concerning the seed of the woman, and it foreshadowed the bruising of that seed. Between the death of the substance and the death of the shadow, there must be a parallel. Death by physical decay would not have sufficed for the shadow; and therefore it would not have been effective in the substance. Why not? Because the condemnation of sin, whether by representation or in reality, is the execution of the penalty threatened for, and incurred by disobedience. If, therefore, the penalty embodied in the Edenic law was death by physical de-

cay, such a death would have sufficed both for the shadow and the substance. But it did not; consequently the penalty due to Adam was death by slaying. And as all his descendants "sinned" in him (Rom. v 12), they deserve, whether actual transgressors or not, a violent death in the execution of the Edenic law. The reason why such a death is not universal is due to the mercy of God, expressed in the Edenic promise. That promise involves the existence of the seed of the Serpent until the time arrives for the conflict between the seed of the Woman and the seed of the Serpent to come to an end. But although the bulk of the human race are allowed to pass away through death by physical decay, such a mode of death will not suffice for the taking away of Edenic, and other sin. God gave to Adam a law, and that law must be carried out in one of two ways. If Adam had obeyed, he would have fulfilled the righteousness of God, and would have experienced the blessing implied in the law by not dying; but having disobeyed, the penalty of the law must be inflicted. If it had been carried out on Adam there would have been no human race, and, as a consequence no sinners to save. But God, in His mercy, "that he might make known the riches of his glory" (Rom. ix. 23) provided a descendant of Adam on whom to execute the penalty; and, in "the depth of" his "wisdom" (Rom. xi. 33), he devised a plan whereby submission to the penalty should constitute a part of "his righteousness," and thus enable Him to "be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 26). Without setting aside the Edenic law God has carried His decree into execution in such a way as to ensure for a great multitude the endless life which Adam lost by violating that law. He has provided one who combined in his own person Adam after condemnation and the substance of the Edenic shadow-sacrifice, and who yet was morally "innocent from the great transgression" (Ps. xix. 13) committed by the first man.

According to custom, Jesus Christ was crucified naked, as indicated by the fact that "many women were there beholding afar off" (Matt. xxvii. 55). This feature possesses a doctrinal significance, which is referred to in the statement that "for the joy that was set before him" he "endured the cross, *despising the shame*" (Heb. xii. 2). He was then in the condition of Adam and his wife after partaking of the forbidden tree and before being "clothed" with "coats of skins" (Gen. iii. 21); they realized through sin "that they were naked" (Gen. iii. 7), and as a consequence experienced "shame." The "sin-in-the-flesh" transmitted by them has the same effect, and hence Christ partook of it. Having lost through "the curse of the law" the covering for sin provided by circumcision and baptism, he was now, in relation to the Edenic and Mosaic laws, in an unjustified condition; he was physically as unclean as he was between birth and circumcision; and the nakedness apparent to the human eye was a counterpart of his nakedness in the sight of God. Although he possessed a record of a blameless life, he could derive no benefit therefrom until his naked condition had been covered by the shedding of his blood.

Knowing the painful and *shameful* death he had to endure—for Jesus predicted that "the chief priests" would "deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify" (Matt. xx. 19)—is it a matter for surprise that as it drew near, he should in his "agony" "sweat as it were great drops of blood" (Luke xxii. 44), and pray, "O my Father, If it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt" (Matt. xxvi. 39)? His exquisitely formed constitution caused him to shrink

from the ordeal by which sin was to be "condemned;" but his perfect understanding of his Father's revealed will led him to suppress or crucify his natural dislike and to submit to the execution of a Divine law which, as proved by events, it was not "possible" to set aside. Was this because God required to be appeased? Not in the sense in which the term is ordinarily used; no amount of zeal, effort or self-sacrifice will take away His anger against sin apart from compliance with God's "way" of righteousness. That "way" originated in the declaration that the seed of the woman should be bruised in the heel by the seed of the Serpent (Gen. iii. 15), and it took practical shape when the Lord God provided sacrifice in Eden to effect reconciliation with the first sinners. This is the only principle on which man can "make peace with God" (Rom. v. 1). As it was God's prerogative to provide the first shadow-sacrifice, so does it belong to Him alone to give the sacrifice of substance. Hence He "hath set forth" Christ Jesus "to be a propitiation" (Rom. iii. 25). In that capacity Jesus "abolished in his flesh the enmity" caused by sin "that he might reconcile both" Jew and Gentile "unto God in one body by the cross having slain the enmity thereby" (Eph. ii. 15-16). God "loved" sinners (Eph. ii. 4), and in a higher sense He "loved" his righteous son (Jno. xv. 9); likewise the son "loved" sinners (Gal. ii. 20), and manifested perfect "love" for "the Father" (Jno. xiv. 31). Notwithstanding this comprehensive love, it could not produce any practical benefit without the physical condemnation of sin. The exercise of God's love is regulated and limited by His other attributes. His law having been violated His justice and righteousness required the vindication of that law to enable Him to give effect to His mercy and love. Hence the need for Christ to suffer the full penalty of the Edenic law before he could reap the reward of an obedient life. Though free from personal transgression, he submitted to that which was the inevitable result of the Father's anger against sin, physically and morally; thereby exhibiting the perfection of righteousness. After passing through the ordeal he was able to say from experience, the Lord's "anger endureth but a moment; in his favour is life; weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning" (Ps. xxx. 5).

The death of Christ was the combined expression of Divine wrath, Divine justice, and Divine love; wrath against sin, justice in the execution of the Edenic and Mosaic laws, and love in opening up a way to immortality. The Divine wrath was buried in the grave with Christ and as regards his own relationship to the Edenic and Mosaic condemnations, it remained there. This enabled Divine justice to raise Christ from the dead and give him immortality—the conditions imposed upon him having been fulfilled. On this basis Divine love has offered the same blessing to others who by reason of their own wicked deeds, are incapacitated from filling the position which Christ occupied.

21.—THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

In the conflict between opponents and defenders of Christianity Christ's resurrection has been discussed solely as a miracle. From a physical point of view, it was a miracle; but from a moral standpoint it was more than a miracle. It was the fulfillment of a promise—the carrying into effect of a righteous law. God had, in effect, said to His Son "If thou wilt walk in my ways, and if thou wilt keep my charge, then thou shalt" (Zech. iii. 7) be delivered from death and be satisfied with "my salvation" (Ps. xci. 14-16). His Son fulfilled these conditions; therefore it was a manifestation of Divine faithfulness to raise Jesus Christ from the dead, and

give him "length of days forever and forever" (Ps. xxi. 4). He was "obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross; *wherefore* God also hath highly exalted him" (Phil. ii. 8-9). By obedience to "the death of the Cross," he had atoned for Adamic and Mosaic "condemnation," and having done nothing by his own action to bring himself under the power of death "it was not possible that he should be holden of it" (Acts ii. 24). He died according to law, and he was released from death according to law. It was not possible, according to the "law of sin and death," for Christ to be freed from Adamic "condemnation" without shedding his blood; and after this event "it was not possible," according to "the law of the Spirit of life," for the grave to retain him. He had, by his shed blood, nullified that which causes death; therefore he was "brought again from the dead . . . through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. xiii. 20) i. e., the covenant made with Abraham. But was he not raised in order that he might receive eternal life? This was the object; but there was also a cause; and between cause and object there is a distinction. He would have had no title to eternal life if he had not "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. ix. 26); and without a title to eternal life he could not have been "brought again from the dead." Between his corruptible body in the grave and the enjoyment of incorruptibility, there were two physical processes to pass through; 1st restoration to a flesh and blood nature; second transformation into spirit nature. The former would not have taken place without the latter; and the latter could not be realized without the former. Between the two processes, Christ was free from condemnation for sin as Adam was before eating the forbidden fruit. "He that hath died is justified from sin" (Rom. vi. 7); consequently death could exercise "no more dominion over him" (ver 9). He could, at this stage, say, "I restored that which I took not away" (Ps. lxix. 4). But he differed from Adam, in that he had been tested by most severe temptation "in all points" (Heb. iv. 15), and had resisted. He had "loved righteousness and hated iniquity; *therefore* God . . . anointed him with the oil of gladness" (Heb. i. 9). Having been "brought again from the dead . . . through the blood of the everlasting covenant," he now, "by his own blood, entered into the holy place" (Heb. ix. 12). These two processes, though attributable to the same cause, are quite distinct; when he came out of the grave he was "justified from sin," though still flesh and blood; and he was immortalized as the result of that justification.

22.—JUSTIFICATION BY CHRIST'S BLOOD

Believing Gentiles, like Abraham, cannot be justified without sacrifice. Hence the Apostolic argument on Abraham's faith concludes with the declaration that Christ "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification" (Rom. iv. 25). From this fact the Apostle draws a conclusion:—"Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (ch. v. 1). And subsequently he uses the expression, "Being now justified by his blood" (ver. 9). The reference to Christ's "blood" shows that the justification took place at a specific time. When was that? When the Roman believers were brought into contact with Christ's blood by baptism into his death (Rom. vi. 4). From what did they need justification? From the "condemnation" arising out of "the offence of one" (Rom. v. 18), and from "those things" they had committed as "servants of sin" (Rom. vi. 20-21). Justification and condemnation are related to each other in the

same way as light and darkness; they cannot exist, in the same sense, and in respect to the same persons, at the same time. Neither can a man be justified from his own "wicked works" (Col. i. 21) without being at the same time justified from the wicked action of Adam: for if he were, his justification would be vitally defective; and inasmuch as he is never by any other ceremony brought into contact with Christ's blood, he would always remain unjustified from Adam's "offence," and as a consequence, would be forever "reigned" over by the "death" which is brought (Rom. v. 17). Moreover, Christ having been "raised again for our justification," it necessarily follows that a believer when raised out of the baptismal water symbolizing Christ's death, partakes of his justification. Christ was, by his shed blood, justified from the condemnation under which he was born: therefore those who are sprinkled with his blood (I Pet. i. 2) at baptism, are then justified from the same condemnation. That is, the Divine disfavour under which they were born and which continued until the time of entering the water, is then taken away. Hence all the passages in the New Testament which refer to the state of "grace" or favour into which brethren of Christ have been introduced, imply that they are no longer under the Divine disfavour arising out of Adam's offence.

In writing to the first century ecclesias the Apostles reminded believers of the favour which had been bestowed upon them in respect to physical as well as actual sin:—"Our old man was crucified with him" (Rom. vi. 6); "his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree" (I Pet. ii. 24); "you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened" (Col. ii. 13). Moses "sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry," and it was "necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these" (Heb. ix. 21-23). "Our old man" is sinful flesh, and as Christ by his death was justified therefrom it necessarily follows that those who are "crucified with him" participate in justification from the same. When Christ "bare our sins in his own body" he did not bare actual transgressions, but through the possession of "sin-in-the-flesh" he bare the "offence" of Adam, and by justification from "one man's offence" the foundation was laid for justification from "many offences" (Rom. v. 16). Those "offences" and "sin-in-the-flesh" are both the result of "the offence of one;" therefore when justification from the "one offence" takes place it is necessarily accompanied by justification from the inherited and individual sin of which it is the origin. The "dead" condition which precedes the quickening at baptism, arises from personal "sins and the uncircumcision of our flesh" (Col. ii. 13); if either of these causes of death remain unjustified, there can be no quickening; therefore the ceremony which justifies from the one justifies from the other. To all in Christ it is said, "ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified" (I Cor. vi. 11). From what are they washed? Like Saul, from their previous misdeeds:—"Arise and be baptised, and wash away thy sins" (Acts xxii. 16). From whom are they sanctified or separated? From all who are still "sinners" in Adam (Rom. v. 19). And from what are they justified? From the "offence" of Adam (Rom. v. 18). The "offence" of Adam is no longer, as it once was, imputed to them; the possession of "sinful flesh" is not any more a cause of Divine disfavour; and if they "walk after the spirit" (Rom. viii. 4) they cannot be condemned by Christ (ver. 34).

Justification from "sinful flesh" is not accompanied by its destruction; if it were, there could not be a probation; but its destruc-

tion is ensured if the justification be maintained. By what can it be suspended or terminated? Not by the sins committed before baptism; nor by the "offence" of Adam; but solely by sins committed after baptism. When once sins are forgiven through the blood of Christ, they are never again the subject of condemnation; and when once the blood of Christ has given justification from the "offence" of Adam, it cannot be re-imposed. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? Is it Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again?" (Rom. viii. 33-34). Neither; but a like condemnation will result from the commission of similar sins if not forgiven. "Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 Jno. iii. 4), and by that law it is condemned. This is legal condemnation; physical condemnation is the execution of the law. The "transgression" of Adam was, in Eden, the subject of legal condemnation; and it was the subject of physical condemnation when "sin-in-the-flesh" was "condemned" on the cross (Rom. viii. 3), but in circumstances which ensured its removal. When believers are baptised into the death of Christ they partake, by a symbol of the condemnation inflicted on him, and of the justification which immediately followed. What is the effect of this? That they are freed from "condemnation" for the "offence" of Adam, in its legal aspect. This is the meaning of the Apostolic statement that "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 1). The remaining clause of this verse, "who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit" is omitted from the Revised Version, because not found in the Sinaitic and Alexandrian manuscripts. This omission is in harmony with the Apostolic argument; for after making the statement Paul gives his reason, and the essence of that reason is, that God "condemned sin-in-the-flesh" of his own Son. The nature of the condemnation which Christ underwent defines the condemnation from which his brethren are now free; it is the condemnation existing prior to baptism, viz., "condemnation" for "the offence" of Adam (Rom. v. 18). They who were "made sinners by one man's disobedience" are then "made righteous by the obedience of one" (ver. 19). Previously the offence of Adam was imputed to them, but now through their faith, Christ's shed blood, and the water of baptism, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to them.

23.—THE LAW OF THE SPIRIT OF LIFE.

This law is founded upon, and, indeed, embodied in, the Edenic promise; it is the antithesis of "the law of sin and death," embodied in the Edenic commandment. These two laws operate at the same time, but not over the same area. All the human race are under "the law of sin and death," but only a limited portion come under "the law of the Spirit of life." "The end" of those who remain under the first law is to "perish" (Jno. iii. 16); but "the end" of those who come under the second law, and depart not from its requirements, is "everlasting life" (Rom. vi. 22). For four thousand years "the law of the Spirit of life" was identical with the Name of Salvation (Prov. xviii. 10), but when that "name" was "given" to God's beloved Son (Phil. ii. 9), it was embodied in him and became "the law of the Spirit of life, in Christ Jesus." Hence each one who is "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts ii. 38) can say with the Apostle "The law of the Spirit of life, in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2). With what effect? That all such cannot, either for the "one offence" of Adam, or for the "many offences" (Rom. v. 16) committed under

"the law of sin and death," perish. Does this ensure their entrance into "everlasting life"? Only by continued conformity with the requirements of "the law of the Spirit of life." If in this they fail, they will "perish;" not through the operation of the law under which they were born—from which they were once "made free"—but for violating the law under which they were placed by Divine favour.

"The law of sin and death" contains no provision for justification from sin, and consequently no element which counteracts the reign of death. All under it, are by birth, "children of wrath" (Eph. ii. 3); as long as they continue under it they are "dead in trespasses and sins" (ver. 1); everything they do is the offspring of sin, and is itself sin, for "the plowing of the wicked is sin" (Prov. xxi. 4); God is angry with them "every day" (Ps. vii. 11); and if they died while under "the law of sin and death," they die under the wrath of God, from which there is no escape.

"The law of the Spirit of life" is the only law which provides for justification from sin and consequently the only law which counteracts the reign of death. Only those therefore, who come under the operation of this law can escape the permanent reign of death. Does it prevent them from going into the death-state? No; but it provides for their resuscitation, and this places them in precisely the same position as they were before dying. Why do they die? As a consequence of "the law of sin and death," but not under its unrestricted operation; having been "made free" from that law it cannot retain its hold upon them; they must rise. Is their death a necessity? No; otherwise the last generation of those under "the law of the Spirit of life" could not escape going into the grave. If, as taught by the Apostacy, the place of reward had always been ready, and there had been a continuous judgment-seat, the faithful would never enter the grave, and the unfaithful would not die until condemned by the Judge. But inasmuch as the place of reward is not fully prepared, as the time of the judgment has not arrived, and as the faithful are to be all "glorified together" (Rom. viii. 17), they who come under "the law of the Spirit of life" and live not till its administrator arrives, simply "fall asleep in Christ" (1 Cor. xv. 18), to await the day of adjudication.

The justification from sin provided for by "the law of the Spirit of life" is due to the fact that God "condemned sin in the flesh" of "his own son" (Rom. viii. 3). The sacrificial death of a righteous one is the basis on which "the law of the Spirit of life" frees men from "the law of sin and death" and brings out of the grave those who pass from the operation of the one law to the operation of the other law. It is owing to "the grace of God" (Rom. v. 15) that such a sacrifice was provided, and therefore it is through "the grace of God" that any are allowed to come under the operation of "the law of the Spirit of life." But having once partaken of that "grace" they are under an obligation to which they were formerly strangers; they are henceforth required to "continue in the grace of God" (Acts. xiii. 43) and to "grow in grace" (2 Pet. iii. 18). If this be not done they "receive the grace of God in vain" (2 Cor. vi. 1), and incur the retribution arising, not out of "the law of sin and death," but out of "the law of the Spirit of life."

When God makes a law, whether as the result of His wisdom (Prov. viii. 29-31), His grace (Rom. v. 17), or "because of transgressions" (Gal. iii. 19), its enactments must be carried out; but only on those who are related to it. "What things soever the (Mosaic) law saith, it saith to them who are under the law" (Rom.

iii. 19). No Gentile unincorporated into Israel by circumcision could approach God by shadow, sacrifices and the Aaronic priesthood; the privileges and retribution of the Mosaic law were confined to the nation which, by blood-shedding, was just in shadow from the "offence" of Adam. In like manner the privileges and retribution of "the law of the Spirit of life" are confined to those who, by sacrifice, come under its operation. Consequently the tribunal which dispenses the reward and punishment pertaining to that law has no jurisdiction over those who have never been freed from "the law of sin and death."

"The law of sin and death" admits only of a life under condemnation, liable to be cut short at any moment. But the Mosaic law offered long life free from disease, after a shadow-justification from Adamic condemnation; and yet its retributions were confined to this life and were consummated in the grave. What does this teach? That as the punishments due to those under the Mosaic law are past, not future, so the punishments due to any under "the law of sin and death" are concluded when that law consigns them to the grave. Is there any obstacle to their being brought forth for future punishment? Yes. What is it? *Precisely the same obstacle which precludes any others from being brought forth to a future probation.* What is that? The fact that while living they were not justified from the "offence" of Adam and their own "wicked works," and that consequently when they died they were consigned by "the law of sin and death" to the endless "power of the grave" Psv. 49, 15-16).

Canst the anger of God against unjustified sinners set aside "the law of sin and death"? This question may be answered by asking another. Can the love of God set aside that law? This may be tested by the ordeal which Christ had to pass through. Speaking of the Mosaic law, he said, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled" (Matt. v. 18). Having been "made under the law" (Gal. iv. 4), and having been also "made a curse" under that law (Gal. iii. 13), he could not be redeemed therefrom without a violent death. And on the same principle, having been "made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4) descended from Adam, he could not be freed from the Edenic law without a violent death. He shrank from such a cup of bitterness, and prayed "earnestly" (Luke xxii. 41) no less than three times (Matt. xxvi. 44) that "if it be possible" God would spare him from it (ver. 39). But God's fidelity to "the law of sin and death" and to "the law of the Spirit of life" prevented compliance with the request. His love for Jesus Christ was greater than that which He has had for any member of the race, and yet He could not, even on this ground, be unfaithful to His own word by setting aside His own laws. Therefore He "spared not His own Son, but delivered him up for us all" (Rom. viii. 32). Divine anger is not more powerful than Divine love; that which the latter was unable to accomplish, the former is powerless to effect. God having decreed that all who remain under "the law of sin and death" shall, for the sin pertaining to that law, "perish," it necessarily follows that when they pass into the grave that law has taken effect on them, and that not having been freed from that law, they must, in the grave, remain forever.

24.—OUT OF ADAM INTO CHRIST

When does this take place? At baptism. In what sense do believers then pass out of Adam? In the same sense that they

pass into Christ. Is it accompanied by any physical change? No; the change is one of relationship; Adam ceases to be the federal head of baptised believers, and Christ takes his place. What is the immediate effect of this? That the righteousness of Christ is imputed to them instead of the "disobedience" of Adam; whereby they cease to be accounted "dead" (2 Cor. v. 14) and are made "heirs according to the hope of eternal life" (Titus iii. 7). What is the effect in relation to the future? That death, as the result of Adam's "disobedience" cannot prevail over them. "By man came death" (1 Cor. xv. 21). How? "Through the offence of one" (Rom. v. 15). When, therefore, the relationship of any toward that "offence" is altered their relationship towards its consequence is altered. In what way? By keeping them from entering the grave? Not necessarily; but, should they enter, by bringing them out.

"By man came also resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. xv. 21). How? By "dying unto sin" (Rom. vi. 10) at the close of an obedient life. To whom does "the resurrection" apply? To those who have "made a covenant with God by sacrifice" (Ps. l. 5), which includes all who have been "buried with Christ by baptism into death" (Rom. vi. 4). It is of such that Christ refers when he says, "The gates of hades shall not prevail against my church" (Matt. xvi. 18). The "church," ecclesia or called out assembly, is composed, not only of the "few chosen," but of the "many called" (Matt. xx. 16). "Against" none of these will "the gates of hades prevail;" for Christ will use "the keys of hades" (Rev. i. 18) to release them from the grave, because, as "the church of God he hath purchased" them "with his own blood" (Acts xx. 28). But against those who, since the establishment of his "church," have not entered therein "the gates of hades" will prevail.

Christ's resurrection was the result of justification from inherited sin, and the resurrection of his "church" is the result of justification from inherited sin and individual "wicked works" (Col. i. 21), whether its members are subsequently faithful or unfaithful. But, did not the resurrection of Christ include immortalization? It was followed by the bestowal of immortality, but the two events were quite distinct. The principle which precludes his being clean when born of an unclean woman applies to his coming forth from the grave. Corruption cannot beget incorruption. The immortal "house not made with hands" comes, not from the earth, but "from heaven" (2 Cor. v. 1-2). The faithful exist as "corruptible," not corruption, when they "put on incorruption" (1 Cor. xv. 53); and therefore Christ as their "forerunner" must have occupied an analogous position. The distinction between resurrection and immortalization is shown by Christ's declaration, "I am the resurrection and the life" (Jno. xi. 25). To make the word "resurrection" here to mean immortalization, would reduce the passage to an absurdity; it would represent Christ as saying, "I am the immortality and the immortality." Christ is "the resurrection" to all who enter the Name of Salvation, the "many called" who constitute his "church," but he will be "the life" only to the "few chosen" who keep God's word (Rev. iii. 10).

"In Adam all die" (1 Cor. xv. 22). Who are they? Those who have not been transferred out of Adam into Christ. Does it not also apply to those in Christ? No; because, when they entered Christ, they passed out of Adam; that is to say, they ceased to be "sinners" in Adam, and were "made righteous" in Christ (Rom. v. 19). They were then "born from above" (Jno. iii. 3), and be-

came "Sons of God" (1 Jno. iii. 1). Although, therefore they die as the result of Adam's sin they do not die in Adam; if they did, they would become dead in Adam; they would, in that case have died "in their sins," and as a consequence would have "perished" (1 Cor. xv. 17-18). But having been "washed" and "justified" (1 Cor. vi. 11) from their sins in Adam, they die in Christ, and hence, while in the grave are "dead in Christ" (1 Thess. iv. 16); and because Christ rose, they will rise. He rose "through the blood of the covenant," and they will rise through the same:—"By the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water" (Zech. ix. 11).

"In Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22). Is this "all" identical with the "all" who die in Adam? No; it is a totally different class. The statement is a contrast, in regard, not only to Adam and Christ, but also to those who are respectively in these two federal heads. The one brings death, and the other brings restoration from death. Does not "made alive" mean immortalize? No; it is synonymous with "resurrection from the dead" in the preceding verse. But is not the word "resurrection" used for immortalize? Not as a rule; only as an exception such as Phil. iii. 10. May it not have the exceptional meaning in the passage under consideration? No; because that meaning is not the point in dispute. The Apostolic argument arises out of the denial by some, of the 'resurrection of the dead' (1 Cor. xv. 12). What was denied? The restoration of the dead to life; and it was to refute this, that the Apostle wrote what immediately follows. His argument on this point continues until the end of verse 22, and then he passes from reasoning to affirmation. To say that the term "resurrection" in verse 21 means immortalize is to represent the Apostle as not dealing with the specific point in dispute, viz., whether or not the dead could and would be brought to life.

25.—WALKING IN THE LIGHT

Writing to "Sons of God" (1 Jno. iii. 1) in the first century, the Apostle says, "If we walk in the light . . . the blood of Jesus Christ, his son, cleanseth from all sin" (1 Jno. i. 7). To "walk in the light" is to conform to the Truth in its doctrinal and practical aspects. On this depends cleansing from sin. What sin? Sin committed after baptism. In what way? By confession thereof; "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." To whom must the confession be made? To God. Through whom? Through Christ in his capacity as a "high priest" (Heb. iv. 15). On what basis is the forgiveness granted? On the fact that Christ "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. ix. 26); sins committed after baptism are forgiven through his shed blood. Are they forgiven without such confession? No; the condition is "if we confess our sins." To omit such confession is one way in which to "walk in darkness," and they who do this are excluded from sin-cleansing. Confession of sins committed during probation is equivalent to baptism for purification from the "wicked works" (Col. i. 21) preceding probation; it occupies the same position in the present dispensation as the offering of an animal sacrifice, prior to the Crucifixion. It is true that Jesus Christ "offered one sacrifice for sins forever" (Heb. x. 12), but that sacrifice is of no avail unless applied individually in the appointed way. It will not cleanse from "wicked works," committed during a state of darkness, without "baptism into" that sacrificial "death," (Rom. vi. 4); and neither

will it cleanse from sins committed after baptism without being made use of by confession, through Christ. Would confession cleanse from "wicked works" while in a state of darkness? No; because in that condition there is no high priest to present the confession; and furthermore, such confession would be futile, because not preceded by justification from the "offence" of Adam. A recognition of the "condemnation" pronounced 'upon all men' for "one man's disobedience" (Rom. v. 18-19), and conformity to God's method of justification therefrom, is an indispensable preliminary to "fellowship with him" (1 Jno. i. 6). The "offence" of Adam, having produced a breach between God and all men, that breach must individually be healed before a probation for eternal life can commence. By the healing of the breach they who "were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ;" they can say "he is our peace" (Eph. ii. 13-14), and "We have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 1).

Does walking in the light justify from the "offence" of Adam? No; justification from "one man's offence" is as much a "free gift" as is justification from the "many offences" of those who "put on Christ" by baptism (Gal. iii. 27). Is not this justification conditional—that is, dependent on conformity with subsequent conditions? No; it is complete in its legal aspect when a believer rises—out of the baptismal water; and if he maintain that justified state by walking in the light to the end of his probation, bestowal of immortality is a certainty. Is not this equivalent to saying that the justification at baptism is provisional? No; because probationary unfaithfulness cannot re-impose the condemnation for "one man's offence" or for the "many offences" preceding baptism; but it can, and will, bring a new and individual condemnation. The unfaithful will be condemned at the day of judgment solely for their own conduct. The "peace with God" which results from justification at baptism is provisional, because liable to be interrupted or terminated by subsequent sins; but the justification which is the foundation for that "peace" is not provisional; it is as regards the offences to which it applies, complete. "Ye are complete in Him" (1. e. Christ, Col. ii. 10).

26.—THE LORD OF DEAD AND LIVING

When Jesus Christ said, "I am the Resurrection and the Life" (Jno. xi. 25), he announced in effect that resurrection and immortality come only through him. He is the giver of eternal life as the result of his own "obedience;" for thereby "he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him" (Heb. v. 8-9). His "obedience" was completed by "the death of the Cross" (Phil. ii. 8); therefore his position as a life-giver is based on his sacrificial death. But he cannot give life to those who are dead unless they are previously raised from the dead. Consequently it is necessary for him to be "the Resurrection" in order to fulfill his position as "the Life." On what basis has he been appointed "the Resurrection"? Is it not the same as that on which he has been appointed "the Life," viz., "obedience unto death" (Phil. ii. 8)? This is obvious. On what basis, then, does he exercise the power pertaining to this two-fold appointment? He bestows "the Life" on those only who "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. vii. 14). The greater portion of these are dead; on what principle are they raised? Because of their relationship to Christ. How is that described? As "Lord both of the dead and living." It was "to this

end," that is, to attain this position, that "Christ both died, and rose, and revived" (Rom. xiv. 9). Who are "the dead and living" of whom he is "Lord"? Those who are in the position to "live unto the Lord," or to "die unto the Lord" (ver. 8). How do they attain to that position? In the same way as the Roman believers, viz. "by being baptised into his death" (Rom. vi. 3). Only such can say "We are the Lord's" (Rom. xiv. 8); and therefore only of such is Christ "the Lord." Does this apply to baptized believers whether they prove faithful or unfaithful? Yes; for even if they go to the length of "denying the Lord" it does not nullify the fact that he had previously "bought them" (2 Pet. ii. 1). No amount of unfaithfulness can set aside the fact that at baptism they were "bought with a price" (1 Cor. vi. 20), even with "the precious blood of Christ" (1 Pet. i. 19). It is on this ground that he raises those who are his, in order that he may test whether they have "lived unto themselves" or "unto him which died for them and rose again" (2 Cor. v. 15).

Do these testimonies imply that Christ is not "the Lord" of any of the dead, who have not been "bought" by his blood? Certainly; and, as a consequence, that he will not raise any of them. Would not this exclude those who lived previous to the Crucifixion? No; for those who had been introduced into "the Name" (Phil. ii. 9) of Salvation, were given to him when that "name" was "given him." To these he refers when he says, "This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day" (Jno. vi. 39). All of the dead have not been "given" to Christ; otherwise he would "raise" them; and that would involve universal resurrection. But all who have been "given" to him he will raise; and he will raise them on the same principle that he was raised, viz., "through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. xiii. 20).

27.—"WE SHALL NOT ALL SLEEP"

The prediction that the faithful who "are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord" (1 Thess. iv. 15) will never "sleep in the dust of the earth" is something more than a matter of interest; it presents a problem, the solution of which exhibits a doctrinal truth. The problem is this:—How can brethren of Christ pass from this life to the next without entering the grave? Are they treated on a principle different from that which is applied to their brethren who go into the grave? Is death necessary for salvation in the one case and not in the other? If it is, there are two ways of salvation, not one. The "dead in Christ" and the "alive" in Christ were both born under condemnation for Adam's "offence." How is it taken away in each case? Do the "dead in Christ," by sleeping in the dust, purge themselves from that "condemnation"? If so, the "alive" in Christ require to be purged in the same way; but, inasmuch as they never "sleep in Jesus," it is obvious that such a "sleep" is not for them a necessity, and if not necessary for them it cannot accomplish anything for the "dead in Christ." The only death which can take away condemnation in Adam is the death of Christ; every other death is powerless for this purpose. And to represent an abode in the grave as contributing towards the removal of Adam's condemnation is to rob Christ of an important portion of the work He has accomplished. The penalty due to sin is a violent death, and therefore the taking away of sin requires a violent death. Moreover, it must be a violent death inflicted by

God on one who is himself perfectly righteous; and these conditions can only be found in the person of Christ. Some of the "dead in Christ" have died a violent death, but they were not free from personal transgression, and therefore their death was of no avail as a sacrifice for sin. The bulk of the "dead in Christ" have died by physical decay; but such a death could avail them nothing, and in addition to this, not one of them was perfectly righteous. There is no death since the introduction of sin which can take away "the offence of one" and the "many offences" of others (Rom. v. 15-16), but "the death of the Cross."

When the brethren of Christ "alive" at His appearing are conveyed to the Judgment-seat their probation is at an end; Christ has ceased to be their high-priest and becomes their judge. It will then be said of them, "He that is unjust let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still" (Rev. xxii. 11). At this stage there will be "no more sacrifice for sins" (Heb. x. 26) for either class. The righteous will not require it; for, having "walked in the light" during probation they confessed their sins, and from these they were cleansed by the intercession of Christ on the basis of His shed blood (1 Jno. i. 7-9; ii. 1). Do they at this time require to be "justified" from the "offence" of Adam, or to be "washed" from their "wicked works" prior to probation? If so, there are no means by which to be cleansed from these defilements, and as "there shall in no wise enter into" the holy city "any thing that defileth" (Rev. xxi. 27), they could not, in that case, receive eternal life. Such a catastrophe is, however, impossible; they who are pronounced "righteous" and "holy" in character at the judgment-seat were "made righteous" (Rom. v. 19) when they rose out of the baptismal water; and having, "by patient continuance in well doing" (Rom. ii. 7) and forgiveness of probationary sin, "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. vii. 14) they are free from any obstacle to the bestowal of eternal life. On this basis the Judge decrees that "they have right to the tree of life" and to "enter in through the gates into the city" (Rev. xxii. 14).

The principle on which the faithful who are "alive," escape going into the grave, is identical with the principle on which "the dead in Christ" are brought out of it viz., justification, by the sacrifice of Christ, from "offence" of Adam. This is equally true of faithful and unfaithful; for until the judgment-seat, the "dead in Christ" are not divided into these two classes: they are all raised, therefore, on the same principle. Like Christ, they are "brought again from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. xiii. 20). The relationship existing between resurrection and justification is parallel to that between death and sin. As death results from sin, so resurrection is the consequence of a justification for that sin. Hence *those who have never been justified are retained in the bondage of death*; but those who die after justification are, by resurrection, replaced in the position they occupied immediately before death; and thus they are put on precisely the same level as the justified ones who "are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord" (1 Thess. iv. 15).

28.—THE JUDGMENT-SEAT SUMMONS

Writing of the time when God will "judge His people" (Ps. l. 4), the Spirit in the Psalmist says: "Gather my saints together" unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice"

(ver. 5). For whom is this command intended? For the "angels" who, says Christ, "shall gather together His (the Son of Man's) elect from one end of heaven to the other" (Matt. xxiv. 31). Why is it recorded so long before it is required? Not merely to inform the "angels." It must be for the enlightenment of those who come within the scope of its operation. Who are they? They are described by God as "My saints." How are they constituted "saints"? By sanctification, or separation from the world of sin. Can they be so separated without justification from that sin? No; the Corinthians who "believed on the Lord" (Acts xviii. 8) were "sanctified" at the same time that they were "washed" and "justified" (1 Cor. vi. 11); they underwent this three-fold change when they "were baptized" (Acts xviii. 8). Being then "sanctified in Christ Jesus," they were "called saints" (1 Cor. i. 2). From that time they were no longer their "own" but "God's" (1 Cor. vi. 19-20). Some of them, it is true subsequently "defiled the temple of God" (1 Cor. iii. 17; v. 1,2), and thereby interrupted or terminated their reconciliation with God, as shown by the exhortation, "Be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. v. 20); but this defilement did not make void the fact that they had been "washed" and "justified" from the sins to which they were related prior to baptism; if it had, they would again have had to go through this ceremony in order to be once more "reconciled to God." All that was needed on their part was to forsake their evil-doing and ask forgiveness through Christ. Having been "purchased" by God "with the blood of His own (Son)" (Acts xx. 28), they had entered upon a relationship which cannot be finally severed on the one hand, or consummated on the other, until God, by that same Son (Jno. v. 22), will "judge His people."

The "saints" whom the "angels" are instructed to 'gather' are defined to be those who "make a covenant with God by sacrifice," not those merely who have *kept* the covenant. Consequently the gathering comprises both faithful and unfaithful. To represent the command to "gather" as specifying only the faithful, is at variance with the expression, "made a covenant;" and furthermore it attributes to the "angels" that which "the Father" has expressly "committed unto the Son" (Jno. v. 22), viz., the work of discriminating between those who have, and those who have not, kept the covenant. This task is not assigned to the angels by the Spirit; they are required to discriminate only between those who have "made a covenant with God by sacrifice" and those who have not.

Do the terms of the command admit of any being gathered to judgment who have not "made a covenant with God by sacrifice"? No: the "angels" perform God's will perfectly (Matt. vi. 10); they neither add to, nor diminish, His mandates; they will gather all who have "made a covenant with God by sacrifice," *but none others*. None outside the covenant are required; for the judgment-seat arises out of the covenant; it is for the purpose of receiving an "account" (Rom. xiv. 12) from those who have made a vow to God and been constituted "stewards of the manifold grace of God" (1 Pet. iv. 10). At such a gathering as this, those outside the covenant have no place; they have no stewardship of which to "give account;" whatever punishment they are to receive will be inflicted without the ordeal of a judgment-seat. Many have suffered retribution in time past, and many more will do so at the epoch of the gathering of the saints; but in their case the retribution is inflicted in this life; being related only to "the law of sin and death" they do not come within the scope of resurrection which is related to the administration of 'the law of the spirit of life.'

29.—THE SECOND DEATH

This expression is only to be found in the last book of the Bible; but this is no proof that the death which it describes is not previously mentioned. The phrase is first used in writing to the seven churches:—"He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death" (Rev. ii. 11), the converse of which is, that he who does not "overcome" shall be so "hurt." What class is represented by the "he"? Those only who have entered upon a "race" (1 Cor. ix. 24) or warfare (2 Tim. ii. 3-5); only such, therefore, as fail in this conflict can undergo "the second death;" it is not threatened against those who never commence the race, and therefore is not applicable to them.

Why is the word "second" made use of? This is a problem given to God's "servants" (Rev. i. 1) to solve; and the only way to obtain a solution is by "comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (1 Cor. ii. 13). A second cannot exist without a first. Is there such an expression as *the first death to be found anywhere?* No; but the thing itself is frequently mentioned: "death by sin" (Rom. v. 12) "By man came death" (1 Cor. xv. 21). What man? "The first man" who was "of the earth, earthy" (1 Cor. xv. 47).

"The second man is the Lord from heaven" (1 Cor. xv. 47). Is there a death to which he is related? Yes; though in a different way from that of "the first man." It is a death which "the second man" inflicts on others for their own sins. Who are they? Some of those who constituted "the second man" in his multitudinous aspect. Can they suffer "the second death" without having previously passed through the first death? No; it would not, in that case, be to them "the second death." Then how can the unfaithful "alive" at Christ's coming suffer "the second death?" By reason of the fact that they died when they were "buried with Christ by baptism into death" (Rom. vi. 4). The death incurred by Adam and inflicted on Christ being a violent death, it necessarily follows that Christ, when "sin in" his "flesh" was "condemned" (Rom. viii. 3), suffered the first death in its most acute form. When, therefore, believers are baptized into that death they die in symbol the first death and so fulfil, in conjunction with Christ, all that is necessary to carry out on them the Edenic law. This suffices to free them from the condemnation of that law, and hence "the second death" is inflicted on the unfaithful solely for their conduct since they were freed from the condemnation which brought the first death; as Christ was condemned to a violent death for inherited sin, so they are condemned to a violent death for personal sin. But here the parallel ends. Christ's individual righteousness was the means of releasing him from the power of the first death, but there is no provision for releasing the unfaithful from the power of "the second death;" being devoid of personal righteousness they are in the position of those who have "counted the blood of the covenant where-with" they were "sanctified"—and also "washed" and "justified" (1 Cor. vi. 11)—"an unholy thing," and there is nothing left for them "but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour" them (Heb. x. 26, 27). Hence the destruction resulting from "the second death" is unending. It places them in precisely the same position when devoured as the Edenic law places those who without justification, die under it; both classes die in their sins and therefore "perish;" there is no provision for the resurrection of either the one or the other; death is in each case a finality.

Cannot those who remain in Adam suffer "the second death"?

No; because they have never been released from the power of the first death. No one could die under the Mosaic curse unless justified by a shadow ceremony from Adamic condemnation; and on the same principle, no one can die "the second death" unless justified from the "offence" which brought the first death. Then why is it said that "the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death" (Rev. xxi. 8)? Does not this category describe sinners in Adam? No, it describes unfaithful in Christ, as shown by the contrast between this verse and the preceding one. "He that overcometh shall inherit all things But the fearful and unbelieving, &c." One class overcomes; the other class does *not* overcome. The former "inherit all things"; but the latter "have their part in the lake" of fire: having brought forth "the works of the flesh" (Gal. v. 19-21), after being justified from "sin-in-the-flesh" as a matter of possession, they experience what a "fearful thing" it is "to fall into the hands of the living God" (Heb. x. 31), and then "of the flesh" they "reap corruption" (Gal. vi. 8). Are not the unfaithful consumed in the "everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. xxv. 41)? Yes; does not this prove that the slanderer and his messengers suffer "the second death" as well as the unfaithful? No; though they die at the same time and in the same way it is not "the second death" to both classes. Why not? Because the term "second death" implies a first death; from which death "the devil and his angels" have not been freed. The consuming of the slanderer and his messengers is, indeed, one form of inflicting the first death; the same fire inflicts that death from which each class has not been freed, viz., the first death on those in Adam and "the second death" on those who were once transferred out of Adam into Christ. But is not "the lake of fire" defined to be "the second death" (Rev. xx. 14)? No; that expression is elliptical; a fire cannot produce death unless something living be consigned to it. It is in reference to the death of those whose names Christ will "blot out of the book of life" (Rev. iii. 5; xx. 15) that the statement in question is made; and it is equivalent to saying, "This [death] is the second death." "The lake of fire" consists of the nations in a state of warfare, and subject to other Divine judgments; into this the unfaithful are cast to suffer their "stripes" and then die a violent death. It is "their part," not the lake of fire, "which is the second death" (Rev. xxi. 8).

Are not the sins of the unfaithful in Christ as effective to lock the gates of the grave as the sins of unjustified Gentiles? No; these two classes are in an entirely different position. Unjustified Gentiles were condemned in Eden, and when they die under that condemnation their eternal doom is sealed. But the sins of the unfaithful in Christ have not yet been the subject of condemnation; therefore they must rise. If they did not, their judgment would be anticipated, and the judgment-seat of Christ would thereby be made void. When they arrive at that judgment-seat they are free from condemnation for Adam's "offence," and without any Divine verdict on their probationary conduct. For the latter alone they will be condemned and their sins will then be as effective to keep them in the grave as in condemnation in Adam to prevent the resurrection of unjustified Gentiles.

Cannot sinners in Adam still under condemnation for the Edenic offence be brought from the dead to be punished for their

own misdeeds? No; such a proceeding would be *equivalent to slaying the slain*; it would be condemning to death men already doomed to death. Is a work of supererogation such as this compatible with the dignity and equity of Divine Majesty?

But will not condemnation at the judgment-seat produce suffering in the flesh? It will; "weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. viii. 12). Is it not, then, solely for such suffering that the unfaithful are brought before it? No; whatever suffering may be inflicted on sinners, the climax is death—death on sinners in Adam now, and "the second death" on the unfaithful in Christ at the judgment-seat. The misdeeds of all who die in Adam are known to God; and if He think well to visit them with tribulation in this life He can and will do so. But if He allow them to pass into the death to which His own law has condemned them, without any tribulation, no one has a right to demur.

30.—IMMORTALIZATION

Jesus Christ was changed to spirit-nature (Rom. i. 4) when, "by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place" (Heb. ix. 12; for the most holy which was beyond "the veil, that is to say, his flesh" (Heb. x. 20), represented spirit-life. He was, therefore, immortalized as the result of justification "by his own blood" from the Adamic condemnation and the Mosaic curse. His brethren, if faithful, are to be made "like him" (1 Jno. iii. 2) on the same basis. They are related to his blood from the commencement to the close of their probation. When washed in the laver of regeneration (Tit. iii. 5), they are sprinkled with that blood from the altar of burnt offering (1 Pet. i. 2; Exod. xxix. 21; Heb. xiii. 10); at the same time some of that blood is put upon their "right ear," the "thumb of their right hand," and the "great toe of their right foot" (Exod. xxix. 20), to show that henceforth they must heed only holy words, perform only holy acts, and walk only in holy ways; and they are clothed with priestly garments (Exod. xxix. 8-11) to enable them to enter, and officiate in, the holy place. When they sin, the horns of the altar of incense have to be touched with the blood of the sin-offering (Lev. iv. 7), and their incense, when offered, must be consumed by fire taken from the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. xvi. 12, 13).

As priests in the holy place, the brethren of Christ are on probation to test their worthiness to be incorporated, by identity of nature, with their great high priest in the most holy place. When he reveals himself from behind the veil, he will be the manifestation of God in spirit, and they will stand in the Divine presence. Whatever their character they will still be, in a legal sense, within the confines of the holy place, and not until the record of their priestly career has been made known, will the decree be given to expel the unfaithful, and to authorize the faithful to pass beyond the veil into the most holy. To enable the latter thus to ascend, they must be made "incorruptible" by "the body of their humiliation" being "conformed to the body of Christ's glory" (Phil. iii. 21), "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" (1 Cor. xv. 52). This consummation is the result of justification on entering the holy place, on the maintenance of that justified condition during their sojourn therein, and on the decree of justification pronounced by their judge. Without justification from all sin to which they were previously related, they could not enter the holy place, and without justification from all sin subsequently committed they cannot enter the most holy.

The foundation and object of the foregoing mixed assembly define the position of those who will constitute it. No provision is made for the inclusion of any who have not been the subjects of a justification by sacrifice; they cannot enter the holy place even to receive condemnation, and they who are already in it cannot come out to be associated during judgment with those who have never been reconciled to God. The occupants of the holy place having been forbidden during probation to ally themselves with any who are without, it would be at variance with Divine principles for these two classes to be brought before the same judicial tribunal. Does this imply that there is no judgment for those outside the holy place? No; but it implies that they are not related to the tribunal which arises out of "the law of the spirit of life."

Under the Mosaic law there was "a remembrance again made of sins every year" (Heb. x. 3). Hence the special ceremonies provided for the annual Day of Atonement. On this day alone the Aaronic high priest went into the most holy place and appeared before the Divine Presence. For this purpose he had to offer "an atonement for himself and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel" (Lev. xvi. 17), and be clothed with "holy garments" (ver. 4); he could not appear there without a covering for sin for himself and for those whom he represented. What did he take with him? A censer containing incense and some of the blood of the slain animal (ver. 13-14); that is to say, he prayed for forgiveness on the basis of sacrifice. On the answer given depended the continuance or the termination of the life of those he represented; it was therefore a verdict of acceptance or rejection for such only as had availed themselves of blood-shedding for a justification from sin.

This verdict was a type of the decision to be given by Christ on his judgment-seat. Hence the same principles are applicable to the one as to the other, viz., the adoption of a covering for sin by those who appear before the Divine Presence. They who are without such a covering have no place there; they are in a *naked condition*, and under the condemnation pertaining to "the law of sin and death." They have, therefore, no place at a tribunal specially constituted to administer "the law of the spirit of life." They are in the same position in relation to Israel after the spirit as that of the Gentile nations in relation to fleshly Israel under the Mosaic law. No Gentile, unless incorporated with Israel, was represented by Aaron when he appeared before the Divine Presence, and therefore no Gentile was affected by the verdict brought forth by the high priest.

31.—RECAPITULATION

The following are the principal truths demonstrated in the foregoing pages:—

First.—That through the "offence" of Adam all men are born under "the law of sin and death," by which they are condemned to death.

Second.—That all men partake of that "offence" by inheriting its consequence, "sin in the flesh"; and that therefore they need individual justification therefrom.

Third.—That in the absence of such justification they cannot be freed from condemnation for Adam's "offence," and that consequently when they die they "perish."

Fourth.—That the penalty due for sin under the Edenic, and

subsequent, dispensations is a violent death, and that for this reason Christ, who had to undergo that penalty, suffered a violent death.

Fifth.—That Christ's death and resurrection was the only effective justification from sin, and that consequently none can be justified from Adamic condemnation unless brought into association with Christ's death by a ceremony related thereto.

Sixth.—That animal sacrifice, circumcision and baptism, being representations of Christ's death, have been appointed, in conjunction with that death, as a means of justification from previous sin.

Seventh.—That this principle of justification has been embodied in "the law of the spirit of life."

Eighth.—That as sin brings death, justification from that sin brings deliverance from death; and that consequently death and resurrection take place through the operation of their respective laws.

Ninth.—That Christ, who is the embodiment of "the law of the spirit of life," experienced and brought resurrection through justification from sin and that consequently those who partake of his justification, by dying in him, will be brought out of the grave.

Tenth.—That those who do not partake of Christ's justification, never come under the operation of "the law of the spirit of life"; and that, as a consequence, Adamic death in relation to them never comes to an end.

Eleventh.—That the object of resurrection to the judgment-seat of Christ is for the administration of "the law of the spirit of life."

Twelfth.—That although justification from the offence of Adam and from previous wicked works gives resurrection to those who before death came under "the law of the spirit of life" it does not ensure the bestowal of immortality.

Thirteenth. — That those only will be immortalized who have maintained their justification by walking in the light and obtaining forgiveness through the blood of Christ.

Fourteenth.—That those who do not maintain their justification will, for their subsequent sins, be condemned to a violent death.

Fifteenth.—That the faithful who are alive when Christ comes will escape entering the grave, by virtue of justification at the commencement of their probation.

32.—OBJECTIONS

In opposition to the conclusions which have been recapitulated, a number of objections are adduced, of which the foremost relates to—

A.—*Historical raising of the dead*—Because Elijah and Elisha raised men who had not been justified from sin, it is contended that any number who have died without such justification can likewise be raised. Yes, for the same object, but not for one totally different. What was that object? To attest the word of God spoken by the prophets, and to strengthen the faith of some. It was therefore, for an object outside themselves, not one to which they alone were related; they died again under precisely the same conditions as those under which they first died; that is, they were re-consigned to the grave, not because of a condemnation pronounced after coming out but because of the condemnation under

which they were born. Their restoration to life did not terminate the death imposed for Adam's "offence"; it merely suspended the operation of that death. Moreover, they were not raised as the result of a promise, or on the basis of a Divine law; their restoration to life was a special exercise of Divine power, unconnected with any preceding conditions imposed upon them. These features are sufficient to show that their case furnishes no illustration of the principle on which "the just and unjust" in Christ will be raised, and that consequently it does not prove the resurrection to punishment of any who have died in Adam.

When a convict is brought into a British court of law as a witness, the process by which he temporarily comes out of prison is very different from that required to release him before his term of imprisonment expires. In the latter case, there must be a remission of the sentence, but not in the former. Thus is it with the raising of the dead; an unjustified Gentile may be restored to life to testify to the power of God, but this is no proof that he could, on the same principle, be raised from death in Adam to undergo "the second death". neither is it an illustration of the principle on which justified Gentiles will be raised to a judgment-seat based upon "the law of the spirit of life."

The dead in Christ are raised for the administration of "the law of the spirit of life," which gives a blessing to the faithful and retribution to the unfaithful. Before coming under that law, they were freed from the power of "the law of sin and death" by justification from that which brought it into operation. The dead in Adam have not been brought under "the law of the spirit of life" and therefore they are not amenable to its retribution. They have never been freed from "the law of sin and death," and therefore the death on which they have entered is endless. To bring them out of the grave for further punishment would be to terminate one endless death for the purpose of inflicting upon them another—an anomaly not to be found in prospective Divine procedure.

Cannot God raise anyone, and for any purpose? No; because to do so would stultify His own word. God has chosen to regulate His action in regard to death and resurrection by law. He has decreed that death must follow sin, and that such death can only be terminated or averted by justification from the sin which caused it. The endless subjection to death of unjustified sinners is essential to the fulfillment of "the law of sin and death"; and, on the other hand, the deliverance from the grave of those who have died after being justified—whether faithful or unfaithful—is equally necessary to the fulfillment of "the law of the spirit of life." To stop the operation of "the law of sin and death" without justification from sin for the purpose of applying a feature confined to the law of the spirit of life," would introduce confusion, and be a violation of justice; it would also destroy the distinction between two laws of an antagonistic character.

God has shown, both by word and deed, that strict adherence to His own laws is a supreme feature of His character. The need for this is obvious in view of the first requisite for His approval: "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6). To produce and strengthen faith God has appealed to His past actions; the precision with which He has already fulfilled promises and executed laws is referred to as the basis for confidence in that portion of His word pertaining to the future. Having promised a blessing on specified conditions under "the law of the spirit of life," He cannot, consistently with His own character, withhold such bless-

ing where the conditions are fulfilled; neither can He consistently give the blessing to any who never come under the law. And in like manner, having decreed that men who live and die under "the law of sin and death" are "perished," He cannot consistently with that decree terminate the reign of "the law of sin and death" without justification from the sin which incurred the condemnation of that law. Faithfulness to His word is equally at stake in the one case as in the other. Only those who were under the Mosaic law suffered the Mosaic curse, and, in like manner, only those who have come under "the law of the spirit of life" can suffer its condemnation.

If the condemnation relating to the judgment-seat of Christ had a different ending from that of condemnation in Adam, the impossibility of inflicting both on unjustified sinners would be apparent. That is, supposing condemnation by Christ were to result in endless life in misery, no argument would be needed to show that this was incompatible with endless death in Adam. But the fact that it is endless death in both cases does not destroy the distinction. If a man who has died in Adam were to be raised and condemned to an endless death for his own offenses, it is obvious that the death imposed on him for Adams' "offence" would have come to an end. In other words, he would be redeemed from death in Adam without the blood of Christ; justification in that case would be set on one side. If this can be done for punishment, why not for probation? And if for punishment and probation, why not for reward? And if the first death can come to an end without justification, why not "the second death?" These questions are but the logical outcome of a position which, under a mistaken impression, sets aside the only means provided for release from condemnation in Adam. The men brought to life by Elijah and Elisha were not thereby released from that condemnation; Adamic death in their case did not come to an end; the principle of justification was not violated; and therefore such instances do not constitute a precedent for raising to an individual condemnation such as have not been freed from condemnation in Adam.

3.—*Rejection of Christ.*—The words of Jesus Christ in Jno. iii 18 19 and xii. 47, 48, teach, it is said, that those who have rejected him will be condemned at his judgment-seat. Within the limits of their application this is true. What are those limits? The generation of Jews then living. "This is the condemnation," said Christ, "that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light." What "world?" The Jewish "world" to which Jesus 'came,' in which he lived, and which "knew him not" (Jno. i. 10, 11); this was a world of "darkness" and Christ was the "light" which shone in it, but "the darkness comprehended it not" (ver. 5). Why did not the inhabitants of this world "comprehend" the light? "Because their deeds were evil" (Jno. iii. 19); and "their deeds were evil" because they believed and obeyed "not Moses and the Prophets" (Luke xvi. 31). "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me," said Christ; "if ye believe not his writings how shall ye believe my words?" (Jno. v. 46 47). What was their relationship to the writings of Moses? That of custodians; a chief "profit" of "circumcision" was, that "unto them were committed the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 1); they had to be justified, in shadow, from inherited condemnation, and thereby constituted "the holy seed" (Ezra ix. 2) in order to become the depositories of "the holy scriptures" (2 Tim. iii. 15). This privileged position imposed upon them a corresponding obligation; they required to believe and de-

find all that was contained in those "scriptures." If this position of privilege and responsibility had been fully realized in the Jewish "world" to which Christ "came," it would have contained no darkness," and would gladly have accepted the further "light" which he brought. But not having understood all that Moses wrote it could not comprehend what Christ spoke; hence it charged him with 'blasphemy' and denied that he was "the Son of God" (Jno. x. 33, 36). It rejected Christ and His words; and of each member of it who so acted Christ said, "the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (Jno. xii. 48).

The generation of Jews contemporary with Jesus Christ was more highly privileged than any previous one. John the Baptist was sent to it to herald the advent of the Messiah; "to revive the fathers' dispositions in their descendants, and to bring back the disobedient to the wisdom of just persons" (Luke i. 17, Dr. Thomas' translation). In this he succeeded; for there "went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in the Jordan confessing their sins" (Matt. iii. 5, 6). They already recognized circumcision as a justification in shadow from Adamic condemnation, and the offering of sacrifice as a similar purification from Mosaic defilement; but in conforming to the preaching of John they submitted to a further sin-cleansing ceremony which represented resurrection as well as death. They would not have done this if they had not believed already in a future life. Whence came the knowledge on which that belief was based? Not from the Mosaic law; for it did not offer to them a life beyond the present. That knowledge came from the promises to the fathers. Whatever, therefore, their previous position, their baptism by John was either an entrance into the Abrahamic covenant, or a confirmation of their having already entered it. If not previously under the operation of "the law of the spirit of life" they thereby came under it; and, as a consequence, became amenable to its future administration.

The transformation effected in the condition of that "generation" by the preaching of John the Baptist is parabolically described by Jesus as that of a man exercised of an "unclean spirit," with the result that he became "empty, swept and garnished" (Matt. xii. 43, 44). This language, although figurative, is sufficiently plain to involve justification from the greatest demerit sin. It shows that that "generation" even if not before, was then brought within the scope of redemption from death by Christ's sacrifice. All who were immersed by John the Baptist thereby "made a covenant with God" by that which symbolized the "one sacrifice for sins" (Heb. x. 12); they entered the Name of Salvation, and when that "name" was "given" to Christ (Phil. ii. 9) they, with all others in the name, were "given" to him; a gift bringing them within the exercise of his resurrection power (Jno. vi. 39). Like those baptized into Christ since the Crucifixion, they have been "purchased" (Acts xx. 28) or "bought" (2 Pet. ii. 1) from the power of "the law of sin and death" by Christ's blood, and therefore form part of "the dead" in Christ (Rom. 14:9-12).

The effect of John the Baptist's mission was very widespread; for even the Pharisees said "All hold John as a prophet" (Matt. xxi. 26). Consequently all men believed his message concerning the appearance of the Messiah. Their demonised attitude towards Christ is no evidence that they had not a "garnished" state of mind during John's ministry. The explanation of their changed attitude is to be found in the fact that Jesus Christ did not, in his person

or his surroundings, realise their expectation. Then the demoniac condition of mind which John had exorcised them, took to "himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself," and returned to his former abode. Though willing for a season to rejoice in John's "light" (Jno. v. 35) they refused Christ's "light." This was a special "sin" (Jno. xv. 22) for which they incurred a special condemnation; "he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (Jno. iii. 18).

Gentiles, it is obvious, do not occupy the same position as that of the Jews contemporary with Jesus Christ and his prophetic forerunner. They are not the custodians of "the oracles of God;" they have not been justified from inherited condemnation; they are "children of wrath" (Eph. ii. 2); they are still under "the law of sin and death," and therefore outside the scope of the resurrection and judgment relating to "the law of the spirit of life." Does this mean that they are outside the scope of all judgment? No; they are liable to whatever judgments God may impose in this life, national and individual. The evil works for which they deserve such judgments are innumerable; and if dealt with according to their deserts they would, by some such calamity as the Deluge, be swept off the earth. The rejection of "the truth (as it) is in Jesus" (Eph. iv. 21) by such as hear it is an aggravation of their previous evil course of life. All this is known to God, and He will, if in accordance with His wisdom, visit such with retribution. He reduced Nebuchadnezzar to the level of the beast for oppressing the poor (Dan. iv. 27); and He smote Herod with a fatal disease because he accepted unlawful homage and "gave not God the glory" (Acts xii. 23). He can similarly afflict those who reject the light of His truth; but if He does, it will be while they are living under "the law of sin and death." He will not raise them from the dead to be condemned to the punishment pertaining to "the law of the spirit of life."

C.—*Rejection of Apostolic Preaching.*—Christ preached only to Jews, but the Apostles preached to both Jews and gentiles. On the principle that to receive or reject the Apostles was to receive or reject Christ (Matt. x. 40; 2 Cor. v. 20), apostolic preaching would bring the same condemnation upon believing Jews as the preaching of Christ had done. Hence the commission which Christ gave after his resurrection. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 15, 16). Into what "world" were they then authorized to go? The "world" into which he "came" (Jno. ix. 39), which for a time went "after him" (Jno. xiii. 19), but "hated" him (Jno. vii. 7); the "world" in which he "spoke openly" (Jno. xviii. 20), which saw him for a time and then saw him "no more" (Jno. xiv. 19); the "world" which he "overcame" (Jno. xvi. 33), and before whose foundation he had glory in the mind of the Father (Jno. xvii. 5); and the "world" in which there were some who "believed on" him (1 Tim. iii. 16). The "world" was of clearly defined limits; it consisted of the Jewish nation only. The Apostles so understood the terms of their commission, for not until a special revelation was given to Peter (Acts x. 34, 35) did they understand that their preaching was to be extended outside the Jewish "world." When preaching to the Jews, they failed not to proclaim that whosoever would not "hear" Christ through them should be "destroyed from among the people" (Acts iii. 23), a punishment involving the infliction of a

violent death. The Jews who heard them had, by animal sacrifices, practically admitted that for their sins they deserved such a death, and that a violent death was necessary for their justification, in shadow; but in rejecting apostolic preaching they refused to recognize that the death of Jesus of Nazareth was the only means of giving substantial efficacy to that justification. By this sin they incurred the destruction foretold by Moses, and the damnation threatened by Christ.

When the Apostles preached to the Gentiles they adopted a different course; they did not threaten a violent death for disbelieving. The reason is obvious; the Gentiles were not the custodians of God's oracles; they had not had the privilege of a long course of tuition in Divine things; they were ignorant of God and His purpose; and they had not been justified from the "offence" of Adam or from their own "wicked works." The object of the Apostolic preaching to Gentiles was "to take out of them a people for God's name" (Acts xv. 14), "to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified" (Acts xxvi. 18). There is no record of the Apostles announcing to Gentiles that if they did not believe the gospel they would be raised to future punishment. Did not Paul announce to the Athenians that "the times of this ignorance God winked at," but "now commandeth all men everywhere to repent" (Acts xvii. 30)? He did; but this does not involve resurrection to punishment. Does not a command from God render those who disobey liable to punishment? Yes, but not necessarily beyond the grave. God sent a message to Nineveh which was equivalent to a command to turn from their evil ways (Jonah iii. ch.); and in the event of refusal he threatened them with punishment, but it was to be inflicted in this life; in "forty days" the city was to be "destroyed." The Ninevites repented, and their destruction was postponed. God gave numerous commands to the nation of Israel, but the retribution specified for disobedience related to this life (Deut. xxvii. 15-68). It is therefore an unsound argument to affirm that disobedience to a Divine command involves a share in the "resurrection of damnation" (Jno. v. 29). For those who are probationers for eternal life it does; but not for unjustified Gentiles. To what punishment are they liable? To such as God may inflict before they die under the "condemnation" of "the law of sin and death." But does not Paul's statement imply that God would deal with mankind in the future in a different way from that which He had done in the past? Yes, but this does not necessarily mean that Gentiles were to be raised to future punishment. God has dealt with Gentiles since the Apostles preached to them very differently from the way in which He previously treated them. He has poured upon them a series of judgments for rejecting and perverting His word, persecuting His saints, and ill-treating the Jews. What mean the exhibitions of His anger portrayed in the seven seals, the seven trumpets and the seven vials? Why was Pagan Rome afflicted with the sword, famine and pestilence, etc., during the first three centuries (Rev. vi. 4-8)? Was it not for refusing to "turn to God from idols" and "to wait for His son from heaven" (I Thess. i. 9-10)? Why did the Empire undergo such a convulsion in the fourth century as to cause high and low to call to "the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb" (Rev. vi. 16)? Was it not to avenge the blood of those who had been "slain for the word of God" (ver.

9)? Why were there in the same century symbolic "thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake" (Rev. viii. 5)? Was it not in answer to "the prayers of saints" (ver. 3)? Why in the fourth and fifth centuries was the western "third" of the Roman Empire decimated by the Goths, the Vandals, and the Huns (Rev. viii. 7-12)? Was it not a judgment on the Apostacy which had taken the place of Paganism as the state religion? Why were the Saracens sent as a plague of locusts from the seventh to the tenth centuries, against the eastern section of the Apostacy (Rev. ix. ch)? Was it not because they "worshipped demons, and idols of gold and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood" (ver. 20)? Why have "the vials of the wrath of God" (Rev. xvi. 1) been poured upon Christendom during the past century? Is it not for "speaking great words against the Most High," "wearing out the saints of the Most High" (Dan. vii. 25), and corrupting the earth (Rev. xi. 18)? These judgments all resulted from neglecting or perverting the word of God. On the assumption that any of those out of Christ on whom they were poured will be raised to a future punishment a difficulty is introduced. Why punish men in this life and then punish them again for the same sins at the day of judgment? This is not in harmony with Divine procedure in the past. But withdraw the assumption and the difficulty disappears. And does not the Bible teach that resurrection to judgment relates only to justified sons of Adam explain why Divine judgments are poured upon the unjustified in this life? If there be no barrier to the resurrection of any who have died without justification, why should Divine wrath be inflicted on them in this life? Is it not because they are, by the operation of "the law of sin and death," excluded from resurrection? Does not the infliction of Divine wrath prove that they deserve it? If then they are within the scope of the law which has brought resurrection, why should their retribution be inflicted on this side of the grave instead of being reserved for the other side? The only satisfactory answer to these questions is to be found in the Bible truth that the resurrection results from a probation under "the law of the spirit of life."

When Paul preached to the Athenians "some mocked" at what he had said concerning "the resurrection of the dead" (Acts xvii. 32); but he did not announce that they would be included in the resurrection; neither did he threaten them with destruction for their unbelief, as when he and Peter preached to the Jews (Acts iii. 23; xiii. 41). Did he not state that "God commanded all men everywhere to repent, *because* he hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained" (Acts xvii. 30, 31)? Yes. Does not this prove that those who refuse to "repent" will be raised to be "judged" in that "day"? No; if it proves their resurrection to judgment it proves the resurrection, not only of those who refuse to "repent," but of all the "world."

The proclamation that God "will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained" is intended as the object of faith and hope; hence the subsequent statement "whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead" The main purport of the judging is rulership of the world for a thousand years, during which period Christ and his immortal brethren will occupy the "set thrones of judgment" in Jerusalem (Ps. cxxii. 5). Men are commanded to "repent" that they may partake of this great honour; and in order that they may have "full assurance of faith." (Heb. x. 22) and "full as-

surance of hope" (Heb. vi. 11) they are referred to the fact that God "hath raised Christ from the dead." The pouring out of judgments on the nations at Christ's appearing, and the infliction of punishment on the unfaithful at the judgment-seat, are but preliminaries to this great work.

Did not the Apostles in their epistles announce that God would punish "Jew" and "Gentile" (Rom. ii. 9); that He "judgeth them that are without" (1 Cor. v. 13); that Christ would "in flaming fire take vengeance on them that know not God" (2 Thess. i. 8); and that he would come "with ten thousands of his saints to execute judgment upon all" (Jude vers. 14, 15)? Yes; but none of these statements involve the resurrection of unjustified sinners. Such as refer to them relate to judgments in this life; and such as refer to probationers for eternal life are applicable to none others. The Apostolic epistles were written only to "saints in Christ Jesus," the unsanctified inhabitants of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Thessalonica, etc., knew nothing of their contents. In every case where "the judgment-seat of Christ" is introduced it is connected with those only in his name; "every one of us shall give account" (Rom. xiv. 12); "we must all appear before the judgment-seat" (2 Cor. v. 10). "you who shall give account" (1 Pet. iv. 5). To extend such passages as these to unbelievers is a violation of the basis on which the epistles were written; it opens the way to extending other passages, relating to the promised reward to those who have never been justified. The passages referring to those out of Christ are very few, and there is no difficulty in perceiving that when speaking of Divine wrath against them it is applicable to judgments in this life.

Were not the Apostles "commanded to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead" (Acts x. 42)? And was not the truth that "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ" a part of Paul's "gospel" (Rom. ii. 16)? Certainly; and to preach the "gospel" without reference to this momentous appointment would be defective work. Its proclamation is a necessity, because the promised reward cannot be obtained without a probation; and a probation involves a scrutiny. It is God's prerogative to carry out this scrutiny; but, as He has delegated the work to His Son, it is of great importance that this fact should be made known to all who are called upon to "wait for God's Son from heaven." It is also a part of "the truth as it is in Jesus" to announce that, after judging his brethren, Christ will pour out Divine judgments on the nations, and then erect "thrones of judgment" (Psa.cxxii. 5), to which all the inhabitants of the earth will be amenable.

What made "Felix tremble" when Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come" (Acts xxiv. 25)? Was it not the prospect of being brought before "the judgment-seat of Christ"? There is no evidence that it was. There was a judgment then impending, and it is quite reasonable to conclude that Paul's reasoning related to it. What was it? The destruction of Jerusalem and the scattering of the Jewish nation, styled by Peter, "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (2 Pet. ii. 7). Though Felix was a Roman, his wife, Drusilla "was a Jewess" (Acts xxiv. 24); and this would be quite sufficient to give Felix an interest in Jewish retribution. Moreover, Felix was a very wicked man. "In the exercise of all kinds of lust and cruelty," says Tacitus, "he exercised the power of a king with the temper of a slave"; and, according to Josephus, he effected the assassination of Jona-

than, the high-priest, because Jonathan "frequently gave him admonitions about governing the Jewish affairs better than he did." It was doubtless on these grounds that Paul "reasoned of righteousness" and "temperance" or self-control. Was it not possible for Paul to so describe the Divine judgments about to come on the Jewish nation for their wickedness as to prick the conscience of such a man and cause him to "tremble"? The description given of these events by the inspired Moses (Deut. xxviii. 49-57), and, subsequently, by Josephus and other historians, produces even now a shudder in sensitive minds. How much more effect would be a prophetic picture by the voice of the Spirit on the verge of its realization. "The wicked flee when no man pursueth" (Prov. xxviii. 1). Unless, therefore, this feature can be eliminated from Paul's address there is no ground for affirming that the Apostle threatened Felix with resurrection to judgment; such a threat would have been out of harmony with the Apostolic reasoning on resurrection elsewhere.

The leading feature required in the proclamation of the truth is expressed in the concluding chapter of the Bible: "The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev. xxii. 17). Attention should be called to God's judgment in the past, and to those which are impending at Christ's coming, and an effort should be made to arouse the conscience to the heinousness of sin; but the bride has no authority to declare that any out of Christ will be brought before a tribunal specially designed for its own adjudication. To do so is to add to the Word of God.

D.—*The justice of God.*—Does not the justice of God require that those who hear the truth and refuse to obey it shall be raised for judgment by Christ? To arrive at a conclusion on this basis is to deal with the subject from a narrow point of view; there are other aspects of Divine prerogative and action which must be taken into consideration; and they who ignore them will, if logically consistent, be compelled to take up a position beyond that intended. Thus if some who sin under "the law of sin and death" are dealt with on the basis of justice, why not others? If those who knowingly disregarded one thing required by God are to be raised to punishment, those who knowingly disregard other things required by God must be raised for the same object. What things? Such as lying, coveting, stealing, drunkenness and adultery. There are thousands throughout Christendom who, while recognizing the Bible to be the Word of God, and knowing that these things are forbidden therein, nevertheless practise them. They have light on these matters, though not understanding the truth, and yet they ignore what God has commanded. If justice require resurrection to punishment for one knowingly violated command, it requires the same of all.

The generation of unjustified sinners living at Christ's appearing is to be subject to judgments unequalled in the world since the Deluge (Dan. xii. 1; Rev. xvi. 18). Many who suffer those judgments will be no worse than some in past generations who have been similarly visited. If justice be the sole principle on which God meets out His judgments, they must be raised to share the vials of His wrath on the generation then living.

During the past eighteen hundred years the number who have had presented to them the truth in its purity is extremely small. For want of this all others have been practically deprived of the opportunity of obtaining eternal life. If justice be the sole prin-

ciple on which God deals with the world of sinners, those who so contend must, if consistent, likewise teach that "children of wrath" who have not heard the pure truth must have it presented to them, and that consequently they must be raised from the dead to have an opportunity of obtaining eternal life.

Divine justice, when misapplied, thus leads, on the one hand, to extensive resurrection for punishment, and on the other hand, to universal resurrection for the offer of eternal life. The fact that these conclusions are incompatible with each other proves that there is a vital flaw in the "justice" argument concerning the Divine treatment of certain unjustified sinners.

Divine action towards the condemned sons of Adam cannot be understood without recognizing that their existence is due to God's forbearance. If God had dealt with the parents of the race on the principle of justice alone they would never have had any descendants. And if justice were now meted out to all who are still under Adamic condemnation, they would be cut off from life expeditiously and without ceremony. But God showed mercy to Adam and Eve, after they had incurred a violent death by promising a descendant who should neutralize the evil of the serpent, and this promise required the existence for a certain time of those who would perpetuate the mind of the serpent. Without this there could not be continued conflict between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent (Gen. iii. 15). When, however, the time arrives for that conflict to cease, what will take place? The seed of the serpent will be "cut off" from life (Ps. xxxvii. 9) by fire from heaven (Rev. xx. 9).

Divine justice is regulated by Divine law, and God does not violate His laws by love on the one hand, or by wrath on the other. His love, in the case of Christ, could not set aside the combined force of "the law of sin and death" and "the law of the Spirit of life." His Son had to drink the cup of a sacrificial death to its dregs. On the same principle the wrath of God cannot set aside "the law of sin and death." That law is founded on justice. God gave a command and it was disobeyed. Therefore death must ensue; and, *in the absence of an antidote*, that death must be endless. The antidote now resides in Christ; but before it was embodied in him justice required him to undergo the kind of death—that is, to be slain—incurred by Adam. God must be "just" in the execution of the penalty pertaining to "the law of sin and death" before he can be "the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 26). Is His justice in administering "the law of sin and death" one sided? Not at all. It cannot be exercised in the act of providing the antidote and be withdrawn where the antidote has no efficacy. It must act with equal impartiality in the process of justification, and in the execution of the law on those who are devoid of such justification. When Christ had, by his sacrificial death, fulfilled the claim of justice in relation to "the law of sin and death," after compliance with the requirements of "the law of the Spirit of life," "it was not possible" for the grave to hold him (Acts ii. 24). Justice required his release. In like manner justice requires the release of all who partake of his justification; and on the same principle justice requires that those who are devoid of Christ's justification shall not be released from the death arising out of Edenic law.

Is not the "command" to "repent" of sufficient force to release from Adamic death such as disregard it for the purpose of punishment? No; because the mere listening to that command does not

justify them from that which brought Adamic death; such justification can only be realized by the blood-shedding pertaining to "the law of the Spirit of life." Does, then, the "command" to "repent" bring no responsibility to those who hear and understand it? Yes, it does; but the responsibility is confined to this life. It renders them liable to any special judgment God may inflict before they die under "the law of sin and death." The writer once witnessed the death-bed of one who had listened to the proclamation of the Truth, and who understood some of its elementary principles, but who, for love of the world, abstained from embracing it. The opportunity was, after some years, cut short by a terrible "accident" which for a few days produced great physical pain. Added to this there was great mental anguish arising from a vivid realization of a neglected privilege. The unfortunate victim viewed the event as a Divine judgment for knowingly disregarding God's command—Who can say that it was not? They who witnessed Herod's death by worms (Acts xii. 23) would not know that it was Divinely inflicted for accepting unlawful homage, unless so informed by Divine authority. Neither should we know unless an inspired writer had so explained it. That which was possible then is possible now. God can inflict a dire punishment in this life as that which the unfaithful will suffer at Christ's judgment-seat. As shown by the numerous cases of Divine judgments in the past, "it is a fearful thing" either on this side the grave or on the other, "to fall into the hands of the living God" (Heb. x. 31).

The "justice" argument is misapplied; it does not begin at the proper time. It ignores the requirement of the Edenic law, and deals only with a subsequent "command." It introduces conflict in Divine action where there should be none. It represents God as terminating in some cases the death decreed by Edenic law without justification from the sin which occasioned it, in order to inflict a punishment for disregarding the "command" to "repent." This discord is no part of the Divine plan. Retribution in regard to both edicts can be carried out with perfect harmony. Punishment can be inflicted in this life for defying God, and then in due course the Edenic law can exercise its full sway. This has been done in the past, and it can be now. Justice, so far from requiring the resurrection of any who have died in Adam, requires that they shall be held fast in the grip of Adamic death.

E.—*The Power of God.*—Is it not limiting the power of God to say that the dead in Adam cannot be raised to judgment? No; it is only recognizing the limitation which God has placed on His own action in the execution of His own law. "All things are possible with God" (Matt. xix. 26) provided they are compatible with His own attributes and His own laws. Such things as are at variance therewith are impossible. "God cannot lie" (Tit. i. 2); "He cannot be tempted with evil" (Jas. i. 13); and "He cannot deny himself" (2 Tim. ii. 13). Some of the things which He has done He defines as necessities. "The priesthood being changed there is made of necessity; a change also of the law" (Heb. vii. 12); "Where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator" (Heb. ix. 16); "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of the things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves (must be purified) with better sacrifices than these" (ver. 23). What is meant by these things being "necessary"? That God could not fulfil His purpose without them. Why not? Because of His previously ordained laws. He could not recognize the purification of the Mosiac "patterns" without the

blood of animal sacrifices; neither can He purify the things which they symbolized without the blood of Christ. That is to say, God cannot purge men from Adamic condemnation, or remit their individual "offences" and so free them from the operation of the Edenic "law of sin and death" without "the blood of the everlasting covenant." Therefore He cannot, without the application of that blood, terminate Adamic death for the purpose of inflicting "the second death." But does it not say "the son quickeneth whom he will" (Jno. v. 21)? Yes; he will raise and immortalize whom he will, but only in harmony with the laws of his Father. Has he not "all power in heaven and in earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18)? Yes, in the execution of his Father's unfulfilled purpose; as the personal "Word of God." (Rev. 19-13). Has he not "power over all flesh" (Jno. xvii. 2)? Yes, in prospect, when he re-appears he will have "power over all flesh" appearing at the judgment-seat to "give eternal life to as many as" are then approved, and to punish the rejected. But the expression "all flesh" does not specify who they are; the word "all," as in many other passages is of limited application; and its limitation must be ascertained from other testimonies. Dead men are not "flesh"; and therefore this delegated "power" does not apply to them. The dead to be raised are those who have been "bought" (2 Pet. ii. 1) by Christ's "blood" (Acts xx. 28), of whom, as a consequence, he is "Lord" (Rom. xiv. 9). The "all flesh" on the earth at Christ's appearing will then become subject to his "power" because he comes to take "possession" of his "inheritance" (Ps. ii. 8); "all flesh" will then be required to "come" unto him in Zion" (Ps. lxxv. 1-2).

F.—*Dr. Thomas' teaching.*—The introduction of this element is superfluous. If the inspired Word clearly foretells the resurrection of any unjustified dead ones, the teaching of Dr. Thomas is not required to support it; and if it cannot be proved from the inspired Word, his teaching is of no authority. His writings, being the best exposition of the Scriptures in print, are of inestimable value; but he did not claim infallibility for them, and it is superfluous to remark that they do not possess it. He would have been the first to say, 'If there be anything in them which cannot be substantiated from the word of God, do not accept it.' It is solely for this reason that his teaching on resurrection out of Christ cannot be endorsed. It is first propounded in *Elpis Israel*, where men who have not been justified from the condemnation which has brought the first death are described as undergoing "the second death" (p. 117). But this is at variance with the Scriptural principles which Dr. Thomas enunciates in the same book.

All men, he says, are by birth constituted sinners, and therefore under condemnation to death. Adam and Christ he treats as two federal heads, the former bringing death and the latter life; but to be transferred out of Adam into Christ it is necessary to undergo baptismal burial and resurrection:—

"As the constitution of sin hath its root in the disobedience of the First Adam, so also hath the constitution of righteousness root in the obedience of the Second Adam. Hence the Apostle says, 'As through one offence (sentence was pronounced) upon all men unto condemnation; so also through one righteousness (sentence was pronounced) upon all men (that is, Jews and Gentiles) unto a pardon of life. For as through the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners, so through the obedience of the one the many were constituted righteous' (Rom. v. 18, 19). The two Adams are two federal chiefs; the first being figurative of the

second in these relations. All sinners are *in* the first Adam, and all the righteous *in* the second, only on a different principle. Sinners were in the loins of the former when he transgressed; but not in the loins of the latter when he was obedient unto death" (p. 118).

"While a believer is out of Christ he is in his sins and while he is in his sins he is under sentence of death, for 'the wages of sin is death.' As soon, however, as his sins are forgiven through Christ's name, in the act of forgiveness he passes from under the sentence of death; and as there is no middle or neutral position, he comes under the sentence of life, and rejoices in hope of the kingdom of God" (pp. 283-4).

What is the conclusion deducible from the premises set forth in these extracts? That when a man passes out of Adam into Christ he is no longer under sentence of death for Adam's disobedience or for his own sins; that, as a consequence, death cannot for these things prevail over him; and that, in the event of dying, he must be restored to life. Dr. Thomas did not carry his premises to their logical conclusion, and hence the discord between his statements concerning the taking away of Adamic condemnation and those relating to resurrection. It is permissible, however, for others to see that which he did not. The contention presented in the foregoing pages though at variance with his illogical conclusion, is in harmony with his premises in the extracts quoted concerning the taking away of Adamic condemnation. His teaching on resurrection out of Christ is not a part of revived Apostolic truth; it is a remnant of the belief of the apostacy in universal resurrection to judgment.

In the administration of British justice, when the occupant of one of Her Majesty's prisons receives a pardon, the sentence passed upon him in a court of law is made void, and his liberation follows as a matter of course. When God pardons or justifies a man in respect to his own and Adam's sin, does not a similar result follow? Is not the sentence previously decreed for such sin made void? It must be so; the abrogated sentence cannot run its course—in God's mind it is at an end. How can this be, seeing that the physical consequences are not immediately removed? Because the abrogation of the Adamic sentence is accompanied by a feature for which there is no parallel in connection with pardon: by an earthly monarch. What is that? A covenant between God and the pardoned sinner to give to the latter, on specified conditions, a nature superior to that which Adam had before he sinned. Those conditions preclude the immediate removal of the physical consequences of Adam's sin; for the reward is promised as the result of overcoming the sin-nature within and without. The death which takes place during Christ's absence is no evidence that the inherited sentence is still in full force, because resurrection rectifies the temporary operation of death, by restoring the pardoned one to the same life that he had during probation. This restoration to life is the combined result of the pardon, the covenant, and the necessity for fulfilling God's part of the covenant—eternal life for overcoming, or "the second death" for being overcome. From this it follows that where there is no pardon there is no covenant, and, as a consequence, no release from Adamic death.

Supposing an earthly monarch were to do as God has done, he would, when granting pardon to an imprisoned subject, say to him, "In addition to pardoning you for your previous crimes by which you are released from your prison tasks, I will enter into a coven-

ant with you, by which you may attain to a joint rulership with my son and heir; the terms of the covenant require that between the time of pardon and the time for release from the prison you shall comply with a series of commands designed to test your love for me; if you succeed you shall, at the time appointed, be transferred from your prison to my throne; but if you fail, you shall for the misdeeds committed subsequent to the time of pardon be punished by imprisonment for life."

In such circumstances as these, there would be no difficulty in understanding the abode in prison during probation; and it would constitute no evidence that the pardon which had been granted was not absolute. It would also be perfectly clear that imprisonment for life would be entirely the result of misconduct after such pardon.

33.—THE UNITY OF THE TRUTH.

"The Truth" is so perfect, and each part is so interwoven with the rest that it is impossible for error to be affiliated to one item without others being affected. The subject under consideration is an illustration of this. If it be said that justification from the "offense" of Adam is not necessary, it logically follows that Christ died only for the individual "offences" of Adam's descendants: and in that case, seeing that Christ had no "offences" of his own, his death was solely for others, not for himself and others. On this hypothesis he would be a substitute; a principle at variance with Scriptural teaching on the Divine method for taking away sin.

If, while admitting the necessity for justification from the "offence" of Adam, it be affirmed that such justification does not take place at baptism, the only permissible conclusion is, that it takes place subsequently. If so how? By a faithful probation? In that case the unfaithful would never be justified from Adam's "offence," and as a consequence, when their probation was over, they would die under Adamic condemnation and so "perish"; thereby being excluded from resurrection to judgment.

A faithful probation involves "patient continuance in well-doing" (Rom. ii. 7); to say that this is necessary to justification from the "offence" of Adam is to attribute to "well-doing" a power it does not possess, viz., the power to justify from sin. And it represents God as requiring from his sons and daughters probationary good works in order to remove a condemnation which came upon them through no fault of their own. This is a violation of the foundation principle of the plan of salvation. As all in Adam have been "made sinners," so all who enter Christ are "made righteous" (Rom. v. 19). This would be impossible without justification from the "offence" of Adam. Believers are "justified freely by God's grace," at baptism, "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii. 24). They are "justified by faith" (Rom. v. 1) truly but in conjunction with Christ's "blood" (ver. 9). Their probationary good works are as useless to justify from the "offense" of Adam as from their own "offenses" before or after baptism. Of what value, then, is "well-doing"? In conjunction with forgiveness of sins during probation (1 Jno. i. 9) it ensures immunity from "the second death" (Rev. ii. 11) and gives eternal life (ver. 7). The "faith" with which probation commences is by subsequent "well-doing," "made perfect" (Jas. ii. 22), and thereby "a man" who has walked in the footsteps of Abraham "is justified by works" (ver. 24). Christ's probation is the most faithful on record, and yet his faithfulness could not cleanse him from

Adamic sin without blood-shedding. That which was not possible for him is certainly impossible for those dependent on him.

If it be said that baptised believers by an abode in the grave pay the penalty for Adam's offence, and are thereby justified from it, much greater anomalies are produced. If such be the case, what becomes of the generation of believers who "are alive and remain" at Christ's appearing? If these fail to pay the penalty they fail to be justified from Adam's "offence," and, as a consequence, cannot enter the kingdom. If, however, they enter the kingdom without paying the penalty, like their brethren who came out of the grave are said to do, there are two ways of salvation fundamentally different; which is an absolute impossibility.

If the death of baptised believers be of any value in purging them from Adam's offence, it must be equally effective for the unfaithful as for the faithful. Would God allow men who deserved condemnation for their own conduct during the probation, to free themselves subsequently, by an event which they could not help, from the condemnation arising out of the conduct of another? Impossible. Does he even allow men who have been faithful during probation to purge themselves by literal death from Adamic condemnation? No; their death is no justification whatever, and contributes not an iota towards their attainment to eternal life. To say that it does is to give to those who have been actual transgressors the power to take away Adamic sin; and to do this is to rob Christ of a part of his redemptive work. Nay more; if carried to its logical conclusion it will rob Christ of the whole of his redemptive work for others. He died to cleanse himself from Adamic sin; and this is accepted by God as the means of cleansing others from Adamic sin and also from their own sins. Thus the same death takes away personal sin and inherited sin. If the literal death of faithful believers can purge them from Adamic sin it is equally effective in purging them from their own sins; and in that case they do not require purging by the death of Christ.

If, while admitting that justification from the offence of Adam takes place at baptism and that resurrection takes place as a consequence, it is also contended that resurrection will embrace others devoid of such justification, what is the consequence? A self-contradictory position, which ignores an axiom of sound reasoning, viz. that every conditional affirmative involves its corresponding negative. Thus when God said to Adam, "If thou eat, thou shalt die" (Gen. ii. 17), He meant, If thou dost not eat, thou shalt not die; and when He said through Peter, "Be baptized for the remission of sins" (Acts ii. 38) He meant, If you are not baptized, you will not have remission of sins. Likewise when it is said to the brethren of Christ, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life" (Rev. ii. 7), it means that he who does not overcome shall not so eat. The Scriptures teem with conditional statements such as these, and, as a rule their negative aspect is as fully recognized as their affirmative. What reason is there for making the statement about resurrection an exception? None whatever, except the exigencies of a false position. When it is said that Christ was "brought again from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. xiii. 20), it means that without that blood he would not have been brought from the dead; and when it is said that baptised believers are by "the law of the Spirit of life" made "free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2), it means that those who have not been brought into the same position are *not* free from the Edenic law.

To say that resurrection at Christ's coming will, in some cases, be through justification, and in others without justification, is analogous to saying that remission of sins is obtainable, in this dispensation, through baptism; or, that the partaking of the Tree of Life will be through overcoming and also without overcoming. The contradictory nature of that relating to resurrection should be equally so.

If resurrection at Christ's appearing will, in some cases, take place without justification from Adam's sin, it could do so in all. If it could, that part of Christ's justifying work is a superfluity; in other words, Christ's sacrificial death was required, not to remove a barrier to resurrection, but only to remove a barrier to eternal life. If this be true, he made a false claim when he said, "I am the Resurrection and the Life;" he should only have said, "I am the Life."

In claiming to be "the Resurrection and the Life," Christ, in effect, attributes this two-fold position to one source, viz., his own sacrificial death. Without that death he would not have been endowed with power to raise the dead or to give eternal life. The source of his power regulates its exercise. He will bestow eternal life only on those who have been "washed" from all sin by "the blood of the covenant"; and he will, in like manner raise only those who have been justified by the same blood from inherited and committed sin prior to probation. To extend his resurrection power outside the scope of his shed blood is to open the door for his life-giving power to be also applied where his blood has had no efficacy.

Serious errors such as these can only be avoided by adhering to those Divine principles which are in harmony with all parts of the Truth. The first requisite for this is a recognition of the full force of "the law of sin and death," and the second, the precise scope of "the law of the spirit of life." The combined operation of these two laws that the condemnation inherited from Adam is a barrier to probation, a barrier to resurrection, and a barrier to eternal life; that "the blood of the everlasting covenant" is necessary for the removal of this three-fold barrier; that resurrection to judgment is the result of probation, and therefore takes place by virtue of "the blood of the covenant;" that condemnation at the judgment-seat is solely for an unfaithful probation, and therefore quite distinct from condemnation in Adam; that approval, resulting in eternal life, is for probationary faithfulness; that sin during probation as well as previously, requires the application of "the blood of the covenant," and that consequently immortality is only obtainable through the blood of Christ.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURES QUOTED

Note: the first figures are the chapter and verse in the Bible: the last figures are the pages in *Blood of the Covenant*.

GENESIS	EXODUS (cont.)	NUMBERS (cont.)
1:27 3	29:8-9 39	7:15 16,17
31 3	14 17	16 17
2:2 3	18 16	17 17
15-18 3	20 39	11:1-3 14
16-17 2	21 39	14:1-4 14
17 19,55	28 17	12 14
21 3	30:33 14	13-19 14
22 3	32:24-25 4	20 14
25 4	40:13 6	23 14
3: 3	14 6	29-35 14
5 3	35 21	15:3-12 16
6 4		30 14,15
7 4,24	LEVITICUS	31 14,15
8 3,4	1:4 6,16	35 13
10 4	9 16	16:32 14
11 4	2:4 16	41-50 14
14-19 5	13 16	21:5-6 14
15 5,11,25,50	3:1 16	25:1-9 14
17 17	4:2 16	
19 19	3 16	DEUTERONOMY
20 6	7 39	10:16 12
21 6,24	12-21 16	12:29 14
4:4 9	7:8 16	13:11 13
26 9	9:24 16	17:7 13
5:5 9	10:2 14	21:18-21 15
24 10	12: 21	28:15-68 15,46
6:12 9	2 21	21-25 14
7:2 9	3 21	49-57 49
8:20 9	4 21	59 14
9:11 14	4-5 21	60 13,14
11:31 10	6 21	61 14
12:1 10	16:4 40	62 14
1-3 2	12-13 39	30:6 12
3 16	13-14 40	15-16 13
7 10	16 17	32:47 13
8 9,10	17 40	
13:4 10	20 17	JOSHUA
14:18 10	21 7	7:20-25 15
15:7-17 2	22 7	11:21 14
9-17 10	33 17,21	
17:12 12	18:5 15	II CHRONICLES
14 11	20:2 14	22:7 14
26:5 1	3 14	28:19 4
	9 13	
EXODUS	10 13	
4:24 11	27 13	
25 11	21:33 21	EZRA
12:15 14	24:16 13,19	9:2 43
48 12	17 13	
15:26 13	28:5 15	PSALMS
19:6 13		2:8 52
20:12 15	NUMBERS	7:11 29
22:18 13	7:10 17	
25:22 16		

PSALMS (cont.)

19:13	24
21:4	26
22:4	9-10 21
30:5	25
32:1	6,8,10
2	8
37:9	12,50
38	20
49:15-16	30
50:4	35
5	20,31,36
14	20
15	20
23	18
65:1-2	52
69:4	26
20	22
85:2	6
91:14-16	25
102:24	22
105:9-10	1
122:5	47,48
143:2	23

PROVERBS

8:29-31	29
18:10	28
21:4	29
28:1	49

ECCLESIASTES

12:14	20
-------	----

ISAIAH

53:8	22
12	7
60:3	20

EZEKIEL

18:24	20
-------	----

DANIEL

4:27	45
7:25	47
9:26	11
12:1	49
2	18,20

JONAH

3:	46
----	----

ZECHARIAH

3:7	25
9:11	32

MATTHEW

3:5-6	44
6	22,23
13-15	22
17	23
5:18	30
6:10	36
8:12	39
10:40	45
12:43-44	44
16:18	31
19:26	51
20:16	31
19	24
21:26	44
24:16	19
31	36
25:41	38
26:39	24,30
44	30
65-66	19
27:46	22
55	24
28:18	52

MARK

1:4	22
9:43-47	12
16:15-16	45

LUKE

1:17	44
35	21
2:7	21
21	21
22	21
23	21
25	20
26	20
29-30	20
16:31	43
22:44	24,30

JOHN

1:5	43
-----	----

JOHN (cont.)

1:10-11	43
29	13
3:3	31
16	28
18	45
18-19	43
34	21
5:21	52
22	36
29	46
35	45
46-47	43
6:39	34,44
7:7	45
8:29	13
9:39	45
10:15	22
33	44
36	44
11:25	31,33
12:19	45
47-48	43
48	44
14:19	45
31	25
15:9	25
22	45
16:33	45
17:2	52
5	45
18:20	45
31	29
19:11	22
31-33	22
34	22

ACTS

2:21	9
23	22
24	26,50
38	9,19,28,55
3:23	45,47
7:51	12
10:34-35	45
42	48
12:23	45,51
13:41	47
43	29
15:6-10	13
14	46
17:30	46
30-31	47
32	47
18:8	36
20:28	31,36,44,52

ACTS (cont.)

22:16	27
24:24	48
25	48
26:18	46

ROMANS

1:4	39
2:7	35,54
4	48
16	48
20	12
25	21,22
29	20,22
3:1	43
2	12
19	13,19,29
24	54
25	25
26	24,50
4:3	10
7	10
9-11	11
25	26
5:1	25,26,33,54
9	17,26,54
10	16
12	4,24,37
14	4,11,14
15	29,31
15-16	35
16	27,28
17	27,29
17-18	19
18	19,26,27,28
18-19	5,33,52
19	4,8,27,28, 31,35,54
6:3	34
4	7,26,31,32,37
6	7,27
7	26
9	26
10	31
20-21	26
22	28
7:7	13
9	15,21
10	13,16
12	13
13	13
18	18
8:1	28
2	1,28,55
3	3,7,13,16,19

ROMANS (cont.)

8:3	28,29,37
4	27
13	18
17	29
19	16
32	30
33-34	28
34	27
9:6	20
23	24
31-32	20
10:5	15
11:33	24
14:8	34
9	34,52
9-12	44
12	36,48

I CORINTHIANS

1:2	36
30	6
2:13	37
3:17	18,36
5:1-2	36
13	48
6:11	27,32,36,37
16	18
19	18
19-20	36
20	18,34
7:14	21
39	18
9:24	37
10:18	20
12:1	18
14:21	37
15:12-22	32
17-18	32
18	29
21	31,37
22	31,32
47	37
52	39
53	16,31

II CORINTHIANS

3:7	15
7-9	18
9	22
5:1-2	31
4	16
10	48
14	7,15,31

II CORINTHIANS (cont.)

5:15	34
20	36,45
21	7,19
6:1	29

GALATIANS

2:20	7,25
3:13	19,22,30
17	6
19	13,29
21	20,22
27	6,33
4:3	12
4	7,13,19,21,30
5:19-21	18,38
24	18
6:8	18,38
16	20

EPHESIANS

2:1	29
2	45
3	29
4	25
10	9
13-14	16,33
15-16	25
4:21	45
5:2	16
6:2	15

PHILIPPIANS

2:8	22,33
8-9	26
9	28,34,44
3:10	32
21	39

COLOSSIANS

1:21	7,17,27,31,32
2:10	17,33
11	11,12,22
12	12
13	27
17	13
20	7
3:3	7

I TIMOTHY

2:14	4
3:16	45

II TIMOTHY

2:3-5.....	37
13.....	51
3:15.....	43

I THESSALONIANS

1:9-10.....	46
4:14.....	19
15.....	10,34,35,44
16.....	32
17.....	10

II THESSALONIANS

1:8.....	48
----------	----

TITUS

1:2.....	51
3:5.....	39
7.....	31

HEBREWS

1:9.....	26
2:2.....	15,20,21
14.....	7,16,19
15.....	13
17.....	7
4:15.....	13,26,32
5:8-9.....	33
6:11.....	48
13.....	1
17.....	1
18.....	1
7:7.....	4
9.....	4
12.....	51
8:2.....	21,22
9:4.....	16
5.....	16
12.....	26,39
13.....	17
13-14.....	17
15.....	18
15-28.....	20
16.....	51
21-23.....	27
22.....	1
23.....	12,51
26.....	11,26,32
10:1.....	7,12
1-2.....	17
3.....	40
4.....	1,23

HEBREWS (cont.)

10:10.....	16
12.....	32,44
20.....	39
26.....	35
26-27.....	37
31.....	38,51
34.....	13
11:5.....	10
6.....	42
12:2.....	24
13:10.....	16,39
12.....	16
20.....	1,26,34,35,55

JAMES

1:13.....	51
14.....	3
15.....	3
2:21.....	10
22.....	54
24.....	8,54

I PETER

1:2.....	7,27,39
19.....	34
2:5.....	17
24.....	16,27
4:5.....	48
10.....	36

II PETER

1:4.....	5
2:1.....	34,44,52
7.....	48
3:18.....	29

I JOHN

1:6.....	33
7.....	32
7-9.....	35
9.....	54
2:1.....	35
16.....	3
3:1.....	32
2.....	39
4.....	28
5.....	23
5:6.....	18

JUDE

14.....	10
14-15.....	48

REVELATION

1:1.....	37
18:31.....	
2:7.....	54,55
11.....	37,54
17.....	16
3:5.....	38
8.....	12
10.....	31
14.....	9
6:4-8.....	46
9.....	46
16.....	46
7:14.....	33,35
8:3.....	47
5.....	47
7-12.....	47
9:.....	47
20.....	47
11:18.....	47
12:17.....	12
13:8.....	7
16:1.....	47
18.....	49
19:13.....	52
20:2.....	9
8.....	9
9.....	9,12,50
14.....	38
15.....	38
21:8.....	38
18.....	49
27.....	35
22:11.....	35
14.....	35
17.....	49