

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1899.

NO. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

COSMOLOGY.

(Continued.)

ANTHROPOLOGY.

God created man in his own image.¹⁾ The creation of man was a part, the closing part, of the six days' work of creation. On the day of which the inspired record says, "And the evening and the morning was the sixth day,"²⁾ God, according to the same account, created man.³⁾ Man is not a product of spontaneous generation, not a result of a long continued process of evolution, but a distinct work of God, made at a definite period of time, and not a rudimentary work, but a complete and finished work.⁴⁾ This work of God was from that first day of its existence *man*, not a cell, a microbe, a saurian, an ape, but man, created according to the will and counsel of God. It was the triune God who said, "*Let us make MAN*,"⁵⁾ and God created *MAN*.⁶⁾ As the human individual, even in its embryonic state is at all times essentially human, so the human race never passed through a state of brute existence or through

1) Gen. 1, 27: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) Gen. 1, 27.

4) Gen. 2, 1. 2.

5) Gen. 1, 26.

6) Gen. 1, 27.

a process of development from an earlier, inferior, to a later, superior state, before he was man. Man as he came from his Maker's hand on the day of his creation was an *intelligent* being, to whom the dressing and keeping of a garden could be entrusted,¹⁾ who had notions of things and their relations, thoughts and combinations of thoughts, the power of reasoning and of intelligent speech.²⁾ And man was from the first day of his existence a *moral* being, endowed with the faculty of applying an ethical norm.³⁾ Nor were these qualities in man potentially only in his mind, to be developed by growth or education and example. Man was not only created physically mature, capable of the performances of an adult individual,⁴⁾ but his mental and moral faculties were also at once of a high order in kind and degree. His understanding penetrated the nature of the things he saw, not after long continued observation and study, but promptly and at first sight he named the objects that were led before him.⁵⁾ His moral sense was at once ready to be called into action,⁶⁾ and for his acts of disobedience committed soon after his creation God and his own conscience held him responsible.⁷⁾

1) Gen. 2, 15: "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it."

2) Gen. 2, 19. 20. 23. 24.

3) Gen. 2, 16. 17: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, 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."

4) Gen. 1, 27. 28: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 2, 15. See above.

5) Gen. 2, 19. 20. 23. 24.

6) Gen. 2, 16. 17. See above.

7) Gen. 3, 7—10: "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons. And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves

All this is, of course, in flat contradiction with all the various fictions which are in our day paraded as scientific theories based upon the hypotheses of an inferior state of primitive man, fictions which are as unscientific as they are unscriptural and antiscritptural. † There never was such a period as a Stone Age of the human race in the natural history of mankind—unless we consider that period as continuing to this day—, and there is nothing in the world to prove that the cliff builders and cromlech builders and mound builders belong to a prehistoric age. In fact, that prehistoric age is, like prehistoric man, itself a fiction. The beginning of the history of man is clearly and explicitly written in the book of Genesis, and the record of the rocks, the history of our race written in the book of nature, has been grossly misinterpreted. Pottery found under deposits of Nile alluvium, declared to have been formed long before the historic period, was, on closer observation or examination, shown to have been turned out of Roman workshops, and the computations of geologists and archaeologists have been so often put to shame, that even the credulity of modern unbelief is no longer at ease under the searchlights of careful investigation.

Another antiscritptural assumption hopelessly exploded and untenable even in the light of scientific induction is that primeval man was androgynous. Man was not created a monstrosity, but the first human being was a male person, and on the same day with the first man a second human being, a mature female person, woman, was made.¹⁾ The sexes are not a result of gradual differentiation, but *in the beginning*, when God made the first ancestors of our race, he *made them male and female*.²⁾

from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden. And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou? And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself."

1) Gen. 1, 27. Matt. 19, 4. Gen. 2, 18. 21—24.

2) Matt. 19, 4.

At the same time, however, the human race had not a dual or plural origin, but its fountainhead is one, the first man, Adam. Out of Adam the substance was taken whereof God made the first woman.¹⁾ And thus was she bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, and she was called נִשְׂאָה, *woman*, because she was taken from אָדָם, *man*, a being different in sex but alike in substance and of the same nature.

In the nature of the first man and, hence, of the first woman, there were two distinct constituent parts, a material part, the body, and an immaterial part, the soul. The substance of Adam's body was taken from the earth, the dust of the ground,²⁾ and formed into an organism by a creative act of God.³⁾ In the continuation of this creative act God created the human soul, but not as in separate and independent existence without the body, to be afterwards united with the body, but by *breathing* and *thus* creating it into the material organism he had made, thus *making*, not the body, but *man, a living soul*.⁴⁾ Adam was not created as two beings, afterwards united into one, but as one creature consisting of two elements, which together constituted one complete human person. From this first human person God then took the substance of a second human person. This was not a chirurgical operation, as a surgeon might perform, nor a generative act performed by Adam, but a creative act of God, who, taking one of the ribs of Adam with the life that was in it, made it a woman, body and soul, a

1) Gen. 2, 21. 22.

2) Gen. 2, 7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Gen. 3, 19: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." 1 Cor. 15, 47: "The first man is of the earth, earthy." Eccl. 12, 7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

3) Gen. 2, 7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Cf. Gen. 1, 27.

4) Gen. 2, 7.

second living soul, another complete human person of the same nature with the first, but differing from the first, as woman differs from man.

Such, then, is man in his composite nature, a mysterious unit composed of matter and spirit, body and soul, no less, no more. No less, whatever theories materialists and pantheists may have advanced in earlier days or advance to-day. No more, whatever trichotomists may object by pointing out a series of texts which distinguish *spirit* and *soul*, *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή*,¹⁾ passages which only view the spiritual element in man under different aspects, not as different substances or entities, but as the same subject asserting or manifesting itself in different spheres of life and activity. Through the Old and the New Testaments נַפֶּשׁ and רוּחַ, *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, are used promiscuously as interchangeable terms. Thus the same affections, as joy, sorrow, anguish, are ascribed to soul and spirit alike,²⁾ and that part of our nature which is separated from the body in temporal death to be with the Lord thenceforth is named spirit and soul.³⁾ Through the Old and the New Testaments man is looked upon as consisting of body and

1) Luke 1, 46. 47: "And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior." 1 Thess. 5, 23: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Hebr. 4, 12: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Luke 10, 27: "And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself."

2) Ps. 35, 9; Ps. 17, 23; Ps. 51, 14; Ps. 143, 12; Ps. 51, 19; Ps. 6, 4. Gen. 41, 8. Ps. 42, 6. John 12, 27; John 13, 21.

3) Hebr. 12, 23: "To the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." Rev. 6, 9: "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held."

soul or spirit, the material and the immaterial element of his nature.¹⁾ Dichotomy is, likewise, the only theory which agrees with the record of man's creation.

From this record of creation it further appears that the first man and the first woman were, according to the plan of creation, designated to be the first ancestors of the whole human race. The institution of matrimony was part of the order of things established by the Creator before the work of creation was finished. Not man alone, not woman alone, but man and woman received the divine blessing, "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth." By the union of one man and one woman the propagation of the human race was ordained, and this divine ordinance was intended to remain in force for all time. It was thus understood by Adam when God himself joined him and Eve in wedlock.²⁾ Extra-connubial or polygamous intercourse of the sexes is, therefore, not in accordance with, but a violation of, the order established in the beginning, wherein and according to which the preservation and propagation of man should be secured. And likewise the union of man and woman rendered unfruitful by the prevention of offspring, whereby the divine blessing pronounced over the ancestors of mankind and their progeny is frustrated, is also a violation of what God ordained in the beginning and for all time.

But here the question presents itself: What was to be propagated by the union of man and woman? Man, being himself a living soul by creation, was to beget living souls by propagation,³⁾ after God had finished his work of creation by immediate action, *ex nihilo*,⁴⁾ to continue it by mediate action through second causes, the parents, as the progenitors of their offspring. When our first ancestors

1) Ps. 73, 26; Ps. 84, 4. Eccl. 12, 7. Matt. 10, 28. 1 Cor. 6, 13. Eph. 4, 4.

2) Gen. 2, 24: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh."

3) Gen. 1, 22; Gen. 1, 28.

4) Gen. 2, 1—3.

were blessed that they should be fruitful and multiply, it was to increase the number of beings of their kind. They were to propagate not only the body but the entire nature of which they were the first representatives. We are nowhere told in the Scriptures that God created a multitude of souls to be in their time united with the bodies to be supplied by propagation, and we are expressly told that God had completed his work of creation at the end of the six days and before the day when he rested from all the work that he had made.¹⁾ While these statements exclude the theory of the preexistence of souls and the creation theory, they do not deny the creation of all human individuals, not only potentially considered, as they were all created in Adam as the fountainhead of the human race, but also individually, inasmuch as they come into being by virtue of the word by which God blessed our first parents, saying, "*Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth.*" In this sense, by mediate action, God has made of one blood all nations of men.²⁾ In this sense we say with the small Catechism, "I believe that God has made me and all creatures, has given me my body and soul, eyes and ears," etc., for in this same sense God says, "*I have formed thee in the belly,*"³⁾ and the Psalmist, "*Thou hast covered me (knit me together) in my mother's womb. I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvelous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well.*"⁴⁾ Since, however, the intermediate causes, man and woman, are now contaminated with sin, which permeates their entire nature, the children, though God's handiwork, are not created holy, as man was in his primeval state, but partake of the fallen state of their progenitors.⁵⁾

Thus the entire human race is one family, descended from one common ancestor, not a variety of races, sprung

1) Gen. 2, 1—3. See above.

2) Acts 17, 24. 26.

3) Jer. 1, 5.

4) Ps. 139, 13. 14.

5) Gen. 5, 3.

from various first ancestors and clustering around various creative centers.¹⁾ The children to-day inherit from their parents the nature which God created in the beginning when he made Adam, though no longer in its primitive state.

PRIMEVAL STATE OF MAN.

Man, as all the creatures of God, was created good, very good.²⁾ Yet all creatures were not made alike. There was one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars, and one star differed from the other star in glory.³⁾ And each creature was made after its kind.⁴⁾ But man was distinguished from and above all other creatures on the face of the earth by a manner of excellence peculiar to him alone. While plants and animals were made each after its kind,⁵⁾ man was made after the image of God.⁶⁾ Man was made, not a God or semi-God, but essentially *man*, consisting of two elements, body and soul, not of three, body, soul, and the image of God. The counsel of God was not, "Let us make our image and likeness," and the creative act of God is not described in words as, "So God created his image, man." God created man *in* his image *after* his likeness. When God breathed into the nostrils of the first human body the breath of life, this was not an emanative act, whereby God had communicated himself, his essence, to the work of his hands, but a creative act, whereby God produced *ex nihilo* the human soul in personal union with the body, which he formed of the dust of the ground. And by this entire creative process God made man after his likeness. But while the image of God

1) Acts 17, 26. Rom. 5, 12 ff.

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) 1 Cor. 15, 41: "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory." Gen. 1, 16: "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also."

4) Gen. 1, 4. 12. 18. 21. 25. 31.

5) Gen. 1, 11. 21. 24. 25.

6) Gen. 1, 26. 27.

was not of the essence of man's nature, it was not a gift bestowed upon man after his creation, not a *donum superadditum*, as a diadem on the head of a monarch or a chaplet on the brow of a bride, but a concreated quality. God did not say, "Let us *give unto* man our image and *bestow* upon man our likeness," but "Let us *make* man in our image after our likeness;" and, accordingly, God *created* man *in* his image, in the image of God *created* he him.¹⁾ Thus man, after the loss of God's image, was still essentially man, not a brute or a monster; and yet the loss of the divine image did not leave man *in puris naturalibus*. Man not only *had* no longer what he *had* before the fall, but he *was* no longer as he *was* before the fall. Man after the fall was still *what* he had been before the fall, but not *as* he had been, no longer in his primeval state.

What, then, was the image of God in which man was created? For an answer to this question we must not look to the physiology or psychology of natural man as now constituted under sin. The image of God, being a concreated endowment of primeval man, would certainly have been transmitted with the nature of our first parents to their offspring by natural propagation, just as sin, which is likewise not of the essence of human nature, is yet propagated in our sinful nature as hereditary sin. Since the image of God was lost, Adam begat children not in the likeness of God, in which he was created,²⁾ but in his own likeness, after his image,³⁾ and it is evidently for the sake of contrast that the two statements are here placed in such close proximity. What Adam transmitted to his children was not

1) Gen. 1, 26. 27. Gen. 5, 1: "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him." James 3, 9: "Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God."

2) Gen. 5, 1: "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him."

3) Gen. 5, 3: "And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth."

the image and likeness of God. It is only by a renewal, by which man is made a new creature, *καινή κτίσις*,¹⁾ a new man, *καινός άνθρωπος*,²⁾ that the image of Him that created him can be restored to man. Hence nothing that is in natural man can be of the image of God. The upright body and the rational soul with its human understanding, affections and will, while wofully deteriorated and in various ways and degrees corrupt in consequence of sin, are still the constituent elements of human nature, and, therefore, must not be considered as constituting the divine image or a part thereof. Conscience, too, the religious and moral sense in man, and the moral law inscribed in the human heart, whereby man is distinguished from brutes in his present state, can not be subsumed under the image of God. The image of God is, in short, nothing whereby man is man as distinguished from inferior creatures, but it is that whereby man was in conformity with God, though being man and not God. The divine image in man was a true reflection of God in the entire nature, especially the intellectual and moral nature of man. Thus the terms *image* and *glory*, *εἰκὼν* and *δόξα*, of God are used conjointly in the Scriptures.³⁾ There was in primeval man a true and thorough knowledge, *ἐπίγνωσις*, of God, which was lost in the fall, but is from day to day being restored to the regenerate in the *ἀνακαινώσις*, the *renewal* of the image of God,⁴⁾ and when that image shall have been completely renewed in us, "*we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.*"⁵⁾ As holiness is the absolute conformity of God with his divine nature, so the image of God in primeval man was holiness, the conformity of man and all his qualities and faculties with God, of man's will with the will of God, his affections with the corresponding attributes of God,

1) 2 Cor. 5, 17. 2) Col. 3, 10. Eph. 4, 24. 3) 1 Cor. 11, 7.

4) Col. 3, 10: "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him."

5) 1 John 3, 3.

the integrity and purity of his body and soul with the integrity and purity of God. And thus the renewal of the image of God is sanctification, *ἀγιασμός*, the putting on of *the new man*, which after God is created in RIGHTEOUSNESS and true HOLINESS.¹⁾ Here the new man is said to be created *κατὰ θεόν*, *secundum deum* (as *κατὰ Ἰσαάκ*, like Isaac²⁾), in the likeness of God, inasmuch as it is created in righteousness and true holiness. And this accords with the will of God as stated by St. Peter, saying, "As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation."³⁾ Thus also where we are reminded of having put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created us,⁴⁾ the preceding and subsequent context is an extended exhortation to sanctification, to put off all uncleanness and to put on holiness.⁵⁾ And, finally, those in whom the divine image is fully restored⁶⁾ are briefly described as *just men made perfect*.⁷⁾ Juvenal's ideal of man was *Mens sana in corpore sano*.⁸⁾ Our aim is higher, the restoration of the divine image, *mens sancta in corpore sancto*.

The possession of the fully restored image of God in the future state of man will, however, differ in one point from the possession of the concreated image of God in man's primeval state. The future state of man will be a state of confirmed holiness. Man's first estate was not a state of *non posse peccare* and *non posse mori*,⁹⁾ but a state of *posse non peccare* and *posse non mori*. This was not a defect in man, as it is not a defect in a child to be child and not an adult. What the manner of man's translation into a confirmed state of holiness and bliss would have been, if he had

1) Eph. 4, 23. 24.

2) Gal. 4, 28.

3) 1 Pet. 1, 15.

4) Col. 3, 10.

5) Col. 3, 5—4, 6.

6) 1 Cor. 15, 49. 1 John 3, 2.

7) Hebr. 12, 23.

8) "Orandum est, ut sit mens sana in corpore sano." Sat. X, 356.

9) Gen. 2, 17.

not fallen, we can not know. What we know is that by Christ's redemption we have gained more than we have lost in Adam.¹⁾

A consequence of the possession of the image of God in man's primeval state was a blissful communion with God, with whom he lived in perfect peace,²⁾ and the absence of everything which might embarrass or abash man in his intercourse with God and man.³⁾ In his state of innocence, man, furthermore, lived in the enjoyment of perfect health of body and soul without a germ or natural liability to disease and death.⁴⁾ He had and exercised dominion over the inferior creatures.⁵⁾ Though not a life of indolence, but of useful employment,⁶⁾ his life was not to be burdensome, loaded down with sorrow and onerous toil, which it was after the fall.⁷⁾

THE FALL.

Man, like the angels that are now evil angels, did not keep his first estate. How it was possible that man, being good, endowed with perfect righteousness and holiness, should fall and become evil, thoroughly evil in every imagination of the thoughts of his heart,⁸⁾ we do not know. We know that his fall was not a matter of necessity, not of coercion on the part of God, but of free choice on the part of man. It was God's will that man, whom he had created very good, should remain very good, and that man should multiply and replenish the earth in the full enjoyment of

1) 2 Cor. 3, 18: "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord."

2) Gen. 2, 18 ff.; cf. Gen. 3, 8 ff.

3) Gen. 2, 25: "And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed." Gen. 3, 7: "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons."

4) Gen. 2, 17.

5) Gen. 1, 28; Gen. 2, 19, 20.

6) Gen. 2, 15.

7) Gen. 3, 16—19.

8) Gen. 6, 5.

his primeval excellence and of such blessings as God might have conferred upon him afterwards.¹⁾ The fall was not a development, but a perversion, of human nature. This perversion received its first impulse not from within but from without, not from human nature but from a fallen creature. But while it was Satan who prompted man to fall, it was man who fell, being tempted as a rational being with an intellect and will of his own.

Woman was the last creature whom God had made, and she, too, was very good.²⁾ She had been created to be a helpmeet to Adam, because it was not good for man to be alone.³⁾ And thus the relation which the Creator established between man and woman was also very good. The conjugal relation was not a weak point in the work of creation, and connubial intercourse was not the fall. We do not read that such intercourse took place before the expulsion of our first parents from Paradise;⁴⁾ and if it had it would have been within the divine ordinance and in conformity with the will of God, not sin, but a work of righteousness.

Yet it is remarkable that Satan in his attempt to work the ruin of mankind selected woman as the first object of temptation. What it was that led the tempter to proceed as he did is nowhere stated; but his success certainly proved the astuteness of the evil spirit,⁵⁾ and whether or not this was in accordance with his calculation, he certainly reached Adam and accomplished his fall by working the fall of Eve, her husband's cherished spouse. Adam, cleaving unto his wife, left, not his father and mother, but his God; and thus, too, the fall was a perversion of that which God had made and established.

1) Gen. 1, 28.

2) Gen. 1, 31.

3) Gen. 2, 18.

4) Gen. 4, 1: "And Adam knew Eve, his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord."

5) Gen. 3, 1.

There is one circumstance which may have seemed to recommend his point of attack to the tempter. To the moral law inscribed in man's heart, God had added a positive law. The injunction of abstinence from the fruit of the forbidden tree had been imposed upon man before the creation of woman,¹⁾ and we do not hear that the prohibition was once more pronounced by God himself after she was made. It was probably through Adam that the woman learned the prohibition of the tree in the midst of the garden. This positive law has been very generally looked upon as a test whereby man should be made to undergo a probation, the event of which should decide his future lot. Others, the federal theologians, Cocceius, Turretin, and their followers, have even supposed a special covenant, which God had established with Adam, promising him eternal happiness on the condition of obedience, and the forbidden tree according to this theory appears as the divinely appointed criterion of man's faithfulness of carrying out his part of the terms of the established covenant. Of all this the Scriptures say nothing, and the special purpose for which God prohibited man from eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is, as the nature of the tree itself, a mystery to us. That Satan took advantage of this prohibition does not prove that it was intended for an opportunity to him for putting man to the test any more than the creation of woman proves that God intended her as a test object for a trial of man's fidelity to his Maker.

But when we come to determine the real point of attack astutely chosen by Satan we find that it was not the relation of man and woman, nor that of man and the forbidden tree, but the relation of man and God. This is indicated by the remarkable word wherewith God himself described what had come to pass in the fall of man, when he said, "*Behold the man is become as one of us.*"²⁾ The relation which

1) Gen. 2, 16; coll. Gen. 2, 18 ff.

2) Gen. 3, 22.

God had established between himself and man was a relation of perfect harmony between the divine Creator and an intelligent, rational, moral creature, whose affections and will, as those of a being inferior to God, were to be in full accord with the superior will of God, not under coercion, but in free and joyful submission. This relation found a special expression in the positive commandment concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, as a special enactment and utterance of the divine will. And thus it was at once a token of satanic malice and diabolical astuteness that the tempter chose as he did his first point of attack when he undertook to bring about the fall of man. "*Your iniquities have separated between you and your God,*" says Isaiah,¹⁾ and to separate between man and God was from the beginning Satan's endeavor. Satan's temptation was from the very outset calculated to induce man to place himself at variance with God, to assert his own will against the will of God, and to emancipate his affections from the superior norm imposed upon him by God's holiness. If man asserted himself as against God, and God in his holiness, according to which he is in energetic opposition to everything that is not in conformity therewith, asserted himself against man, the separation between God and man had been accomplished, the primeval relation of God and man had been disestablished. And this was Satan's aim.

With this object in view Satan indeed chose his measures with consummate subtility; and hence the narrative of the fall of man is fitly opened with the statement, "*And the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord had made.*"²⁾ That the moral law, inscribed in man's heart, was in every way the rule of life conducive to man's well-being, that love, the love of God and his fellow-man, would prove a source of happiness to him, was in every way evident. But here was a positive law, which,

1) Is. 59, 2.

2) Gen. 3, 1.

while it left man free to eat of every tree of the garden, enjoined him from eating of one particular tree under penalty of death. In his relation to God it was incumbent on man to trust to the wisdom and holiness of his Maker, to be fully persuaded that this enactment of the will of God tended to his benefit, and in willing obedience to conform himself with the will of God also in this particular case, even though God had reserved unto himself and his superior wisdom the peculiar reasons of such dispensation. To draw into question the propriety of this special commandment of God and to withhold his compliance therewith was rebellious self-assertion against God on the part of man, and not only an alteration, but a perversion, of his relation to God, whereby he would make his own the superior will and himself the superior, occupying the position which God could not but reserve to himself alone. To achieve this, Satan set in with impugning the validity and propriety of that one special commandment, changing and garbling it at the same time. While God had premised to his injunction the free permission to eat of every tree of the garden to indicate his goodness and kindness toward his creatures prior to the manifestation of his legislative majesty, Satan, reminding the woman of the divine commandment, employs a form calculated to obscure the goodness of God, saying, "*Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden,*" and thus forbearing to mention the permission and mentioning only the restriction, and that in an indefinite way. The questions which he evidently endeavored to rouse in the woman's mind were: "Why is it that God should withhold from us part of the blessings which we might enjoy? Why does he place his will between ourselves and a source of pleasure to us? Is this goodness and kindness toward his creatures? Can he mean what he says? And if, is he really disposed toward us as he would seem to be?" To suggest such questions and misgivings as these, Satan exhibited to the woman the divine commandment in its disfigured form, knowing

that each and every such question was, in fact, rebellion against God and a breaking away from the divinely established relation between God and man. But God had not only said in a different way what he had said, but he had also said more than the mere prohibition. He had also added the words, "*For in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die,*" and these words the tempter omits with an evident view of leading the woman to set aside the sovereign majesty of God manifested in that threat, while asserting her own dignity as infringed upon by the divine injunction.

Alas, from the manner of Eve's answer it would seem that Satan had with one fell blow brought our first mother to stagger or to fall, though for the moment she seems yet to cope with her assailant. She even seems to correct Satan in his recital of the divine commandment when she says, *We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden,*" and supplies what Satan has omitted when she continues, "*But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God hath said, Thou shalt not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.*"¹⁾ But right here it should be noted that Eve also changes the word of God in a way which would indicate that Satan had indeed stirred up rebellion against the will of God in her heart. The words, "*Neither shall ye touch it,*" are not God's, but Eve's. Why should she add these words imposing a restriction of man's freedom which God had not made? To add to a law of God is just as truly sin as to take from it, a usurpation of that, which is God's exclusive prerogative, and the addition to the divine prohibition clearly indicates that Eve had been led to feel under undue constraint as concerning the forbidden tree. And if so, she was already in rebellion against God and therefore separated from God, a fallen creature, with sin in her heart, and sin in her members, first of all

1) Gen. 3, 2. 3.

in her tongue. Satan certainly appears emboldened by what he has heard the woman say. He now promptly and openly gives God the lie, saying, "*Ye shall not surely die,*" and openly and explicitly states what he has found implied in the woman's speech. "*God does know,*" says he, "*that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.*" He accuses God of withholding from Eve and her spouse what they might secure by eating of the tree in the midst of the garden. The divine injunction is here exhibited as a measure whereby man should be kept from a station within his reach, but denied him by a jealous God. Instead of indignantly resenting this blasphemous speech of the tempter, Eve, already under the growing influence of sin, permits the deadly malady conceived in her heart to permeate all her faculties and their organs. Her eyes are now sinful eyes, *seeing that the tree was good for food*, though God had declared that its fruit should not be eaten. Her affections are changed from their primeval rectitude. She derives pleasure from what she should have viewed with awe, and desires what she should have shunned, and seeing that the tree was pleasant to the eyes and to be desired to make one wise, she openly cast away all constraint and took of the fruit of the forbidden tree and did eat. Nor was that all. Having turned away from God, she unhesitatingly becomes an accomplice of the devil, a tempter and seducer like him. *She gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat*, having evidently gone through the entire process of alienation from God and rebellion against his holy will.¹⁾

This, according to the divine record, was the genesis of sin and of the fall of man, the disruption and disestablishment of the primeval relation between man and God. Man, instead of confidently trusting in the goodness and wisdom of God and adhering to his word, and conforming

1) Gen. 3, 6.

himself to his will and seeking and finding the fulness of his bliss in such holy conformity with God, was led to seek superior bliss in himself and other creatures in inward and outward opposition to the will and word of God, and thus we may understand why it has been found difficult to determine the nature of the first rudiment of sin in the human heart, some describing it as selfishness, others as pride, still others as unbelief. Sin from the beginning did not consist in any of these transgressions singly and alone; nor did it consist merely in the setting aside of a positive law. The first sin was essentially the willful and fundamental disruption of the divinely established relation between man and God in all its various respects, man casting away his trust in God, the fear of God, the love of God, the filial spirit of obedience toward God, and thus breaking away from God and separating himself from his Creator, became an enemy of God, making himself his own god, of whom the Lord God said, "Behold, the man is become as one of us."

THE PENALTY OF SIN.

When the injunction concerning the forbidden tree was announced to our first parent, God said: "*In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*"¹⁾ In his primeval state man was a living soul in the full sense of the word. In his fallen state he was consigned to death in the full compass of the term. Death was not only to be the future lot of fallen man at the end of his mortal life, but the penalty which God had imposed upon the transgression of his law was to set in on the day of his first transgression, and there is no sufficient reason in the text or context to depart from the common meaning of the word *day*, in this connection. Neither are we by anything in the text or context led to restrict or weaken the meaning

1) Gen. 2, 17.

of the word *die* in the divine announcement of the penalty of sin. On the contrary, when God says מוֹת תָּמוּת, *thou shalt die the death*, or, *thou shalt surely die*, the emphatic form of the expression evidently indicates an energetic inauguration of the reign of death in the human race subsequent to man's transgression. This does not say that death should run its full course at once before the termination of the day of man's first transgression, or that all the various phases of death should at once appear in the fallen creature; but what the divine announcement of the penalty of sin clearly and expressly says is, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

The penalty of sin thus described was, then, not to be annihilation. Man was not, in consequence of the fall, to cease to be, to pass out of existence. His existence was not only to continue but also to continue as human existence. Fallen man was still essentially man, consisting of the constituent parts of his nature, body and soul, a human body and a human soul. Man by sin did not sink to or below the level of beasts. By sin man was not deprived of an intelligent mind, of understanding, reason, will, human affections, or anything essentially human. Fallen man was as truly man as he had been in his primeval state. And yet there was between that first estate and his fallen state a difference so vast, that a restoration could be wrought by God alone.

But as life is a mystery, so also death is a mysterious thing. Death is not the mere negation or absence of life. A stone or an iron statue is lifeless, but it is not dead in the proper sense of the word. Death presupposes a former state of life from which the subject has passed and which itself has passed away and can not be restored but by divine intervention. No power on earth can restore even a dead tree or worm to life. Death, then, is in one aspect a cessation of life within a living organism, an internal separation from that by which that organism was naturally deter-

mined from within itself. But inasmuch as life is sustained and invigorated by nourishment drawn from without, the separation of the living individual from that by which it is sustained will result in death. A tree uprooted from its proper soil, an animal shut off from light and air and food will die. Now, the sustaining principle of human life is God. In him we live and move and have our being.¹⁾ We live by the power of God.²⁾ When Adam sinned his iniquity separated between him and his God,³⁾—and Adam died. Having sinned, he was now dead in sin.⁴⁾ Living unto himself alone, he was dead while he lived.⁵⁾

Furthermore, death in man is more than death in a brute. Death in man is an execution of divine judgment over man's sins, a manifestation of divine wrath.⁶⁾ Thus death, progressive death, was, in Adam, the beginning and continuation of the execution of divine judgment, the infliction of the penalty imposed upon man's first transgression. That first sinful act of man was sin not only on the day when it was committed, but stood before God and between man and God as sin, an act which could never be anything but sin. No power in heaven or earth, neither man, nor angel, nor God himself, could ever change that sin into righteousness or into something morally indifferent. Hence death as the penalty of sin could not be but eternal death. Anything less than that would have been incompatible with the eternal justice and holiness of God, even if the first transgression had remained the only sin to be dealt with. The reason why death, which actually set in when man had fallen, was not at once consummated through all its stages was this, that God in his goodness and mercy had a decree of redemption and a decree of predestination to execute in time and did not suffer sin to frustrate the designs of his benevolence and grace.) In fact, on the very day

1) Acts 17, 28.

4) Eph. 2, 5.

2) 2 Cor. 3, 14.

5) 1 Tim. 5, 6.

3) Is. 59, 2.

6) Ps. 90, 7—11.

when death was come into the world and God in his judicial righteousness pronounced his just judgment over fallen mankind, he was already at hand with his saving grace and with a remedy against death, the precious gospel of the seed of the woman, who was to bruise the head of the serpent.

Death, then, was the penalty of sin. Death was not identical with sin. Man had committed sin, but man had not committed death. Sin was contrary to, and a violation of, the law; death was according to, and a vindication of, the law. Neither was death the natural consequence of sin or a product of the evolution of evil in man, not an evil fruit naturally growing on an evil tree, according to a law of nature. Death was not produced by sinful man, but a penalty inflicted by a righteous God. /God did not and does not cause man to sin, but death came and comes upon man by the wrath of God,¹⁾ and thus, when death was inflicted upon the first transgressor, this was not a violation but an assertion of the righteousness of God.)

That death, even eternal death, should be the penalty of sin is not only, as we have briefly shown, in full keeping with the nature of sin and with the righteousness of God, but also in full accord with the true nature of punishment and punitive justice. Of course, if the end and ultimate purpose of punishment were, as is widely claimed, the reformation of the sinner, then death, eternal death, would be the most improper punitive measure conceivable, and incompatible with the wisdom of God, according to which he employs the proper means to accomplish the proper ends. But such is not the nature and purpose of punishment. A penalty is not a bitter medicine administered to a patient to work a cure, but the infliction of just retribution upon the transgressor of the law to vindicate the majesty of the law and the lawgiver. Punitive justice is not determined by the amount of improvement of which the offender is in

1) Ps. 90, 3. 5. 7. 11.

need or capable, but the enormity of the offense committed and of the guilt thereby incurred. God in his justice does not say, "Chastisement is mine, I will reform the delinquent," but "VENGEANCE *is mine, I will REPAY,*"¹⁾ and of the persecutors of the church it is said: "*They have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; FOR THEY ARE WORTHY.*"²⁾ This is the nature of punitive justice everywhere. Even civil government when it metes out justice is *the minister of God, a REVENGER to execute WRATH upon him that DOETH EVIL.*³⁾ That civil authorities, in dealing with criminals, also look to the protection of the community and its members is not due to the nature of justice but to the nature of civil government, *one* of whose purposes is to afford protection to society. Even a human judge is just in exercising what is called judicial clemency only when he considers mitigating circumstances to the crime whereby the degree of guilt is lessened, and to grant a pardon where punishment has been merited is not of the province of justice but of grace, and is very properly not a function of the judicial but of the executive branch of government. Besides, human administration of justice is imperfect. It is an approximate vindication of *crime* committed in violation of human laws, not an adequate vindication or just recompense⁴⁾ of *sin*, committed in violation of divine law as such. And God does not say, "The cure of sin is death," but "*The WAGES of sin is death.*"⁵⁾

Again, however, the death of Adam was not death to him alone. Adam's death was the death of us all, even as Adam's sin was the sin of us all. Adam was in truth the fountainhead and representative of the entire human race. He was not only אָדָם, *a man*, but הָאָדָם, *the man*, both before the fall⁶⁾ and after the fall.⁷⁾ Adam's sin was, therefore,

1) Rom. 12, 19.

2) Rev. 16, 9.

3) Rom. 13, 4.

4) Hebr. 2, 2.

5) Rom. 6, 23.

6) Gen. 1, 27; 2, 7. 8. 15. 16. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 25.

7) Gen. 3, 8. 9. 12. 22; 4, 1.

not only the sin of a man, a human individual, but of man in general, of mankind, the human race, all of whose members existed substantially in their first ancestor, from whom all of them have their being, their nature, their fallen nature, which alone Adam could, and which alone he did, propagate.¹⁾ But even if Adam could have propagated his nature *in puris naturalibus*, without inherent sin, the first actual sin committed by him, for which the death penalty was imposed upon him, must have been imputed to all his children as their sin, committed in Adam, and this imputation actually took place. Adam had disobeyed God. That was his sin; but not his alone. *Διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, through the disobedience of that one man, Adam, the many were constituted sinners.*²⁾ When? Not at the present time in their personal individual life and existence. Not at some future time in the final judgment. For *κατεστάθησαν* is neither present nor future, but the aoristic past. The many who were in Adam when he sinned were constituted sinners through that first act of disobedience at the time when it was committed. All the millions of Adam's children were accounted sinners, because in Adam they had as truly, though not in the same manner as if they had in individual personal existence transgressed the law of God, been implicated in an act of disobedience. Hence when judgment was passed over Adam because of the sin he had committed, that judgment led to condemnation, but not to the condemnation of Adam only. *Τὸ κρίμα ἐξ ἐνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, the judgment, proceeding from one, resulted in condemnation.*³⁾ Judgment and condemnation extended over Adam, the transgressor, but not over him alone. The Apostle does not say *ἐν ἐνί*, or *εἰς ἓνα*, but *ἐξ ἐνός*. The judgment and condemnation proceeded from Adam to his children and to all of them, not only because of their particular sins committed

1) Gen. 5, 3.

2) Rom. 5, 19.

3) Rom. 5, 16.

after the beginning of their personal lives, nor only because of their inherent sinfulness inherited from their immediate and remote ancestors, but because of the sin Adam had committed in Paradise. *Δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντα ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατὰκριμα.* That one first transgression, that sinful act of their first ancestor, *παράπτωμα*, resulted in the condemnation of all men, inasmuch as they were in Adam when he sinned. And now the sentence pronounced over Adam was, "Thou shalt die." And that death, again, was not the death of Adam only, but *τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον*,¹⁾ *because of that one sin of the one man, Adam, not Adam alone but the many died.* When? St. Paul does not say *ἀποθνήσκουσιν*, as of death as being in process at the present time or through all time, but again uses the aoristic past, *ἀπέθανον*. On that day when death came into the world by sin, Adam's sin, not Adam alone but the many who were in Adam when he sinned were engulfed in death, died as truly as and in the same sense in which they had sinned. This appears again when St. Paul says *ἐν ἑνὶ παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε διὰ τοῦ ἑνός*, *by one offense death reigned through the one man Adam*.²⁾ And in order to preclude the supposition that what he said concerning the consequences of Adam's sin should be understood as referring to the transgressions of divine commandments during their individual personal lives, St. Paul calls our attention to the fact that *death reigned even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression*.³⁾ That supposition is likewise excluded by the trend and scope of the entire argument, extending from Rom. 5, 12 to v. 21, in which he draws the parallel between Adam and Christ and between Adam's *παράπτωμα* and Christ's *δικαίωμα*. As Adam's disobedience, his offense, *παράπτωμα*, had been the act of one man, Adam, so Christ's obedience, his enactment of righteousness, *δικαίωμα*, was the perform-

1) Rom. 5, 15.

2) Rom. 5, 17.

3) Rom. 5, 14.

ance of one God-man, the second Adam. But Christ's obedience, though performed by him alone, had its significance, its blissful consequences, not for one, but for many, and in this it resembled the disobedience of the first Adam, which, though also an act of one, the first transgressor, had its significance, its deplorable consequences, not for him alone, but for the many. Nor does the parallelism end here. Christ's *δικαίωμα*, his work of obedience, is to bring righteousness upon the many, not inasmuch as they follow his example and perform the same works of righteousness as they walk in newness of life, but Christ's own fulfillment of the law is itself the righteousness of the many by imputation. And in this also Christ's *δικαίωμα* resembles Adam's *παράπτωμα*, which has resulted in condemnation and death to the many, not inasmuch as they walk in their father's footsteps, transgressing as he transgressed, *ἁμαρτάνοντες ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ*, sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression. It is that one first act of disobedience, the first *παράβασις* and *παράπτωμα*, committed by Adam, which itself brought condemnation and death upon all men by imputation, Adam's sin and death being the sin and death of all his children, who were in him when and as he sinned.

Of course death is also the penalty of sin as inherent in and committed by the individual descendants of Adam, who was the first but not the last transgressor. Of Adam's children individually considered the Apostle says, "*There is no difference, for all HAVE SINNED and come short of the glory of God.*"¹⁾ And hence as concerning them all the Lord says, "*The soul that sinneth, it shall die,*"²⁾ and "*The wages of sin is death.*"³⁾ And thus we see that death is amply merited by all mankind and by each and every man, death in the true and full sense of the word, and that there can be but one way of averting death from a sinful world or a single human individual, and that is by full atonement

1) Rom. 3, 22. 23.

2) Ezek. 18, 4.

3) Rom. 6, 23.

for the sins of the world, Adam's sin and the sins of all his children. And since such atonement has actually been made, there is now a way of escaping death as the penalty of sin, and to those who have, hold and enjoy the benefits of the atonement made for them what is yet called death is no longer death in the true and full sense of the word, not a penalty, though still a consequence, of sin.

CONSEQUENCES OF SIN.

The consequences of sin in man as distinguished from the penalty of sin differ from the latter inasmuch as they are of the nature of the first transgression, not brought upon man by the righteous will of God, but acquired by man by his own voluntary departure from his primeval holiness under the temptation of Satan. The first sinful act of man superinduced a sinful state of his entire nature. Fallen man was a changed being, thoroughly changed and deplorably changed. This appears with remarkable clearness from the Mosaic narrative. Immediately after the words: "*And he did eat,*"¹⁾ the record continues: "*And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked.*"²⁾ The statement is not: "They knew that what they had done was wrong." This they knew when they committed the sinful act. But the first discovery they made after the first actual sin concerned not that act but themselves. Looking upon themselves, they discovered that they were naked, that they had now something to be ashamed of. In their primeval state of holiness their nakedness had been but an exhibition of their primeval purity, and hence *they were not ashamed.*³⁾ Now their nakedness was an exposure of an unholy body, inhabited by an unholy, unclean soul. Thus, then, the image of God was lost, and man was now depraved in his understanding, his will, and his affections, in soul and body. In his primeval state man had been in con-

1) Gen. 3, 6.

2) Gen. 3, 7.

3) Gen. 2, 25.

formity with the holy will of God, according to which he loved God with all his heart and his neighbor with a true and holy love. All this was now changed. Man no longer loved God. Love is a desire for, and delight in, union and communion with its object. But when Adam and his wife heard the voice of the Lord in the garden, that voice no longer sounded sweet to them as a father's or mother's voice is sweet in the ears of a loving child. The nearness of God did not prompt them to draw nigh unto him, to seek his face and hold converse with him, but they hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God, avoiding communion with him, fleeing from him, for they loved him no more. *There is no fear in love*, says the Apostle,¹⁾ and St. Paul says, *Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear.*²⁾ But when Adam made answer to the question: "*Where art thou?*" it was: "*I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid.*" There was no longer in Adam that spirit of filial love which cries "*Abba, Father,*"²⁾ and Adam was no longer the free man under God, but a bond-slave, crouching before his God in fear as of an enemy. Indeed, man was actually turned into an enemy of God, raising his accusing voice in blasphemy against his Maker and laying at his benefactor's feet at least part of the blame of his sin and charging his God with having brought upon him his ruin. For when he is asked, "*Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?*" his answer is, "*The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat,*"³⁾ as if to say, "I might have abstained from eating of that tree, had it not been for that gift of thine, woman, to whom thou hast bound me for life and who has now wrought my ruin." At the same time these words of Adam reveal also a woful change of his relation to the person who was not only his neighbor but also his spouse. In his primeval state his first

1) 1 John 4, 18.

2) Rom. 8, 15.

3) Gen. 3, 11. 12.

words after Eve's creation had been an utterance of exulting joy and holy love, a promise of cleaving to the helpmeet with whom God had blessed him. Now after his fall his first words concerning her are words of accusation as of an enemy, and instead of taking the whole burden of his responsibility for his sin upon himself and lovingly pleading for his wife, he is all selfishness and endeavors to throw the burden of his guilt at least in part upon the woman by his side, though the result be her greater condemnation. The Apache Indian, who loads down his wife with a burden of peltry and provisions, while he, the lord of the wigwam, walks by her side unburdened, is pointed out as a picture of selfishness; and yet there is no essential difference between him and his first father immediately after the fall. Another immoral trait in fallen man appears in Adam's lack of openness and honesty and his manifest deceitfulness, going into hiding where he should face his God, and seeking subterfuges where he should have confessed. And all this in dealing with an omniscient God, who sees even the thoughts of man afar off. The very thought of deceiving him was foolishness in Adam and, in fact, a denial of God. Thus was man's understanding also darkened in consequence of sin. And as for his physical nature, that, too, was weakened and depraved. Man was no longer in his primeval vigor. Labor was thenceforth onerous toil in the sweat of his face under gnawing sorrow,¹⁾ and the germ of dissolution was already in his body,²⁾ for whose protection God made him garments, not of leaves, only to protect his nakedness, but of the skins of animals, to protect him lest he should be prematurely exhausted by the influences of the elements, against which he was no longer proof.³⁾ Thus was man sent forth from the garden of Eden, which was no longer for him an appropriate environment and dwelling place, and thrust out into a land of sorrow, bringing forth

1) Gen. 3, 17.

2) Gen. 3, 19.

3) Gen. 3, 21.

thorns and thistles, as for a fallen creature, though even then God had stretched forth his saving hand to lift him out of his misery, whence he could never have raised himself. For in all that we here learn concerning man in his fallen state as represented in Adam, there is not one redeeming feature, no vestige of that concreated holiness which was the glory of primeval man, nothing the development whereof might bring him nearer to his first estate. This does not say that man's depravity as it appears in Adam was not capable of variation or growth, that depraved as he was he could not have become more intensely depraved, that the darkness which encompassed him could not grow deeper and thicker, that his will had been unable to choose between one evil and another, that his affections were no longer human but had given place to the instincts of a brute. Adam was still man, a human, rational being with all the essential attributes and capabilities of human nature. He still possessed a certain knowledge of the law, and a conscience to remind him of the stringency of the law and his responsibility for his transgressions. But whatever he was, he was now in the bonds of sin, with not so much as a desire to free himself from such bonds. In all his conduct, his affections, his thoughts and words and acts, he exhibits himself as evil and only evil.

This state of total depravity did not, however, terminate where it originated, in our first ancestors. Of Adam we read that he *begat a son in his own likeness, after his image.*¹⁾ Of Adam's children and later descendants it is said, "*that which is born of the flesh is flesh.*"²⁾ Adam being totally depraved brought forth children also totally depraved. Not by a process of evolution extending through many generations was sin finally developed as from a microscopic germ, but Cain, the firstfruit of human propagation, was also the first murderer who, without real provocation,

1) Gen. 5, 3.

2) John 3, 6.

in sheer selfishness, violently took his brother's life,¹⁾ thus committing that crime which is even now registered among the most atrocious offences in the penal codes of the world, and under circumstances all of which would be considered aggravating and not one extenuating in any court of justice. Again, before that generation had passed away, there was another murderer among Adam's descendants, Lamech, the bigamist.²⁾ Whence was that murderous spirit in Cain? It was not by following an evil example that he committed this evil deed, but that first murderous act was a fruit of an evil heart as described by Christ, saying, "*Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders,*" etc.³⁾ And this description of the human heart was not only true in the days of Christ. The very first portraiture of the human heart laid down in holy Scripture is a picture of total depravity. Of the days when man began to multiply on the face of the earth,⁴⁾ it is said: "*God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.*"⁵⁾ There is in all the Scriptures no text which asserts more forcibly the total depravity of the heart of man. The terms employed are cumulative. The statement is not that man, or even all of the acts of man, were imperfect or evil. It does not say that the imaginations or thoughts of man were largely or preponderatingly evil, or evil at times and frequently; but it says that every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart was evil and only evil and continually evil. The babe in its mother's arm, men and women in the full vigor of manhood and womanhood, the aged stooping under the burden of years, all of them by day and by night, are here described as evil at heart, thoroughly and persistently evil.

This was before the flood, from which eight souls only were rescued, not because of an innate difference between

1) Gen. 4, 8.

4) Gen. 6, 1.

2) Gen. 4, 23.

5) Gen. 6, 5.

3) Matt. 15, 19.

them and those who perished. For such difference there was not. They were saved by faith through the goodness of God.¹⁾ And of Noah and his household according to the flesh, who gathered about an altar which Noah, the preacher of righteousness,²⁾ had built unto the Lord, God said, "*The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.*"³⁾ And thus when in the dispersion of Babel the human race was scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth,⁴⁾ it was a sinful race which sought new habitations and which has since then multiplied and replenished the earth, so that among all the nations and tribes of men not one has to this day been discovered which was not contaminated with sin from generation to generation. There was sin in the house of Abraham, sin in Egypt and in Canaan, sin throughout Jews and Gentiles, sin in our Lord's disciples as in the Pharisees and Sadducees, at Herod's court and Pilate's tribunal; sin is written on all the pages of history, sin wherever man has found a dwelling place. All this admits of but one explanation. It is this that innate, congenital sinfulness has taken the place of original concreated righteousness and holiness throughout all mankind. And this is the explanation we find in the Scriptures. "*That which is born of the flesh is flesh.*"⁵⁾ "*We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags.*"⁶⁾ For "*Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.*"⁷⁾ "*Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me,*" says David.⁸⁾ Not contaminated with sin by environment or steeped in sin in the course of years, but conceived in sin and coming into being in iniquity as he was shaped in his mother's womb, thus with congenital sinfulness permeating his body and soul was David and every other man ushered into existence.

1) Hebr. 11, 7.

4) Gen. 11, 4. 8.

7) Job 14, 4.

2) 2 Pet. 2, 5.

5) John 3, 6.

8) Ps. 51, 5.

3) Gen. 8, 21.

6) Is. 64, 6.

Thus is man by nature *carnal, sold under sin*,¹⁾ and in him, that is, *in his flesh, dwelleth no good thing*.²⁾

This innate sinfulness is also accounted as sin in the sight of God. Paul says of himself and of others like him, "*We are by nature the children of wrath, even as others.*"³⁾ Wrath is the assertion and exertion of divine holiness against sin, and we are by nature under the wrath of God. *Ἦμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς* are Paul's words, *φύσει* being in emphasis. Not only by what we have done, not by what we have become in the course of our lives, but as we were made and came into being in the course of nature, by our conception and birth, we are under wrath, the *wrath of God revealed from heaven against all ungodliness of man*.⁴⁾

This total depravity of our corrupt nature extends to all our faculties. Our desires and affections are turned into inordinate affections and evil concupiscence,⁵⁾ lusts of uncleanness, walking after which is walking after the flesh,⁶⁾ and desires of the flesh,⁷⁾ deceitful lusts, according to which our old man is corrupt.⁸⁾ Our will is perverted and opposed to the will of God and only prone to evil, the carnal mind being enmity against God, not subject to the law of God and unable to be.⁹⁾ Our understanding is darkened, totally blind in spiritual things,¹⁰⁾ so that the *natural man conceiveth not the things of the spirit of God*: for they are *foolishness* unto him; *neither CAN he know them*.¹¹⁾ This deterioration is particularly and painfully evident in the derangement of human conscience after the fall and under the influence of sin. For while no man is entirely destitute of conscience, the faculty of rating the ethical acts of man according to

1) Rom. 7, 14.

2) Rom. 7, 18.

3) Eph. 2, 3.

4) Ps. 5, 5. Rom. 1, 18.

5) Col. 3, 5.

6) 2 Pet. 2, 10.

7) Eph. 2, 3.

8) Eph. 4, 22.

9) Rom. 8, 7.

10) Eph. 4, 18: "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart."

11) 1 Cor. 2, 14.

the moral norm congenital in man is no more that reliable witness bearing testimony to the stringency of the law and man's responsibility for every deviation therefrom, but largely fails to perform its primary and secondary functions. Thus the torpid, sleeping, callous, weak, or erring conscience, neglecting to act and react according to the true norm, or performing its various functions according to false norms, might alone suffice to exhibit human nature in its fallen state as a lamentable ruin of its former self. Thus all our faculties are enslaved under the power of sin, without any ability in any measure to work our own spiritual restoration. "*I am carnal, sold under sin,*" says Paul.¹⁾ That which determines our actions is sin, as Paul says, "*I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind and bringing me into captivity of the law of sin which is in my members.*"²⁾ Sin is a power which governs us, making us the servants of sin,³⁾ and thus are we *all* gone aside and *altogether* accounted filthy.⁴⁾

Such is the natural *state* of fallen man under sin. But this is not all, though it is fully and abundantly sufficient to merit death and everlasting damnation under the righteous wrath of God, which is revealed against *all* ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.⁵⁾ The evil tree also bears evil fruit, the contaminated fountain issues forth contaminated waters, the natural depravity of man is productive of manifold actual sins. Man is not only evil but also does evil. *There is none that DOETH good, not one.*⁶⁾ Man by evil acts fulfills the desires of the flesh.⁷⁾ Being by nature darkness he performs unfruitful works of darkness,⁸⁾ and being flesh

1) Rom. 7, 14.

2) Rom. 7, 23.

3) Rom. 6, 17: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to you." Rom. 6, 20: "For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness."

4) Ps. 14, 3.

5) Rom. 1, 18.

6) Rom. 3, 12. Ps. 14, 3.

7) Eph. 2, 3.

8) Eph. 5, 11.

he exerts himself in works of the flesh;¹⁾ his heart being desperately wicked²⁾ he brings forth wicked works;³⁾ being corrupt he does abominable works.⁴⁾ Sin dwelling and rooted in our hearts works in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.⁵⁾

Actual sins may be variously classified. Thus there are sins of commission⁶⁾ of that which God forbids, and sins of omission⁷⁾ of that which God demands, internal,⁸⁾ external,⁹⁾ voluntary¹⁰⁾ and involuntary¹¹⁾ sins, sins committed directly against God¹²⁾ and sins committed indirectly against God,¹³⁾ and directly against the sinner's self,¹⁴⁾ or against his neighbor,¹⁵⁾ sins committed by ourselves¹⁶⁾ and sins of others in which we participate.¹⁷⁾

A. G.

1) Gal. 5, 19. Col. 5, 19.

2) Jer. 17, 9.

3) Col. 1, 21.

4) Ps. 14, 1.

5) Rom. 7, 5.

6) Gal. 5, 19—21. Rom. 1, 23; Rom. 3, 13—15.

7) James 4, 17. Rom. 1, 21. Dan. 9, 13.

8) Matt. 5, 28. 1 John 3, 15.

9) Matt. 12, 34. Gal. 5, 19—21.

10) Rom. 1, 32. Is. 3, 9.

11) Numb. 15, 22. 24. Luke 12, 48.

12) Ps. 41, 1. Rom. 1, 21—23. Prov. 8, 36. Exod. 20, 3. 7.

13) Gen. 39, 9. Acts 5, 2. 3.

14) 1 Cor. 6, 18. Eph. 5, 19.

15) Exod. 20, 12—16.

16) 2 Sam. 12, 7. Gen. 3, 12. 13.

17) 1 Tim. 5, 22. Eph. 5, 7; 5, 11. Rev. 18, 4.

(To be continued.)
