

CHAPTER 3

ANTITHETIC DUALISM OR LIFE VERSUS DEATH

"Let it be assumed that each article of our creed is well warranted by Scripture; it may notwithstanding be true that indefinite misconceptions, affecting the Divine character and government, or that certain modes of feeling generated in evil days, and still uncorrected, exist, and operate to benumb the impulsive and expansive energies of the Gospel. Our interpretation of Christianity may be good, and may be pure enough for private use; it may be good in the closet, good as the source of the motives of common life, and good as the ground of hope in death, and yet may be altogether unfit for conquest and triumph. That it is so unfit, should be assumed as the only pious and becoming explication we can give of the almost universal ignorance and irreligion of mankind."

-- Fanaticism, by Isaac Taylor.

The whole Universe so far as it is brought within the comprehension of man by scientific observation or revelation, is divided morally into two great empires, good and evil, which include the sum total of rational created being. I say "created being", for while God is imminent in both, yet He transcends both. Each of these empires seeks supremacy and universality at the expense of the other. There is no third empire and there is no neutral ground. Every rational intelligence is here, or there, or nowhere. The antithesis is constitutional, ineradicable, and universal. One of these opposing empires may, I do not say it will, some day cease to be; but while it exists and persists it cannot be or become other than it is by virtue of its essential nature. Light in its essence can never become darkness, nor darkness light. The Empire of truth and purity and love can never bring aught to man but what is essentially good, though the good may not always seem to be what it really is. So, on the contrary, the empire of darkness can never bring aught but evil, though it may often seem otherwise. This truth is not open to intellectual demonstration except through the avenue of the heart; and not even there except through the fellowship of the Christ and His Cross. Compare Gen. 3 and Phil. 3.

Herein lies the problem of life, a problem which every finite intelligence is seeking consciously or unconsciously to solve by way of Calvary, or by way of an all absorbing egotism.

If each of these vast antithetic empires occupied a place, or territory, or world, by itself, the one equally tive to the other, and one could choose for himself to live here or there, the problem would be vastly simplified for honest hearts. But would not the very fact of such simplification carry with it by logical sequence the nullification of latent possibilities? How then would that "eternal life" which was with the Father and which was brought into manifestation through the agony of Gethsemane and the tragedy of Golgotha get a real root and a firm footing in the heart and life and destiny of man? That which was born into objective being in the Christ through indescribable moral conflict can only become subjectively real and victorious in man by extension of the same ethical process through the power of the Holy Spirit within. "If we have been planted together in the likeness of His death we shall also be in the likeness of His Resurrection", Rom. 6:3-5, and not otherwise. In the nature of things there is no

simplification of the necessity and mystery of Calvary. If it were now possible for God by an almighty fiat to completely separate these two great empires so as to dissolve the dualism subjectively in His people, and place an impassible gulf between the good and the evil, the result would, it seems to me, be as unfortunate for the Christian as for the sinner; for the reason that that would be to annihilate the mystery by bringing the moral conflict with its beneficent discipline to a premature termination, and thereby to rob life (zoe), if we have it and know it, of its latent potentiality, thus obliging redeemed man to spend eternity at an unfortunate distance from his Creator and Redeemer; for man can only be what he ought to be as he is conformed to the image of the Christ through suffering, in the possession of conscious freedom, in depth of virtue, and wealth of personality.

It is difficult to conceive of a world of absolute goodness into which children might be born where neither they nor their parents had ever known evil even through the prohibition of something within the limits of human desire; and where at the same time, moral integrity could be preserved only by a heroic choice of the will. Could freedom, virtue, and personality, have anything more than an imaginary existence in such a state?

The thought of God as unitary, self-existing, selfdetermining, eternal, immutable, and holy, is not only thinkable but absolutely necessary. The thought of God as not self-existent and self-determined is unthinkable, and such a God would be dependent, and therefore not God at all. The dependent is the finite and relative, and implies the independent, the infinite and absolute. A chain of unlimited antecedents, or sequents, is unthinkable; therefore the conception of independence, self-existence, eternity and holiness, considered individually and in their unity as attributes of God, is a primary postulate of the human mind and heart. Thus there is no room and no possibility of an antithetic dualism in God. This conception of God is immediate and intuitive.

But on the other hand that which precludes the possibility of such a dualism in the Creator is the very thing which makes it possible, and, I might almost say, desirable, in the creature, as the world, as the universe, as man.

God could not contemplate the work of creation as He made it without foreseeing the possibility and, indeed, the certainty of the entrance of evil, for the simple reason that an independent, self-existing creation is an impossibility. The rational creature must be free to choose between moral opposites in order to possess rationality and moral integrity worthy of man in his relation to his fellows, the world, and God. Such a being must be bound to God and to the whole of which he is a part by many bonds of relationship-physical, mental, and spiritual-with their accompanying power of affirmation and negation, of knowledge and ignorance, moral integrity and moral obliquity. Thus, and thus only, can freedom in choice, loyalty to truth, and devotion to God be embodied in human personality worthy of intimate, comprehensive, and

abiding communion with God.

Thus this antagonistic dualism, with all its latent possibilities for good or evil, is not only in the world, but it is in man; and not simply in man as a sinner, but in man as a saint. It is in every man who is born of woman and begotten of man. But there was and is One Man born of woman but not begotten of man, and He was absolutely sinless. And yet in being "made sin for us" He entered into the profoundest experience of the heights and depths of this awful dualism in a way forever beyond the capacity of any finite personality. And in doing so He broke its power for all who truly love Him, and paved the way for the everlasting separation of these two great empires, with complete victory on the side of truth and righteousness and God. Thus, indeed, will the empire of evil lose its relative greatness. Jesus Christ is not a son of a man; but He is the Son of Man. The Fall came through man and so must the Restoration. Rom. 5:12-21. The Christ must triumph. He is not only self-existent but in Him the created universe consists.

Granting then: 1. The self-existing and holy God; 2. the fallen sinful creature; and 3. the incarnate God-Man between and with one hand on each, I conclude that this is the best of all worlds into which a man can be born; and where freedom, virtue and personality can, because of the presence of good and evil, be developed to the highest possible degree of perfection; and thus man to all eternity may find the most intense and comprehensive correspondence in thought, feeling and volition with the ultimate First Cause-the Triune God. This, and not mere locality, is what constitutes Heaven. And the want of this with its ethical and spiritual implications, and not mere locality, is what constitutes Hell.

Thus the consciousness of a subjective dualism, involving as it does betimes the most fearful conflicts both within and without, is not really a calamity except as we deliberately make it so by personal choice of the evil in preference to the good.

Shall we then say that sin was, or is, a necessity? Not so if God were satisfied with man as a creature only. But this could not satisfy the love and wisdom and power of God. He could and did produce His image in man by creative fiat; but He could not impart His nature so that fallen men might become His sons, except by the incarnation, the suffering and sacrificial death of the Christ, wrought out first objectively and then subjectively.

To ask the question: Was sin a necessity? is virtually the same as to enquire: Could man become what Christianity proposes to make him without being subjected to the process of discipline implied in his position in a world where he is permitted to voluntarily choose between good and evil in various ways and under diverse circumstances? If so we have no way of knowing it, or even conceiving of it. I state this not to raise the discussion of a metaphysical problem in which men are apt to lose themselves in useless speculation, but because the fact and the question have

profound eschatological significance and real profit.

Redemption is not an expedient of Divine wisdom to repair the damage effected in the first creation by the introduction of sin; but it is the fact and the process whereby the first creation can find its true use and end in providing a platform on which the mystery of the incarnation and the tragedy of the Cross might be enacted and God revealed. In short, apart from the fall man never could have been what he now can be and will be. And may I go a step further and say that without the fall of man God could never have been what He is, and yet shall be, in manifestation of the deepest glory of His character. God is Spirit; God is Light; God is Love. And that not as inward potential possibility; but as outward manifested reality and glory. This is equivalent to saying that the ultimate end of creation and redemption must justify the Divine permission of evil, and that on a scale of overwhelming magnitude.

In the former chapter we were occupied with the words "eternal life"; and there we saw that the Scriptures reveal a synthetic dualism—the gift and the prize, the former containing the latter in germ, and the latter carrying to full manifestation the inherent potentiality, worth and glory of the former.

But once the gift has been received there rests upon the receiver a tremendous responsibility in that he must co-operate with the Holy Spirit and with the Divine Trinity in developing the latent possibilities of the germ, so that God may perfect through discipline the work He began in the new birth. The Christian who resists the Spirit's leading and neglects God's provision in this matter is a greater sinner than the Israelite who refused to overcome the difficulties of the wilderness and thus enter Canaan; and his penalty will be more severe, for "how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation"? Heb. 2:1-3; Matt. 24:13.

In other words, THE BELIEVER IS ON PROBATION. He has to choose between eternal (age-lasting) salvation; or eternal (age-lasting) judgment. The Church on earth does not so teach nor believe; but the Bible does; and so do all the saved who have passed behind the veil. Moses said to Israel: See, I have set before thee this day life and good (on the one side) and death and evil (on the other). Deut. 30:15. Paul says to the Church of the present dispensation, or age: "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die (spiritually); but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live (spiritually). Rom. 8:13. Both Israel and the Church with few individual exceptions have chosen the way of spiritual death. Only those who have attained real spiritual union with the Christ by self-denial and self-sacrifice effected through the power of the Spirit of Christ as crucified and risen, will share in the glory of the first-resurrection. This is the meaning of Rom. 6:3-5; Matt. 10:32-39 and 7:13-14.

Here is a mighty truth and its exposition will show how defective and delusive is the eschatology of the various churches for many hundreds of years, both in its relation to the saved and the unsaved. In demonstration of the truth of this position we must lay our foundations deep in the word of God. We are not anxious about anything else. Man's approval or disapproval is nothing except as it expresses the mind of Christ.

In the preceding chapter our discussion turned chiefly on the Greek adjective *aionios*. In this we will investigate a biblical phrase of somewhat synonymous meaning, and doing so will find ourselves conducted to the same conclusion and with corresponding effect on the traditional teaching of the churches as to the future state. That phrase is *eis ton aiona*, which is usually translated in A.V. and R.V. "forever", a meaning which it never has, and therefore should in no case be so rendered into English. We have pointed out the fact that the adjective *aionios* (translated indifferently "eternal" or "everlasting" in A.V., and "eternal" only in R.V.) is derived from the noun *aion* an age, a period of time short or long with clearly marked beginning and end. In the phrase *eis ton aiona*, *aiona* is the accusative singular of *aion*. The word *eis* is a preposition usually rendered in, into or for. The little word *ton* is the accusative singular, masculine, of the definite article.

Our of the New Testament *aion* leads us back to the *olam* of the Old Testament—its equivalent. It is impossible, as already remarked, for any language to get along without words which mark time; and in this respect what the *aion* was to the Greeks the *olam* was to the Hebrews. When longer periods of time are involved the idea is expressed by plural forms, or by duplication. The *olam* is employed with or without the prepositions *le* and *ad*, signifying to, or into, also *min*, from. In both A.V. and R.V. the *olam* of the Old Testament is translated "everlasting" or "for ever" which are utterly misleading and confusing, and wholly indefensible from the standpoint of scholarship and of energetical consistency, as we shall soon see. Young invariably translates *olam* as he does *aionios* by "age-lasting". So also Browne's Triglott.

In the Greek New Testament we have the noun *aion* (age) with its derivative adjective *aionios* (age-lasting); but in the Hebrew of the Old Testament we have the noun *olam* with no corresponding adjective, so that the noun has to do double service; i. e., it has to serve as adjective and noun. The Hebrew language is said to be rich in nouns and verbs but deficient in modifiers.

Before going back to investigate the use of *olam* in the Old Testament let us take a few examples of mistranslations of *aion* in the New Testament. First, as to the use of the noun without the preposition and article. Here the A.V. and R.V. have confounded the *aion* with *kosmos*, owing to the fact that they usually translate both words by "world". Now *kosmos* is always properly translated "world", but *aion* ought never to be so rendered. I am not ignoring Heb. 1:2 and 11:3.

They make Christ say "Lo! I am with always, even unto the end of the world". Matt. 28:20. But what He does say is, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the age (*aion*). The consequence is that the Church, with few exceptions, believes that Christ will not come till the end of the world (which, by the way, is not a biblical expression). But He says He is coming again at the end of the present age; and He spoke of the "age to come", after this has run its course, when He will establish His Millennial Kingdom in power and glory; and when He will reward the faithful and punish the unfaithful among His people as we have seen in 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Heb. 6:4-8; 10:26-31.

In Matt. 13:39, the versions make Him say, "The harvest is the end of the world"; but He says "The harvest is the end of the age (*aion*)", meaning, this age of grace. In verse 38 the translation "world" is correct for it is not *aion* but *kosmos*. See margin of R.V. In Luke 18:30 it is *aion*. We have given only three samples out of many. Were the translators and revisers really trying to bolster up that sorry tradition of post-millennialism? Their acts would lead one to that conclusion.

Let us now take two samples of the false rendering of the adverbial phrase *eis ton aiona*. When Christ cursed the fig tree, the type of barren but showy Judaeism, they make Him say to the good olive tree (Rom. 11:17), "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward *for ever*." But the seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:16) did not, and cannot say that. He said, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for the (this) age"-the time limit of the curse. What a decisive exegetical difference this makes both in process and conclusion. But it is only by such, shall we say, deliberate confusion of terms that the illusion of postmillennialism can perpetuate its fictitious existence and wield its enslaving, blighting power. And this remark is true of the traditional eschatology as a whole. Right here it may be opportune to quote some words of Lord Bacon as to the process of logical reasoning. He says:

"The syllogism consists of propositions; propositions of words, and words are tokens, or signs of notions. Now if the very notion of the mind be improperly or overhastily abstracted from the facts, vague and not sufficiently definite, faulty, in short, in many ways, the whole edifice tumbles".

Before proceeding farther in our discussion I ask the reader to seek grace to apprehend and, if possible, also to progressively comprehend a great Biblical fact, in order to get the correct view point and perspective in this study. It is this:

The grand outlook of the Saints in both Testaments was not on eternity and completely consummated redemption; but on the Messianic Age and its glorious Theocratic Kingdom under the whole heavens. From Adam to Abraham; and from Abraham to Malachi; and from Matthew to John in Patmos, this thought of the Sovereign Rule of the Seed of the woman and of Abraham; this Son of David on David's Throne, fixes the prophetic horizon of futurity and declares in unmistakable terms that there is no peace for the world, and no reward for the saints, till Jesus comes in

the glory of His Father and the Holy Angels to found that Kingdom which, because of His rejection by the Jews, was postponed at His first Advent.

And what is more: The Old Testament prophets and saints, by no fault of theirs, did not see the present dispensation. It was a mystery hid in the mind and plan of God. Their vision was beyond, to the glorious Messianic Kingdom, the time limits of which they did not know.

On the contrary the Church, since the third century, has been so deeply absorbed in the coming eternity that it refuses to see this most pernicious and fatal heresy of post-millenarianism in the history of Christianity.

This great truth not only affects Biblical Eschatology, but the whole range of Biblical Theology. Historical and Systematic Theology for 1600 years have refused to see the facts from this point of view; but have painted a picture of the future according to the carnal fancy of Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene apostasy. And let the fact be remembered and pondered, that Past, Present, and Future, constitute a unity in truth or in error, in God, or in Satan. I cannot be wrong as to the future and right as to the present and the past; and vice versa. The unity of personality demands this. Past and future can only be viewed through the medium of what I am. Fiction here will project and objectify itself there. Hence the necessity of a pure heart, a surrendered will, and a renewed mind. These, however, can only be realized by degree and in fellowship with the Christ as rejected on earth and accepted in heaven.

We will now cite a few passages to show the practical force and utility of this manner of viewing the past, present and future, and specially with reference to its bearing on Biblical Eschatology:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Who so eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever".
John 6:47-58.

Here we have *aiōnios zōē* (eternal life) twice, verses 47, 54; and we have also the phrase *eis ton aionā* (for the age) twice, verses 51, 58. The latter modify and complete the predicate "shall live". Thus we see the synonymous character of the two thoughts. Now the traditional and orthodox method of treating these words of Christ assumes that He is here speaking and discoursing concerning what English readers understand by the "eternal state" which follows the judgment of the Great White Throne. But this is all wickedly wrong. The subject under discussion here is the same as in Luke 18:18-30; namely, THE AGE TO COME; that period of time after the second advent of Messiah and lying between the judgment of the Bema, 2 Cor. 5:10 (where only the saved appear) and the judgment of the Great White Throne-Rev. 20:11-15; these time points definitely marking the termini of the period; and John tells us that the time between them is 1000 years. Rev. 20:1-6. Strictly speaking there is "a little season" between the end of the 1000 years and the White Throne judgment. Rev. 20:3. Now if this be the correct interpretation it is easy to see its tremendously significant bearing on Biblical Eschatology; and at the same time the delusive falsity and fatality of the traditional interpretation.

We will therefore proceed to establish the fact. In the light of Lord Bacon's warning let us be mercilessly severe in our definitions. Let us also remember the Jewish expectation of their Messiah and His Kingdom as their one hope. They were right in "the hope" but wrong in their manner of cherishing it. They thought that when Messiah came it would be in glory and irresistible power, and that He would at once break the hated yoke of the Romans and set them free. They never dreamed of a humble, rejected, crucified Messiah; and much less of their need of special moral and spiritual preparation for entering the Messianic Kingdom when the time had come. In short, the priests and people alike were the helpless victims of a false and delusive system of interpretation. And, let me add, this is one cause of the trouble in the Church in the present dispensation. And who but a blind man can fail to see the hand of the Prince of this world behind the whole matter? I Cor. 2:14; John 14:30; 9:39-41.

In the Synoptic Gospels the condition, when once salvation from the guilt of sin has been received, of entering this Messianic Kingdom is utter self-denial, and the sacrifice of everything for the love of Christ and one's neighbor. Matt. 19:16-30; Mark 10:17-31; Luke 18:18-30 and 10:25-37. But in John's Gospel, as might be expected, Christ goes deeper and reveals the fact that no man can fulfil such a condition except by a living abiding union with Himself as the Bread of Life. John 6:35-63; 10:1-10. And this union with Him and abiding in Him implies that all other relations in life must, if evil, be abandoned, and if good take a wholly subordinate place. Luke 14:25-35; Jas. 4:4; I John 2:15-17. This means complete separation from the world and deliverance from its enslaving spirit. It means conformity to Christ in life and in death. And this is secured by nothing less than abiding in Him and continually eating His flesh and drinking His blood. In Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament I find a couple of remarks to the point in this connection. In his definition of *alma* (blood)

he says:

"Perhaps too 1 John 5:6, 8 and especially John 6:53-58, where the phrases to 'eat the flesh' and 'drink blood of Christ', signify to become wholly united and incorporated with Christ, i.e., to imbibe His Spirit and appropriate to oneself all the benefits of His advent, to be wholly conformed to Christ."

Were the Corinthians and Galatians thus living on the Life-giving Spirit of the Christ? I Cor. 15:45. Only those so living are the wheat to be gathered into the heavenly garner. Matt. 13:30; 13:49; Luke 3:15-17. When Christ revealed to John in Patmos the spiritual condition of the seven representative churches in Asia, both literally and prophetically, did He present a scene of the branches abiding in the vine, or of world wide declension and apostasy? Compare Rev.2, 3 and Matt. 13; also Heb. 3, 4.

The "fathers" came out of Egypt under the blood of the Passover lamb, and virtually under the blood of Christ, and were owned as the people of God. But they refused to come, by faith, into the place of living union with Jehovah as did Joshua and Caleb. They clung to the place of death (disobedience) spiritually, and therefore had no power to obey God. And when the final test came at Kadesh-Barnea they filled up the measure of their iniquity and God gave them over to die physically and spiritually in the wilderness. They died as they had lived-in a state of spiritual death (relatively), having no fellowship in their spirit with God, no correspondence.

But their position in this state of relative death was not that of the Egyptians, or of other nations generally. They were still God's people. The death in which the nations are involved is not relative but absolute death. But to this day the "fathers" are in this state of relative death. John 6:49. But how different was and is the case of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? They too died as they had lived. They lived by faith (Hab. 2:4) in fellowship with the living God. Thus God is only really the God of those of His people who live and die in faith. These and these only will share, physically and spiritually, in the first resurrection. He will become 'the God' of the others later on. Only those of the saved who live and die in faith by continually eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood will attain to eternal (age-lasting) life in the Messianic Kingdom. Heb. 11:13. He said to the Jews:

Search the Scriptures for in them ye think ye have "eternal (age-lasting) life" (in the Messianic Kingdom), and they are they which testify of Me (your Messiah). John 5:39.

But, like Christians, instead of searching the Scriptures, they searched the traditions of the elders and asked, "Have any of the rulers of the Pharisees believed on Him"? John 7:48. Their faith in man made faith in Christ impossible.

That the above is the correct interpretation of John 6:49 and Matt. 22:31, 32, is clear from John 6:50 and 11:26; I Cor. 10:1-10. "This is the bread that came down from heaven that a man may eat thereof and not die". Now, Peter, James, John and Paul, all ate of that bread and yet every one of them died physically. This proves that He is not talking of physical but of spiritual death; and in the case of the saved not of absolute but of relative death; and not of the life in the eternal state beyond the White Throne judgment, but of age-lasting life in the Millennial-Messianic Kingdom after the Bema Judgment, 2 Cor. 5:10; for He says, "he that eateth of this bread shall live for the (millennial) age". John 6:51, 58; 8:51. Thus the "eternal life" of John 6:47,54; and the "shall live for ever" of 6:51, 58 are identical expressions, and should be translated "agelasting life" and "shall live for the age", respectively.

Here we quote again from Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament. In his definition of *Zoe*, he says:

"In the Christian sense of *eternal life*, i.e., that life of bliss and glory in the Kingdom of God, which awaits *the true disciple of Christ after the resurrection*; so *zoe aionios*. Matt. 19:16, 17". The italics are mine.

It is significant not only that he defines "eternal life" in this way, but also that he adduces as proof text the question of the Young Ruler. Note also his assertion that this "eternal life" is only for "the true disciples of Christ", and to be entered only "after the resurrection". Thus he distinguishes by implication between eternal life as the gift of free grace, and eternal life as the prize; for every saved man has the former whether true to Christ like the Thessalonians, or untrue like the Corinthians and Galatians. But it is almost certain that Robinson failed to see the real eschatological significance of his own distinction.

Let us now turn from John to Paul:

"Howbeit that for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Christ Jesus might show forth all long suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting".

He is here not talking of the free gift as in Rom. 6:23, but of the prize which can only be secured through fellowship with Christ in His sufferings; and says that God has appointed him (Paul) to be a pattern to other believers, that by word and deed he might persuade Christians to "put off the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and that ye put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness", for only thus can those who have received the new birth believe unto life age-lasting (in the Messianic Kingdom). Alas! how few Christians seek honestly to do this. `With the thought of failure among the saved he says:

"Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an example. For many (Christians) walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things."

How pathetic the thought that for the great majority of Christians their end is not maturity and Millennial glory, but exclusion, destruction and age-lasting judgment. Alas! How will we preachers and teachers of the Word stand before our judge in that terrible day? Surely Isa. 3:12 is appropriate here. We have tried to save our life from the offence of the Cross, but in doing so we have lost it for the age to come with the consequence that we have exposed ourselves to eternal (age-lasting) ment. The Master has pictured the true and false servants in Matt. 24:42-51. But thank God for Paul and Peter and James and John. Listen to Paul again:

"But refuse profane and old wives' fables (and much of theology comes under this head), and exercise thyself rather unto Godliness. For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and that which is to come." I Tim. 4:7,8.

Ungodly believers may have the life that now is and it is true life (zoe), but they have no claim on the life of the age to come. Contrast Gal. 5:19-21; and Matt. 19:27-30. The antithetic Dualism in different classes of believers is very clearly marked here.

Listen to Paul further:

"But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal (age-lasting) life" whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses." 1 Tim. 6:11,12.

There is no need of fighting for the free gift. The hand of faith simply reaches out to the God-Man and takes it. Not so, however, with the prize. In verse 19 Paul exhorts the rich in this world's goods who think that by means of their money and social position they know something of real happiness, "to lay hold on the life that is life indeed." R.V. With such pictures of the Millennium as we have in Isaiah, chapters 52-66, Ezek. 40-48, Psa. 72, Rev. 22, the contrast between this age and that, even on earth, will be extraordinary. But if the glory be so great on the terrestrial side of the Kingdom, what infinite bliss will be the portion of those on the celestial side, those who share in the first resurrection? We can only reply: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. I Cor. 2:9. True, indeed, "God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit", but we see through a glass darkly, oh, so darkly. And note the limitation of this coming blessedness *which God hath prepared for them that love*

Him. And who are they that love Him? Not all the saved. Only the saved and sanctified, the overcomers, the Lord's Jewels. Matt. 3:16-17.

In this connection let us look for a moment at the death of Christ: Two views which are complimentary:

1. Objectively and historically: We are disposed in our conception of death to emphasize the physical element, the dissolution of soul and body; and we are in danger of missing the essential factor in the fact. The physical death of Christ was a fact, a necessary fact, but His death was primarily a soul-death. In the circumference of His being He died to physical comfort, to physical pain; but deeper than that, in His soul He died to the world, to sin, to self, and emphatically and fundamentally, He died for and to the Law. He died unto sin once for all and forever. Rom. 6:10. As the Federal Head of the new creation, and the Sin Bearer, both sin and the law had claims on Him, for the strength of sin is the Law. But He died to both. Here we are in Romans 5 and 6. But when He had so died death could not hold Him. Because by dying to sin and the Law He had overcome and abolished death, and therefore rose as Conquerer of sin and death. The relation of the resurrection to the death therefore was that of effect and cause. Note further, and this is vital: When Christ died on the Cross-the consummation of a death process reaching from childhood onwards-the whole human race, past, present and future, died in Him Judicially; and in His resurrection rose with Him potentially. 2 Cor. 5:14; Rom. 5:12-21. The conception of a limited atonement is a mental and moral monstrosity; and in this respect the Confession of Faith is really a confession of Unbelief. But please notice carefully the modifying power of the two adverbs, "Judicially" and "potentially". Do not read the sentence as if I said "actually".
2. Subjectively and experimentally: The fact that Christ judicially tasted death for every man does not necessarily compel any individual man to accept that death as endured for him. In this case the logical result is as if Christ had not tasted death for every man. This leads us to ask, What was the purpose of the death of Christ considered as an objective and historical fact, and in its essential physical and spiritual essence? It was: (1) That God in the expression of His infinite love might impart the free gift of eternal life to all who in their hearts believe on Christ as the Sin-Bearer of the world. This presupposes repentance, regeneration and justification. (2) That He might bestow the prize of eternal (age-lasting) life in the Messianic Kingdom on all who earnestly desire to have Christ by the Holy Spirit live in them to will and to do of God's good pleasure. This implies separation from the world, emancipation from its spirit, having the seed of the word fall into the heart as into prepared soil and bringing forth fruit 30, 60, or 100-fold. It means actual fellowship with Christ in His rejection by men and His acceptance with God. In other words, it means that the very spirit of the death of Christ, the utter self-denial of Christ, shall work in us as it did in Him and thereby secure to all

who will a place with Him in the first resurrection, and that "so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into His everlasting (age-lasting) Kingdom. 1 Peter 1:10-11.

Thus to obtain the free gift and yet to despise the prize; that is, not to be willing to pay any price and endure any pain for it, is not only to nullify, temporarily, the purpose of the atonement and thus do despite unto the Spirit of grace, but it must also be regarded ethically and spiritually as an abortion. Heb. 12:6-8. "We which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our mortal flesh". 2 Cor. 4:11. This manifestation is physical, intellectual and spiritual. And this affirmation is not of all Christians, nor of the many, but of the few. Matt. 7:13,14. The vast majority refuse to be delivered unto death for Jesus' sake. John 6:64-68; Luke 13:24-25. Only a few Christians can be said to be "dead indeed unto sin and alive unto God". The converse is true of the many. Matt. 24:12; Gal. 5: 19-21; I Cor. 3:1-15. "She (a believer) that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth". I Tim. 5:6. As Paul speaks of carnal and spiritual Christians, so does he speak of dead and living Christians, and the two expressions are synonymous. "If a man (a believer) abide not in Me, (the source of life) he is (by the law of life) cast forth as a branch, and is withered (spiritually); and men gather them, and cast them into the fire and they are burned". John 15:6. Be careful not to carry the figure too far, for if you do you cannot stop short of annihilationism. The fire here is the same as Mark 9:49, 50; Heb. 12:28,29; Matt. 3:10,12. Every saved man must have his baptism of fire now in this age, or in the age to come. God is not mocked. Gal. 6:6-8. Only thus can sin's kingship in the soul be destroyed.

The altar sanctifies the gift, but only by fire. Matt. 22:22. This baptism follows full consecration. Rom. 12:1-2. But, like Israel at Kadesh-Barnea, Christians can refuse and reject the will of God, though at terrible cost. Only those who by eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, which is a material way of expressing the thought and need of living in spiritual union with Him, the Head of the body, will find the Holy Spirit within them becoming a fountain springing up into everlasting (age-lasting) life. John 4:10-14; 2 Peter 1:10-11. If any man eat (habitually) of this bread, he will live for, or in, the age (to come). John 6:51; Luke 18:28-30. Dead Christians in this age will continue to be dead Christians in the age to come. Hence Gal. 1:4; 2 Peter 1:4. And dead Christians cannot have glorified bodies. The way to be and continue a dead Christian is to keep on sowing to the flesh. Gal. 6:6-8. Such can never glory in the Cross of Christ. Gal. 6:14. Christ said to the lawyer: "This do and thou shalt live". Luke 10:28. The "shalt live" here, and the "shall live for, or in, the age (to come)" of John 6:51 are identical. "Blessed and holy is he that (as a result of obedience and living union with Christ) hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power; but they (and they only) shall (in the age to come) be priests of God and of Christ and shall reign with Him a thousand years". Rev. 20:6; 1 Cor. 15:24-28.

Worldly, carnal Christians can not be either "blessed" or "holy" in this sense. Blessedness and holiness are inseparable now and in the age to come, and in the Kingdom of God as then realized. Heb. 12:14; John 12:23-26.

I believe that from the standpoint of the New Testament the two great Biblical facts of Synthetic and Antithetic Dualism in the Church of God on earth, with their logical and ethical implications, are fully established. The facts, however, will become more and more apparent, and their spiritual significance more decisive and impressive with every step forward to the end of the book.

We will now go to the Old Testament and look for our facts there; and owing to the organic nature of the Scriptures it may be assumed as an axiom that there can be nothing explicitly affirmed in the New Testament that is not implicitly contained in the Old. And we shall not only find the truth for which we are contending in the O. T., but we shall find it there in a glorious process of unfoldment. The unbelief of the Jews stopped the process in that age just as the unbelief of the Church has done in this age. The victories of the Book of Joshua in that dispensation and those of the Acts of the Apostles in this should have continued till the commission was executed and the goal reached. But in both cases the Holy Spirit not only gave the commission but He foretold the failure, apostasy, and rejection. Deut. 28; and Rev. 2, 3.

It may surprise the reader to be told that the Old Testament has far more to say about the Age to Come and its glory than the New. It is a fact nevertheless. The Patriarchs and Prophets of that Age knew nothing of the present age, nor yet of the Eternity which lies beyond the Age to Come. They were wholly occupied with the latter and did not know how long it might last. Placing various prophecies side by side, however, they could easily perceive from passages like Isa. 65:17,22 that the Age to come, so far as the earth and its people were concerned belonged to the sphere of things temporal.

THE HEBREW "OLAM"

This noun is derived from the verb *alam*, to hide, to conceal. Psa. 90:8; Isa. 58:7. Gesenius defines it thus:

"What is hidden: specially hidden time, long: the beginning or end of which is either uncertain or else not defined: eternity, perpetuity. It is used of time long past, antiquity."

There is an apparent inconsistency here. He speaks of the *olam* as a period of time, as having a beginning and end, but of which the one or the other may be "uncertain or else not defined". That statement is all right. But notice what follows: with a semi-colon after "defined" he adds, eternity. Surely that is an illogical and indefensible

process. Eternity proper as understood in English is without beginning or end. How can he effect the passage from the finite to the infinite except by simply making an assertion which the facts of the primary definition will not allow. This is the way all error creeps in, and once in there is the piper to pay in order to drive it out.

Of course it is quite proper to speak of eternity past and eternity future. But surely there is an unbridgable gulf between past eternity and antiquity. So is there a like difference between the age to come and future eternity. Among the passages cited by Gesenius under this head are Amos 9:11; Mic. 7:14; Isa. 63:9; Deut. 32:7; Gen. 6:4; I Sam. 27:8; Psa. 26:5; Pro. 8:11; Isa. 42:14; Isa. 58: 12; 61:4. Let us look at some of them.

Amos 9:11. This is a prophecy that after the children of Israel have been chastened for their sins, the nation shall again come together at the second advent of Christ, and the coming glory will be like that in the days of old (*olam*); that is, as it was in the days of David and Solomon, only better. Mic. 7:11-14 is the same. There is no reference to eternity. Isa. 63:9: He bare them and carried them all the days of old (*olam*). This refers to ehovah's kindness to Israel when He brought them out of Egypt and placed them in the land of Canaan.

So in Deut. 32:7; Gen. 6:4. In Gen. 6:3, "*Olam*" is rendered "always." Psa. 25:6 is the same as Deut. 32:7; Isa. 42:14: "I have *long time* (*olam*) holden my peace." This, as Gesenius says, refers to the Babylonian captivity.

The only place where eternity (past) seems to be in view is Pro. 8:23; and even here, as far as this text is concerned, it is sufficient to render, "I was set up before the world was created."

The Editor of Bengel's Gnomon (Matt. 25:42-46) says:

"The Bible has no metaphysical distinctions, therefore it has no one word to express eternity."

This is equivalent to saying that neither the *olam* of the O.T. nor the *aion* of the N. T. is used with reference to eternity; and this is all I contend for.

Dr. Tregelles (editor of Gesenius) takes him to task for his translation of Dan. 9:24, where the prophet speaks of "everlasting righteousness". Gesenius makes it refer to the past, the righteousness of the fathers; while Tregelles affirms it is to be future, and in this he is right.

But what future? Here is what he says:

"It hardly need be pointed out to any Christian that this passage in Daniel can have no such meaning as this; it speaks of the everlasting righteousness to be brought in through the atonement of Christ."

But Tregelles makes it refer to eternity future which is not true. The passage does not refer merely to what Christ procured by His holy life and vicarious death; but to the actual establishment of that righteousness in the Messianic-Millennial Kingdom, and as definitely embodied in the domestic, social, and national life of Israel, while yet in the limits of time. This will not be true of the Gentile nations as of Israel during that period. The declaration is for the comfort of Daniel's people, and has no reference to eternity except by implication. We might carry this criticism of the Lexicons, and likewise of the commentaries, much further if space permitted.

Let us look briefly into R. B. Girdlestone's HEBREW SYNONYMS: In Chap. 30, and under the heading Eternal, Everlasting, The Age to Come, he begins beautifully:

"The Old Testament words representing duration, and their Greek equivalents, call for the most careful consideration in consequence of the fact that the whole revelation of man's future destiny must depend to some extent upon their accurate interpretation."

That is well and truly put. But it is one thing to see a general principle and quite another to accurately apply that principle to particular cases. We all fail here, and often to the irreparable injury of our selves and our fellow men. This work of Girdlestone is of exceeding great value to the Bible student; but in the realm of eschatology he has followed the beaten path altogether too closely.

Let us note a few examples of this. Under the definition of the Hebrew *ad* he refers to the Greek phrase "*eis to telos*," and says:

"Three times in the New Testament we read that, he that endureth to the end (*eis telos*) shall be saved. By this we are to understand that he who holds on fast through tribulation, without wavering, shall ultimately find God to be his deliverer."

Not so. The man who holds on, endures, is the man who, like Joshua and Caleb in the wilderness, is finding God a deliverer every hour as he moves towards the *telos*, the goal, and there receives the prize. See Paul, Phil. 3:7-14. The believer has his daily choice of two things:-to abide in Christ (by a continuous surrender of his will to God) and then, "bear more fruit," and "much fruit;" and have that fruit unto holiness and the end (*telos*) everlasting (Millennial) life. John 15:1-10; Rom. 6:22; or, by preferring his own will to God's will, become unfruitful and be cut off and withered

and cast into the fire; because the wages of sin is both physical and Spiritual death. John 15:6; Rom. 6:23; 8:13. In other words, he must press on through the wilderness and entering Canaan begin to possess his possessions; or he must back-slide and die in the wilderness and thus forfeit all claim on the first resurrection and the glory of the Messianic Kingdom. Obadiah 17; Deut. 6:23; Heb. 4:1.

On page 502 he says: "In Isa. 60:15, *Olam* is rendered eternal, "I will make thee an eternal joy," and he assumes that the prophet has eternity in view, whereas the reference is to the terrestrial glory of Israel during the thousand years; and *aionios*, or *olam*, should here be rendered age-lasting. Then he quotes Psa. 12:7; "God preserves the righteous for ever," and assumes that this is correct, when the reference is to the same Messianic Age and should be rendered, "God preserves the righteous for the age (to come)". Compare Luke 18:28-30; John 6:58; 8:51; Matt. 13:43, 49; 1 Tim. 6:12. He quotes Psa. 61:4; 73:26; 81:15; 112:6; 125:2; Ecc. 3:14; Isa. 40:8; 51:6; Dan. 7:18; and takes it for granted that "for ever" has exclusive reference to future eternity, whereas in every case the writer has his mind on the Messianic Millennial Kingdom, or some nearer period of time.

Before giving the next quotation from Girdlestone let the reader reflect on the fact, that, with the probable exception of Pro. 8:23; the passages we have cited from those he adduces as example, have no reference to eternity, because the outlook of Prophets and Patriarchs was exclusively confined to Israel's Golden Age, when the Messiah shall sit as a Priest-King on the throne of His father David. Psalms 2, 45, 72, 110. Recall also the first sentence we quoted from his book and then read the following from page 503

"In the passages quoted which are a considerable proportion and a fair specimen of the whole, the LXX rendering is usually *aionios*, or *eis ton aiona*; these Greek phrases when they appear in the N. T. must be interpreted in accordance with the word *Olam*. They give a conception which though negative, is sufficiently clear. Eternity is endlessness; and this idea is only qualified by the nature of the object to which it is applied, or by the direct word of God. When applied to things physical it is used in accordance with the revealed truth that the heaven and the earth shall pass, and it is limited by this truth-When the word is applied to man's future destiny after the resurrection, and after the passing away of all things physical, we do right (unless there be some revelation to the contrary) to give it the sense of endlessness, without any limitation".

This paragraph completely nullifies the gracious concession he made at the beginning of the chapter. He has already laid down the general principle as to the need of great care in the interpretation of eschatological terms; and then, when face to face with the facts, he so construes them as to abandon the principle, and especially where the specific application of the principle might have turned darkness into light. Read again, if there be any doubt, our discussion of the term *aionios* in Chap. II.

Note a few remarks on the above quotation:

1. He says the meaning of the Greek adjective *aionios* and the phrase *eis ton aiona* must be interpreted in accordance with the word *olam*. That is, the Hebrew determines the Greek, because it is the language of God's revelation to Israel, and not contrary-wise. This is all right. But he has not yet decided the prime question; namely, what is the true definition of the Hebrew *olam*? From the beginning of his discussion he has missed the trail. He has cited about a score of passages where the word in question occurs, and taken it for granted that in practically every case it is truly rendered in our A. V. But this is begging the very question at issue. It is the translation that I challenge, and that especially on exegetical grounds. It is as if out of twenty men nineteen had the unmistakable marks of the Englishman and only one those of the Frenchman, and some one should try to convince us that they were all Frenchmen.

He says:

"When applied to things physical it is used in accordance with the revealed truth that the heaven and the earth shall pass, and it is limited by this truth."

I freely grant the deduction. Let us take a passage to illustrate his meaning. In Gen. 49:26 Jacob says to Joseph:

"The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting (*olam*) hills".

His reasoning is to the effect that as the heaven and earth are to pass away, therefore the "hills" must pass, and on that account they cannot be everlasting. The temporal nature of the hills necessitates a limitation of the adjective. That is good logic. Wherein then is he wrong? He errs thrice. (1) Since the English word "everlasting" has the idea of endlessness, eternal, why does he not challenge the translation and insist that, in this case at least, *olam* should be rendered into idiomatic English by age-lasting, or age-abiding, for when thus used we see that the adjective refers to temporal things and limited periods of time; and thus we harmonize etymology and exegesis. We have no more right to apply the term everlasting to "hills" than to sunflowers.

- (2) He ignores the fact that the age, *aion*, or *olam*, to follow the present lies this side of eternity, and that the present heaven and earth will continue through that age. He assumes that the "age to come" is the eternal state beyond the White Throne judgment; whereas it is wholly on this side of that great event and within the limits of temporal existence so far at least as the earth is concerned. We have already proven this in our discussion of Luke 18:28-30; and will yet give fuller proof.

My point is this: Why apply to the Hebrew adjective (olam) in the present age a principle of limitation guaranteed by revelation and deny the application of the same principle to the same word in the age to come when the natural phenomena of heaven and earth, hills and mountains, seed time and harvest, summer and winter, continue substantially as they are in this and past ages? The only way that post-millenarians can plausibly evade the inconsistency is to deny that between the present, or 6th age, in the unfoldment of God's Plan of the Ages, and future eternity, there is another, a 7th age, an age of Millennial blessedness and while men on the earth are still in the flesh. But to do this is to oppose the explicit teaching of Patriarchs and Prophets as well as of Christ and His Apostles. In other words it is to substitute the Nicean Theology of the so called "fathers" of the Church, for the Evangelical Theology of the inspired founders of Christianity. See the quotation from Dean Stanley in the introduction.

- (3) He affirms that where olam is applied to man's future destiny after the resurrection we are "to give it the sense of endlessness without limitation."

Very well: Grant it and see how the assumption will work. We have proven from Scripture that Carnal believers at and after the resurrection will be excluded from the Millennial Kingdom. Gal. 5:19-21; 2 Cor. 12:19-21; Heb. 12:14. He says the meaning of olam is eternal, everlasting, endlessness, and that it must determine the force of the Greek *aionios*. Grant this also. What then? Simply that according to Christ's own teaching a believer in actual possession of the gift of eternal life can find his abiding portion in everlasting hell-fire. Matt. 18:8, 9; 7:13, 14. If so all carnal believers are eternally lost. We have proven also that the eternal judgment of Heb. 6:1-8 is threatened to believers. Perhaps when our author discovers his own peril and that of believers generally he will be glad to give up man's traditional fiction for God's statement of immutable fact.

The ground of his erroneous definition of olam and his false exegesis is the unproven and unprovable assumption that there is only one resurrection, and that at the end of the world when heaven and earth pass away. This, however, is only one of a concatenated series of assumptions which go to constitute, in a large measure, the very warp and woof of traditional theology, and especially of traditional eschatology. The leaven of unrighteousness pervades and saturates the whole structure of Modern Christianity as an anomalous survival of Latin Christianity. As a matter of imperishable fact there are two resurrections—one at the second coming of Christ, and the beginning of the Millennium; and the other at its end when the present heaven and earth pass away. These two pivotal events stand out in contrast and yet in unity as parts of one system as clearly as do the Old and New Testaments, as records of God's working in Creation and Redemption.

I quote again:

"The adjective aionios is used more than forty times in the N. T. with respect to eternal life, which is regarded partly as a present gift, partly as a promise for the future secured to all disciples of Christ." page 504.

Here he follows closely the traditional path which ignores one of the most important distinctions in the Bible-that between the free gift of eternal life and the prize of eternal life. Surely the thing for which Paul urged Timothy to contend (1 Tim. 6:12) was not the thing he received when he became a Christian. If it were would Paul not rather have urged him to hold on to what he already had. John says, "This is the promise which He hath promised us, even eternal life (life in the Messianic Kingdom)". The International Commentary says that the phrase "Eternal Life" in our Lord's Day was synonymous with Messiah's Kingdom. And of this there can be no doubt. But the writer being a postmillenarian does not see the real significance of his own remark. Bishop Swete says the phrase "Eternal Life" first appears in Dan. 12:2. But when he comes to interpret it and look at it in the light of Christ's talk with the Rich Young Ruler he completely misses the mark.

Let us analyse the quotation from Mr. Girdlestone as given above:

Here he assumes (1) that "eternal life" as a present gift and a future realization are simply two phases of one and the same thought; whereas one is the free gift of God to naked faith, and the other is the prize to be won by conflict, even to soul agony and the loss of all that the natural heart counts precious. Luke 13:23, 24. If we suffer with Him we shall reign with Him-not otherwise. 2 Tim. 2:10-13. The Young Ruler refused to go thus far. His is a typical case. Bishop Swete following Bengel says we are not to infer that because Christ adopted this method of dealing with this particular enquirer that the Saviour meant thereby to affirm a general principle applicable to all. But he would not have said this if he had known the exact meaning of the Young Ruler's question. "Except a man forsake all that he hath he cannot be My disciple" is of universal application when the Messianic Kingdom is in view, and is specially applicable to preachers and bishops. Then you say, "Few will get in". That is the very thing the Christ affirms, and which the Church refuses to believe and teach.

He assumes (2) that the outlook on eternal life as properly understood in Luke 18:18-30, and many like passages, is identical with the outlook on the Eternal State beyond the Great White Throne judgment, whereas it is clearly Millennial when, viewed in the light of prophecy and sound exegesis.

He assumes (3) that this eternal life which was the subject under discussion in the conversation of the Young Ruler with Christ is sure to all believers, all the saved, when on the contrary is only sure to the righteous, the holy, those who forsake all to follow the Master. Matt. 13:49; Heb. 12:14; Gal. 5:19-21; Luke 18:18-30.

I am hopeful that by this time the intelligent and unbiased reader is fully convinced that so far as Biblical Eschatology is concerned Christian Scholarship has pathetically failed in its illuminating purpose and solemn mission, and has left the people groping in the darkness of the Middle Ages. This is surely a crime against truth and righteousness, against Humanity and God. We have some idea of the terrific judgment of the Jewish people, and especially their leaders, as the result of false teaching-false interpretation of God's Word. Then, since in the mercy of God through Christ much more light is given in this age, will not the people, and especially the accredited teachers, be correspondingly responsible, and subject to and deserving of a much severer penalty. This is the explicit teaching of the Bible. Heb. 2:1-3; Luke 12:46-48; 1 Cor. 4:2. The fear of being found unfaithful in That Great Day, quite as much as the love of truth and righteousness, makes me cling tenaciously, amid storm and conflict, to the narrow way, the way marked and made sacred by the foot-prints of the Son of Man. It will be openly demonstrated in the judgment of believers at the Bema (2 Cor. 5:10), just as effectually and solemnly as in the judgment of sinners a thousand years later at the Great White Throne (Rev. 20:11-15), that God is no respecter of persons and that He is not mocked. Gal. 6:7. The Christian who enters upon and wilfully follows the easy path of conformity to the world and thinks that he is safe because he can plead the blood of Christ to cover his sins, is mocking God; and that more daringly than the thief, the drunkard, or the harlot. In the light of reason and revelation such a man ought to reap as he sows.

Let us now, and briefly, turn to the Word for a little further light on this momentous and ever pregnant question of human destiny. The worth of theology, of ethics, and all humanitarian theories, must prove their essential claims to recognition by being able to stand unabashed in the awful white light of God's Holy Word when consistently interpreted and faithfully applied. If any where and at any time in his life, surely here, mortal man should remove his hat, bow his head, and worship as one consciously treading on holy ground. Here, if any where, tradition, sectarian bias, antiquated scholarship, and all exegetical parleying should be regarded as unclean and insufferable intruders. The aim of Biblical Science quite as truly as any natural science, say anatomy, is to discover facts and their relations and arrange them systematically and concisely for convenient practical use. Utility is the immediate goal.

The Biblical use of *olam*.

In Gen. 6:3; 1 Chr. 16:15, it is translated "always". "My Spirit shall not always strive with man". If, as the authorities maintain, its one abiding meaning is eternal, or eternity, why did the translators not render it so, and read, "My Spirit shall not strive eternally with man?" If they answer that that would not express the thought of the writer, I reply that this is just what I am contending for: namely, that we should seek the aim of the writer, and in our translation preserve his thought as nearly as possible. But the difficulty is that postmillennialism compels its votaries to put a construction on the language of Scripture which substitutes another meaning for the true one. For example, as already noted, Christ says, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the age," this age; but the translators make Him say, "unto the end of the world". Matt. 28:20. The servant who says:

"I love my master, my wife and my children; I will not go out free. Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, and to the door post; and his master shall bore his ears through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever" (*olam*).

Why, in the interest of truth and common sense, did they not say: "and he shall serve him as long as he lives." One might think from the A. V. that the institution of human slavery was going to extend its evil influence into the eternal state, even into the purity and freedom of heaven. We find the same confusion of terms in 1. Sam. 1:22:

"But Hannah went not up; for she said unto her husband, I will not go up until the child be weaned, and then I will bring him, that he may appear before -the Lord and there abide for ever (*olam*). See ver. 28.

As in Gen. 49:26, the force of the adjective was limited by the fact that the hills must pass away; so here by the fact that man is mortal.

It may be said of God that He is everlasting; and of the hills that they are age-lasting, but neither term is applicable to man in his present state.

We will now take another use of the word *olam* which is of vital importance in its bearing on Biblical Eschatology. One of the essential factors in the Abrahamic Covenant was the promise of the land. No one element in the Covenant is more emphasized than this. The promise is repeated seven times. The Holy Spirit foresaw that post-millennarians would spiritualize this Covenant so as to nullify its prophetic significance, and therefore took this precaution to safe guard the truth by repetition, also by the oath. Gen. 22:15-18; Heb. 6:13-18.

"And Jehovah said unto Abram after that Lot was separated from him, lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land that thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed for ever (olam)." Gen. 13:15.

In Gen. 15:18, the land is geographically defined as from the Nile to the Euphrates. Now we want to know definitely the meaning of olam in this and correlated passages; and knowing that inquire what light it throws on what we may call the science of Biblical Eschatology.

Note carefully:

1. The land is promised to Abraham personally as well as to his seed. Gen. 12: 1-3; 13:15; 15:18.
2. He never got possession of any part of it during his life time except the field and the cave which he bought of Ephron the Hittite for four hundred shekels of silver. Gen. 23:1-20. Abraham regarded himself as a stranger in the land. Gen.23:4; Heb.11:8-10.
3. The proto-martyr Stephen and the Apostle of the Gentiles testify that the promise still holds good. Acts 7:5; Rom. 4:13; Heb. 6:11-19; with Gen. 22:11-18.
4. The time when the promise is fulfilled is the time when the human family is still divided into nations and therefore must be this side of the eternal state. Gen. 22:18. This promise cannot be fulfilled through the ministry of the Church, for God's favor to the Gentile nations is through restored and converted Israel, and through the righteous government of David's throne and when that throne is occupied by David's Greater Son. Amos 9:11-15; Acts 15:12-17; Luke 1:30-33; Matt. 1:1; Rom. 4:13; 11:13-32.
5. Therefore the Abrahamic Covenant must be literally interpreted; and in the light of this interpretation we know that at no period in the History of Israel, even in the days of David and Solomon, was the nation in possession of all the land from the river Nile to the river Euphrates; and at the present time that land is in possession of the "worst of the heathen"-the Turks. Ez. 30:1-7; 36:21-38.

I Kings 4:21 was a little foretaste. The reigns of David and Solomon were typical and prophetic. Psalms ~45, 72, 110; 2 Sam. 7.

6. The promise of the land to Abraham and his seed, and the promise of the Kingdom-to David (2 Sam. 7) cannot be fulfilled in the eternal state for the same reason already given by Mr. Girdlestone. I will repeat that part of the quotation which is pertinent to the subject in hand. He says:

"When applied to things physical it (*olam*) is used in accordance with the revealed truth that the heaven and the earth shall pass, and it is limited by this truth."

That is, the Hebrew *olam* when applied to things physical, like hills and mountains, cannot be translated everlasting, neither, by implication, can it be translated or ever, which is the equivalent of everlasting. Therefore since the words everlasting and for ever cannot be applied to "hills", because they must pass away, neither can they be applied to that portion of the land promised to Abraham for the same reason, because the land, as now constituted, must, as truly as the hills, pass away to make room for the new earth. Isa. 65:17; Rom. 8:19-23. We thus see that on the grounds of etymology and exegetical necessity we are obliged to place definite limits, a quo and ad quem, to the Hebrew *olam*. But inasmuch as the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants constitute the center and also the immediate goal of the Old Testament and of the New, we are compelled to find the eschatological horizon of both Testaments confined almost entirely to the *olam* as just now defined and located.

And if this be granted, as it must where there is honest dealing with the Word of God, it follows that the Hebrew *olam* whether used as noun or adjective, and in the singular, is employed only as the designation and measure of definitely limited periods of time. And in the same manner, because of this affinity and interdependence, we infer that the same limitation applies to the Greek noun *aion*, and its cognate adjective, *aionios*. I need hardly point out the tremendous effect of this conclusion in its bearing on Biblical Interpretation, and specifically on Biblical Eschatology.

The inevitable conclusion, based solidly on the above Biblical facts, which are only samples of scores of the same evidential significance and value, is approximately this: That the traditional advocates of eternal punishment are obliged to surrender from 80 to 90 % of their proof texts, their working capital. Will any honest Bible student with the facts before him dare to deny it. And, more than that, they are obliged to confess that a very large proportion of those Scriptures which they have supposed to reveal the eternal peril of the sinner, on the contrary actually reveal the age-lasting peril of their own souls. If a Christian were trying to prove the Deity of Jesus Christ, and out of one hundred Scriptures quoted ninety were irrelevant, I would feel it my duty to protest, and also to insist that Scripture doctrine must be Scripturally supported and legitimately demonstrated. This is why I discriminate between the "traditional" and the real.

7. It is clearly evident from numerous Scriptures that Abraham and the "heirs of the same promise," some already deceased, and others living on the earth, must at the appointed hour inherit together; that is, at one and the same time. In short, there can be no fulfilment of the promises, in accordance with the terms and

specifications of the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants, except in and through the resurrection of the dead, and the conversion of the living; and since there can be no resurrection of the dead apart from the Second Advent of the Christ in Glory, we are obliged to infer by deduction that the Second Coming must be premillennial; and this conclusion is overwhelmingly confirmed by an inductive study of the Word. Thus we conclude that the Covenant with Abraham was not, and is not, an everlasting Covenant at all, but an age-lasting covenant, a covenant for the age to come. Of course its final issue is everlasting, eternal blessedness. But this farther eschatological horizon is not within the vision of Prophets and Apostles except occasionally, incidently, or by implication. Therein we find the reason for the emphasis which Paul placed on the (first) resurrection. Acts 17:18; 17:32; 23:6; 24:15,21; Phil. 3:10-11. Compare Rev. 20:6; Luke 20:35; 21:36.

To Paul "the hope of the first resurrection" was the full, literal, and spiritual realization of the unsearchable riches of the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants, and of the New Covenant through the shed blood of the Son of God, the latter being the basis and medium through which they come into full effect.

We will take one more instance of the use of the *olam* and this of a negative character:

"And the Lord said to Samuel, Behold, I will do a thing in Israel at which the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle. In that day I will perform against Eli all things which I have spoken concerning his house. When I begin I will also make an end. For I have told him that I will judge his house for ever (*olam*) for the iniquity which he knoweth; because his sons made themselves vile and he restrained them not. And therefore I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering for ever (*olam*). 1 Sam. 3:11; comp. 1 Sam. 2:27-32.

Both the A.V. and R.V. would lead us to believe that Eli and his sons are eternally lost, whereas the declaration is to the effect that they are to be excluded from Messiah's Millennial Kingdom, and the implication is that at the end of that period they will be restored to the favor of God. And this exegesis harmonizes with John 6:49; Gal. 5:19-21; Matt. 5:21-26; Rev. 20:5; Matt. 18:8,9.

Over against this sentence on Eli and his family read the following:

"And I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in my heart and in my mind; and he shall walk before mine Anointed (Jesus Christ) for ever (for the age to come). 1 Sam. 2:35.

Who can this priest be who is to take the place of Eli in the Messianic-Millennial Age? He is Zadok. See Ezek. 44:15; 40:46; 43:19; Ezek. 48:11; Ex. 32:25-19. Surely the most superficial examination of the text and context demonstrates that the above passages from Samuel and Ezekiel have nothing to do with the Eternal State, but are confined wholly within the Millennial Age. Surely no sensible person thinks for a moment that bloody sacrifices will be offered in the Eternal State after sin and suffering have been absolutely abolished from the New Heaven and Earth. See Ezek. 45:9-25; 43:7; Rev. 20:1-6; 21:1-7.

We may conclude this chapter by a well grounded and far reaching generalization: Namely, The words *eternal*, *everlasting* and *for ever*, except when they apply to God and the free gift of eternal life, ought to be banished from our Bibles and Lexicons with the least possible delay. Let it not be overlooked, however, that so far we have not touched the discussion of the terms *olam* and *aion* in their plural and duplicated forms.

These carry us far beyond the limit of the age to come. Whether or not they convey the idea of absolute endlessness in every case is not so easy to determine. Thus: "To Him that liveth unto the ages of the ages (eis tous aionas toon aionoon). Rev. 1:6; 4:9,10; 22:5. That God's existence is absolutely eternal there is no doubt. The point is as to whether the Greek Language, even by means of these plural and duplicated forms, can express that conception, if we may thus speak of that which is inconceivable while yet believable. "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever (eis aionas aionoon)". Rev. 14:11. I will not dare, with present light, to bate one jot from the terrible force of that expression. We may, however, keep in mind two facts: 1-This declaration has reference to a special form of sin-taking the mark of the Anti-Christ. Matt. 12:31,32 seems to convey the same idea. This fact greatly limits the comprehension of the term. 2-We have only a partial revelation of the farther eschatological horizon, just as in the age of Moses and the Law they had only a partial revelation of the nearer eschatological horizon. And as the present age of Grace brought all needed light on the nearer, so will the advent of the age to come bring a full unfolding of all the facts connected with the more distant. In the meantime let us be careful not to confound and confuse the two as we now know them, at least, may know them.

The conclusion to which we now come as a result of our studies so far may be expressed thus: For those who truly love God and His Word, and are determined at any cost to walk in the footsteps of the Christ (Luke 14:25-35), there is the assurance that even in this present life sin's power in the heart shall be completely broken and the love of truth and righteousness shall be there enthroned; and that at death all consciousness of the subjective dualism with its implied limitations and restrictions shall for ever be dissolved; and that then the gift and the prize shall be merged in the divine synthesis of consummated redemption, when the subjects of the first resurrection will enter into the fathomless bliss of the Messianic Kingdom

and that on its celestial side.

"Oh, bliss of the purified! bliss of the free!
I plunge in the crimson tide opened for me;
O'er sin and uncleanness exulting I stand,
And point to the print of the nails in His hand".

But for all others of the saved who like the Rich Young Ruler refuse to put all on the altar and meet the conditions dictated equally by the mercy and holiness of God, the fact, and the consciousness of the fact, of the antithetic dualism will continue into and through the intermediate state and be an abiding source of unrest and distress. And be it remembered that this is only the subjective side of the intermediate state. Such a subjective condition must have an objective environment to match it. The inner and the outer are both embodied in the very solemn teaching of Christ to His own disciples as we find it in Matt. 18:1-9 and 25:30. If God's people could only be brought to see this very solemnizing truth what a tremendous change it would make in their mode of living and in their relation to the Kingdom of God in general. That which will make the teaching of this book offensive to the average Christian of this wicked generation cannot be its lack of Scriptural support; but the fact that it exposes the falsity of established religious opinions, and especially that it puts a disagreeable barrier in the way of the free and licentious indulgence of the flesh. But is not the utter destruction of the flesh in God's people one of the beneficent purposes of the Plan of Redemption in its fullest significance and widest sweep? To implicitly teach, as do Calvinism, Arminianism, Lutheranism, and Roman Catholicism, that because of the fact that the grace of God abounds through the power of Calvary, the believer can, with impunity, indulge the evil propensities of his fallen nature on the antinomian assumption that the redemption in Christ makes it possible to God's power and agreeable to His holiness to overlook and even wink at the wilful sins of Christians, is to ignore the analogy between Israel and the Church, to trifle with the awful facts of human destiny, and even to challenge the sovereign rights and eternal prerogatives of the Living God.

The Dualism of Eternal Life: A Revolution in Eschatology
by Pastor S. S. Craig