

The
Mystery of Evil



By J. W. Williams
Gladbrook, Iowa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evil a Mystery	2
The Meaning of the Word "Evil"	4
Evil As a Necessity for Divine Self-Revelation	4
The Divine Control of Evil	5
The Divine Relation to Evil	
1. "Why Does God Permit Evil?"	6
2. Does God "Use" Evil?	7
3. God as Creator of Evil	9
A Divine Purpose in Evil	10
Shall Man Purposely Do Evil That Good May Result?	12
God Not Bound By His Own Laws	14
The Temporary Character of Evil	18
Names and Titles of Evil	19
The Source of Temptation and the Process of Sinning	20
The Origin of Sin	24
"Adamic" Sin and Death	25
The Province of Law	28
The Deception of Eve	30
Serpent's Dust	32
Satan and Job	34
The Temptation of the Savior	35
The Destruction of Sin and the Devil	36
The Dispute Over the Body of Moses	36
Lucifer	38
Fallen Angels	39
"The God of This World"	40
"The Prince of This World"	40
Exorcism (Evil Spirits)	41
The Dragon	48
The Devil's Apostles and Angels	49
The Mission of Sorrow	50

The Mystery of Evil

By

J. W. WILLIAMS
Gladbrook, Iowa

An exposition of evil as suffering and sin, for the comfort of those in Christian affliction and the practical benefit derived from an understanding of the doctrine of satan.

Sent Free on Request

EVIL A MYSTERY

The greatest mystery about evil is God's relation to it. That makes it perplexing, at the same time that it is painful. It is the purpose of these pages to ease the pain and dispel the perplexity, through understanding.

Why should evil be present in the domain of an omnipotent and beneficent Father? To think of him as helpless to prevent or terminate it denies his omnipotence; while to think that he wills it seems to deny his beneficence and make him a guilty partner to its existence. Truly the matter is a perplexing and distressing dilemma, for we cannot concede that our God is guilty, and we should not admit that evil came in contrary to his will, for in our conception that would dethrone him, and so work havoc with our trust. We then could not see all things working together for our good.

The dilemma is aggravated by the divinely revealed assurance that ultimately evil will be endlessly banished, for since he therefore is not helpless to terminate it, why not now? And since he will banish it, why did it ever enter his domain? To give the usual answer that after coming it must run its course, to educate people or celestial beings against it, implies that it is needful, and was therefore needful for that purpose in prospect before it came; and we thus take the second horn of the dilemma—in affirming that God willed it in purposing it—instead of the first horn—that he was helpless to prevent it. And in seizing this second horn, how will such apologists absolve him from guilt, in their conception of him, as they feel that they must do if he purposed evil? But if we seize the first horn, and affirm his helplessness to prevent the entrance of evil, how may we be sure that he will be able to banish it after it has established itself? In that case what certainty is there of a final salvation for us?

The nearest that pagan religions have come to a solution of the problem is to say that there are two gods in conflict, the one good and the other evil, which offers no solution of the origin of the evil god. It is to be feared that Christendom has not come any nearer the solution, whether its evil god be a fallen angel, man in his "free will" or any other origin to be offered apart from Deity. All such attempts at exoneration are made at the expense either of his intelligence—in lacking foreknowledge—or of his power—in lacking ability to prevent or banish evil. The only satisfactory solution possible is to reconcile evil with the divine will and purpose. That is the thesis set before the reader of this treatise.

No other solution of the problem satisfies either the intellect or the emotions. There has probably been no more prolific cause of atheism than the inability to harmonize suffering with faith in God. Many are asking just now, "Why, if there be a God, do we have to have such an overwhelming evil as this war?" Such conditions not only demand an answer from Christian faith, but they furnish a great opportunity for Christian ministering to these who are sinking into the pit of despair.

The prevalent conception that after the coming of evil God did the best he could under the circumstances, by planning Calvary as a remedy, will not stand scrutiny, since Calvary was planned "before the world began" (Eph. 1:4; 2 Tim. 1:9; 1 Pet. 1:20). And since God thus planned the remedy for sin

before it came, if he wished it would not come (as if God could "wish," and wish in conflict with his plan!) why then did he plant the tree of knowledge in the garden and put the serpent there, knowing, by planning for sin before it came, that the sin would result when the tree and the serpent were put before the woman? Or do we hear it said that the serpent just happened to enter in there without the Creator's notice or intention? Is Christendom's god careless? That the Creator could have kept the pair away from the tree, and the serpent out of the garden, and thus prevented sin, is shown by the fact that he did keep them away from the other tree after their sin.

How can we apologize for the entrance of evil on the ground of divine ignorance in not foreknowing, when we read that he knew all his works from the beginning? (Act 15:18). And how can we apologize for it on the ground of divine helplessness to prevent it, when we know that he is able to create even an angel that is mighty enough to bind satan and imprison him? To say "divine ignorance" and "divine helplessness" is self-contradictory, for neither idea is compatible with the revealed character of our God, though that is the nature of pagan gods. It would seem improper even to suggest such imperfection of our God were it not needful to do so to combat the limited views held of him in Christendom.

After satan is safe in prison why turn him loose again, even "for a little season"? And what will the nations do for an asserted need for an education against evil while satan is in jail? And who will tempt them to commit the sins predicted in Isa. 65:20 and Zech. 14:16-19 while he is jailed? And why should he be loosed again to deceive the nations unless there is a wise divine purpose in temptation (Jas. 1:2), as was the case with our Savior?

Again, if God could not prevent the entrance of evil after supposedly creating a man with a "free will," and if evil began in heaven by the sin of a "fallen angel" who became the devil, what prospect is there for a universe ultimately endlessly free from evil, since the same lapse might then be repeated by people who become "equal unto the angels" (Lu. 20:36)?

There is a mystery in the way that evil came into human experience, for the serpent comes upon the fair scene in paradise suddenly and without introduction or explanation or record of origin. The villain appears on the stage so suddenly and seemingly so disastrously as to make the heads of the spectators swim, so to speak. The Creator has never given an explanation of the origin of his villain, regardless of the claims for a mythical Lucifer-angel, which we will consider in its place.

The scriptures never speak of God creating an evil being called the devil or satan. The Hebrew scriptures never speak of "the devil" (singular number). They use the word only in the plural, for the non-existent pagan gods, the deified (supposed) immortal souls of dead heroes or leaders, as they are still deified in paganism. Neither is the word "satan" used in the Hebrew scriptures for one single evil personality, but is used for different adversaries, some of whom were even good, adversaries only of evil, as we shall see. We shall also find that these two words "devil" and "satan" are common nouns instead of proper names, and so not used exclusively as titles of one lone evil personality. That being true, it would not be proper for the scriptures to say that God created a being called "the devil" or "satan," though he did create people, some of whom are called both devils and satans, as we shall also see.

THE MEANING OF THE WORD "EVIL"

In the scriptures, as in every-day good usage, the word "evil" is used for both suffering and sin. Suffering includes death as evil (Ex. 32:10 with verses 12, 14; Judg. 20:34-35; 1 Sam. 5:11 with 6:9; 25:33, 39).

In the Hebrew scriptures the word for evil is "rah." It refers to Job's afflictions (42:11) and to David's sin (Psa. 51:4). It is translated "affliction" (Neh. 1:3) and "wickedness" (Jer. 44:3).

In the Christian scriptures the word for evil is "kakos." It refers to the poverty and sickness of Lazarus (Lu. 16:25) and to Saul's sins (Ac. 9:13). It is translated "harm" (Ac. 28:5) and "wicked" (Mt. 21:41).

It is necessary to understand and remember this double use of evil for both suffering and sin when considering this subject.

These twin ideas of suffering and sin as evils are closely related in the scriptures, not only because the infliction of trouble is sometimes sinful, but because under law, suffering is a penalty for sin, so that in cases where there is no sin as a penal cause of suffering, questions of divine justice arise, as with Abraham before Sodom, and the experience of Job, where the problem is debated at great length. Many a person in trouble has had this perplexity keenly thrust upon him, as he mistakenly thinks that all trouble is—or should be—imposed as a punishment for wrong-doing, and if he suffers at the same time as feeling innocent he gets into the deplorable state of doubting divine justice, and that destroys trust.

The problem reached its climax and solution at Calvary.

We shall have occasion to distinguish this double usage of the word "evil" as we proceed.

EVIL AS A NECESSITY FOR DIVINE SELF-REVELATION

Man cannot discover God (Job 11:7; Eccl. 3:11; Ro. 11:33). Natural religion has produced only idolatry and mythology. God must therefore reveal himself (1 Cor. 2:11-16). That revelation is made in both his works and words (Psa. 19). The complete revelation was made in the works and words of the Perfect Man (Jn. 1:18; 14:6-11). The works cited again as those of the natural creation (Ro. 1:20) reveal God only imperfectly, so that the pagans who saw them comprehended God only dimly enough to worship the works instead of the Worker. But the works that reveal God are not only those of nature, but are also the workings of his spirit through human actors in historical operation. God operates in evil, as well as in good, in both spheres, the physical creation and the human performance. In nature there is such evil as adversity and catastrophe. Frost smites life and earthquakes destroy millions. In human activity he enters into man's thoughts (Prov. 16:1) and deeds (verse 9). In that performance through man he operates in the evil of both suffering and sin. When he chose Pharaoh as one through whom to make his power known and declare his name (himself) to all the world (Ex. 9:16) he operated in the suffering of the ten plagues and in the sin of Pharaoh's tenfold sin in disobeying the command to let Israel depart. And God worked in Pharaoh's heart (Prov. 21:1) by hardening it to produce that sin of disobedience, as well as softening it to make him willing, as declared by Solomon already cited (Prov. 16:1).

Again, in order that law might produce condemnation for sin that leads to grace (Ro. 5:20-21) by silencing all self-righteous boast of possible obedience to law (Ro. 3:19-20) and thus reveal God as "the Father of mercies," he gave Israel law that they could not keep, and which therefore produced their sin, as he foretold it would (Deut. 31:24-30; chapter 32).

He did the same in Eden, by giving Adam a law that revealed man's evil of nakedness, as well as God's mercy and grace in coats of skins. We say "man's evil of nakedness" because nakedness was the physical "evil" that the pair came to know by the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil." We shall consider this fully later.

Finally, in order to reveal his infinite love, the Father reared a cross on Calvary, which is the acme of the evil of all ages, in both its forms of suffering and sin.

The more needy man is, in all evil of hunger, sin and all else that inheres in mortality of nakedness, the more God can reveal his care and loving-kindness in meeting those needs. Thus our every tear of pain or shame forms within itself a rainbow of promise inviting us to look up to heaven where the sun shines. "What A Friend We Have In Jesus" has reached sales of over sixty-million copies.

In like manner to the Father's working in evil, the Son declared that the evil of congenital blindness was for the divine purpose of manifesting the work of God in him (Jn. 9:3). He removed sickness and death in like manner, to reveal his power and himself as the promised One. If those evils had not been there he could not so reveal himself. Therefore every afflicted person was an unwitting instrument for his glory. How that eases all our pain and guilt! In his removal of the evil of sin in forgiveness, he even went so far as to declare that the amount of Christian love is proportionate to the degree of sin forgiven (Lu. 7:47). He did not mention the possibility that someone might cry out, "You encourage sin by such teaching on grace." But such divine working in all evil as we have cited should silence all outcry against God's relation to evil.

(His guiltlessness in it is explained in our free booklet, "A Primer Of Predestination").

THE DIVINE CONTROL OF EVIL

Evil never gets out of bounds in the universe. It is circumscribed by divine power, wisdom and love, so that in God's hands it all works good (Ro. 8:28), else he restrains it (Psa. 76:10).

That he does so control it is declared in such cases as the following:
First, as suffering:

He kept Laban from hurting Jacob (Gen. 31:7).

He kept pagan peoples from harming Israel (Gen. 35:5; Psa. 105:14).

He kept satan from injuring Job except in what was specified and limited (Job 1-2).

He made satan a servant to purify a fornicator and teach preachers not to blaspheme (1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:20).

He kept the apostles from harm even when they were sent out as sheep among wolves (Mt. 10), including Paul (Ac. 18:10; 26:18). Because the Good Shepherd's eye was watching and the Infinite Shepherd's power protecting (Jn. 10:28-29).

He likewise kept his Son alive in the midst of his enemies until the day set for his sacrifice (Jn. 7:30; 8:20).

Why then does he not restrain all suffering, except that it is all for his glory?

Again, the restraint of evil in the form of sin:

He withheld Abimelech from adultery (Ge. 20:6), but brought the adultery of David's wives upon him as a punishment for his adultery (2 Sam. 12).

He promised his people that no one should confiscate their land while they were absent at Jerusalem attending religious service (Ex. 34:24). What a pity the excusers did not know that about the farm, the oxen and the wife, and go to the Great Supper! (Lu. 14). But he took away the same land of Israel from the Canaanites.

When men please the Lord he controls the conduct of their enemies (Prov. 16:7).

He kept his Son holy under temptation by making him "of quick understanding" by the Spirit (Isa. 11:3; Mt. 4:1-11).

Why then does he not restrain all sin, except that he makes the wrath of men praise him? (Psa. 76:10).

Those who observe his work in evil understand his lovingkindness (Psa. 107:43).

Under such infinite control, evil is safe in God's universe, so that we need never fear nor fight. God's people have a better weapon and refuge than military might, and a better defender than flesh and blood can furnish. A sheep among wolves looks helpless till we see the Good Shepherd and the Greater Shepherd. Since he "sits in the circle of the heavens" the universe is in safe hands.

Evil is not only necessary for divine self-revelation, but is necessary for man also (Eccl. 1:13; 3:10). Painful discipline yields the peaceable fruit of righteousness (Heb. 12). By suffering we are made perfect (1 Pet. 5:10), even as our Savior was (Heb. 2:10; 5:8).

THE DIVINE RELATION TO EVIL

1. "WHY DOES GOD PERMIT EVIL?"

Why say that he permits it? The scriptures never say that. That is only man's well-meant but imperfect and unsuccessful effort to solve the problem of evil. For even if he permitted it, who introduced it, for God to permit him to do so? Man did not, for it was here before him. If satan did, and was an angel, who corrupted that angel, to whom God permitted the evil of corrupting his heavenly creature? Such thinking requires a tempter as old as God. To say that God permits evil is also a needless effort to exonerate his relation to it, for he needs none of man's efforts to apologize for him by toning down his declarations that he creates evil, does it, gives it to us and brings it upon us, by saying that he "permits" or "allows" evil. For like all

man's other efforts to help God out of imagined difficulties, the proffered help is but a hindrance.

The first evil of which we read in scripture was Adam's nakedness, and it existed in the animal creation before man was made. So that evil was not permitted to man, nor even to satan, for it was in the garden before the serpent was. Nor could permission of evil to enter heaven in any fancied fall of an angel have anything to do with that evil of nakedness. He did not "permit" that evil to anybody. He created man thus evil (naked).

Then to whom did God permit evil? Let those answer who say that he did, for he never says so. If he permitted evil, why is he not as "responsible" for it as people think he is anyway, whatever solution is offered? And weak, for thus yielding, as well as being "responsible"? Thus is evident our declaration that such efforts are worse than silence.

Even on the assumption that God permits evil, it would still be evil, and so its presence would still be an unsolved problem and unpenetrated mystery. But on the hypothesis of God's own proposition that man's evil is God's work of holy love, the problem is solved and the mystery disappears. And there is no other solution of the problem or dissolution of the mystery than this one, that God himself gives us in his own words. Man's evil in God's hands is good; else He would be guilty. And God's good in man's hands is evil, else he would be innocent. Sin is a misuse of good, through fleshly lusts.

Here probably "some man will say," "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil" (Isa. 5:20). But the context here shows that those words are a remonstrance against Israel for calling their own "sin" (verse 18) "good," in order to "justify" it (verse 23). Will any possible objector have the temerity to place himself before our divine Judge in the attitude of such unjust charges against us?

He "turned" (or as we probably might properly say "transformed" or "changed") Balaam's curse into a blessing (Deu. 23:5) by actually changing the intended words of cursing into words of blessing in his mouth. But with the sin of Joseph's brothers it was different; for when they "meant" it for evil, God "meant" it for good (Gen. 50:15-20), but he made no change in the evil. He merely so changed the course and the results of it that it eventuated in good to all concerned, including even the sinning brothers. But it remained evil. It was the same at Calvary. But the divine purpose so overshadowed the evil human motive that Joseph even told his brothers that it was not they, but God, who sent him to Egypt, though in the minor, human sense, they did send him there. From this we see that from the divine view there is no evil in the world, because his working in it is "unto good" (Gen. 50:20), so that it all works "for good" to us (Ro. 8:28).

The evils of sin, suffering and death will always remain evils on the human side until God finishes working in them, so they must finally be abolished, or swallowed up (Isa. 25:7-8) or destroyed (Hos. 13:14) in immortality. Not "sublimated," but "turned," and finally be "no more" (Rev. 21:4).

2. DOES GOD "USE" EVIL?

This is a less faulty effort than to say he permits it, but the scriptures never say that he even uses evil.

If he does use evil as a means to accomplish his purposes, what would he

have done if evil had not been introduced into his realm by an intruder, so that he might so use it? For on the assumption that he does use evil for his purposes, some means would have been necessary for him to accomplish his ends, and if there had not been a satan in Paul's time what would he do to purify the Corinthian fornicator (1 Cor. 5:5) or instruct Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Tim. 1:20)? Will our critics join us in saying that evil is necessary? If so, will they say that God needs the devil?

Then, too, on the assumption that he uses evil, it would still be evil, and so the problem and mystery of its existence would persist.

So all such efforts as saying that God permits or uses evil, commendable as they are as intentions to relieve the difficulty, do not reach bottom.

It is probably permissible to say that God uses evil in the same sense that man makes his own tools before using them, for God does work his will through evil, but only after he creates his own evil, instead of using the evil created by another. In a proper sense it may be permissible to say that he even permits evil, as by saying to Job's adversary, "He is in your hand" (1:12, margin).

The idea we protest is that evil came into the world contrary to God's intention, by "free will" of man and formerly of an angel to "fall" and become the devil, and that then God did with it what he would not have done if he could have had his way (!) about it all.

Evil as trouble is by itself neutral. When man inflicts it in hate or vengeance it becomes evil in form of sin. But God takes vengeance, though in love and holiness, because he cannot really hate or take revenge, because "whom the Lord loves, he chastens." Even when he inflicted the adultery of David's wives upon him, avenging Uriah by paying David back what he had done to his neighbor, he was "justified" in his part in that adultery, as David himself later acknowledged (Psa. 51). God not only thus avenged Uriah, but he does many like things. He transmuted the hate and murder that men committed against his Son into the sacrifice for the world's sin. How wonderful is divine alchemy!

In remonstrating against God permitting or using evil we are thinking of the beginning, of the impropriety of asking, in the past tense, "Why did (not "does") God permit or use evil?"

To think thus would require an evil being coexistent with God from the beginning, to whom he permitted evil or from whose introducing he used it. When he alone existed, who but he could foreordain the evil that he foreknew and planned Calvary to cure? No one believing otherwise has yet answered our question, "Who foreordained the evil that God foreknew?" Some shy away and try to shoo us away, telling us not to meddle with God's business. Others just say nothing, because from their view there is no answer. Another may evasively say, "I don't know," and another may boldly venture to say, "Nobody did." Then how could God foreknow what was not forecertain? And if certain, or fixed, what is that but foreordained? Is there any possibility that what he foreknows will not occur? If so, how could it properly be said to be "known" before? And how then guarantee prophecy to be more certain than heaven and earth? (Matt. 24:35).

Since there was a time when God alone existed, evil had to come from him, directly or indirectly. If we say, "Indirectly," we charge him with

ignorance and incapacity, and so blame him with lack of foresight or power. If we say, "Directly," we seem to charge him with guilt. But we do not, as we shall see. He created the evil of nakedness, and out of that naked and ignorant flesh all evil of sin has come, as we shall also see.

3. GOD AS CREATOR OF EVIL

Instead of scripture saying he permits evil to someone else, it says he creates it himself.

He creates bodily ills (Ex. 4:11).

"I make peace, and create evil" (Isa. 45:7). It may be freely granted that "evil" here means, not sin, but trouble, for it is used as the opposite of "peace," and the context shows that it refers to war, the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, who was addressed here, and given the mission of this conquest for the deliverance of Israel from their seventy years of exile. But this conquest involved all the sins committed in war, so it is all the same as if God had in mind all these sins as secondary evils involved in the primary evil of that war when he said of that conquest, "I . . . create evil," for such sins (plunder and slaughter) are named in a similar war of conquest (Isa. 10:5-7).

Even to admit that God is the Author of trouble as evil, apart from the evil of sin, is vexing enough to disturb our moral complacency, for it raises the question of his justice, as Abraham did in his inquiry about the destruction of possibly righteous people in Sodom. So it matters little what definition we attach to the word "evil" in Isa. 45:7—the problem remains. We propose to offer the solution the scriptures give, in all its satisfaction to the intellect and its comfort to the afflicted and troubled.

Another section of scripture (Amos 3:1-8), "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?", is much like Isa. 45:7. This language also uses "evil" for trouble, judgment, as the context shows, saying God will "punish" Israel for sin. That is to say, whenever trouble such as this came to them they were to consider their ways, for the law covenanted to them freedom from trouble for obedience. So if such "evil" came in a city, its presence was evidence of their sin.

Two similes are used to illustrate the idea that there is no evil in a city except what God does, prey taken by a lion and a bird taken in a snare or "gin" (engine).

In verse 6, where the question about evil is asked, another question is put to Israel, which they would well understand, about a trumpet portending trouble from enemies, who were to conquer them only if they had disobeyed the law covenant. They were to consider and repent in view of such danger, so that they and their God might "walk together" in righteousness (verse 3), under the covenant. So in case of judgment for sin Israel was the prey caught by the "lion," God, and the bird ensnared by him, as is shown by the parallelism in verse 8, where God is in figure the Lion. Just as he here speaks of doing this "evil," so he elsewhere calls his punishment of Israel under the covenant "evil" brought upon them (Deu. 29:21; 31:29; Neh. 13:18; 2 K. 22:16, 20; 2 Chron. 7:22).

Here, as in Isa. 45:7, when God brought upon Israel evil in the form of trouble, one of the most frequent forms of it was conquest by a Gentile nation, and that involved all the sins committed in war, such as robbery, rape and

slaughter; so that any efforts to exonerate God from seeming blame by limiting "evil" in these two scriptures (Isa. 45:7 and Am. 3:6) to neutral evil is of no avail. There is a proper way to understand his exemption from guilt even when making man's sin glorify him. The reader is referred to our "PRIMER OF PREDESTINATION" for the solution of that problem.

"The Lord has made all things for himself, yes, even the wicked for the day of evil" (Prov. 16:4). Here again "evil" probably refers to trouble, judgment, but the mysteriously strange declaration is that evil people are created for that judgment. Paul's teaching on grace completes the explanation by revealing that the divine purpose in condemnation is justification.

So God creates evil (Isa. 45:7) and does evil (Am. 3:6). He creates evil in the form of blindness, deafness and dumbness (Ex. 4:11). He created the blind man for his Son's ministry (Jn. 9). He took Joseph through his evils of both suffering and sin inflicted by his brothers, in which Joseph said that God was the one who did those same evils (Ge. 45:5-7; 50:15-20). He does evil in the form of man's sin without any guilt on his part, as he did at Calvary, though man is guilty in such deeds. He offered his Son by taking his life (Isa. 53:10), through man's sin of murder (Ac. 7:52). His motive of love made that act righteous at the same time that man's motive of hate made the same deed sin by man. God's hand (Ac. 4:28) and man's hand (2:23) joined in the same deed that was both evil and good, owing to the side from which it is viewed.

"Thou shalt not kill" is quoted by the Son, "Thou shalt do no murder" (Mt. 19:18). Capital punishment by man is not murder, but private slaying contrary to law is. So while man murdered the Son, God sacrificed him. He did not violate the law in doing so, for he was not under it, and even then, he followed the highest principle underlying all law, which is love, in giving his Son in death (Jn. 3:16).

In addition to creating evil and doing it God has "given" it to us (Eccl. 1:13). He brings it upon man (Job 42:11), so that we receive it from him (2:10). And though evil is attributed to satan (Lu. 13:16), there is no contradiction, for the way in which he brought it upon Job was by satan's hand (Job 1-2).

As we show in the later chapter on "Doing Evil That Good May Come," God does five evils that are sins for men to do: swearing, cursing, vengeance, killing and deceiving, without any guilt whatever. He does not do these things because a supernatural devil tempts him. He "cannot be tempted" (Jas. 1:13). So he can perform evil without a supernatural devil. Sin results by exposing the flesh—desires and ignorance of flesh—creatures to law, as it did with Adam and Eve, and would do with the animals if he should subject their conduct to law, in their killing, anger and stealing, though they now do those evil acts without guilt or imputed sin, because they have no law. And they, too, do those deeds without a supernatural evil being to tempt them. So again it becomes evident that evil (which in their case is not sin only because of absence of law) can result without supernatural solicitation. These matters are more fully discussed in later sections.

A DIVINE PURPOSE IN EVIL

It is generally recognized that God provides evil in the form of trouble to fulfill his purposes. The scriptures abound in such cases, of which the following are samples:

Satan was God's servant, designed to purify a fornicator (1 Cor. 5:5) and teach false guides not to blaspheme (1 Tim. 1:20).

Seven years of insanity, sent from heaven for the purpose, taught Nebuchadnezzar that God rules in politics and history.

A man was born blind that God's power to heal might be manifested in his blindness (Jn. 9).

Paul was given a thorn in the flesh to keep him humble, and suffered many troubles in order to be fitted to comfort others similarly afflicted (2 Cor. 1:3-6).

There is a purpose in our sufferings similar to that (2 Cor. 4:10-11; Phil. 1:29).

The experience of Israel for forty years in the desert was for the purpose of doing them good in the end (Deu. 8:16).

God perfected his Son through sufferings (He. 2:10), and uses his cross to save us.

And finally, all our suffering is divinely purposed for our good (Eccl. 1:13; 3:10).

But although it is generally conceded that God works in the evil of trouble to perform good purposes, people are very reluctant to admit that he does the same in evil in the form of sin, because of his seeming guilt if that be so. However, notice the following cases of that:

He fulfilled the prophecy that Esau should serve Jacob through a lie by Jacob and Rebecca.

He sent Joseph into Egypt by means of the sin of his brothers (Ge. 45:5, 8) to save the lives of them and of the Egyptians (50:15-20), and caused the Egyptians to hate them (Psa. 105:25), to make them want to return to Canaan.

He hardened Pharaoh's heart to disobey, in order to reveal himself to the world (Ex. 9:16).

He willed that Samson marry a Philistine, contrary to the law (which would therefore be sin), in order to overthrow her people (Judg. 14:1-4).

Because of Judah's sins he said he would make them drunk (Jer. 13:13).

He gave David's wives into adultery in order to punish him (2 Sam. 12).

Though guarding land from confiscation (Ex. 34:24), he took that same land from the Canaanites.

He sent the Assyrians on a plundering and killing campaign, to punish Israel (Isa. 10:5-7).

He deceived false prophets (Ezek. 14:9; 1 K. 22:15-23) for a test to Israel (Deu. 13:1-3).

He will prompt the ten last kings to contribute to idolatry, to fulfill his words (Rev. 17:17).

He causes both Israel and Gentiles to disbelieve, in order to show mercy to all (Ro. 11:32).

He brought about the betrayal and murder of his Son, to save the world (Ac. 2:23; 4:28).

And finally, he makes all man's wrath glorify him (Psa. 76:10).

(Our PRIMER explains this more thoroughly).

As shown before, evil is necessary to reveal God. For God is love, and love is expressed in gifts and service (Jn. 3:16; Gal. 5:13; Mt. 5:44; Ro. 12:20). That necessitates that man be needy and require service, which is but another way of saying that he must be in evil. His first evil of nakedness required

clothing, and that naked flesh required food to satisfy the evil-suffering of hunger. And creation in flesh entailed all the evils dormant resident in flesh, which were sin, suffering and death.

God's revelation of himself to the ancient world through Pharaoh involved both forms of evil—suffering and sin—ten troubles and ten acts of disobedience.

Law for the purpose of sin, for the purpose of grace (Ro. 5:20-21).

The pinnacle of Calvary for supreme and infinite love.

When he finishes revealing himself, and becomes all in everybody, he will banish all evil in both its forms, for all future time.

SHALL MAN PURPOSELY DO EVIL, THAT GOOD MAY RESULT?

This question naturally follows the idea of a divine purpose in evil.

Paul says that he was slandered by some who asserted that he taught, "Let us do evil, that good may come" (Ro. 3:8). The author has been similarly clubbed for teaching Paul's words.

The immediate cause of his introducing that quotation here is that it concerns justification by faith. He raises the plausible question of Israel's disbelief of the gospel nullifying God's fidelity to his gospel promise—"Shall their unbelief make the faith (faithfulness, fidelity) of God of none effect?" (verse 3). That is, would he refuse to justify the "remnant" who believed, because the nation disbelieved, or not eventually have mercy on the nation?

In verse 5 he raises the question that since our sin ("unrighteousness") is a requisite for the display of God's "righteousness" (justification of sinners), why should sinners be condemned? Then in verse 7 he comes definitely to the question of doing evil purposely, that good may come out of it, which is naturally suggested by the preceding thought that man's sin is a necessity for his justification—"For if the truth (fidelity) of God has more abounded (in justification of the few who believed) through my lie (disbelief) unto his glory; why yet am I also judged as a sinner?" That is, since man's sin is a necessity for the display of God's attitude to sinners, why should they be condemned? Why should they not rather say, "Let us do evil, that good may come"? Paul's teaching on pure grace naturally led his ignorant critics to accuse him of teaching the false proposition contained in the question, which he repudiates. Such critics do not seem to realize how shortsighted such reasoning is; for if a sinner is right in sinning for the purpose of grace, how can such right conduct be made right in justification? What is already right cannot be rectified. The same shortsighted objection is made when we think of Adam's transgression as being a necessary background for the display of divine grace. People tell us, "If I believed as you do, I would ditch my bible, and have a good time."

Why not do evil intentionally after we learn the precious truth that all evil is divinely created, purposed and given to us for good, as we have previously cited scripture to show?

There are two reasons for not doing so. The first is, that we cannot control evil for good, as God can; and the second is, that the suggested course is impossible for one who has been saved. We shall consider a few cases in which God does evils for good in which man cannot so control evil to do so.

1. Swearing. On many occasions God swore (Heb. 6:13-18; Lu. 1:75; Num. 14:21, 28; Deut. 32:40). Angels also swore (Dan. 12:7; Rev. 10:6).

But men are forbidden to swear (Matt. 5:34; Jas. 5:12). Then "Is God unrighteous who" does what is sin for man to do? and does he sin when he does contrary to law, which would be sin for man to do? Why may not man swear "that good may come," since God does it that the good of assurance of the truth of his words may result, as is said to be the reason he took oath (Heb. 6:17)? Especially since human oaths are for the purpose of assuring others of the truth of what the swearers say, and they thus do the same as God?

The Savior gave two reasons for not swearing. The first was that we cannot control the fact of that by which we swear, and so might be falsified in the oath. If we should swear by the "head" (of "hair". verse 36), making our word "as sure as" the color of our "black or white" hair, the color might change over night, as it has been known to do, and so by the time the oath is due we could not change the color back to agree with the oath, ("because thou canst not make one hair white or black"), and thus we could not control the fact that was the basis of the oath and would thus be falsified in the oath. And so an oath might force the swearer into a lie. By the time the performance of such an oath comes due we might be bald, or even dead.

But God can control all the issues, so in his swearing there is no risk of his being falsified by contingent facts or changes. He controls all in the universe. But man cannot control the results of the evil he commits under motive of bringing good out of it, and if he assumes that God will rule it for good, he presumes upon God, tempts God. Man therefore cannot properly purpose evil for good, though God can, for he can transform evil into good (Deu. 23:5). Even a good motive does not make evil good for man to do, for he cannot properly purposely commit sin, because it violates conscience. "To him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean." There are no "white lies."

Now for the second reason against oaths: "Whatsoever is more than these ("yes" and "no," without adding, "as sure as—") cometh of evil," evidently the evil of conceding that the Christian's word is so doubtful that he needs to fortify it by an oath. Though under the law swearing was recognized, just so men did not "forswear" (falsify the oath), but did "perform" it, as the Savior here quoted the law (Matt. 5:37), yet he was bringing his disciples to greater righteousness than that of the scribes and Pharisees (verse 20), so with the disciples "yes" and "no" was to be sufficient. That made Christian life more dignified and operative according to a higher standard of ethics.

2. Cursing. God curses. He cursed the ground for Adam's sake. He cursed Cain (Ge. 4:11) and cursed Israel (Deu. 27-28) if they should disobey the law. He cursed any one else who should curse Israel (Ge. 12:3). He curses anyone who trusts in man (idolatry?) (Jer. 17:5) or preaches a perverted gospel (Gal. 1:9).

But man is forbidden to curse (Ex. 21:17). Why then may not man do what God does, and why is not God guilty for doing what is sin for man to do?

The reason why the evil of cursing is not for man to pronounce upon others is that he does not do it for man's "sake," as God did in cursing the ground for Adam. Imagine a man cursing in love, for the good of the one

upon whom he pronounces evil! But God does. Neither can man make his curse come true. God can.

3. Vengeance. God says that vengeance belongs to him, and that he will repay the wrong-doer (Ro. 12:19; He. 10:30). So he bids us not avenge ourselves (Prov. 24:29; Ro. 12:17-19). Again imagine a man taking vengeance upon his enemy in love for the enemy's good! But God does.

4. Killing. God kills (Deu. 32:39; Job 1:21). Can "Christian soldiers" kill their enemies while loving them? God loved his Son even while taking away his life. A court trial is now in progress in an eastern city over a man accused of killing his infant child pronounced hopeless by the doctor. The state does not legalize "mercy slaying." It would be too hazardous.

We sometimes read of an aged person becoming a suicide because he felt "in the way." We can pity the victims and blame the negligent—if there was neglect—but can we justify the suicide? God can make the care of helpless infants and aged people a blessing to those who need to learn patience and gentleness, and he can restore the life he takes away. But man cannot, so it is sinful for him to attempt to bring good out of purposed evil. He cannot control evil for good. God can. He makes all things work together for our good (Ro. 8:28). Could we justify anyone for purposely making an infant helpless or an aged person feel in the way, even for the good of those who had the care of them? God does such things (Ex 4:11-12; Jn. 9:3). Because he can bring good out of it all. But we may properly exult in God for the wickedness of betrayal and murder that provided us a Savior, without being willing to have participated in that wickedness. When God takes away life he takes only his own (Job 34:14-15; Eccl. 12:7).

5. Deceiving. God deceives (Ezek. 14:9; 1 K. 22:23). He used the deception of false prophets for good, to test Israel (Deu. 13:1-3). Can man properly do that?

It seems shocking to objectors to see such things in the scriptures, but what will they do with them? But they need not perplex and distress. There is a solution in harmony with divine holiness, and marvelous in satisfaction to our intelligence. Here it is:

GOD NOT BOUND BY HIS OWN LAWS

God is not bound by his own laws that he gives to man. He does not sin when he does what we sin in doing, as we have seen in all the foregoing five cases. Because sin is transgression of law, and he has no law to transgress, but is prompted in his conduct only by his own nature, which is perfection itself. Law was made for the unholy and sinners (1 Tim. 1:9) and implies a need for control, which he does not need. Where no law is, there is no transgression. His conduct can be scanned only on the ground of the ethical, by the standard of love, which is the only absolute and perfect standard of conduct. It is the measure of conduct for God and man, as is so well known as not to need citations of scriptural evidence. Then whatever God does in love is right, just as is true of us. And he can, and does do all the above evils thus, while man cannot do any of them so. Since God "cannot be tempted," he needs no law to restrain him from doing wrong.

Even some men were not bound by the law governing the group. Samson's marriage of a foreign woman contrary to the law was "of the Lord" (Judg. 14:4), and God told Shimei to curse David contrary to the law (2 Sam.

16:11). The judges of Israel who paid offenders back with exact legal vengeance were obeying the law. So even some men are outside law in their acts. Christians are to live above law, doing even more than it demands. So does God.

So God is not subject to his own law, nor to anyone else's law. He does not make laws for himself, but for others who need them. If he could be so imperfect as to act culpably, and thus make it possible to require law that would restrain his conduct, then he, as Judge, could acquit himself in his own court, or as Legislator, could reverse the law and thus make his fault legal, and so be legally guiltless, though not ethically faultless, just as men say, "The king can do no wrong," but to conceive of our great heavenly Father thus would place our religion on the same level with paganism, whose gods war over triangles of love. Our God does not need to resort to any such subterfuges as the above to be seen as holy and perfect in his relation to evil in both its forms.

So God's conduct is outside the jurisdiction of law, though it includes the spirit of all legal righteousness without the letter of it.

Love as the perfect ethical standard includes doing good (Mt. 5:44) and doing no harm (Ro. 13:8-10). This last citation says that it fulfills all the requirements of law. But it is not judged by law, and is not subject to law.

Then the only ethical question about God's conduct in his relation to evil is, Does he do only good to everybody concerned in creating evil, bringing it upon man and bringing man under condemnation of law for sake of justification by grace? All such questions are answered in the affirmative in scripture.

That the reader may fully and forcibly realize the truth of the above principles, we reverently suggest to think of the absurdity of applying to God the laws against eating pork and the one requiring an Israelitish widow to marry only her dead husband's brother! If he were under the decalogue he could not make the sun rise or the rain fall on Saturday, or take the life of his innocent Son or of babes that have never come to the knowledge of sin; and if under the law he gave Adam he must not know the evil of nakedness in which he created him.

God is not subject to his own law any more than is a parent who forbids his children to cross a dangerous street, but does it himself to earn their food. Like Samson, God married a wife who was an idolatress in the worship of the golden calf only a few hours before their wedding, but there was no risk of her leading him into idolatry, as with Solomon and Ahab.

As there is no court in which to bring nations to the bar for war, and none in which to try cases of evil conduct by one animal against another, because of the absence of legal—and even moral—law governing their acts when they merely follow the natural laws of self-preservation engraved in their bodies, so human reason has no more jurisdiction over God's conduct than his own law has, when he follows the perfect law of love in evil engraved in his own holy and infinitely perfect nature. He simply throws such cases out of his court, saying, "Who has known the mind of the Lord? or who has been his counsellor?"

The sins of eating pork or catfish, working on Saturday or failing to practice circumcision or offer an animal for sin were arbitrary matters, involving no ethical principle; not unrighteous, but only sin because illegal; sin

only because of law that made them so, such as our recent law requiring us to give in all our gold to the government. Before that, it was legal to keep it. No ethical principle in it either way.

So it is with the above laws of Moses. Nonconformance to them is no sin to us who were never under them. It was sin to Israel only because law made it so, temporarily, as with our gold. When those laws were rescinded at Calvary by fulfillment, the sin of disregarding them ended. Henceforth no attempt to fasten them on Gentile conduct was permitted, and then Peter, a Jew, could disregard them with Cornelius. It was like our enactment and change of speed laws.

Any ethically neutral act can thus be made sin by law. That was the case in Adam's sin, as we shall see. And even a highly ethical act may be made sin by prohibiting it. "Doth this offend you? What and if?" you should be told that praying would be sin by being forbidden? Well, here it is: God told Moses to quit praying for what he was asking, because he was begging contrary to the divine will (Deu. 3:26); he told Joshua to quit praying as he was, and get up from lying on his face, because his prayer was an uncalled-for complaint of unbelief, and because it was a time for action, not words (Josh. 7); and he told Jeremiah not to pray at all for Israel (7:16), though the same intercession was proper about seventy years later (Da. 9). All this requires that we understand clearly the nature of sin—that it is any conduct (wrong, neutral or even righteous) forbidden by law, and that God can make any act sinful by law or do away with all sin by rescinding all law. But mark you, that is not saying that all conduct would then be good or righteous. Wrong conduct would still be evil, even as the acts of animals are evil, because then man's faulty conduct would not measure up to brotherly love. If people were right, no law would be needed on our statute books but, "Love your neighbor." And even that would be superfluous.

So then sin should be distinguished from evil, the generic term under which sin is a specific and legal term. And sin should also be distinguished from wrong and unethical conduct. And all these terms should be distinguished from evil as suffering.

It is necessary only to prohibit by commandment anything—bad, neutral or good, to make sin of it. Thus sin did originate in Eden—by a command against a neutral act that exposed a neutral condition—nakedness.

When God created man flesh, and thus in the "evil" of nakedness, it involved all the other evils that have come out of flesh. The fact that the cross was foreknown and foreordained "before the foundation of the world" and pictured typically in the wounding of the first Adam's side before sin came shows that the Sacrifice was not a mere contingency, depending upon whether or not Adam should sin, but was a certainty, depending upon God's "eternal purpose." The way of entering into immortality by works of obedience to law was as much an impossibility for Adam as for any of his posterity, and did not the Father know it and plan for it before inspiring Paul to write it? It is preposterous to think that a supposed free will of a pair of specks of dust should thwart the will of him who "hangeeth the earth upon nothing," "taketh up the isles as a very little thing" and creates a universe so vast that tiny man must measure its far-flung spaces by light-years. The marvel is that he should be "mindful" of such infinitesimal specks in such infinite space.

The second reason why man may not properly purpose to do evil "that good may come" is that the suggested course is impossible for those to whom the suggestion is made. Not physically impossible, but spiritually so. It is about the same suggestion as the later one, "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?" since the declaration just preceding is that law came in order to increase sin, to display greater grace.

The answer (in next verse) is that it is impossible—as impossible as for a dead person to return to the old life. Christians saved by grace are dead to sin. An immortal person, risen so from the grave, cannot reverse his course backward through resurrection and death into flesh life. It would be a physical impossibility, because immortality cannot end, which it must do in such reversal. The analogy implies that those saved out of death in sin to spiritual life in grace cannot so violate grace and love as to revert into sin. That would be as much a spiritual impossibility as the other would be a physical one.

We close this section on evil as a divine creation and work of God by calling the reader's attention to the statement of Paul to the Athenian Philosophers that man exists in God (Ac. 17:28), as he quoted their poets in corroboration, by their saying that man is related to God. That being true, added to the truth that man was created in nakedness of evil, takes that evil back to the Creator, where he places it in all the scriptures we have now finished considering.

Then since man exists in God in a state of nakedness as evil, no attempted solution of the problem of evil is a real solution as long as evil is thought of as separate from God. And since man exists in God, so does all the rest of the universe, and it was all latent and potential in God "in the beginning", and by creation became actual. Not only the "material" universe of science, but since man was a part of that so-called "material universe", the active universe expressed in history and the moral universe of religion—all were preexistent in God "in the beginning".

Since nakedness of flesh was "evil", and since sin came from the desires of that flesh coupled with ignorance, all evil as sin was thus secondarily a divine creation by subjecting that flesh to law. The question is, Should God have an imperfect creation and bring it to perfection through the experience of evil, or should there be nothing existent but God? The answer was imperative that there must be a creation because "God is love", and love must express itself by giving (Jn. 3:16) and serving (Ga. 5:13) to an imperfect creation that needed gifts and service.

The fact that the universe exists in God solves the problems of science, philosophy and religion, for truth without religion is incomplete.

Ever since a mind looked through wondering eyes on a fair creation, human thought has asked, "What do I see?" Atheism says, "I see but the universe". Pantheism says, "I see the universe as God, and God as the universe." Immanence says, "I see God in the universe". Transcendence says, "I see God beyond the universe". But the great apostle told the assembled philosophers of conflicting schools of thought that the universe is in God. For since people exist in God, as he there told them, so does all the rest of the universe. The true answer, then, is, "I see God."

Science has come nearer to the riddle of the universe than philosophy has, for it is about to conclude that the material universe is not "material" sub-

stance at all, in the sense of the former conception, but is "energy," that the scriptures call the divine spirit, but what that "energy" of science is, science has never discovered, because it does not profess to be religious. For apart from God science can never really solve the riddle, because God's spirit formed the universe (Job 26:13; 33:4). Thus by his spirit he is omnipresent (Psa. 139:7-12) and fills heaven and earth (Jer. 23:24) so full that they cannot contain him (1 Kin. 8:27), so that he must contain them (Ac. 17:28). So because philosophy cannot correctly read the created universe, and because science cannot analyze God in a test tube nor uncover him with a scalpel nor find him with either a telescope or a microscope, nor the science of logic corner him with a syllogism, both philosophy and science became the wisdom of this world by which the world estranges itself from God (1 Cor. 1:18-31), as even the Athenian philosophers and worshipers themselves admitted, by calling him "the unknown God," instead of feeling after him and finding him who is so near that they live and move and have their existence in him, as Paul then declared to them. The human spirit forms the body by heredity.

So because God is Spirit (Jn. 4:24), and by that spirit created the universe that exists in him, the universe is spirit instead of even "energy" as something apart from him. There is no solution of the problems of science and philosophy apart from him.

These truths of creation show also the religious error of saying that God created the world "out of nothing."

Though science should say, "I see God by means of the universe", as some devout scientists have said, and though a combination of science and religion should say, "I see God as abstract principle," yet the Christian, even if he does not know the secret of the biblical solution of the problems of science and philosophy, can say, "I see God in Christ" (Jn 14:9; 2 Cor. 5:19). For the Infinite is incomprehensible to the finite mortal until it becomes Man.

The weary old world, with failing sight, says, "Oh that I might see Christ in Christians. Then I could believe". There is the challenge to us from those who seek loveliness of life.

THE TEMPORARY CHARACTER OF EVIL

Evil is temporary. It will be abolished in both its forms of sin and suffering at the consummation of the ages when God becomes "all in all". For God's will is to be done in earth as it is now done in heaven by the angels. That will terminate all sin. And when God wipes away all tears and there is no more pain or death, that will be the end of all suffering. Thus both forms of evil are temporary.

That leaves no possibility of endless hell torment or endless death. For such torment would cause pain, and such death would make it impossible to say "no more death" (not "dying"). And unless death is abolished there will still be tears of bereavement. So all evil is temporary.

That demonstrates that it is here by divine will. Else, since he will end it, why not now? Or why is it here at all? To have kept the pair from the tree would have insured innocence—a state of childhood,—but not virtue of righteousness.

NAMES AND TITLES OF EVIL

We come now to the consideration of the vexing problem and mystery of satan, or the devil.

The words "satan" and "devil" are not proper nouns, so should not be capitalized. The other pair of names, "serpent" and "dragon" are never thought of as being proper nouns, so they are not capitalized, even in the bible. And though "Devil" and "Satan" are capitalized in Rev. 12:9 and 20:2 in the A.V., "devil" is not capitalized in Matt. 4:1 and Jn. 8:44. "Satan" is always capitalized in the A.V., but if "Devil" is a proper noun in Rev. 12 and 20, why not in Matt. 4 and Jn. 8? But we know that the punctuation of the A.V. is not inspired, for biblical punctuation was not used of these scriptures until the 15th century. If "satan" and "devil" are proper nouns, names of a supernatural evil being, how could the word "satan" be used of a good angel (Num. 22:22), of good king David (1 Sam. 29:4), (where the Hebrew word is "satan" in both these places, and translated "adversary"), or how be used of Peter (Mt. 16:23)? Our how could the word "devil" be used of Judas (Jn. 6:70), or in the plural of women (Titus 2:3, where the Greek word translated "false accusers" is the one elsewhere translated "devil")? The fact that both "satan" and "devil" are common nouns may thus be seen in all these references. "Satan" means merely an adversary, either good or bad; and "devil" means an accuser, or slanderer. So then "satan" and "devil" do not necessarily mean a supernatural adversary, slanderer or accuser, and the scriptures do not present a supernatural devil to us. In Mt. 16:23 "satan," as applied to Peter, is a translation of the Greek word "satana," which is a transliteration of the Hebrew word "satan."

It presumably is permissible to capitalize "satan" and "devil" when the words are names of evil personified, just so the personification is not considered proof of personal reality of what is personified.

Then there is no one and only satan or devil in all the scriptures, nor in the universe. The nearest thing to it is that the serpent, which is the same as satan and the devil, in the Greek scriptures, is a lone tempter in Gen. 3, but even "serpent" when used as a tempter, is not a title of a supernatural evil being, but is used in a symbolic way, as will be explained later.

"Devil" and "Satan" (Rev. 12:9) are titles of the dragon and serpent, which are evidently symbols.

The natural man's mind or spirit ("the carnal mind," "the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience") is often personified as the devil or satan, and sometimes generalized into a political organization and called "the dragon," "the prince (or "god") of this world," etc., in addition to the titles of "devil" and "satan." And for purposes of hidden symbolism, man is called a "serpent" (Matt. 3:7; 23:33). When this human serpent idea is also generalized as a civil power, the serpent and the dragon are identical, as in Rev. 12 and 20.

Another title of the devil is "Beelzebub," "the prince of the devils." For what the Pharisees called both "Beelzebub" and "devil" Jesus called "Satan" (Matt. 12:26).

Besides these titles of evil there are others in the scriptures, such as "adversary," "enemy" and "wicked one," none of which needs any special notice, as they do not change the idea any.

THE SOURCE OF TEMPTATION AND THE PROCESS OF SINNING

The source of temptation and sin is clearly stated by James: "Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed" (1:12-15). Temptation does not come from without, but from within. Even though there is an appeal from the outside, as when another person entices, or when exterior appeals are made to "the lust of the eyes," or by odor, sound, taste or contact, there is no temptation unless there is flesh-desire on the inside for what is outside. The field of conflict is not the whole world outside, but the narrow circle of consciousness. Our conversation with the tempter is all in our thoughts. He speaks the language we know, and no other. Those who speak more than one language find that he tempts them in their native tongue mostly, or mixedly. If he is a real being, he knows all the languages of earth, and never uses one on us but one we know. Temptation comes from the desires of flesh, when we are "drawn away" by them (Jas. 1:14). He states it again in 4:1, and so do the Lord (Mk. 7:20-23) and Peter (2 Pet. 1:4) and Paul, when he calls it "the body of sin" (Ro. 6:6) and "the body of the sins of the flesh" (Col. 2:11-13) and "the works of the flesh" (Gal. 5:19) and by the one word "flesh" (Ro. 8) and the phrase "the carnal mind," the flesh-mind, the "natural" as contrasted with the "spiritual."

James here uses the striking figure of sin as a child born from lust, or flesh-desire, as its mother, "when it hath conceived." That requires a father. Paul and Peter identify him as "ignorance" (Eph. 4:18; 1 Pet. 1:14). The three flesh-desires in Eve (Ge. 3:6) when they were married, so to speak, to ignorance of good and evil, produced the first sin. But when they were divorced from ignorance by the presence of the Holy Spirit in its fullness in the mind of the Savior in his temptation in the wilderness, no sin resulted. The flesh-passion of hate, if it had not been united in wedlock-figure to ignorance, would not have brought forth the murder of God's Son (1 Cor. 2:8). But since the Father purposed it, he designedly kept those truths from them, as the Master said in his reason for teaching in parables. God united ignorance and desire as man and wife, to be sure of the offspring of sin, else no saving cross.

This flesh-desire is three-fold, "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." They are "all (the evil) that is in the world" (1 Jn. 2:15-17). All, because classified as "the world," "the flesh" and "the mind" (Eph. 2:1-5). For since these are the outside (the world), the inside (the mind) and the middle (the flesh), they are necessarily all, because anything else than the outside, the inside and the middle is unthinkable.

The flesh-desires themselves are not sinful. Our Lord ate and drank. We are told to glorify God in all these (1 Cor. 10:31). But it was sinful for Adam to eat of one tree, or for Israel to eat pork, or would have been wrong for our Savior to eat bread made from stones by power of the Spirit. It was right for him to eat, or show himself to Israel by a miracle, or desire to rule the nations, but not in the way and at the time his mind contemplated under temptation. Sin comes out of our desires only when we are "drawn away" by them. Then the resulting sin becomes a child born from desire as its mother and ignorance as its father. The marvel of the birth of this sin-child, the

mystery of the origin of sin, lies right here in the matrix of human consciousness, where a neutral flesh-desire unites with neutral ignorance, and the evil of sin comes into existence, as when harmless carbon and hydrogen unite chemically with life-giving oxygen and produce deadly carbohic acid.

This ignorance that is the father of sin is especially sinful when it is "willingly ignorant." Unbelief may be said to be a form of this ignorance, as when Eve disbelieved the words of God for the words of the "serpent," and when in the Lord's temptation the "if" of doubt of the divine Voice declaring him God's Son was the basis of his temptation.

A little observation and reflection will show how true are the words of the Lord and the apostles cited above. For our gluttony, drunkenness, defrauding and lewdness do not come from any supernatural evil voice, either audible or in consciousness, soliciting us to evil. We hear no supernatural voice and see no evil form.

It is the same with the lower animals: they do evil deeds like ours, such as theft, murder and revenge. Does a supernatural devil tempt them? or is it not enough that hunger, self-defense, self-preservation and other similar desires of flesh identical with ours, and combined with their ignorance as with ours, cause them even involuntarily to do such evil things? But these same desires prompt them to deeds of self-sacrifice and self-denial. A dog will give his life to rescue his master, and all creatures risk any hazard for their offspring. Under such conditions as mating-desire a rooster will give a choice morsel to a hen. But not to another rooster. He is his enemy, and he will kill him if he can. So flesh-desire is neutral, and capable of good when love governs it, or capable of evil when ignorance is the father.

If it took a supernatural evil being to cause human beings to sin, would it not require at least as strong a corrupting evil being to tempt the angel that supposedly became the devil and tempted Eve, and then would not that chain of tempting beings run into an interminable beginning, and require a devil as old as God, as in paganism, if it did not even run the evil god into the Godhead for its source, and thus the effort to apologize for God in the existence of evil be worse than no explanation? Truly, evil is mysterious—as long as we think that evil is evil on God's side, and fail to see that it is so only on man's side, which is the true solution.

If God created an angel that became satan, and that was the origin of evil, how does that exonerate him from guilt any better than to see that he created a man that originated sin? And if an angel fell and became the devil, what assurance that when we become equal to angels we shall not likewise fall? and then what permanence would there be in God's kingdom, in which the disciples were taught to pray that his will may be done as it is in heaven, by the angels, where we are traditionally told that sin started by a fall of an angel? Is there no stability or permanence anywhere in God's universe? And if God be infinite in power and not in wisdom and love he could not be God. For then he would use that omnipotence improperly, which would itself be evil. And if God created a free willed man he made something greater than himself, for then he could not have his way with his creature.

Could God sin against us and so come under the death-penalty of his own law, and leave behind him only chaos? But do not worry. He cannot sin, because he "cannot be tempted" even, and cannot die, because he has im-

mortality (1 Tim. 6:16). Then because he cannot harm nor wrong us, as people in trouble often (as Job did) charge him with abusing them, he can do nothing but love us perfectly and infinitely. Then what else can matter? His is a "fourth-dimension" love (Eph. 3:18), because it is measured from us as the center of his universe!

The word translated "lust" is also translated "desire," and sometimes refers to a spiritual desire as well as to a flesh-desire. The Savior had a "desire" to eat the passover supper (Lu. 22:15), and the angels "desire" to peer into the Savior's sufferings and subsequent glory (1 Pet. 1:12).

The Son also did not know everything. He did not know the date of his return. Neither did the angels. But this ignorance was not joined with flesh-desire to cause heavenly angels to sin, because the desire they had (1 Pet. 1:12) was not a flesh-desire, for they are not flesh, but spirit (Heb. 1:14). Hence they do not sin, and never did. We shall explain later that the "angels that sinned" (2 Pet. 2:4) were not what we have just called "heavenly angels."

The fact that celestial angels do not sin nullifies the tradition that an angel fell and became the devil, as well as that other tradition that angels as "sons of God" joined with antediluvian women to become parents of giants. They have no mating desire (Lu. 20:36), nor are they ever called "sons of God" in scripture. Nor is there any scripture authority whatever for either of the above traditions.

As to desire and ignorance, the celestial angels are thus in one way opposite to the Son, for while they have some ignorance and no flesh-desire, he had flesh-desire, but no ignorance stayed in his threefold temptation, because the Spirit dispelled ignorance by enlightenment. And though he did not know the date of his return, that did not join with any flesh-desire to cause sin, because there are some things he would have no desire to know, any more than normal people desire to know when and how they will die. Knowledge of when he will return would not gratify any flesh-desire. Nor was his "desire" to eat the passover a flesh-desire, to satisfy hunger.

Since angels are not flesh beings, like us, how could they be tempted at all, since sin starts in flesh-desires? For our change from flesh to a "spiritual body" will leave behind all flesh-desires (since those will not marry, for instance), and so leave behind all temptation, so that we shall be eternally safe from falling away when we reach immortality. If not, then is our Savior himself secure, and if not, might we not even yet fail of salvation?

The traditional conception of temptation is that the human mind is a battle-ground between God and the devil, where each contestant seeks the loyalty of the person tempted, God speaking through conscience, and the devil speaking—well, how? Nobody seems to know, or to think about such a mysterious process, but just concedes that satan is as omniscient, omnipresent and heart-entering as God is, and far more successful in the number whose loyalty and service he succeeds in winning. Inquiry into the process of his tempting us will, however, be very profitable to us, not only intellectually and theoretically, to understand the doctrine we are considering, but practically, that we may know where to watch for the enemy, to guard against being taken unawares by his approach, for as in Indian warfare, he who expected an attack in the open might be caught by an assailant behind a tree, so with us, so Paul spoke of being aware of satan's devices (2 Cor. 2:11). How, then does he tempt us?

One way is through the mating-desire (1 Cor. 7:5). Our Lord was tempted first through hunger. Another way is through thirst, toward drunkenness. But eunuchs cannot be tempted as the couple in the Corinthian congregation; and when a person is nauseated he cannot possibly be lured into gluttony or drunkenness. This all shows that at least the immediate source of seduction is the flesh-mind, and if there be a supernatural seducer, he cannot appeal to us except through our flesh-desires.

Now let us examine a scriptural case of temptation and sin that is very enlightening on the process: the lie of Ananias. When satan filled his heart to lie (Ac. 5:3), Ananias filled his own heart to do it (verse 4). Such things in the scriptures are not accidents, but are there for our enlightenment.

This case shows very clearly that Ananias did what "satan" also was said to have done. It therefore shows conclusively that Ananias's tempter was his own desire for money, which is "the lust of the eyes." Or if we desire money to buy food, the money-desire becomes "the lust of the flesh." Or if to gratify ambition, it is "the pride of life."

It was exactly the same in the case of Judas. Satan put it into his heart to betray the Lord (Jn. 13:2). Luke (22:3) calls this same event satan entering into him. Thus satan entering the heart is identical with the idea of his prompting: a thought in the mind, not a personal entrance. Thus satan again entered into him later (Jn. 13:27). That is, the thought of betrayal again came to his memory because of what the Master just said. Judas had the same desire as Ananias, love of money. But no person thinks continually on any one thing, and the betrayal was out of his mind until it returned when Jesus hinted it to him. That is, the "devil," through memory, reinstated the forgotten thought. How could a supernatural evil being really enter into a person every time he sins? And how be at the same time literally inside every one of the billions of people all the time, since most of them are continually occupied with sinful thoughts and deeds? But when satan thus fills the heart in the true sense, there is no room for Christ. Contrariwise, when we have the consciousness of his companionship, the devil flees (Ja. 4:7).

But it was no new thing for Judas to be carnal minded. He was "a" devil (Jn. 6:70) "from the beginning" (verse 64). He was not "the" devil, but "a" devil, like Peter (Mt. 16:23), only more so, for Peter only temporarily lapsed into opposition, because of ignorance, but Judas never was a Christian, for he "believed not," "from the beginning." Nevertheless, he was only "a" devil, for the word is a common noun.

The writer was once highly ridiculed by a fellow-minister for showing that Job's wife was his adversary. The brother wrote in a paper he edited as follows: "I have learned something. What? I have found who the devil is. Who? Job's wife." That illustrates how critics can reason faultily by the fallacy of what logicians call the non-distribution of the middle term. We have never taught that Job's wife is "the" devil. Were Peter and Judas devils, or not? Let the critic answer. If he says "Yes" I can say, "I have found out who the devil is. Who? Peter." But if he says "No" he does not believe God. Which horn of the dilemma will he seize?

A good way to understand the process of temptation and sin is to notice two more cases of it, Job and David. God brought all Job's troubles upon him (42:11), by his hand (19:21); yet satan did it (2:7), by his hand (1:12;

2:6). The conclusion is that satan is an agent of God, limited by the Father (1:12; 2:6). Satan purified Job, as he did the fornicator (1 Cor. 5:5).

The same idea of satan as an agent of God comes out in a study of David's case. When he numbered Israel, satan prompted him to do it (1 Chron. 21:1), yet God prompted it (2 Sam. 24:1), because, as with Job Israel needed the chastening brought on by a Father's love through some adversary (satan), perhaps the man named in next verse after the one telling that God was seeking to punish Israel in this matter (2 Sam. 24:2), for Joab would be the one naturally most concerned to know the strength of the army. He could be a "satan" as well as Peter.

Since man's thoughts and words are under divine control (Prov. 16:1; 21:1) God is the real and only ultimate Worker back of satan as his agent in the thoughts. How else could he cause all to work for our good (Ro. 8:28)? The treason of Judas was necessary, else we would have had no Savior. For without the betrayer and crucifiers he would have lived out his natural life-span and died a natural death, and then where would we be? "Then thank Judas?" No, thank the God of Judas, who chose him for our sake. Jesus, knowing all from the beginning (Jn. 6:64), chose Judas for the part (verse 70; 13:18).

Lest any reader be so troubled as to fear that he cannot be saved without understanding this subject of satan, we would say that since all Christians, regardless of their views about this and many other subjects, are saved by faith in Christ, and not by knowledge about the devil, and since all know that whatever satan is he tempts us only through the flesh, the practical result is the same in temptation and sin whether the devil be personal or impersonal, and we are still saved by faith in "Jesus only." All we say is that we can understand temptation better by knowing the truth about it, and we can better understand even saving faith in Christ by the way of the cross when we see that his crucifixion destroys our "body of sin" (Ro. 6:6), and so destroys the devil (Heb. 2:14).

THE ORIGIN OF SIN

Following John's words about the three flesh-desires, and those of James about the source of temptation, and its course into sin, we observe the verification of it all in Eden. For Eve was tempted by the three desires that John named, in the exact way that James stated. For she saw that the tree was good for food (the desire of the flesh), and that it was pleasant to the eyes (the desire of the eyes), and that it was a tree to be desired to make one wise (the pride of life, in knowledge that puffs up, 1 Cor. 8:1.) This threefold desire is what James put as the mother of sin. And we find the father, ignorance, present, for they were ignorant of good and evil until they transgressed. But they felt no shame because of their nakedness, which was the "evil" they came to know by transgression. In their innocence they were like all other animal creatures, that feel no shame over lack of loin-coverings. If God should give animals law that would make sin of their vicious acts, such as killing each other, they would likely feel guilty over these acts, as a dog does when it does what it knows is displeasing to its master, and in that case the animals would probably feel ashamed of their nudity. Modern nudists are trying to return the race to the primeval state, contrary to all the divine course decreed.

So then, the evil that became sin by law originated farther back. Animals do their evil acts because created so. They were not involved in any traditional "fall of man." Where does scripture support such ideas?

The same moral awakening that came to Adam and Eve, normally comes to children at puberty. Because of social custom this consciousness comes to civilized children earlier, but with uncivilized children at puberty.

So then the origin of sin is right there before us in Genesis in satisfying simplicity. For when the combination of flesh-desire and ignorance in the first pair came in contact with law, sin inevitably resulted, because of the inability of ignorant flesh to obey law, just as the Creator knew it would result, since he planned the remedy for it before it came.

What a slanderous view of the Deity traditional theology presents! For it says that it was proper for God to create the evil of nakedness, just so he did not permit his naked creatures to discover his work! Then instead of seeing his wisdom in subjecting the race to condemnation for sake of grace and justification, it tries to exonerate him from a supposed mistake and failure by laying all the blame for the course of events upon the creatures for the exercise of a mythical "free will."

"ADAMIC" SIN AND DEATH

There is no such thing in the scriptures. We should be on our guard about traditions, and constantly test them by the sure Word. The expression "Adamic" sin and death, not being scriptural, can mean anything the user means of scripture. As we understand what is thus meant, "Adamic sin" means the same as "Original Sin" and "Inherited Depravity," which again are unscriptural phrases, and therefore to be suspected at once. Under these expressions we are given to understand that we have inherited a "fallen" (again beware the unscriptural word) nature from Adam, a sinful nature that he did not have until his transgression, and that this depraved nature constitutes us sinners and under condemnation whether we have sinned or not, including even innocent infants. And as we understand "Adamic death," it means that we die because Adam sinned, which we would not if he had not sinned. It has been suggested that when Adam ate he became mortal. There is no such scriptural declaration, and we believe that there is no scriptural evidence for that idea, but that what the scriptures do say is against it.

The only changes in Adam and Eve that are in the Record are two: one a mental change of guilt, and the other an environmental one, outside paradise, that entailed death at an earlier time than would have occurred if he had not sinned.

To explain: After transgressing, and being sentenced, the implication is that Adam would have lived "forever" if he had not been expelled from paradise. Not endlessly, because any lexicon will show that such time-words do not mean endlessness. The word here means a longer time than Adam's 930 years. So he died penally, earlier than he would if left in paradise. He was like every other executed criminal who dies earlier than he otherwise would.

"Mortal" means "susceptible to death." Not certain to die, but may die. The mortal members of the church at the second advent will not die, but be translated. "Immortal," being the opposite of "mortal," means "that cannot die."

Then if Adam had been immortal before he sinned, he could not have been subjected to death as a penalty for sin, as he was (Gen. 3:17-19.) At least, he could not have been executed until changed from immortality to mortality, which would be impossible, by the very meaning of "immortal," for then his change would end immortality, which is a self-contradiction. Then what else could he have been by creation but mortal? Is there a neutral and middle condition between the two? It has been said that there were three such "planes" of existence: mortality, innocence and immortality, and that Adam was on the plane of innocence until he sinned, then descended to the plane of mortality. But the fallacy in that idea is at once evident, for it is a jumbling together of two planes of life and one plane of morality, and calling them all planes of life. Of course Adam was what is called innocent, but he was evidently on the plane of mortality at the same time.

The evidences for his mortality are conclusive: (1) He was flesh (Gen. 2:23-24) and flesh is "mortal" (2 Cor. 4:11). (2) He was naked, and the "naked" state (2 Cor. 5:3) is "mortal" (ver. 4). (3) He ate, and food is for the purpose of renewing destroyed tissue, and that destruction is a death-process of mortality. (The reason the Savior ate after resurrection was for evidence of identity, not because of bodily need). (4) The procreation enjoined upon him (Gen. 1:28) proves separation and destruction of cells, which again was a dying condition of mortality. The fact that marriage will be absent from resurrection life in immortality proves that mortality was present in his wedlock. And they were wedded before they sinned. (5) Adam and the lower animals all in common ate alike (Gen. 1:29-30), so their eating proved them all alike in mortality. The animals were not immortal before Adam's sin and not reduced to mortality by sharing his penalty. There is no scriptural authority for such a tradition, and no justice in such a supposed sentence. They and Adam were on the same plane of "flesh" (Gen. 7:21-23.) And flesh is mortal (2 Cor. 4:11.) (6) Since all animal creatures enter life naked (mortal) they were all mortal from the beginning and not neutral (neither mortal nor immortal) and so were not changed to mortality when Adam was sentenced. So there was death in the world before Adam sinned, even before he was warned of the penalty. There was death of vegetation used for food, and the life and death process is the same in plant and animal forms. It is also inconceivable that every ephemeral life-form continued to live from its creation till Adam's sin. If so, there would be no extinct species in the world and those creatures would all have continued till now and filled the world. Fossils prove their death before Adam's creation. All life, vegetable and animal, runs through a cycle of seed, germination, growth, woody or ossified condition of age, seed-bearing to continue the species, then a return to the parent-dust. The penalty on Adam merely hastened this end by expulsion from the garden and the tree of life, but it did not hasten death to the other forms of life that grew outside the garden. Only to the pair of people, who alone were contemplated as possibly eating of the tree of life. It is never mentioned in scripture as being for any other creatures but people. (7) Adam's mortal condition before transgression is evident in the warning of the penalty. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:17), or as in the margin, "dying thou shalt die." For this is in the form of an oath, which when expanded is, "As surely as you are dying you shall die." That this is the true form of expansion of oaths is evident by comparing Heb. 6:13-14 and Gen. 22:16-17 with such as Num. 14:21 and 1 Sam. 28:10. That made Adam's

"dying" condition the basis of the oath-bound penalty threatened. But before his sin the tree of life made it possible for the dying condition of mortality to be averted long enough for translation to be a possibility in sight as a termination of mortality without death (as it will come to the church at the advent) if the other possibility of Adam's obedience were valid. But immortality through translation was not open to Adam by obedience to law. Remember, it is "not of works."

Logically, no middle state is possible between mortality and im(not)-mortality, because a term and its repetition with a negative particle make a universal.

Neither is a change from immortality to mortality possible, because that would end the endless state of immortality, by death, as in Adam's case if he had been thus changed.

Christ died for our sins (Ga.1:4). Where is the scripture that says he died for "Adamic" sin, or that there is such a thing? And who died to redeem us from it? And if nobody did, will it not get us anyway, and so we be hopelessly lost even after our Savior gave himself to redeem us?

Fairness calls for an examination of the supposed evidence for what is called "Adamic" sin and death, the language in Ro. 5. Verse 19 seems to suggest "Adamic sin"—"For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners . . ."; and verse 15—"Through the offense of one many be dead," verse 17, "by one man's offense death reigned" and verse 18—"by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation," all seemingly suggest "Adamic death," or the idea that we die for what Adam did. But why should we? We reverently ask, as Abraham did, "Is not God just?"

The beginning of this whole matter is in what is said in verse 12, that because of one man's sin, death came into the world, and thus death came through to all mankind. The gist of the whole matter is contained in this one simple idea—that he is speaking in the judicial sense of death as a penalty for sin, not of the death contained in mortality, that comes to all life outside the human family when mortality has run its course. He speaks of the death that came to Adam outside paradise, away from the tree of life, which death came sooner than it would have come to him and to us if he had not sinned. That is the judicial and penal sense in which he writes.

But the question of divine justice in causing us to die sooner than otherwise merely because our first parent brought us outside paradise in his loins remains to be solved. So notice closely here in verse 12: The reason given why death came to all of Adam's posterity is not "because Adam sinned," but "for that all have sinned." By putting together the two ideas that death came because Adam sinned, and the one that we die because of our sin, the truth becomes evident that we sinned and died in Adam, inclusively, which is the thought in the whole context, together with the contrast that we were justified and given life in the second Adam, both reckoned conditions being apart from any actual sin of ours before we were born, to cause us to die, or any possible works then as a possible basis of justification. There are two Adams, and each includes the race in himself, in a paternal way representatively, Adam for sin and death, and the Second Adam for justification and life. There is another case that explains this—that of Levi paying tithes in Abraham three generations before he was born (Heb. 7:9-10). This shows the

divine principle that all posterity is included in ancestry, and that what an ancestor does is reckoned to his descendants. So then, the sin and death of Adam are reckoned to us because we were there in his loins when he sinned and was sentenced, and our reckoned sin became actual as soon as we were born (hence divine justice, based on his foreknowledge): and in like manner, we were with our Savior when he died for us (Ro. 6:6), so that his righteousness and life are reckoned to us, and will become actual through him, in Christian life and immortality. All this "without works," remember, for this whole fifth chapter is part of Paul's marvelous treatise on justification.

So we sinned "in Adam." We would have done exactly as he did if we had been in his place. For we are in his place, and are doing exactly as he did. For the whole scene of the origin of the consciousness of good and evil pertaining to nudity is enacted before our eyes every time a child reaches puberty, as it was enacted by us, too, when we passed through that stage of life.

Sin is not a heritable quality. Flesh is inherited, and the desires in it, coupled with the ignorance in which we all were born, produce sin when people are subjected to law. Since sin comes from flesh, in its three desires, the only way we inherit sin from Adam is that we inherit flesh from him, exactly the same flesh that sinned in him, not any "depraved" flesh or changed body, but flesh containing the same three desires that were in our mother Eve that caused her to sin. We do not inherit sin from Adam's sin, but from his flesh. He sins in us, actually, as we sinned in him, representatively and reckonedly. And we inherit the same environment outside paradise, and excluded from the tree of life, that he had. In that way we die penally because of his sin, earlier than we would die naturally if in access to that tree, which was all true of him. In that way his penal death came through to us, and only in that way.

THE PROVINCE OF LAW

Our last thoughts above lead to a consideration of the purpose of law.

Men make moral laws to prevent crime by penal deterrents. And while God did the same as far as Israel after the flesh was concerned (Deut. 6:1-2; Josh. 1:8), yet he knew that they could not find his righteousness by it, as Paul so cogently proves, for God foreknew, and foretold for a testimony against them that they would fail to obey the law (Deut. 31:16-30; 32). All this therefore seemingly meaningless giving of law was for the purpose of extending grace to them after the law's "witness against Israel" (Deut. 31:19) had fulfilled its purpose of condemning their helplessness so that they would be ready to seek mercy, the law thus being a "schoolmaster" to bring them ultimately to Christ for justification by faith (Gal. 3:24).

So we have Paul's word for it that in the gospel sense law was not for a means of righteousness by works of obedience, but for guilt through helplessness (Ro. 3:19-20), so that condemnation might lead to grace (5:20-21). And in this last reference he speaks in the context of law not only at Sinai, but in Eden also.

For the same foreknowledge of coming sin was present to God in Eden as at Sinai, as shown by the fact that the great Sacrifice for sin was in his mind before the creation of man.

So when reading Gen. 3 we should keep in mind Paul's words in Ro. 5:19-20 that law was for the purpose of condemnation to lead to grace, then we can see the grace in the coats of skins after the shame of sin was accomplished.

Why should it cause an outcry of "guilty" against God for making the pair aware of a condition already existent? If he should be called guilty for purposely causing them to sin in failing to keep the command he gave them, he should be called more guilty yet by such objectors for creating them in naked evil that was thus exposed by law. Does any objector wish to enter that blasphemous charge against him? Then let it not be entered for exposing the evil for sake of grace.

Was it not better to give the pair knowledge of a condition from which they needed salvation and would find it by grace than to leave them in their fleshly, mortal condition, to perish with the rest of the animal creatures, even though they would have lived longer ("forever," which would not be endless, but an age) if they had not been ordained to transgress? Just there is a simple and clearly evident explanation of the origin of evil and sin, without resort to the futile shifting of it to heaven, among the angels, which is an apologetic that is not only unscriptural but does not satisfy, because it merely changes the field from earth to heaven and leaves the mystery as great and unsolved as before, and moreover, is aggravated by making the first transgressor an angel instead of a man. For sin originated in the combination of human flesh-desire and ignorance, by resultant failure to obey a command that contained no intrinsic ethical principle, but was like the forbidden meats to Israel, which were a mere shadow of the Gentiles, and like the first command, led to grace in Christ, the law in Eden doing so in the type of the coats of skins, and the laws about meats being a shadow of Calvary (Col. 2:14-17).

This purpose of grace after law is well illustrated in the case of the woman at the well (Jn. 4). She was a sinner, living in open, unmarried adultery with a mere consort, because of despair of a happy marriage after five unsuccessful attempts. The Savior surprised her by speaking with a purpose toward grace. But before giving the gracious water of life in his words of grace—"I that speak unto thee am he"—he gave her a command that she could not possibly keep, for she had no husband to bring when he commanded her to bring him, and he knew the impossibility, too, and that was why he gave her the command. But it did bring her to his grace.

Who would think of raising an outcry against the Savior for causing the woman to sin by giving her a commandment that she could not keep, and thus bringing her into his grace? It was the very same in Eden.

The same is true of another case in the Savior's ministry. When he was about to feed the multitude he first commanded his disciples to do it. He knew they could not, and said it to test them (Jn. 6:6). As with the woman at the well, he thus led them to himself and his enabling grace, for they could—and did—feed the multitude by his enabling power by carrying the multiplied food from his hands to the people. This shows that all the righteousness in the commandments of law, and all the will of the Father concerning us and our conduct can be fulfilled in us by his indwelling power (Ro. 8:3-4). It also clarifies the occurrence in Eden in a very satisfying way.

So law was given to reveal sin and bring a sense of guilt (Ro. 3:19; 5:20). It did this in Eden when it was introduced into a condition of the combination of flesh-desires and ignorance. Job's experience illustrates the same fact.

His flesh-desire for comfort, combined with his ignorance of God's ways in evil, caused him to become self-righteous and boast greatly in his defense against the charge of his three friends that some sin caused his troubles. His trial in evil exposed the dormant spirit of self-righteousness that otherwise would not have been expressed. The darkness brings out the stars that were there before. The rainstorm paints the rainbow on the sky. The prism shows the seven tints in white sunlight. The chemical bath brings out the picture on the film. So trial leads us to God.

Deadly carboic acid is a combination of three harmless elements. The destructive acid is produced by the chemist who combines these elements, just as sin is produced by combining desire and ignorance in an environment of law. The divine Chemist knew what that combination would produce. He was as wise as the chemist who compounds carboic acid. But he was no more "guilty" than a chemist is to blame for suicide by carboic acid. Another marvel of chemistry is the fact that common salt is a compound of a deadly metal, sodium, and a poisonous gas, chlorine, which illustrates the power of the divine Chemist to transform deadly evil into good by combining it from desire and ignorance in the environment of his wisdom and love.

THE DECEPTION OF EVE

"... the serpent beguiled Eve" (2 Cor. 11:3). Who tempted Adam? Eve was deceived, but Adam was not (1 Tim. 2:14). "The serpent beguiled Eve," and "By one man sin entered into the world" (Ro. 5:12), and he was "Adam" (ver. 14:ff). "By putting two and two together" we can see who was the first symbolic "serpent" that deceived his wife. God gave him the command not to "eat," but did not give it to her. But someone taught it to her, for she knew it when the temptation was put before her. The husband is the wife's teacher (1 Cor. 14:35; 1 Tim. 2:12). That gave Adam the desired opportunity to deceive her because of his body-desire, and so her punishment was partly that of being subjected to him in the family.

The reasoning of the serpent, by which he deceived his wife, is transparently evident. For "the dead know not anything" (Eccl. 9:5; Psa. 146:3-4). But the commandment suggested that there would be knowledge by the tree of the "knowledge" of good and evil at the same time that the penalty of that law suggested that there would be death for eating of it. How easy, then, for the "serpent" to reason plausibly, "How can we be dead and at the same time know good and evil?" The answer is contained in the oath-form of the penalty threatened, "dying thou shalt die," as we have already explained it as being, when expanded, "As surely as you are dying (when you eat) you shall die." The "dying" would no longer possibly be averted by the tree of life, but the death toward which that dying tended would be certain from the moment of transgression ("in the day that thou eatest"), for immediately after their sin they were excluded from the tree of life which could avert death "forever." Death as a certainty began to operate right then, by their exclusion from the tree of life that previously could counteract the "dying" process that operates in all life-forms, and was even then operating in the pair, as shown by the fact of their needing food, though that dying process was held in abeyance by abounding life and renewal in their early and vigorous life at the beginning. But as we have seen, that "dying" was the basis of the oath-bound penalty, as previously explained.

The aprons showed the nature of the transgression. It was concerned with "childbearing" (1 Tim. 2:15). They did not cover their mouths, as if they had literally eaten fruit from a tree. The normal condition in nature is that this desire awakens first in the female, so Eve first came under temptation and condemnation which the law of Moses made "unclean" (Lev. 12 and 15).

Most people cannot see the fitness, or even justice, of condemning a natural bodily condition and prohibiting the exercise of that bodily function, especially since it was formerly enjoined upon them for procreation (Gen. 1:28). Their first use of this function was evidently in this time of her "separation," not for procreation, for the first child was born from a later union (4:1). People are about the only creatures that thus misuse it.

The failure of people in general to understand the propriety of condemning that condition in Eden is because they fail to understand the purpose of law, including, perhaps, not noticing the unchastity of a misuse of the procreative function. So let the reader ponder well the presentation previously given on "The Province Of Law," and be assured that self-righteousness in thinking that Adam and Eve could have been saved by obeying their law, and that God therefore intended that they should obey and thus attain to immortality by works will blind the eyes to the truth here in Genesis 3, as it blinds self-righteous seekers to the whole gospel, for that was "the blindness of Israel." So if it seems preposterously incredible that commands could be given to be transgressed, just remember the outcast woman at the well, and that the same Lawgiver who said to Israel, "Thou shalt not kill," or as quoted by the Son, "Thou shalt do no murder" (Matt. 19:18), was the very Father who purposed that Israel should murder his Son in sacrifice (Ac. 7:52 with 4:28).

Since the man was more guilty than the woman, being her deceiver, he was punished more severely than she, being sentenced to suffering and death (with dust-eating as a figurative punishment, as explained in our next section), his penalty being proportioned to his offense, since he sought to "rule" her, so he was subjected to rule, which is the scriptural interpretation of the dust-eating, as we shall see. Seeking to rule her body in deceiving her, he, as the "serpent," was subjected to being ruled himself, while as the literal man, he was subjected to suffering and death, while her two penalties were subjection and pain. And that in this very same delicate matter as we have followed it.

There is also the wonderfully redeeming feature of the whole matter in that the first Adam typically represented the Second, (as we have already seen in Rom. 5), in that both went willingly, not ignorantly, into the condemnation in which each one's helpmeet was already. For as we have seen, Eve was "unclean" as the law of Moses later called it, before Adam was (Lev. 15:16). So her condemnation fitly represented the sinful state of us for whom the Second Adam has willingly gone into our condemnation to take us out by justification through grace.

We thus see the reason for three penalties upon two persons: One pair of literal penalties on the man; one pair of literal penalties on the woman; and first of all, a figurative pair of penalties on the figurative "serpent"—man, crawling and dust-eating.

Who are the seed of the serpent?

The fact that people who were called children of the devil (Jn. 8:44) were also called "serpents" (Matt. 3:7; 23:33) shows that their first ancestor was the first figurative "serpent" in the first sin, as sin makes us children of the devil (Ac. 13:10; 1 Jn. 3:8).

SERPENT'S DUST

Eve was sentenced to sorrow in motherhood and to subjection to her husband. Motherhood is connected with the first transgression by Paul also (1 Tim. 2:11-15). Adam was sentenced to suffering and death. And the serpent was sentenced to crawl and eat dust as one penalty and to enmity ending in his crushed head as the other penalty. A double penalty on each party to the sin, as in the usual procedure in human courts, with fine and imprisonment as the two penalties. The wisdom of the same course in divine procedure in this case is at once evident. The penalties of suffering and death on Adam included Eve also, and the suffering of life makes men and women perfect, and is thus reformatory; while death destroys even the source of sin—"the body of sin"—and is thus a permanent cure for the malady.

Some interpreters assert that the serpent was not the devil himself, but only his mouth-piece. Then why punish the tool instead of the real culprit, and let him go free? The scriptures never even hint that the serpent was merely a tool and not the real devil, but contrarily they do declare in just so many words that the serpent is the devil and satan (Rev. 12:9; 20:2). And again, the serpent of Gen. 3 is "satan" in Rom. 16:20, and "the devil" in Jno. 8:44, which again verifies the truth that the serpent is the devil himself, and not merely his mouthpiece. So then, if we insist on being literal, the devil is a snake and that is all there is to the matter.

Then the real devil was sentenced to crawl and eat dust. If that be literal, how can it be explained? It is just impossible to follow a literal view of the scriptures on satan from the garden of Eden to the holy city. If the reader thinks it can be done let him try to pursue the following devious trail of the serpent without ever departing from a literal interpretation:

In the garden of Eden he was a serpent with one head, sentenced to crawl and eat dust all his life until he should finally be killed by having his head crushed by the heel of the woman's seed; but in the book of Job (1:7) we find him walking instead of crawling; in the time of the apostles he was like a lion, still walking, and eating people instead of dust (1 Pet. 5:8); able to transform himself into an angel (2 Cor. 11:14); in the time of the man-child (Rev. 12) he will stand instead of crawl, and seek to eat the woman's child instead of dust; at that time, instead of being a serpent, with one head, as in Eden, he will be a red dragon, with seven heads, wearing a crown on each head, with only one tail for the seven heads, but long enough and strong enough to lash stars out of the sky; cast out of heaven then (Rev. 12:9-10), instead of when the Savior saw him fall from heaven (Lu. 10:18), without any explanation of how he got up to heaven after being sentenced to crawl on earth all the rest of his life; and finally, though he was to be destroyed by the Savior's death (Heb. 2:14), his destruction had not occurred years after the crucifixion (Rom. 16:20), when it was still to be future after that; and the last we are told about him is that he will be tormented for the ages of the ages in the lake of fire, (Rev. 20:10), instead of being destroyed at all. Can the reader

reconcile all these truths to each other in a literal exegesis? The writer will welcome any such explanation. Where is this literal snake to be found that literally eats dust? When it is found, the finder will have discovered the literal devil, if there is one, for the serpent, the devil, satan and the dragon are all identical, as already shown, if Rev. 12:9 and 20:2 are accepted as literal, as they must, if we assume a literal interpretation of the matter. Then the lake of fiery sulphur in which this "old serpent" is tormented for the ages of the ages will be literal too. But this "fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41) will naturally be used for the purpose for which it was prepared. Well, now notice what devil it is that is cast into this fire prepared for him: "nations" (ver. 32). For in Daniel's prophecy the thing that has seven heads and ten horns is the fourth nation, that will exist in a tenfold form at that time of the end, when the devil is the red dragon with its seven heads and ten horns. Daniel, too, saw this devil-beast cast into the "burning flame" (7:11). The heaven from which it is to be cast will be the political heaven, as Haggai used the terms "heaven and earth" for "nations" (2:6-7). The time will be that of Messiah's reign (Rev. 12:9-10), when there will not be a possibility of earthly rule over the same territory as his, so it is "cast out." The "fire" would then be the "fiery trial" such as the judgments on those nations stated literally by Zechariah (14:16-21).

The editor of the C. V. says that when the verb is present in the Greek in such cases, the language is figurative. The verb "is" is present in these scriptures about the dragon, serpent, devil satan and the lake of fire, so according to that we would have figurative language there. The literal says of the seven heads and ten horns that they are "kings" (Rev. 17:9-12). That settles the matter of this devil being symbolic. Let us bow to the word.

There is no need, nor even possibility, of a literal interpretation of the serpent's dust-eating, for later scriptures interpret it figuratively. The serpent will eat dust in the millenium (Isa. 65:25), the new political heaven and earth (ver. 17). Then the seed of the woman, identified as the church (Rom. 16:20), will bruise the serpent's head, that is, the regnant church will subdue civil powers to the King on Zion, as the nations will then be subjected (Isa. 2:2-4; Mic. 4:1-3; Zech. 14:16-19).

That is the way the serpent will eat dust. For when those rulers bow in subjection and worship to the King of Kings, with their faces low before him in worship, they will get dust in their mouths, so to speak. To save space from quotation, let the reader see the following scriptures that show that idea very clearly: Psa. 72:9; Isa. 49:23; Mic. 7:16-17. It is the "head" of such civil rulers that is to be crushed, or "wounded" (Hab. 3:13; Psa. 110:6).

That is the way the serpent's head will be "bruised," for to bruise turns out to be to rule (Dan. 2:40), or have dominion over enough to destroy, and having under feet is ruling over (Psa. 8:6; 1 Cor. 15:27-28), based on the performance of the elders of Israel placing their feet on the necks of conquered kings (Josh. 10:24) as a symbol of subjection. (See also 2 Sam. 22:38-39). So bruising is ruling over (Psa. 110:6; Dan. 2:40). Paul makes the time of this bruising of satan future (Rom. 16:20), evidently when the church shall reign. The "seed" of the serpent would be the ruling successors of Adam, begun in the family rule that is the source of all political power, and extended to Adam's posterity, who will be the political rulers of the end-time. Thus the serpent grows into a dragon, "red" with the political philosophy that is already called by that color.

As to the "enmity" between the two seeds, there has always been that between those of flesh and those of spirit. Cain began it. As the political powers of Israel and Rome, it bruised the heel of Messiah at Calvary and has always persecuted God's representatives, from the ancient prophets to modern Christians, wherever the governments do not forbid it by a guarantee of religious liberty. The heel of Messiah being wounded, or "bruised" (in the civil powers ruling over him), shows that the wound would be only temporary, while the wounding of the serpent's "head" shows a final end of earthly rule, when Christ subdues all authority and power to himself (1 Cor. 15:24-25).

SATAN AND JOB

Job was an Edomite, the king of that people in Bozrah. Since the Edomites did not have the Israelitish scriptures, God gave them a revelation in the book of Job which remarkably parallels our bible as a whole, for in the beginning of the book we have the mysterious entrance of evil through a woman (Job's wife), as we do in Genesis; Elihu as mediator, in the middle, corresponding to the Great Mediator, and the happy epilogue at the close, corresponding to the happiness of the holy city at the end of our Bible. And in Job we have evil entering mysteriously, in exact parallel to that in Genesis, for as the serpent lied to Eve, we have the lies that Job's slaves told him at the end of chapter 1, prompted evidently by Job's adversary.

For as Adam's helpmeet gave him of the forbidden fruit, Job's wife tempted him in his third trial (2:9) to provoke God to destroy him. For Job had three trials, as Eve had hers. First, the slaves told him that all his property and children were destroyed, while they were alive and feasting in the oldest son's house, instead of being destroyed, though the trial was as severe to Job as if it had been true, because he believed the lie. That was the "world" outside of Job ("the lust of the eyes"). Then his flesh was stricken (corresponding to "the lust of the flesh"), the middle. Then he was prompted to curse God ("the mind", on the inside). Since his wife was the tempter in this third trial, that suggests her as the one who prompted the lies of the slaves that tried him in the first instance, and also as the cause of his boils, which could be accomplished by infection. There were two points of identification from the first two trials to the third, holding fast his integrity instead of cursing God, and since his wife was the one who mentioned them in the third test, the inference is strong that she was the one who was adversary in all three, instead of in just the last. Lest anyone should unduly blame Mrs. Job or Eve, it should be remembered that Paul makes the relation of man and wife an illustration of redemption of the church by Christ. So just as the church must be under condemnation to be saved, so must Eve be in condemnation by first partaking of the forbidden tree, before Adam, typical of Christ, did. And the same of Job's wife: she must correspond to Eve in being to blame. So it is not that women are worse than men, but only that there must be a significant symbology.

The conversation between God and Job's adversary is explicable by the fact that thought is called speaking in many scriptures (Matt. 3:9; Lu. 5:21-22; 7:39).

We should remember that "satan" is not a proper noun, but a common one, and means an adversary, either good or evil, human or divine, and as

such, could as fitly designate Job's wife as it did Peter (Matt. 16:23). For a more complete explanation of this part of our study the reader may have a copy of the author's free print, "A study Of The Book Of Job."

THE TEMPTATION OF THE SAVIOR

There was a divine purpose in the Son's temptation, for the Spirit, which was the Father's Presence, led him into it.

James tells the general purpose of temptation (1:2-4, 12) as being to make the tempted ones perfect. So we read that our Lord was thus made perfect (Heb. 2:10; 5:8-9). At first he was an imperfect babe, but he "increased in . . . stature." Also "in favor with God and man" (Lu. 2:52).

We also read that he was tempted "in all points" even as we are (Heb. 4:15). We have seen that "all" are three, and that we are tempted when these three desires draw us away. So when we read the account of the Lord's temptation we find that it was exactly so, tempted by his flesh-desires, and the same three as ours.

First, hunger—should he use the Spirit to feed himself? That was the desire of the flesh. He did not know. And that lack of knowledge was not a fault. It is not culpable unless we are "willingly (wilfully) ignorant." Remember that he "learned obedience" (Heb. 5:8,) and "increased in wisdom" (Lu. 2:52). Even at the end of his life he did not know the date of his return. The Spirit instructed him not to turn stones into bread.

His second temptation was the desire of the eyes—should he exhibit himself to Israel as Messiah by jumping unhurt from the temple? Again he did not know, but the Spirit again informed him, and he waited for Cana, as he had already waited till the angels should feed him. To place himself needlessly in jeopardy by jumping from the temple would be to "tempt. . . God," as the Spirit showed him. That is, it would be needlessly putting God to the test in rescuing him.

The third temptation was on "the pride of life," the "glory" of the kingdoms of earth—should he use the power of the Spirit to seize the nations for his dominion? Again he did not know and again the Spirit guided him to understand. He was to wait until the Father shall make his foes his footstool (Heb. 10:13). In all cases the Spirit made him "of quick understanding" (Isa. 11:1-3), just as predicted.

In all these trials we see what we saw before as to the two parents of sin, flesh-desire and ignorance. But although the mother, flesh-desire, was present, the father, ignorance, was driven away by inspiration, so that no sin-child was begotten.

Remember that the flesh-desires are not themselves sinful. If so, then he would have been defiled from birth. The "flesh" is reckoned as sin (Rom. 8) only because it is the source of it. Flesh-desire is "sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3) only because sin comes out of desire. Desire itself is not sin. It was no sin for him to be hungry, nor to desire to manifest his Messiahship to Israel miraculously, for he later plainly so declared himself on several occasions; neither was it wrong to desire the nations for his subjects, for they were promised to him (Psa. 2:8; 110:1). The primary sin in each case would have been unbelief in the Voice that said "This is my . . . Son" when the other doubting voice said "If thou be the Son," for the doubt, if gratified,

would have led to putting the Spirit to the test to see if he could perform the miracle needed to satisfy the doubt. The secondary sin would have been selfishness in using the Spirit to serve the flesh. He probably later ate when he fed the multitude; he did later manifest himself as Messiah at the wedding in Cana, and he will yet have the nations for his subjects. But he must first be "made perfect." In the wilderness of perfecting was the wrong way and time for all this.

The seeming conversation between the Son and his tempter has already been explained in principle in the interpretation of Job and his adversary, when we showed that thought is called speech in such scriptures as those cited. The thoughts passing through the Son's mind, pro and con, were the inner conversation between desire in momentary ignorance on the one hand and the Spirit on the other. But inspiration dispelled the momentary ignorance before it could sire sin.

The Savior's triumph over temptation shows us the way to our victory over it through him. For it is by his indwelling presence in our consciousness by his Spirit that we may resist temptation and become perfected in righteousness by his love. The Spirit of Christ displaces the natural or carnal mind from which temptation comes, and thus we have the spiritual mind instead of the natural, that all animal creatures have in common with us, which natural mind causes them to do the evil things that they do, without any supernatural tempter to cause them to act thus. The same Spirit that in the Savior enabled him to overcome, called God's holy Spirit, or Mind, when it dwells in us as the Spirit, or Mind, of Christ, will keep us in the hour of temptation as it kept him, as we yield to it. This is fully explained in Rom. 8 and like scriptures.

THE DESTRUCTION OF SIN AND THE DEVIL

Our Savior's sacrifice was designed to destroy sin (1 Jno. 3:5, 8) and the devil (Heb. 2:14). Since sin has its source in flesh, destroying the flesh destroys sin (Rom. 6:6), and thus also destroys the devil by ending all desires of the flesh. This is the practical application of the blood of Christ that cleanses from sin. When our Lord rose from death into the "spiritual body" he left his flesh and blood nature behind, and so, to him, the devil is dead and the Savior is immune to temptation. And when we reckon ourselves thus dead to sin it has no more dominion over us (Rom. 6).

Thus our eternal security in immortality is assured. We then can never "fall." Neither could heavenly angels, who are not flesh and blood, to whom we shall be "equal."

The cross is thus a full remedy for all evil as sin, suffering and death, and that is why the death penalty was put on sin in Eden (Rom. 6:6; Col. 2:11-13). Endless torment would never have done that, but would have aggravated the matter endlessly.

THE DISPUTE OVER THE BODY OF MOSES

"Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, 'The Lord rebuke thee' (Jude 8-9).

This is an allusion to Zech. 3:1-7, as shown by the quotation Jude makes. That requires that we consider Zechariah's vision, in order to understand this matter. Since it was a vision, it would not be real, so we need not think of an actual dispute, but see that it represented what was occurring in opposition to the restoration of Jerusalem and the temple after the Babylonian exile.

The general and superficial thought of those who read these words seems to be like the case of the negro who sat outside the fence of a cemetery and overheard two boys dividing their chestnuts, when they said. "Now we'll get the one outside the fence," and Sambo didn't wait to see how many corpses the two dividers had, but precipitately fled; for people generally seem to think that Joshua and the devil both wanted the corpse of Moses, the devil desiring to exhibit it as a trophy.

But when Zechariah saw this vision, Moses had been dead a thousand years. How then could his corpse be in existence enough to dispute over? That whole interpretation seems so improbable that it is imperative to look further into the incident.

When we do that, we find that Zechariah and Haggai began prophesying under the restoration of Israel from exile, in the second year of Darius, when Zerubbabel was governor of Judah, Joshua was the high priest and Ezra and Nehemiah were leaders in the restoration (Hag. 1:1; Zech. 1:1; Ezra 6:14; Neh. 7:7; 8:9).

Peter, in speaking of this same matter that Jude does (2 Pet. 2:9-10) shows that it was people that were the adversaries (satans) in this matter, and Jude mentions people just before he speaks of the dispute. Now notice the margin at Zech. 3:1, "an adversary" who was the one who was Joshua's "satan." Then turn to Ezra 4:1, "adversaries." Read their names in Ezra 4:7; 5:3; Neh. 4:3-7. So here are the adversaries of the restoration, and we do not need to search far to find their chief, who would be the one particular human satan referred to by Jude, for it was Tatnai, he being the "governor" of the people who ignorantly opposed the restoration (Ezra 5:6) because of patriotic fear of the stubborn resistance of the Jews (Ezra 4:11-22), not knowing the divine purpose in the restoration.

So here was Joshua's adversary or "satan" in Zechariah's vision. The evident purpose of the vision may be seen by the sequel: God was encouraging the Jews in the rebuilding, in spite of opposition (Hag. 2:4; Zech. 6:12 with 3:8). The reference to "Jerusalem" (Zech. 3:2) shows this encouraging. In the dispute before Michael, the controversy was settled in favor of Joshua and Israel. Settled through human instrumentality (Ezra 6), but nevertheless settled by the Lord, who rules in the kingdoms of men (Dan. 4:17). So Michael works with the kings of the nations (Dan. 10:12; Ezra 4, 5 and 6).

Then over what "body of Moses" were Joshua and Tatnai contending? Why, over the nation of Jews, to be sure. Moses and his "house" represented Christ and his church (Heb. 3:1-6), so just as the church is called "the body of Christ" the Jews were called "the body of Moses." For the whole controversy was over that body of Jews, whether or not they should proceed with the restoration begun by divine purpose working through the Persian monarch's decree of return from exile, as that return was predicted by Jeremiah (25:12; 29:10).

So there was no dispute over a corpse, but a very sensible idea when we trace it out.

And do not neglect to realize that here again we have "a" satan, a human adversary, as in so many other occurrences, and not "the" satan, as if a supernatural one.

LUCIFER

"Lucifer" (Isa. 14:12) refers to "the king of Babylon" (verse 4). The "heaven" from which he fell was the political one. As the literal heaven is high above the earth in space, and its planets "rule" day and night (Gen. 1:16), so kings are high in authority over the subjects they rule. That shows the fitness of heaven being used thus figuratively. That it is so used may be seen in Isa. 65:17-18, where "Jerusalem" corresponds in the parallelism to the "new heavens," and "her people" corresponds to the "new earth." The same figurative use of heaven and earth is visible in Hag. 2:6-7, where "nations" are the heaven and earth to be shaken by a quake that must therefore be political, so that when those civil "powers" (Matt. 24:29) are removed, the unshakable kingdom of God will remain (Heb. 12:26-28).

No angel or devil is referred to anywhere in this section of scripture nor in Ezek. 28, which is thought to be a companion reference with this. The only possible way in which these scriptures could refer to a supernatural devil falling from heaven is on a principle comparable to Messianic prophecy, which we might call "serpentianic" by analogy. But while there is definite scriptural authority for the Messianic idea, there is none whatever for the serpentianic one.

The language in Ezek. 28, sometimes considered as addressed to satan, is definitely said to be addressed to Tyre. Any reader can see the impossibility of either Isa. 14 or Ezk. 28 being addressed to the devil of Christendom. Try it on Isa. 14:16, 19 and Ezek. 28:13, 16, 18-19. But the language in each chapter is sensible when considered as addressed to the ones cited, "the king of Babylon" and "the prince of Tyrus," or some of Ezek. 28 as addressed to the city itself, as when it is said that they filled it with merchandise and that a fire would destroy it. For a comparison of Dan. 7:17 with verse 23 will show that ruler and realm were used synonymously in scripture, which was appropriate in the case of those monarchies. Isa. 14:13-14 shows that the king of Babylon had an ambition to sit on David's throne in Jerusalem. But though he captured the city and burned the temple, his ambition was denied him, as Isaiah predicted.

The ruler of Tyre was told that he had been in Eden. This has suggested him as the devil to many, along with the companion statement that he was "the anointed cherub that covereth." But Eden was the name of a large territory that evidently included Trye, so that language need not be a difficulty. And as the cherubim guarded the gateway to Eden, so he could be said to be the guardian of Tyre. "The stones of fire" (verse 14) is probably a reference to his glittering decorations. The serpent wore no gems, as far as the record goes, and no such idea has ever been suggested for the traditional devil.

The attempt to connect Lu. 10:18 with these chapters to support the traditional view of the devil as a fallen angel will not do, for our Lord was then speaking of the time referred to by the disciples in their casting out demons.

Again, both Isa. 14:12 and Lu. 10:18 refer to a different time from that of the casting of satan as the dragon out of heaven in Rev. 12, for that refers to the time of God's kingdom yet future (verses 9-10). The way in which satan fell from heaven at Lu. 10:18 is that the Master gave the disciples "power" over satan (Matt. 10:1; Lu. 10:19) so that he could not inflict sickness (Lu. 13:16) that the disciples could not heal. He thus lost his place in the "heaven" of ruling power over sickness. That is similar to the sense in which the dragon will be cast out of heaven, as we shall see. For he will lose his political authority, as satan here lost his bodily authority.

The editor of "Unsearchable Riches" has this to say about Lucifer: "Moreover, an examination of the Hebrew text will convince anyone that the evidence for the title 'Lucifer' is exceedingly slight. It is precisely the same word as the translators rendered 'howl' in Zech. 11:2. In the feminine it occurs again in this very chapter, at the beginning of verse 31. In slightly different forms it is found in Isaiah ten times, and it is always rendered *howl* (13:6; 15:2, 3; 16:7, 7; 23:1, 6, 14; 52:5; 65:14). There is no valid reason why Isaiah 14:12 should not be rendered 'Howl!' instead of 'Lucifer.'" This name is a human invention and should have no place in the Scriptures." Vol. 15, page 205.

FALLEN ANGELS

There is no scriptural authority for thinking that the devil is a fallen angel. There is no "fall" of angels mentioned in all the bible. It speaks of "the angels that sinned," but they are not what is generally thought, as we shall see in a moment. Jude evidently wrote of the same thing that Peter did in the above citation (Jude 6). Both were writing about the same event, as is manifest in their words. Jude is more explicit than Peter, and tells more about it. He says that these messengers "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation." That was the way in which they "sinned," as Peter wrote it. So it should be noticed that this was their sin, instead of rebelling in heaven, through envy of their leader (supposedly Lucifer) for the higher position of a preexistent Christ as the archangel Michael, as the tradition has been passed on to us.

When we scan the history of Israel, followed by Jude, for such a forsaking of an estate or habitation by certain messengers just after being "saved out of the land of Egypt," as he wrote, we find just such an event in the conduct of the ten spies sent to scout in Canaan, for in the original Greek we find such spies called by the same word translated "angels" in the above language of Peter and Jude (Jas. 2:25). So that shows who the sinning messengers were who kept not their estate, which was the land of Canaan. The dark caverns of tartarus ("hell", 2 Pet. 2:4) to which they were cast were their burial-places in the desert.

The word translated "angel" means merely "messenger" either divine or only human. The Hebrew word is "malak." It is used for the spies (Josh. 6:17, 25); for the priests of Israel (Mal. 2:7); for Haggai the prophet (1:13); prophetically for John Baptist (Mal. 3:1) as quoted in Matt. 11:10 by using "aggelos" of him, which is the Greek word for "angel"; and "malak" is used even for the whole nation of Israel as God's "messenger" (Isa. 42:19). There are many other cases where "malak" is used for ordinary human beings, as anyone can verify with a Hebrew lexicon or concordance.

The Greek word corresponding to "malak" is "a(n)ggelos," as is seen in Matt. 11:10 cited above. Besides being translated "angel," it is translated "messenger" or "messengers" in Matt. 11:10; Lu. 7:24; 9:52; and Jas. 2:25. In all these cases the "angels" were men. And the "angels" of the seven churches in Rev. 2 and 3 were evidently the elders in charge.

"THE GOD OF THIS WORLD" (2 Cor. 4:4).

This is evidently another title for the devil and satan, for the identification is clear from a comparison of this scripture with others. Here the reception of the gospel is hindered by "the god of this world," and in Lu. 8:12 it is the devil that does this. So we are justified in identifying the god of this world as the devil.

Another identification may be seen by comparing some other scriptures, in which we find that "the prince of the power of the air" and "the prince of this world" are two other titles for the devil and satan. For it is the devil that causes our sins, and in Eph. 2:2 this cause of sin cited in verse 1 is called "the prince of the power of the air," which is next called "the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience," the spirit or mind that is elsewhere called "the carnal mind." In verse 3 this is called "the lusts of our flesh," which are easily identified in many scriptures as the cause of our sins.

So as god of this world, that spirit of carnality blinds the minds of people to the gospel, as stated in 2 Cor. 4:4. This hindering of the reception of the gospel is identified in Matt. 13:19 as "the wicked one," called "satan" in Mk. 4:15, and "the devil" in Lu. 8:12. But in the interpretation of this parable in Matt. 13:22 this hindrance is called "the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches," called in Mk. 4:19 "lusts." Thus this idea of the devil runs through a variety of titles and ends by being the desires of the flesh, or the natural man's mind. For instance, a man bent on getting money cannot give much heed to the gospel; a society woman is too preoccupied with the audience; a person full of liquor or too full of food to keep awake or mentally alert cannot listen. So it should not be difficult to understand how the devil keeps people from believing the gospel. Many people are so occupied in satisfying fleshly lusts that they will not even go near a church or buy and read a bible. But if the hindrance referred to is the opposition of a supernatural being, it would be difficult to understand how the omnipotent Father would let such an adversary thwart his plans. So when Paul says that satan hindered him (1 Thess. 2:18) we are to understand from such scriptures as we have just considered that somebody's affairs prevented Paul doing as he planned, and not that the salvation of people according to a powerful Father's love can be hindered by a being strong enough to resist God. But by the other view we can see how God holds back certain people and calls only those who now are to make up his Son's body.

"THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD"

"The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me" (Jn. 14:30). Since this was just after satan had entered into Judas at the supper-table, it is evident that satan was the prince here referred to. The Lord spoke of this prince as about to be cast out by being judged (Jn. 12:31). But if we try to make all this language literal we shall get into difficulty, for the Savior had

previously said (Lu. 10:18) that he had already seen satan fall from heaven as if "cast out." Then again (Jn. 16:11) he said that this prince would be judged at the coming of the spirit at Pentecost. But in 12:31 he had said that this prince was judged then. And in Rev. 12, as the dragon he is not to be cast out until the time of God's kingdom (verses 9-10). Thus a literal view makes contradictions.

The explanation of all this may be found by realizing that the spirit or mind of the natural man is manifested nationally as well as individually, and that nationally it becomes a political power, as in Rev. 12, where the crowns on its heads so identify it. The civil power in the form of the sanhedrin and the court of Pilate arrested the King of Israel, and found "nothing in" him, as he said. His declarations of royalty seemed ludicrous to them, so they put a mock crown of thorns on his head and a reed for a scepter in his hand. But the coming of the spirit at Pentecost demonstrated that this King was glorified and in heaven, since he sent that spirit (Ac. 2:32-33). That reversed the decision that the King was an impostor, and resultantly "judged" (condemned) those human judges. And inside of forty years the sanhedrin was cast out of its place in the political heaven. Thus he triumphed over his false judges (Col. 2:15). Notice here that what was judged or condemned was "principalities and powers" (Jewish and Roman), the civil powers, and that he triumphed over them in his cross.

This explains Lu. 10:18 also, for when the disciples healed diseases, that were thought to be caused by the devil, he (by miraculous far-sight) saw it, and thus saw satan fall from his place of authority, or "heaven."

From the study we are drawing toward a close it is clear that we have the welcome privilege of revising our ideas on satan and evil, as well as on hell and some other matters.

It is difficult to escape from mistaken early teaching. It was difficult for Jonah to overcome national prejudice and for Peter to enlarge his vision so as to include Gentiles in salvation. But divine grace was sufficient for them both, as it will be for us in our needed change of view on this subject, and the joy of freedom in new-found truth will repay the sacrifice and loneliness.

EXORCISM (EVIL SPIRITS)

In the time of our Lord and his apostles the belief prevailed that diseases were caused by evil spirits, as it prevails yet in many pagan lands. A few clergymen in Christian countries also still profess to exorcise such demons, as is the persisting practice among the pagan natives of Africa and parts of Asia.

It is to be frankly conceded that a strict adherence to the letter of scripture compels belief in demon possession. But that practice would also compel belief in pagan gods and in an angry, vengeful God of Christians. For example, Baal (1 K. 18:21); Beelzebub (Mt. 12:27); and Moloch (Ac. 7:43) are named as if they were real. And Paul says "There be gods many, and lords many" (1 C. 8:5). But he explains by saying that they exist only by being "called" so. And in the verse preceding he says that they "are nothing in the world." Assumption of untruth as truth is a common practice for sake of discussion, both in sacred and profane language. The Master Teacher used it in the parable of the lost sheep when he assumed that the Pharisees were

such as to "need no repentance," and again in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus he represented the beliefs of the Pharisees in the regions of the dead as being correct, merely to give them a taste of their own doctrine.

These demons (and generally the pagan gods) were supposed to be the disembodied immortal souls of dead people. Idols and devils are the same in 1 C. 10:19-20 and Psa. 106:36-38. And in verse 26 of this Psalm these idols or devils are identified as "the dead." In Deut. 32:17 they are called "gods," and in 1 Sam. 28:13 these gods are the dead. So then, gods, devils, idols and departed spirits are all the same, except that the wooden and stone images represented the invisible deities.

The pagans often deified their heroes after death. The Romans worshipped their dead emperors. Ancestor worship is common yet in many lands.

But since there is no immortal soul to be disembodied, there can be no demon to "possess" the body of a living person and cause trouble. The immortality of the soul is entirely absent from the Hebrew and Christian scriptures. The Pharisees believed that the spirit of the crucified Nazarene may have spoken to Paul (Ac. 23:8-9), but that Teacher repudiated their doctrine as "leaven." Their creed is stated in Ac. 23:8, and the only possible error in it to be called "leaven" is their belief in spirits. Thus it is a plain case that the Great Teacher repudiated the possibility of a disembodied spirit speaking to Paul. It was the risen Christ that did so.

The pagan belief about these demons was that disembodiment was a state of torment. So the departed spirit in the parable in Mt. 12:43 was represented as being restless until it returned to its former habitation. And in an actual case, when Jesus said, "Come out," to the "unclean spirit" of insanity (Mk. 5:8), or to the "legion" which the crazy man thought were in him, the demons (Mt. 8:29), that is the man (Mk. 5:7), thought it would be torment to be disembodied "before the time" (Mt. 8:29), that is, the time of the man's death, when all the demons, or the one demon, which was also the man's erratic thought, would be disembodied again, along with the man's immortal soul. The poor man was so demented that he thought he himself was in danger of being tormented (Mk. 5:7), as maniacs are always suspicious because of their keen insight.

So because of the belief that disembodiment was a state of torment, these spirits were believed to be continually seeking to inhabit the bodies of living people, and that when successful they caused diseases. The ancients seemed to think that a person could endure one immortal soul in a body, but that when a disembodied one also entered, it made more disturbance than the proverbial mother-in-law in her daughter's home.

This case of this maniac is probably the strongest scriptural evidence there is for demons being real beings. But here we have simply a crazy man healed of insanity, for after his restoration it says that he was "in his right mind" (Lu. 8:35). He had the usual symptoms, for he was nude, cried, mutilated his body and had the abnormal strength that maniacs often exhibit. When he said "Torment me not" it was the usual symptom that such patients show in fearing that people will do them harm, when they flee from those who would put them under proper care. Agreeably to the current ideas, he thought he had a demon, or later, in his erratic thinking, that he had a legion of them, and that they would be in torment if expelled from him. The demons, that is, the man, thought they might be sent "into the deep," so the request

was made (through the man, who was the only real being existent) that they might enter the swine. Even walls of pork would be preferable to disembodiment. An insistence on literal interpretation would make a contradiction between one demon and a legion, but an understanding of the man's erratic thinking and the accommodation of the record to it relieves our credence of such a difficulty.

So the man's crazed mind conceived the idea that instead of the demons being disembodied and sent "away out of the country," or "into the deep," it would be better for them to live in pork houses than in none at all, hence his request to send "us" into the swine rather than torment "me," the one devil of Mk. 5:2, by disembodiment. "Torment me not," as given by Mark and Luke, or "Torment us not," as Matthew gives it, in accommodating the Lord's gentle pity to the crazy man's train of thought, is all the same practically. For though the "us" of Mt. 8:29 is the two maniacs (Matthew says there were two) yet the "us" of verse 31 is the devils. But the man, not the devils, did the talking, and "me," the man, and "us," the devils, are evidently all the same. In one crazy train of thought it is the devils that ask not to be tormented, and again in another crazy turn of his mind it is himself that fears the torment of disembodiment.

"Art thou come hither to torment us before the time," said the crazy man, or the demons, whichever you prefer. Why should the Lord interfere to disturb their domestic tranquillity prematurely? For then the usurping legion, and one more spirit, the man's soul, would be in unrest or torment till they became again housed. So the devils "all" besought him, or the "devil" of the first of the record, for it was all the same to the crazy man whether he have or be, one or a legion, man or devils. The maniac was the spokesman, of course, in this request, as always in such cases the people spoke for the demons, or the demons spoke by the speech-organs of their hosts. The record accommodates itself to the man's thought and to the ideas then current, just as I am speaking here as if demons really existed. Inspiration must use their expressions or it would defeat its own purpose of revealing truth. "Curing insanity" was unknown to them and would be incomprehensible, when insanity was not known or understood; but "casting out demons" they knew and could understand.

Since swine were illegal in Israel, the Master in healing the poor crazed man sent his disease upon the hogs, and they became suicidal from the insanity, just as he had been when he cut himself with stones, and just as insane people today seek to harm themselves and others. There were as many pigs as demons in the man—enough to make the poor fellow crazy! Destroying the hogs would punish the owner for law-breaking at the same time as healing the demented man, thus being at the same time a miracle of judgment and of mercy, as others of that time were judgments, such as the death of Ananias and the blinding of Elymas. Paul smote Elymas with blindness, and Jesus smote the swine with insanity. But since blindness then was thought to come from demon-possession (Mt. 12:22), if demons were real, Paul should thus be considered as putting a demon in Elymas in the same miraculous way as that in which his Lord took them out. Both cases, Elymas and the pigs, were judgment miracles, attending the kingdom proclamation that the kingdom was at hand. For since it was present while the King and his officers were, judgment, as well as mercy was in order, because both will operate in the coming kingdom, of which these miracles were samples.

We often see animals crazy today. But did anyone ever see a pig with a demon in it? Or a crazy man, either, for that matter?

So the poor maniac who previously had both one demon and a legion was next seen "sitting, and clothed, and in his right mind." So may we also have a sane view of this subject. "For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind" (2 Tim. 1:7). For John speaks of fear as a demon to be exorcised (1 Jn. 4:18).

In Acts 5:16 "everyone" was "healed," which included some who were possessed with devils. In Lu. 7:21 those having devils were "cured." Those who were "oppressed of the devil" were healed (Ac. 10:38). In Mt. 12:22 one possessed of a devil is healed. His double devil was that he could neither see nor speak. Read the account of this same case in Lu. 11:14. Notice that Matthew says the man was dumb, while Luke says the devil in the man was dumb. If it was the demon that was dumb, why not afflict him with paralysis and every other trouble, to make him as helpless as possible? But why insist on a perverse literalness in reading such scriptures? It was the man who was blind and dumb, as Matthew says. Neither does Luke contradict if we let the idea of exorcism be what the scriptures show, cure of afflictions. For then the man's devil was dumbness and blindness, so in that case of course the demon was blind or dumb or whatever else ailed the body.

Again, in Mt. 4:24; Lu. 6:17-19; 8:2; 9:42, casting out devils is healing diseases, and in Ac. 19:12 some were sick of diseases and others were sick from devils, that is, those who had devils were merely sick, as otherwise expressed in the same verse.

Jn. 10:20, "He hath a devil, and is mad." That is, they charged Jesus with being insane from an evil spirit in his body.

Mt. 9:32-33, "a dumb man, possessed with a devil." That is, having a devil was being mute.

It may be asked, "If the demons were not real, why the language in scripture that speaks as if they were?" The answer is, that to understand this subject we need to realize the following principle of scriptural interpretation: Since the scriptures were written for our understanding, the truths in it are expressed in our terms of usage, which often seem to sanction erroneous ideas, because of the need of expressing truth in terms we use, and can therefore understand. This principle is stated and explained in Ro. 6:19, where Christian life is called slavery, in harmony with the universal custom of enslavement at that time, when really, Christian life is freedom from the slavery of sin.

For instance, probably none of us believe in witchcraft, and few, if any, in ghosts; but Simon "bewitched" the Samaritans, and Paul asked the Galatians who had bewitched them, that they should not understand justification. And the disciples were told when they thought their Master was a ghost that ghosts do not have flesh and bones as he did (Lu. 24:39), thus seeming to concede the existence of ghosts. In the same way, God speaks of himself as if he regretted past deeds, and as being furious, full of hate, revenge, anger and the like.

By that same principle on which we find in scripture all these gods, witches, ghosts and so on, we find the cure of diseases often called by the current language of casting out demons.

We do exactly as was done then. We say "Pandemonium broke loose" when we hear a big noise. But by derivation "pandemonium" means "all the demons." However, we do not really mean that all the demons have burst out of confinement. It may be nothing more than the children playing hide-and-seek in the next room, and if they are our own offspring we shall not tolerate anyone being so literal as to imply that we are parents of literal demons. Why not be as reasonable when we read the scriptures on exorcism?

We also say that we "vulcanize" a tire or we say "martial" and talk of "lunacy." But by using such superstitious language we do not confess Vulcan as the god of fire, nor Mars as the god of war nor that Luna is really a moon-goddess who causes lunacy by her victims being "moonstruck," as people used to consider that such feeble-mindedness was caused by sleeping in the moonlight. All the names of the days of the week are derived from pagan gods, "January" from Janus, the god who faced both ways like a politician or some other policy-people and "March" is from Mars, god of war. Some very conscientious Christians will not use these names, but call the days by number, lest they be idolatrous, and some plead very tenaciously for a revision of the divine names in scripture, but nobody can take the language of demons out of the Book and make it say simply "healing disease," and there is no necessity for such extremes of casuistry, for there are names of pagan gods in the Book. Paul stood in Mars' hill (Ac. 17:22) and sailed in a ship whose sign was Castor and Pollux (28:11), but our God does not admit the real existence of those gods, for he says through Paul that they "are nothing in the world." If it were ethically necessary to purge our Christian speech from all taints of paganism and superstition, we could not use enough language to be understood. How else than to say "Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill" could it be told where he stood? or how else than to name the ship by the two sons of Jupiter could it be told in what ship he did sail? You might make signs to the garage man to "Vulcanize" your tire, but what would you do in a sudden emergency need to invoke martial law, or write any legal business papers dated January or March? Elijah spoke of Baal as if he really existed (1 K. 18:21), as the Savior did of Beelzebub. If your child calls the catsup "medicine" you must do the same when you call for it, or he might pass you the vinegar. You must accommodate your language to his, as people humor insane people, even though you risk being charged with lying by the ultra-punctilious. Though Simon is literally said to have bewitched the Samaritans and though the risen Savior said "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have" (Lu. 24:39,) yet Luke does not debase inspiration to the depth of recognizing the reality of witches and ghosts, though the same argument for the reality of demons would prove these relatives of theirs. The Master was not so intent on correcting their superstition or their language here in Lu. 24 as he was on proving his identity, as before, when walking on the sea (Mt. 14:26). If he had stopped to argue the point with the disciples then, Peter would have lost the argument because his mouth would have been full of water. People are dying now, too, though not by drowning, while dogmatists argue over trifles.

So when we become more enlightened we shall continue to say "vulcanize" and "martial" and "lunar" and "pandemonium," and when we read of demons we shall understand. We will be as consistent when we read the scriptures on exorcism as we are in our daily speech. At least, we should be as consistent the other way around, and if we believe that diseases are caused

by demons, call in an exorcist instead of a doctor. And if a chiropractor or an osteopath succeeds in correcting our ills we should say the demons cannot endure the jarring of the ridge-pole of their houses; or if medicine cures us, say that demons do not like the taste of drugs and move out rather than swallow them; or if an optician relieves headache, say that demons will not stay in houses if they have to look through glass windows. And then we should not smile when we read that the Orientals make a big noise on New Year's day to drive the demons out of their homes. And it will not help any to say that only part of our diseases are caused by demons, for back in bible days they laid all frailties to demons, from deafness to insanity. Inspiration merely used the imperfect vehicle of human speech involving paganism, just as we do in such words as the four offered above as examples. On that principle impersonal evil, as either trouble or sin, is represented in scripture as being a personal devil. It is just the same as demons, the personal devil was a belief among the pagans, just as the demons were held to be real. Diseases are called devils and attributed to satan (Lu. 13:16) and to the devil (Ac. 10:38), and sin is attributed to him as well as to the desires of the flesh.

Since the "gods" (1 Cor. 8:5) were the same things as "devils" (10:20), and the gods were "nothing in the world" (8:4), the truth shines as clear as the sun that these demons were "nothing in the world." Being the pagan gods of ancestor-worship, the immortal souls of "the dead" (Psa. 106:28, 36-38), they were non-existent. If demons really caused disease now, we would be at their mercy, for the miraculous power by which they were cast out has ceased to perform miracles (1 Cor. 13:8-10).

Though those ancients thought that all disembodied souls were in torment while disembodied, modern theology has left only part of them in torment (in hell), and found a place of bliss for the remainder, in heaven. But obsession would be impossible now, on the theological basis of those who believe in it among Christians, for since such demons are the supposed disembodied souls or spirits of dead people, which are now supposed to be fixed endlessly in heaven or hell, it would be impossible for them to leave their endless abodes to return and vex the bodies of the living, for that would terminate an endless state, which is verbal contradiction. Such endless abode in heaven or hell would also make a resurrection of the dead impossible. The only alternative possibility for present obsession would be to abandon the scriptural idea that demons were the supposed souls of the dead, and say that they were personal devils like their prototype, perhaps other "fallen angels" like Lucifer, for which there is no scriptural authority.

But it may be argued that Jesus rebuked these devils, as in Mt. 17:18, and why would he do so if they were not real beings, and could not hear? Well, he rebuked the wind and the waves (Mt. 8:26) and a fever (Lu. 4:39). These troubles are not called demons, though elsewhere we read of such ills as fevers being so called and rebuked, just as most of the ills named in Mt. 15:30-31 are elsewhere attributed to demons, though in this reference they are called simply diseases healed. Again, in Mal. 3:11 "hard times" or "the devourer" will be rebuked. Since winds, waves, fevers and hard times obey words of rebuke, why should not all these bodily ailments that are often called devils do the same? This explains Mk. 9:17, 25. If the demon here was the one that was deaf, as it reads, how could it hear and obey the call to be exorcised? But deafness and dumbness were spoken to, the same as the storm

and the fever, but the deaf and dumb demon did not need to hear the command any more than the wind and the fever did, for only the man was deaf and dumb, and that was his only devil. He was an epileptic, as the translation is in other versions, including the Revised. Are our epileptics really obsessed? The man need not hear to be healed, any more than a storm or a corpse needed to hear in order for a miracle to be performed. The Lord spoke of a tree or a mountain being commanded to obey (Lu. 17:6), and he spoke to the dead maiden and the dead widow's son and his dead friend Lazarus, and they arose as commanded. This was evidently to prove that the miracles resulted from his power, instead of being merely coincidental. For sometimes miracles resulted without words being spoken, as when healing was done by manual imposition, or the woman who touched the hem of his garment, or the soldier who came to life when buried upon the dust of the dead prophet (2 K. 13:21), all of which cases show that when words were spoken for miraculous results, it was for other purpose than necessity.

Since all pagan religions abound in the belief of the immortality of the soul, and its consequent ghosts, necromancy and other superstitions, Israel in dispersion naturally brought back to Palestine such ideas at their return from exile in Egypt and Babylon, as the worship of the golden calf at Sinai and the worship of Baal testify. So it was natural that they should think as those idolaters did about demon-possession, and it is just as natural that the scriptures should use their terminology for ills and their cure, just as we use such pagan words, as above cited. The Israelitish absorption of paganism explains the belief of the Pharisees in the immortality of the soul.

But it is noticeable that the casting out of demons begins in the gospels and Acts, and that it is not found in Moses and the prophets, before Israel's dispersion. Then king Saul was "well" when the evil spirit left him because of David's music, as music is still used to aid recovery of the deranged, for Saul's trouble was evidently that. His "evil spirit" was "from the Lord," as was the trouble with the pigs that jumped over the precipice when Jesus healed the demoniac. Saul's evil spirit was not therefore one in the pagan sense of a disembodied soul, but an evil spirit in the sense of an evil mind, or deranged mind, just as the treachery between Abimelech and the men of Shechem (Judg. 9:23) was an evil state of mind. And that was also from the Lord. For all bodily ills are from the Lord (Ex. 4:11; Job 42:11). This first reference shows that even blindness, which is attributed to demon-possession (Mt. 12:22), is from our Father for good, as in the case of the man born blind (Jn. 9). There is not in the books up to Matthew the idea of a demon such as we find expressed from Matthew onward. The later believers in the immortality of the soul developed the idea to greater and greater proportions, so that the modern hell of torment outdoes anything in paganism. The horrors of Calvin and Jonathan Edwards could not have been conceived in the dull minds of pagans. In Saul's day the woman of En-dor did not believe that the departed spirits were active, either to enjoy heaven or suffer torment in hell, for her words to Saul, when she pretended to be Samuel talking to him, asked him, "Why hast thou disquieted me—?" Then the dead stayed down and were quiet, instead of flying away to heaven or traveling to the infernal regions of torment. For the farther we go into error the worse we become, so that professed Christianity of the apostasy outdoes anything in paganism.

In those ancient days in Israel, just as Saul became "well," so Naaman was "cleansed." His leprosy did not come from a demon. And Nebuchadnezzar's "understanding returned." His insanity was not attributed to a demon, as was that of the man having the legion of devils.

A further objection in favor of the reality of demons needs to be cleared up: In Mk. 3:11 we read that unclean spirits prostrated themselves before him, so it may be reasoned, "How could they do that unless they were real?" Well, it is evident that it was the persons who were supposed to be possessed that did the prostrating and talking. That was always the way in such speaking—the persons did it. Lu. 4:41 records a similar instance. And Mk. 1:23-27. Here what cried out was the man. In Ac. 19:16 it is made clear that it was the man who did the acting when he leaped upon his would-be healers. You will find that these marauders and usurpers always used the tongues, eyes, ears and limbs of the people they were supposed to inhabit when they heard, spoke and acted. Why is this? Are they helpless and inactive out of flesh? There is not a case on record of such an evil spirit speaking or doing anything unless it is said to be in a person and using his body, except in the parable in Mt. 12 before referred to. In such figurative language that is permissible, for in parables such things as trees are represented as talking (Judg. 9:8), and in the Lord's parables he used their beliefs as they held them, as we have already cited. In the fifth sentence back we have spoken as if these demons were real, by calling them "marauders and usurpers," just as the scriptures assume them to be real because the people so believed.

THE DRAGON

It will have a throne (Rev. 13:2). That identifies it as the civil power, the fourth world-government of Dan. 7, having the same ten horns as that beast was represented as having. We have seen this rule beginning in Eden at the first transgression, when the man ruled the woman as head of the family. Civil rule began in family life, as the history of all people shows, and was manifested strongly in the time of the patriarchs. "Patriarch" means "chief father." When this political rule reaches its culmination it will be the dragon and wild beast, antichrist. The seven crowns on its heads (Rev. 12:3) again identify it as the civil power. It will be chained and put in the abyss or deep, the waters (mass of people) from which Daniel saw it, as the fourth beast, arise. That is, during the millenium, while Christ reigns, all human rule will be suppressed and its citizens called upon to worship and serve him. The kingdoms of men will be come his (Rev. 11:15). It is expressed figuratively in another way by saying that he will dash them, as pottery, into pieces. That is, they will be reduced again to their original condition of disorganization, as when they, as beasts, were in the deep of waters. The literal statement is that they will be subjected to him (Isa. 2:2-4; Zech. 14:16-19).

After the millenium this dragon, serpent, devil, satan will be loosed and will gather armies, again an evidence of civil rule. Then he is tormented in the lake of fire for the ages beyond. That is, all mortal, national groups will be subjected to such judgments as Zech. 14 says. The devil will be chained. Kings will be bound with chains (Psa. 149:5-9). Again put two and two together and see what you have. The devil to be withstood by the Ephesians (6:11) was the civil powers named in next verse, for then Christians were

arrested and tried on charges of hyphenated loyalty (Ac. 17:7) and later martyred for refusing to submit to emperor worship. The "heavenly places" named here in Eph. 6 would be the political heaven, as before cited.

The dragon is the devil, or slanderer, or accuser. For the civil authorities arrested the Lord and his apostles and accused them falsely at the bar of their courts. So the dragon is true to his title of devil or slanderer, in being an "accuser" (Rev. 12:10). The slanderer was a "plaintiff" (1 Pet. 5:8, C. V.). "Accusers" (Titus 2:3) is translated from the same word as "devil," showing that this word "devil" is a common noun, as we have before shown.

The dragon is also satan. "Satan" means adversary, or opposer. So the dragon is true to the character of that title "satan" also, for as antichrist he resists the political sway of Messiah.

To summarize the four titles, "dragon," "serpent," "devil" and "satan," we see how Adam, Job's wife, Peter, the women under the ministry of Titus, and other persons could all, in proper times and circumstances, be devils and satans, thus showing that these words "devil" and "satan" are not proper nouns designating one supernatural evil being.

In Rev. 20 we find the dragon as the serpent, devil and satan seized and cast into the abyss, or deep, the waters of Dan. 7, from which the prophet saw the four beasts, or civil powers, rise. For the identifications we have already considered show that this dragon is a civil power. During Messiah's millennial reign, there will be no room for civil powers to rule, since he occupies the whole world-territory, so they are suppressed, as shown by the seizing of this dragon and putting him back where Daniel saw civil power come from—that is, the masses of the people, symbolized by waters, as in Rev. 17:15.

Then the loosing of the dragon from his prison would be the liberty granted to people to form civil powers again. This would be accomplished by the resurrection of the dead that occurs at the end of the millenium. For that is the exact time when the dragon is loosed (20:2-3, 7-8). These dead people will know nothing of the glory and power of the millennial reign that subdued all the nations existing during the millenium, so that accounts for their foolish and futile rebellion. The fact that the dragon gathers armies confirms the interpretation here given, for armies are a sure accompaniment of national organization.

The torment of the dragon in the lake of fire "forever and ever," or "for the eons of the eons" (C.V.) would be the infliction of judgment on the nations that form after the millenium (Rev. 20:8) as on the previous national groups during that thousand years.

Since the fourth "beast" ("kingdom," Dan. 7:23) will be given to the "burning flame" (ver. 11), and "nations" go into the fire prepared for "the devil" (Matt. 25:31-46), the "dragon" that is the "devil" is again by this identified as the civil power.

THE DEVIL'S APOSTLES AND ANGELS

(2 Cor. 11:13-15; Rev. 12:9)

The gospel of justification and grace by Paul was opposed by those of his own nation who still held to the law for justification and salvation. They followed his ministry at all places with their opposition. Much of his epistles is devoted to this controversy. The contention became so sharp that he called his adversaries "false apostles" and "ministers" of satan, thus implying that

they were apostles of the devil. He said that they transformed themselves into the apostles of Christ. It is evident that this transformation was not real, but that what Paul meant by that was that those false teachers succeeded in making their disciples believe that they were servants of Christ. The transformation was merely in the minds of their dupes. The same is true of the transformation of satan into "an angel of light." It would be impossible for a supernatural being, a fallen angel or other, to literally transform himself into a good angel. So these apostles of the devil were not literally sent out by a real evil being. They went out of their own accord, and were apostles of satan only in being what Paul calls "the servants of sin."

The devil's angels, if literal, would be messengers of the dragon, that is the civil power at the end of the era just before the millenium. Thus the popular conception that the devil is a fallen angel, and has other angels at his bidding, would be impossible on the basis of this devil here in the Revelation, where satan is a political power, for that could not have literal angels, since it is an abstract thing, devoid of consciousness and intelligence necessary to send out angels.

The fact that Paul's "thorn in the flesh" could be an angel of the devil (2 Cor. 12:7) shows that such messengers as these of the dragon need not be taken too literally, any more than the devil here in this scripture must be so taken. And even if the dragon's angels must be taken literally, they could be regarded as being the inferior officials of the civil power called in figure of a dragon, a thing that has no existence in real life.

THE MISSION OF SORROW

"Sorrow is better than laughter: for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better" (Eccl. 7:3).

We have shown the divine purpose in evil, and if the reader has accepted the Father's will thus in his Gethsemane, he is ready to receive the designed benefit from it.

The first purpose of suffering that we meet in the scriptures is as a punishment for sin. Many have hastily concluded that this is the only purpose of it, and they therefore tell innocent sufferers that they have sinned to cause their suffering. It is true that we reap as we sow, but it is also true that we suffer for righteousness' sake and also from the sins of others. If all suffering were for sin there could be no possibility of suffering for righteousness, as the Master taught. Suffering for sin is the lowest form of sorrow, but it has a value—that of correction. And in the marvelous divine alchemy it may be transformed into the highest form of suffering—that for the sake of others—for he who has learned by experience the weariness and pain of harvesting from sin-seed may warn others.

Another purpose of suffering is to make us perfect. We read (Heb. 2:10) that our Savior was perfected thus, and that we are to be the same (1 Pet. 5:10). It subdues the will of the flesh to the will of the Father and weans us away from the pride and lusts of the flesh. This is spoken of as the crucifixion of self (Ro. 6:6; Gal. 2:20-21; 6:14). That is the present part of salvation, being freed from sin. And from suffering, also. Lust then no longer entices, pain of body or spirit no more torments us nor fears torture, for perfect love has then cast out all fear. As a dear aged sister recently said, "Nothing hurts any more." For a dead person cannot be enticed into

any sin nor feel any pain. And since in this crucified state we are dead and also risen into the new life (Ro. 6:4), we are past death also, in the sense of being dead to sin (verses 2, 11) and quickened into righteousness, and there remains only the physical resurrection to complete our salvation in immortality. As long as the sins of others and the sorrows of life hurt us we must have a continued experience of that irritation in both their sins and our sorrows until we no longer feel the pain. Then the daily cross-bearing will have taken us to our Calvary, where sin and pain end and the glad new life awaits. This is the experience of salvation by the gospel of grace, and every feeling of guilt or need, every temptation or fear, every care or pain or tear, is an invitation to go to the throne of grace with it, where we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need. Thus sin and trouble drive us to God, to find relief in him (Isa. 26:16; Hos. 5:15; Ac. 17:26-27). This is the greatest mission of sorrow.

Again, suffering causes humility, and that is the way into greater faith (Lu. 17:5-10). When helpless, we are invited to go to the Great Helper.

Another great gift of adversity is sympathy, which literally means "to suffer together." That is the emotional side of brotherly love. The Israelites were told that since they were strangers in Egypt they knew the heart of a stranger, and therefore not to oppress strangers (Ex. 23:9). The frail mortality of the Son of man made him priestly sympathetic to the sorrows of men (Heb. 2:16-18; 5:1-4). The same is true of us (Gal. 5:1-2). He who has suffered can pity, and he who has sinned knows the heart of a sinner and can enter sympathetically into his experience by putting himself in imagination in that other's place.

But the greatest meaning of suffering is to fit us to serve. Moses was led to Midian, and practiced long gentleness with sheep till he should learn that he was not to free his people by the power of his fists or be so hasty as to try it forty years prematurely. Paul spent two years in self-imposed seclusion in Arabia, to become adjusted to his sudden tremendously different new life and to be fitted for his calling, before entering upon his fruitful service. And our Savior must be made Victor over the flesh by forty days of fasting and trial before starting on his ministry. "Tarry ye..."

We are told that it is given to us to suffer for Christ's sake (Phil. 1:29). So Paul found some residue of affliction to fill up for sake of the church (Col. 1:24), and he wrote that his sufferings were designed to prompt him to comfort others with the same comfort he had received (2 Cor. 1:3-10).

It is a blessed thing to capitalize on affliction and give the interest to others. One of the most touching things in sorrow is that it prompts its disciples to comfort others. Our President has founded a hospital at Warm Springs, Georgia to help those who suffer as he did. A man named Beers became deranged and tried suicide three times, but failed, then recovered his sanity, wrote a book, "A Mind That Found Itself" and founded the "Save-A-Life League" which has helped to rescue many from self-destruction.

The maniac that the Savior healed and who as a result wanted to go with his Benefactor was told to go home and tell what great things the Lord had done for him. For there is no such effective advertisement for a physician as a grateful healed patient, and no missionary or evangelist quite so fruitful as one who knows that he himself was a weak and helpless sinner saved by grace.

When we realize that such blessings come from adversity, we cease to marvel so much that evil is such a great mystery, and conclude that it is a blessing in disguise.

May the reader be fitted by his sorrows to serve better and find in his adversity the divine love and mercy that overshadow all.

