

inferior in *degree*, we can find such evidence, we may confidently expect, that it shall not be *ratified*, only but also *augmented* from that source of knowledge which is *more full*, and which is given to us for that express purpose.

We may here compare Mr. White's view and that of Mr. Constable as to the question of the mortality of Adam as created.

Mr. White says: "We suppose then, that, from the simple account furnished in Genesis, we are to understand that Adam was not created in possession of immortality either in his soul or body, yet also that he was not created under sentence of death (as was the rest of the creation around him [?]), since the prospect of "living for ever," by the help of the tree of life, was open to him upon the condition of obedience during his trial; in other words, the first man was not created immortal but was placed in probation in order to become so." *Life in Christ*, p. 109.

Mr. Constable says: "Immortality was given to man at his creation. This priceless gift was one of the gifts which a bountiful Creator bestowed upon a favoured creature. But it was alienable. It might be parted with; it might be thrown away; it might be lost. So He, the Law-giver, said when, in giving immortality, He also adds the warning, 'In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' What is more, this immortality was alienated; this priceless gift was lost. Man sinned and lost his immortality."

The argument of Mr. White appears to me to be open to more objection than that of Mr. Constable's, in these respects: 1. That it favours the theory of Development, so that man is put absolutely, as to his *destiny* (because of his *nature*) in the same category as the brute creation, without a Resurrection; the more so, because that his immortality is supposed to be derived through a *material* cause. 2. Because by a literal interpretation of Gen. 2: 17, 19, it falsifies the Divine Word. Facts are *entirely* against Mr. White's literal interpretation; but more than this, Mr. Constable's theory is *reconcilable* with facts, just as he interprets what is meant by "Thou shalt surely die," that is, does the threat refer to the *body* or *soul* of Adam? But as he says that this refers to *literal* death, that is, death of the body of man, in a similar way to the death of that of the animals, such literal interpretation cannot agree with the fact of the narrative in Genesis 2: 3. The threat to Adam was: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Death is held by Mr. White and his friends to mean the dissolution of life, both of soul and body: *destruction*. This they say was the nature of the penalty pronounced at the Fall. The language of the Creator, however, couples time and character *together*: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." If the literal interpretation is to hold, it must do so, not only as to the *character* of the penalty, but also as to the *time*. So, also, if the death spoken of was such a death as the animals suffer, it must include the destruction of the soul as a living organism, at the same time as the *body* ceases to live.

see not how this can be avoided. Mr. White admits that the penalty *threatened* was indeed loss of life, at the *time* of transgression, but that in consequence of the provision of His Redemption, it was *suspended* though not *rescinded*.

But what does this involve? Nothing less than God falsifying *His own Word*! Mutability in the *Immutable*!!

We know that nought could change the word or purpose of the Most High, under a covenant which spoke not of *mercy* but of *justice*. The difficulty is utterly insuperable, that God could nullify His own Word, when the command was *absolute*. Could such be the case, well might sinners promise to themselves that God does not mean *all* He says! This is fatal to the whole theory.

The threatenings of God under a *declared* gospel, and after the Fall, when there was a promise made of a Deliverer who should *break* the power which Satan had acquired by *sin*, was with an ascertained and *declared* provision for pardon upon *repentance*. Without that Repentance looking to covenanted and promised mercy through a Deliverer, there could be no change in Him, "with whom there is no variableness neither shadow of turning." To Adam it spoke only as a ray of hope amidst darkness and sorrow, but it was sufficient to tell of its *existence*. It is inconceivable that God had made *provision* to stultify His own Word, and while He threatened *Death*, he intended to give *Life*, which He had not promised under such conditions. The point at issue here is this: What is the *primary* meaning of Death in the penalty declared against disobedience? This being understood it must also be evident that the *whole passage* must be treated in accordance therewith. This does not exclude *concomitant* results; these, however, are the *accidents* rather than the *elements* of punishment. What, then, we will now ask, was the main feature of the punishment threatened? In answering this, we have to consider man's relation as a moral agent to his Creator. This evidently must be a prime consideration and not his animal character as a corporeal being. This would give an entirely new aspect to the matter, to be considered hereafter.

This being premised, we may now compare the received and Orthodox interpretation, and consider what difficulties does this present when compared with the former. We hold that the *primary* meaning of death, as threatened to man as the lord of the visible world, although it included concomitant results, have reference to a state of his moral nature, Objective and Subjective, in relation to his Creator, entirely different from the one he then occupied, and so fitly and powerfully described by the word *Death*. The threat was directed primarily against his spiritual nature—his *soul*. This, as the animating principle, is regarded as the man—Adam. So, also, we must give prominence to that act of the moral nature, in reference to a known command, of a Being also well known as to His character, and not the physical effect, of the act of eating a certain tree upon his physical frame. So we interpret death to

mean, *primarily and chiefly*, a perverted and corrupted moral constitution in reference to his Creator—exactly parallel with what the New Testament describes as "dead in trespasses and sins"—or being "without God in the Word." This, the *great evil* of the fall, was to take place *in the day* that he disobeyed; and it *did so*. God's word was strictly verified. There is no difficulty here: God does not stultify Himself. So also remember, we are told "by one man *sin* entered into the word, and death by *sin*." He does not say (as well he might, if the gentlemen referred to were correct) "death entered into the world," but *sin*—the evil in its *spiritual* aspect, and in its effects upon a spiritual substance, and death, as it respects the body, following after as a concomitant result. Surely this is the most reasonable and the *only* exegesis consistent with all the facts!

The *spiritual* evil, entailed by Adam's transgression, and transmitted by him as an infection of their moral nature, to his posterity, is not only clearly separable from the *physical* evil which was only a concomitant result, but it must also take *precedence*, and be indeed the *evil* of the curse, as it was addressed to a being endowed with such moral faculties as *man* possesses. So, the act and habit of sin against God necessarily *following* from such an infection, as a quality and character, separates man from God. The *spiritual* evil and *physical* evil, are *conjoined* in the penalty as pronounced in Eden. Still we hold that the *first* is the primary one, and that *chiefly* intended.

Also, it must be remembered that it is upon such a basis that Scriptural Theology requires a regeneration of our nature. However this is taught, it rests upon *this* basis. Our Lord distinctly says "except a man be born again, or from above, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." What part of his nature is so to be regenerated? Not his body, but his *soul*; further, this regeneration is said to be a "new creation," (Kaine Ktisis.) Now, to create is to *call into existence*, therefore, the soul of man has by the sin of Adam inherited the curse from him, in this: not that it has become corruptible, or lost its existence as a spiritual quality for ever—but that it has *lost the Divine image* in the moral qualities being agreeable to His will. So only in consistency with all the facts, can we interpret the threat as to be fulfilled, "in the day" of transgression. So, also, is this agreeable to the account of the serpent's temptation. In knowledge of the *actual* meaning, in its highest and primary character, he said, "Ye shall not surely die," your bodies will not perish. To them it may have meant God will not do as He *threatens*; but the concealed fact was, God does not intend *this* by "death." Here we may admit, not that Adam knew what death meant by the knowledge of animal death, either as witness of the fact or by "gospel evidences," but by the death of vegetable nature, or *suspension* of its energy. So, he may have had an *idea* of what was therein conveyed. It is not necessary in order to justify, to our sense of right, the action of the Creator and Judge of