

# OUTLINE STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES

by

George P. Pardington, Ph.D.

Copyright © 1916

## CHAPTER FOUR

### ANTHROPOLOGY

#### TOPIC ONE: THE CREATION OF MAN

##### I. THE FACT

The Scriptures clearly and distinctly teach that man was created by God: Genesis 1:27; 2:7.

**NOTE:** Attention has been called to the occurrence of the Hebrew verb for create (*bara*) in Genesis 1:27, showing the absolute separation of mankind from the animal kingdom.

##### II. THE METHOD

The Scriptures also clearly and distinctly teach that man is the result of an act of immediate divine creation: Genesis 2:7; Job 32:8; Ecclesiastes 12:7; Zechariah 12:1.

**NOTE:** There is no foundation in Scripture or science for the belief that the body of man, much less his moral and mental nature, is the result of evolution from lower forms of life. Dr. Strong says: "No single instance has yet been adduced of the transformation of one animal species into another, either by natural or artificial selection; much less has it been demonstrated that the body of the brute has ever been developed into that of man. All evolution implies progress and reinforcement of life, and is intelligible only as the immanent God gives new impulses to the process. Apart from the direct agency of God, the view that man's physical system is descended by natural generation from some ancestral simian form can be regarded only as an irrational hypothesis. Since the soul, then, is an immediate creation of God, and the creation of man's body is mentioned by the Scripture writer in direct connection with this creation of the spirit, man's body was in this sense an immediate creation also."

##### III. THE UNITY OF THE RACE

The Scriptures teach that the whole human race is descended from a single pair—the first pair, Adam and Eve: Genesis 1:27, 28; 2:7, 22; 3:20; 5:2, 3; 9:19.

This Scriptural revelation finds a fourfold corroboration :

**1. From History.**

“So far as the history of nations and tribes in both hemispheres can be traced, the evidence points to a common origin and ancestry in Central Asia.”

**2. From Language.**

“Comparative philology points to a common origin of all the more important languages, and furnishes no evidence that the less important are not so derived.”

**3. From Psychology.**

“The existence, among all families of mankind, of common mental and moral characteristics, as evidenced in common maxims, tendencies, and capacities, in the prevalence of similar traditions and in the universal applicability of our philosophy and religion, is most easily explained upon the theory of a common origin. It is probable that certain myths common to many nations were handed down from a time when the families of earth had not yet separated. Among these are the accounts of the making of the world and man, a primitive garden, innocence, a serpent, a tree of knowledge, a temptation and fall, a flood, sacrifice, etc.”

**4. From Physiology.**

“All races are fruitful one with another. The normal temperature of the body is the same. The mean frequency of the pulse is the same. There is liability to the same diseases. These facts are not true of other animals; and again, human blood can be distinguished by the microscope from that of any other animal.”

#### **IV. THE TWIN TRUTHS**

The origination of the race of mankind from one pair involves what we may call the twin truths:

**1. The organic unity of mankind in the first transgression, and of the provision of salvation for the race in Christ:** Romans 5:12; I Corinthians 15:21, 22; Hebrews 3:16.

**2. The natural brotherhood of mankind and, in consequence thereof, our obligation as believers to bring the knowledge of Christ and the blessings of His salvation to every member of the race of Adam:** Acts 17:26; Hebrews 2:11; Luke 10:25-37; Matthew 28:18-20; Mark 16:15, \*6; Luke 24:46-48; Acts 1:8; Romans 1:14-16.

**NOTE:** Conservative science estimates the time of man’s appearance upon the earth at from 8,000 to 10,000 years B. C. Scripturally, there is nothing against this view, inasmuch as in the opinion of many “there is no fixed chronology before the time of Abraham.”

Archbishop Ussher's Chronology, adopted in our English Bibles, has no higher authority than an act of the British Parliament. This fixes the time of man's creation at B. C. 4004.

## TOPIC TWO: THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF MAN

### I. GENERAL STATEMENT

The Scriptures clearly and distinctly teach that man as constituted by creation has a material nature and an immaterial nature. The material nature is his body. The immaterial nature consists of his soul and spirit. This is proved by:

1. **The record of man's creation:** Genesis 2:7.
2. **Passages in which the human soul or spirit is distinguished, on the one hand, from the divine spirit, and on the other hand, from the body, which it inhabits:** Numbers 16:22; I Corinthians 2:11; Hebrews 12:9; Genesis 35:18; I Kings 17:21; Ecclesiastes 12:7; James 2:26.
3. **The mention of the body and soul (or spirit) as together constituting the whole man:** Matthew 10:28; I Corinthians 5:3; III John 2.

**NOTE:** The Hebrew word commonly rendered soul is *nephesh*. and the word commonly rendered spirit is *ruach*. The Greek word commonly rendered soul is *psuche*; and the word commonly rendered spirit is *pneuma*. The primary signification of these four words is practically identical, namely, wind, breath, the animating principle of a physical organism.

### II. TRICHOTOMY vs. DICHOTOMY

The question arises: Does the Bible teach that the soul and spirit of man are two separate entities, or two aspects of one and the same entity? (The term entity means thing). Two views are held, namely: Trichotomy and Dichotomy.

**NOTE:** The root of these two words is Greek, namely: *temno*, cut; *dika*, in two; and *trika*, in three. Hence, trichotomy means the three-part nature of man; and dichotomy, the two-part nature of man.

### III. THE TRICHOTOMOUS VIEW

This view maintains that there are three essential elements of humanity; namely, body, soul, and spirit.

- The body is the material part;
- The soul, the principle of animal life;
- The spirit, the principle of rational and immortal life.

At death the body, if it is held, disintegrates into dust; the soul ceases to exist; while the spirit alone abides, and at the resurrection is reunited to the glorified body. The spirit is peculiar to man and possesses reason, will, and conscience. The soul, which is possessed also by the brute creation, is endowed with understanding, feeling, and sense—perception.

The body, alike of man and of brute, is, of course, pure materiality. The above is the common view of trichotomists. Some, however, hold that the soul is not a distinct entity, but a kind of resultant of the union of body and spirit. This is drawn from the language of Genesis 2:7. Others hold to a “dualism of being, but a trichotomy of substance.” The “**living soul**” of Genesis 2:7 is described as a *tertium quid* (that is, a third something) attaching itself not to the body but to the spirit, from which it springs. “The soul is the effulgence of the spirit and its bond of union with the body.”

Trichotomists adduce the following points in support of their position:

- 1. The record of man’s creation:** Genesis 2:7. Here there seem to be three things: the body formed from the dust of the ground, the breath of life (Hebrew, *lives*) breathed into the nostrils, and the living soul.
- 2. The song of the virgin:** Luke 1:46, 47. Here Mary seems to distinguish between her soul and spirit.
- 3. Paul’s prayer for the Thessalonians.** Here the apostle prays that their “**whole body and soul and spirit**” may be “preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ”: I Thessalonians 5:23.
- 4. Description of the Word of God by the writer to the Hebrews:** Hebrews 4:12. It is characterized as “**piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit.**”

**NOTE:** Consult also these references: I Corinthians 2:14: “**The natural** (Greek, *soulish*) **man receiveth not the things of the Spirit.**” I Corinthians 15:44: a natural (*soulish*) body is contrasted with a spiritual body. Ephesians 4:23: “**That ye may be renewed in the spirit of your mind.**” And Jude 19: “**Sensual** (*soulish*) **not having the Spirit.**”

#### IV. THE DICHOTOMOUS VIEW

This view maintains that the soul and spirit are not two substances or parts, but that they designate the same immaterial principle from different standpoints. Dr. Strong thus states the dichotomous position: “The immaterial part of man, viewed as an individual and conscious life, capable of possessing and animating a physical organism, is called *psuche*; viewed as a rational and moral agent, susceptible of divine influence and indwelling, this same immaterial part is called *pneuma*. The *pneuma*, then, is man’s nature looking Godward, and capable of receiving and manifesting the Holy Spirit; the *psuche* is man’s nature looking earthward, and touching the world of sense. The *pneuma* is man’s higher part, as related to spiritual realities and as capable of such relation. Man’s being is, therefore, not trichotomous but dichotomous, and his immaterial part, while possessing a duality of powers, has unity of substance.”

Dichotomists adduce the following points in support of their position:

- 1. The record of man’s creation:** Genesis 2:7. Here, it is held, there are only two parts, viz: the material body formed of the dust of the ground and the immaterial principle of life derived by the inbreathing of God.

**2. The interchangeable use of the terms soul and spirit:** Genesis 41:8; Psalm 42:6; Matthew 20:28 (*psuche*); 27:50; John 12:27; 13:21 J Hebrews 12:23; Rev- 6:9; 20:4.

**NOTE:** This is true both of the living and the dead.

**3. Spirit as well as soul is used of the brute creation:** Ecclesiastes 3:21; Revelation 16:3. (In this latter passage “soul” refers to fish).

**NOTE:** The living principle in beasts (*soul or spirit*) is believed to be irrational and mortal; in man, rational and immortal.

**4. Soul is ascribed to the Lord:** Amos 6:8 (lit., *by His soul*); Jeremiah 9:9; Isaiah 53:10-12.

**5. The highest exercises of religion are ascribed to the soul:** Mark 12:30; Luke 1:46; Hebrews 6:18, 19; James 1:21.

**6. To lose the soul is to lose all:** Mark 8:36, 37.

**NOTE:** The witness of consciousness corroborates the dichotomous position; when we look within ourselves, we can distinguish the material part (the body) from the immaterial part—but the consciousness of no one can discriminate between soul and spirit.

## CONCLUSION

In view of these two classes of strong passages, it would seem that the teaching of the Scriptures as to the unity or duality of the soul and spirit of man is inconclusive. Accordingly, upon this question as upon all other questions which the Bible leaves in uncertainty, it is the wiser and safer course not to dogmatize. Moreover, as Dr. Miley well says: “The question, that is, as to trichotomy and dichotomy, does not seriously concern any important truth of Christian theology.”

**NOTE:** As to the origin of the soul there are three theories, viz: preexistence, creationism, and traducianism. The first theory, which explains itself, is wholly without Scriptural foundation. In support of the second theory, which also explains itself, the following passages are adduced: Ecclesiastes 12:7; Isaiah 57:16; Zechariah 12:1; Hebrews 12:9.

The traducian theory is that “the human race was immediately created in Adam, and, as respects both body and soul, was propagated from him by natural generation—all souls since Adam being only mediately (that is, indirectly) created by God, as the upholder of the laws of propagation which were originally established by Him.”

This view accords best with Scripture, which “represents God as creating the species in Adam, Genesis 1:27, and as increasing and perpetuating it through secondary agencies, Genesis 1:22, 28. Only once is the breath of life breathed into man’s nostrils, Genesis 2:7, 22; 4:1; 5:3; 46:26; Acts 17:21-26; I Corinthians 11:8; Hebrews 7:10, and after man’s formation God rested from His work of creation, Genesis 2:2.”

Again, this view is favored by “the analogy of vegetable and animal life, in which increase of numbers is secured, not by a multiplicity of immediate creations, but by the natural derivation of new individuals from the parent stock. A derivation of the human soul from its parents no more implies a materialistic view of the soul and its endless division and subdivision, than the similar derivation of the brute proves the principle of intelligence in the lower animals to be wholly material.” Again, this view finds support in the “observed transmission not merely of physical, but of mental and spiritual characteristics in families and races, and especially the uniform evil moral tendencies and dispositions which all men possess from their birth.”

## **TOPIC THREE: THE MORAL NATURE OF MAN**

### **I. DEFINITION**

By the moral nature of man is meant those powers which fit him for right or wrong action. These powers are intellect, sensibility, and will, together with conscience and free agency.

Says Dr. Strong: “In order to moral action, man has intellect, or reason, to discern the difference between right and wrong; sensibility, to be moved by each of these; free will (or free agency), to do the one or the other. Intellect, sensibility, and will are man’s three faculties. But in connection with these faculties there is a sort of activity which involves them all, and without which there can be no moral action, namely, the activity of conscience. Conscience applies the moral law to particular cases in our personal experience, and proclaims that law as binding upon us. Only a rational and sentient being can be truly moral.”

### **II. ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS**

Assuming the threefold powers of intellect, sensibility and will, as belonging to man’s personality, the essential elements of his moral nature are two, viz: conscience and free agency.

#### **A. Conscience.**

##### **1. Definition.**

Conscience comes from the Latin *conscientia*, which is compounded of *con*, with, or together, and *scientia*, knowing skill, or science. The Greek word for conscience is *suneidesis*, signifying a co-perception or co-knowledge. *Sun* in *suneidesis* is the equivalent of *con* in *conscientia*, and is commonly expressed in English by the prefix *co*, meaning with, or together.

##### **2. Nature.**

Some regard conscience as a separate faculty—the faculty of moral obligation, which gives us the feeling of “I ought,” or “I ought not.”

It has been called the voice of God in the soul of man. Others regard conscience as rather the response, so to speak, of the entire personality to an accepted and authoritative standard of duty. This latter view we take to be the correct one.

### 3. Contents.

A mental analysis of conscience discloses the following constituent elements:

a. *Self-consciousness.*

Primarily conscience is a knowledge of self—together with intellectual and emotional states and volitional acts. This is the meaning of Hebrews 10:2.

b. *Knowledge of a standard of duty, or the moral law.*

At this point conscience touches the moral reason. The working of conscience calls for some known objective standard of moral conduct, with reference to which the quality of states and actions may be discriminated and judged accordingly as right or wrong.

This standard of moral conduct may be imperfect; but such as it is the conscience will respond to it in approval or disapproval. This we take to be the meaning of Romans 2:13-15. Again, the standard of moral conduct may be erroneous; but if accepted as authoritative the conscience will respond to it in approval or disapproval.

Illustration: The Indian mother who from religious belief throws her babe into the river Ganges. For this reason the conscience, we say, needs enlightening; but what we mean is that the moral reason (that is, the reason controlled by the moral nature) needs enlightenment.

The true standard of conduct, of course, is the moral law of God, in part engraved upon our hearts but revealed fully in the sacred Scriptures. Very many of the Lord's people lack full Scriptural enlightenment upon the question of Christian duty and privilege, and as a consequence their consciences are "weak" and easily become "defiled": I Corinthians 8:7-13; Titus 1:15.

c. *Knowledge of conformity or non-conformity to a standard of duty, or the moral law.*

This is the exercise of self-examination. It is the correlation of the first two elements of conscience—the knowing of self in relation to a testing law of duty. Applying this accepted and authoritative law of duty to concrete cases in our own experience, we discern and pronounce our states and acts—past, present, and future—as right or wrong.

d. *Remorse or complacency in view of conformity or non-conformity to a standard of duty, or the moral law.*

This is the exercise of self-judgment. Having by self-examination discerned and pronounced our states and acts to be right or wrong with reference to the standard of the moral law, we commend or condemn ourselves accordingly. In the former case there is an instinctive sense of God's favor with a corresponding expectation of blessing; while in the latter case there is an instinctive sense of God's disfavor with a corresponding realization of being deserving of punishment.

This is what is meant by having, on the one hand, a “good” or “pure” conscience, or a conscience “**void of offense toward God and toward men**”: Acts 24:16; I Timothy 1:5; 3:9; and, on the other hand, an “evil” conscience or a conscience “**seared with a hot iron**”: Hebrews 10:22; I Timothy 4:2.

## **B. Free Agency.**

### **1. Definition.**

By free agency, or the freedom of the will, is meant the power of rational and responsible personal choice with respect to character and conduct.

### **2. Contents.**

In free agency there are four constituent elements, viz: a purposive end, a motive state, a rational judgment, and an elective decision.

#### *a. A purposive end.*

All intelligent and responsible action is taken with reference to some end in view—the attainment of a purpose through the use of appropriate means.

#### *b. A motive state.*

All action looking to a rational end or responsible purpose is influenced by motives, and motives produce states of mind and heart corresponding to them. Such are called motive states.

#### *c. A rational judgment.*

We have power over our motives and their corresponding motive states. Herein is the fundamental and essential fact of free agency. We can choose our course of action in accordance with the strongest motive or the weakest motive present to the mind at any given time; or we can suspend choice altogether, while by reflection and deliberation we bring into mental view other facts and considerations, having the force of new motives and producing corresponding new motive states, out of which in turn may spring personal choice and consequent action wholly different from what was at first contemplated. A denial of this power over or contrary to motives is a denial of free agency, or the freedom of the will.

#### *d. An elective decision.*

This is the actual exercise of the power of choice with respect to motives. Dr. Miley says: “The rational judgment does not include the elective decision . . . In the judgment we estimate the value and character of the end, while in the elective decision we determine our action respecting its attainment. The act of judgment is complete before the elective decision is made. The judgment, however, is necessary to the rational character of the choice and, therefore, the choice itself, which in the very nature of it must have a reason for itself.”

Dr. Strong thus states the question of free agency: “Free agency is the power of self-determination in view of motives, or man’s power (1) to choose between motives, and (2) to direct his subsequent activity according to the motive thus chosen. Motives are never a cause, but only an occasion; they influence, but never compel; the man is the cause, and herein is his freedom. But it is also true that man is never in a state of indeterminateness; never acts without motive, or contrary to all motives; there is always a reason why he acts and herein is his rationality.”

**NOTE:** Opposed to free agency, or the freedom of the will, are two theories which are forms of necessitarianism, or the doctrine of necessity. These are fatalism and determinism.

*Fatalism* admits the certainty, but denies the freedom of human self-determination—thus substituting fate for providence. “Under the sway of fate,” says Dr. Miley, “all things are absolutely determined; so that they could not but be, nor be other than they are. Fate binds in equal chains of necessity all things and events, all intelligences, thoughts, feelings, volitions, and even God Himself—if there be a God. Materialism and pantheism are fatalistic in character.”

*Determinism* holds that choice is always in accordance with the stronger or strongest motive present before the mind at any given time. Just as the heavier pan of the scales descends, so the weightier motive controls personal action. Determinism denies the power to suspend choice in the presence of motives, or to choose contrary to motives present at any time before the mind.

## **TOPIC FOUR: THE IMAGE OF GOD IN MAN**

### **I. GENERAL STATEMENT**

The Scriptures clearly and distinctly teach that man was created in the image and likeness of God: Genesis 1:26, 27; 5:1; 9:6; I Corinthians 11:7; Colossians 3:10. See also II Corinthians 4:4; Colossians 1:15; Hebrews 1:3.

**NOTE:** The Hebrew word rendered “**image**” signifies *shadow* and the Hebrew word rendered “**likeness**” signifies *resemblance*. The Greek word rendered “**image**” means an outline resemblance, i. e., a profile. In Hebrews 1:3 a different Greek word is used, meaning an exact copy or an engraving. Attempts to find an essential distinction in meaning between “**image**” and “**likeness**” must fail; they are substantially identical. Thus Dr. Strong says: “Both (i. e. words) together signify ‘the very image.’” And commenting on the force of both terms, Campbell Morgan writes: “Perhaps the simplest exposition of the thought would be gained by the contemplation of the shadow of a man cast upon some white background, by the shining of a great light. What the shadow would be to the man, the man would be to God. Like and unlike, suggesting an idea, but by no means explaining the mystery, impossible apart from the substance, yet infinitely less in essence than the substance. Man no more perfectly expresses all the facts concerning God than does the shadow those concerning man. Nevertheless, the shadow is the image of the man, and indicates the truth concerning him.” (“*The Crises of the Christ*,” pp. 25, 26).

## II. CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS

The image of God in man is twofold, namely: Natural likeness, or Personality; and Moral likeness, or Holiness.

### 1. Natural Likeness, or Personality.

Personality, as we have seen, consists of intellect, or the power of thinking; sensibility, or the power of feeling; and volition, or the power of willing. To complete the idea we must, however, add three other elements: self-consciousness, conscience, and free moral agency.

Dr. Strong says: “By virtue of this personality, man could at his creation choose which of the objects of his knowledge—self, the world, or God—would be the norm and center of his development. This likeness to God is inalienable (that is, it cannot be lost), and as constituting a capacity for redemption gives value to the life even of the unregenerate”: Genesis 9:6; I Corinthians 11:7; James 3:9.

**NOTE:** Dr. Farr says: “Man cannot lose this likeness (that is, the natural likeness or personality), or element of the divine image, without ceasing to be man. Insanity can only obscure it. Bernard said that it could not be burned out even in hell. The lost piece of money, Luke 15:8, still bore the image and superscription of the king, although it did not know it and did not know that it was lost. Human nature is, therefore, to be revered. He who destroyed human life was put to death: Genesis 9:6. Even men whom we curse are made after the likeness of God: Psalm 8:5; James 3:9.”

### 2. Moral Likeness, or Holiness.

The Scriptures clearly and distinctly teach that by creation man was pure, upright, and holy: Ecclesiastes 7:29; Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10. This holiness, or righteousness, which constituted man’s moral likeness to God, was forfeitable (that is, it could be lost) and it was forfeited or lost by the original sin: Ephesians 4:23, 24; Colossians 3:10.

#### a. *Its Nature.*

The nature of the original righteousness, or holiness, is to be viewed:

(1). Not as constituting the essence, or substance, of human nature; for in that case, as Dr. Strong says, “human nature would have ceased to exist as soon as man sinned.” “Nature” comes from the Latin *natura* (*nascor*, to be born). Sin can properly be called a nature only in the sense of its being inborn, i. e., in the race of Adam. “Disposition” would be a synonymous expression.

(2). Not as a gift from without, foreign to human nature and added to it after man’s creation; for man possessed the divine image by creation and not by subsequent bestowal. Dr. Farr says: “Adam was created with a holy nature, i. e., tendencies toward God, as all men since are born with a sinful nature, i. e., tendencies away from God.”

(3). In distinction from these negative theories, the original righteousness, or holiness, consisted, in the language of Dr. Strong, in a “direction or tendency of man’s affections and will, still accompanied by the power of evil choice, and so, differing from the perfect holiness of the saints as instinctive affection and childlike innocence differ from the holiness that has been developed and confirmed by experience of temptation.” The same author continues: “It was a moral disposition, moreover, which was propagable to Adam’s descendants, if it were retained, and which, though lost to him and to them, if Adam sinned, would still leave man possessed of a natural likeness to God which made him susceptible to God’s redeeming grace.”

**NOTE:** Another way of putting it would be that by creation man had a holy nature in distinction from a holy character. What is meant is that through birth (in the original instance through creation) a nature, or disposition, may be received, while character is the outgrowth and development only of moral probation, i. e., by the exercise of the power of free moral choice in the presence of good and evil.

Two facts should be added: the first is that this holy nature was more than innocence; it was a positive likeness to God in rectitude and purity. The other fact is that righteousness, or holiness, both of nature and of character has two sides: it is a knowledge and perception as well as an inclination and feeling: Colossians 3:10.

b. *Two Erroneous Views.*

Of man’s original state two erroneous views are held:

(1). The image of God included only personality.

“This theory,” says Dr. Strong, “denies that any positive determination to virtue inhered originally in man’s nature, and regards man at the beginning as simply possessed of spiritual powers, perfectly adjusted to each other.”

There are three objections:

(a) It really makes Adam the author of his own holiness. But this is contrary to analogy; for our sinful condition is not the product of our individual wills but rather the result of the first transgression; and our subsequent condition of holiness is not the product of our individual wills but rather the result of God’s regenerating and sanctifying power.

(b) Knowledge, which was an element of man’s holy nature, logically presupposes “a direction toward God of man’s affections and will; since only the heart can have any proper understanding of the God of holiness” (Strong).

(c) A likeness to God in personality alone does not satisfy the demands of Scripture, in which “the ethical conception of the divine nature so overshadow\* the merely natural” (Strong).

(2). The image of God consists simply of man’s natural capacity for religion.

This is the view of the Roman Catholic Church. A distinction in meaning is made between image and likeness. The former alone was man's by creation; the latter was the product of his own acts of obedience. Dr. Strong thus elaborates the idea: "In order that this obedience might be made easier and the consequent likeness to God more sure, a third element was added—an element not belonging to man's nature —namely, a supernatural gift of special grace, which acted as a curb upon the sensuous impulses, and brought them under the control of reason. Original righteousness was therefore not a natural endowment, but a joint product of man's obedience and of God's supernatural grace."

There are three objections:

(a) There is no real distinction in meaning between "image" and "likeness."

(b) Whatever may be denoted by "image" and "likeness," either singly or together, was conferred upon man in and by his creation. "Man is said to have been created in the image and likeness of God, not to have been afterwards endowed with either of them."

(c) The theory is in direct contradiction to the Scriptures, in that it makes the first sin to have been a weakening but not a perversion of human nature, and the work of regeneration to be not a renewal of the affections but merely a strengthening of the natural powers.

"The theory," says Dr. Strong, "regards the first sin as simply despoiling man of a special gift of grace and as putting him where he was when first created—still able to obey God and cooperate with God for his salvation, whereas Scripture represents man since the fall as **'dead through trespasses and sins,'** Ephesians 2:1; as incapable of true obedience, Romans 8:7, **'not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be'**; and as needing to be **'created in Christ Jesus for good works,'** Ephesians 2:10."

### III. RESULTS

Man's possession of the divine image and likeness resulted in four things:

#### 1. His physical form was a reflection of an original and heavenly type.

It is true that by His incarnation Christ took our nature: John 1:14; Galatians 4:4; Hebrews 2:14. But it is also true that by his creation man was molded after a divine pattern even as to his body: Ezekiel 1:26. In like manner the tabernacle was modeled after a heavenly pattern: Exodus 25:40; Numbers 8:4; Hebrews 8:1-5. Dr. Strong says: "Even in man's body were typified those higher attributes which chiefly constituted his likeness to God. A gross perversion of this truth, however, is the view which holds, upon the ground of Genesis 2:7 and 3:8, that the image of God consists in bodily resemblance to the Creator. In the first of these passages, it is not the divine image, but the body, that is formed of dust, and into this body the soul that possesses the divine image is breathed. The second of these passages is to be interpreted by those other portions of the Pentateuch in which God is represented as free from all limitations of matter: Genesis 11:5; 18:1-5."

## **2. His sensuous impulses were in subjection to the spirit.**

Dr. Strong says: “Here we are to hold a middle ground between two extremes. On the one hand, the first man possessed a body and a spirit so fitted to each other that no conflict was felt between their several claims. On the other hand, this physical perfection was not final and absolute, but relative and provisional. There was still room for progress to a higher state of being: Genesis 3:22.”

## **3. He had dominion over the lower creation:** Genesis 1:26, 28; Psalm 8:5-8.

Adam was the crown of creation. Having a perfect mind, he was not dependent upon the laborious processes of inductive and deductive reasoning in the acquisition of knowledge, but had immediate and intuitive insight into truth. Of this there are two proofs: first, his naming of the animals: Genesis 2:19, 20.

Evidently, Adam had insight into the nature and habits of each animal and gave it a name corresponding to these. Second, his naming of his helpmeet: Genesis 2:23, 24; 3:20. Adam first called her woman because she was taken out of him.

In English there is no connection between the words man and woman, but in Hebrew the connection is very close. In that language “man” is *ish*, and “woman” is *isha*. That is, literally, woman is the manness, or female man. Woman is not, as has been suggested, man’s woe, but rather his woo.

Next, Adam called his helpmeet Eve, because she was the mother of all living. “Eve” signifies living. Thus on the one hand, the name “woman” reflected her origin, and on the other hand, the name “Eve” reflected her destiny.

Of the woman’s creation Matthew Henry says: “Not out of his head to top him, nor out of his feet to be trampled on by him; but out of his side to be equal with him, under his arm to be protected by him, and near his heart to be beloved.”

**NOTE:** Man’s dominion over the lower creation involves his absolute separation from the animal kingdom—in origin, association, and destiny. A beast cannot ascend to the level of a man, but a man can easily descend to the level of a beast: Psalm 49:10; Proverbs 30:2; Jeremiah 10:21; II Peter 2:12. By the Law of Moses defilement with beasts was punishable by death: Leviticus 20:15, 16.

## **4. He had communion with God:** Genesis 3:8, 9.

Dr. Strong says: “Our first parents enjoyed the divine presence and teaching: Genesis 2:16. It would seem that God manifested Himself to them in visible form: Genesis 3:8. Companionship was both in kind and degree suited to their spiritual capacity, and by no means necessarily involved that perfected vision of God which is possible to beings of confirmed and unchanging holiness: Matthew 5:8; I John 3:2; Revelation 22:4.”

## **TOPIC FIVE: THE PROBATION OF MAN**

### **I. GENERAL STATEMENT**

The Scriptures teach that after his creation God placed man in a garden in Eden and subjected him to a state of probation: Genesis 2:8-17.

**NOTE:** Eden signifies pleasure, delight. Its exact site cannot be determined. Speaking generally, its location must have been in the Mesopotamian valley, near the headwaters of the Tigris and Euphrates. The wildest theories have been advanced as to where the Garden of Eden was. There is a serious book written by a serious scholar, called "*Paradise Found*," claiming that the Garden of Eden was at the North Pole. However, unless revolutionary topological and climatic changes have occurred, Peary's discovery exploded this theory.

### **II. DEFINITION OF PROBATION**

Probation, from a Latin word signifying to prove or test, is a period of trial under a law of duty, which is the test of obedience and is enforced by the sanctions of reward for a right choice and good conduct, and punishment for a wrong choice and evil conduct.

Miley says: "Probation is a temporary economy. Its central reality is responsibility for conduct under a law of duty."

### **III. NECESSITY OF PROBATION**

While our first parents were created with holy natures, whose fluctuating emotions and spontaneous tendencies were wholly toward the good, yet they were susceptible to temptation from without.

Consequently, a period of probation was essential in order to test their loyalty to God by obedience or disobedience to His command. Thus our divine Lord was likewise susceptible to temptation from without, from the reality and power of which He keenly suffered: Hebrews 2:18; 9:14.

**NOTE:** Dr. Miley says: "With a holy nature, there were yet susceptibilities to temptation. In temptation there is an impulse in the susceptibilities adverse to the law of duty. This is true even where it finds no response in the personal consciousness. Yet, in the measure of it, such impulse is a trial to obedience. The proof of it is in a primitive constitution with susceptibilities which might be the means of temptation. These facts are entirely consistent with the primitive holiness which we have maintained. In such a state primitive man began his moral life. The only way to confirmed blessedness was through temporary obedience. But obedience requires a law of duty and, with the natural incidence of trial and the possibility of failure, such a law must be a testing law. It thus appears that a probationary economy was the only one at all suited to the state of primitive man."

#### IV. PURPOSE OF PROBATION

The purpose of the probation of our first parents was, so to speak, to test their virtue—to transform their holy natures into holy characters. As has been pointed out, a moral nature is the result of creation, or birth; but moral character is produced only by probation, by the free personal choice of good in the presence of evil and with full power to choose evil. Now Adam and Eve were created with holy moral natures. A right choice—that is, obedience to God’s command—would have transformed these holy moral natures into holy moral characters. As it was, however, their wrong choice—that is, disobedience to the command—transformed their holy moral natures into sinful moral characters, and involved both themselves and their posterity in the guilt of sin and the defilement of depravity.

#### V. THE PROBATIONARY LAW

The probationary or testing law is recorded in Genesis 21:6b, 17: **“Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”**

In character this probationary or testing law was positive, not moral. The difference is that while “the obligation of a moral law is intrinsic and absolute; the obligation of a positive law arises from a divine commandment.” In other words, a moral command carries its own reason for obedience, but a positive command does not.

Thus, the Ten Commandments are moral in character, because we are so constituted as to understand their reasonableness and realize their necessity. For, the Ten Commandments are not right because they were given of God; they were given of God because they were right.

On the other hand, God’s call to Abraham to offer up Isaac (Genesis 22) was a positive command, because Abraham did not understand its reasonableness or realize its necessity.

Another name for positive command is personal command. Now, it is of the very essence of moral probation that the testing law should be a positive or personal command, the reasonableness and necessity of which are not made known to the one who is subjected to the probation. In the case of our first parents, as we have seen, the probationary law was a positive or personal command. It was God’s right to command: it was the duty of Adam and Eve to obey.

**NOTE:** Dr. Strong says: “Since man was not yet in a state of confirmed holiness, but rather of simple childlike innocence, he could be made perfect only through temptation. Hence the ‘**tree of the knowledge of good and evil**’: Genesis 2:9. The one slight command best tested the spirit of obedience. Temptation did not necessitate a fall. If resisted, it would strengthen virtue. In that case, the *posse non peccarre* would have become the *non posse peccarre*. (That is, the ability not to sin would have become the inability to sin). The tree was mainly a tree of probation. It is right for a father make his son’s title to his estate depend upon the performance of some filial duty, as Thaddeus Stevens made his son’s possession of property conditional upon his keeping the temperance-pledge. Whether, besides this, the tree of knowledge was naturally hurtful or poisonous, we do not know.”

## VI. REASONABLENESS OF PROBATION

The reasonableness of the primitive probation is seen from the following facts:

**1. In the love and wisdom of God**, who could not and would not have subjected our first parents to any state of trial or probationary test which was not for their highest development and eternal welfare and consequently absolutely necessary. Therefore the prohibition of Genesis 2:17 must have been just, wise, and good.

**2. In the manifold source of delight and satisfaction which were provided for Adam and Eve by their Maker:** Genesis 2:9. They had everything.

### TOPIC SIX: THE TEMPTATION OF MAN

#### I. GENERAL STATEMENT

The Scriptures clearly and distinctly teach that our first parents were tempted to sin by disobeying God's positive command: Genesis 3:1-6; II Corinthians 11:3; I Timothy 2:14.

#### II. THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument in the temptation of our first parents was the serpent: Genesis 3:1, 4, 5; II Corinthians 11:3.

**NOTE:** The serpent is included among the beasts. He is described as being more subtle than them all. The Hebrew word translated subtle signifies *crafty or cunning*. It is not unlikely that originally the serpent was a very beautiful creature; and he seems to have possessed the power of upright locomotion: Genesis 3:14.

#### III. THE HIGHER AGENT

The higher agent in the temptation of our first parents was Satan: Revelation 12:9.

**NOTE:** The devil used the serpent as an instrument in tempting Adam and Eve. Thus back of this "**beast of the field**" was a higher, even a supernatural intelligence. God's curse upon the serpent makes this fact unmistakable: Genesis 3:14, 15—particularly the latter verse.

#### IV. THE THREEFOLD FORM

Notice that the serpent approached the woman in two ways: first, by an affirmation followed by an interrogation, "**Yea, hath God said,**" etc.: Genesis 3:1. So he approached Jesus with an insinuation, "**If thou be the Son of God,**" etc.: Matthew 4:3. The writhing shape of the serpent is not unsuggestive of a question mark. Second, he made a flat contradiction of God's Word, "**Ye shall not surely die**": Genesis 3:4.

But in particular notice that in form the temptation of our first parents was threefold:

### **1. The Physical Nature.**

Satan first attacked Eve through her body. He showed her that the tree was “**good for food**”: Genesis 3:6a.

### **2. The Psychical Nature.**

Satan next attacked Eve through her mind. He showed her that the tree was “**pleasant (Hebrews a desire) to the eyes**”: Genesis 3:6b.

**3. Satan finally attacked her soul, or spirit.** He showed her that the tree was “**to be desired to make one wise**”: Genesis 3:6c.

**NOTE:** In the wilderness Satan patterned his temptation of Jesus after his temptation of our first parents. See Matthew 4:1-11; Luke 4:1-13.

We follow the order of Luke, whose Gospel is chronologically arranged. There we notice—as also in Matthew’s account:

- That *Christ’s body* was first attacked: in His intense hunger He was bidden to make bread of the stones at His feet.

- Next *Christ’s mind* was attacked: the vision of all the kingdoms of the world was an appeal to His ambition to make Himself a universal ruler, as Alexander the Great, Caesar, and Hannibal had aspired to be.

- Finally, *Christ’s soul, or spirit*, was attacked: from the pinnacle of the temple He was bidden, as the favorite of heaven, to hurl Himself into the abyss in presumptuous defiance alike of gravitation and Providence. But again, Satan tempts the children of God today, as he tempted Eve and Jesus. In I John 2:16 we find the same threefold attack:

- (1) “**The lust of the flesh**”;
- (2) “**the lust of the eyes**”;
- (3) “**the pride, or vain glory, of life.**”

We may call this the trinity of evil.

## **TOPIC SEVEN: THE FALL OF MAN**

### **GENERAL STATEMENT**

The Scriptures clearly and distinctly teach that Adam and Eve fell from their first estate, in sinning against God by disobeying His positive and personal command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil: Genesis 3:6b; Romans 5:12, 19; I Timothy 2:14.

This was the first or “original sin.”

**NOTE:** Dr. Torrey points out five steps leading to the first sin;

- 1. Listening to slanders against God.**
- 2. Doubting His Word and love.**
- 3. Looking at what God had forbidden.**
- 4. Lusting for what God had prohibited.**
- 5. Disobeying God’s command.**

As Dr. Strong says: “The first sin, was in Eve’s isolating herself and choosing to seek her own pleasure, without regard to God’s will. This initial selfishness it was which led her to listen to the tempter instead of rebuking him or flying from him, and to exaggerate the divine command in her response: Genesis 3:3 . . . This was followed by positive unbelief, and by a conscious and presumptuous cherishing of desire for the forbidden fruit as a means of independence and knowledge. Thus, unbelief, pride, and lust all sprang from the self-isolating, self-seeking spirit, and fastened upon the means of gratifying it: Genesis 3:6.”

In this connection we may notice the Apostle James’ account of the origin, development, and fruition of sin: James 1:13-15.

The consequences of sin were manifold and varied; we may notice them under four topics as follows: The Immediate Effects of Sin; The Fourfold Divine Judgment; The Threefold Separation; and The Threefold Death.

## **I. THE IMMEDIATE EFFECTS OF SIN**

The immediate effects of sin (Genesis 3:7-13) were six in number, viz:

- 1. A sense of shame.** This was due to the awakening of conscience.
- 2. The covering of fig leaves.** This was a bloodless covering. See Genesis 3:21; Philippians 3:9.
- 3. A feeling of fear.** This arose from their guilty conscience.
- 4. An attempt at concealment.** Foolishly Adam and Eve supposed that they could hide from the presence of God.
- 5. An effort at self-vindication.** Though guilty, yet Adam and Eve tried to justify themselves.
- 6. The shifting of blame.** Adam laid the blame for his sin upon Eve, and Eve laid the blame for her sin upon the serpent, i. e., Satan.

## **II. THE FOURFOLD DIVINE JUDGMENT**

After this painful scene the Lord God pronounced a fourfold judgment: Genesis 3:14-19. This was:—

- 1. Upon the serpent.** This was the *curse of degradation*: Micah 7:17.

**NOTE:** During the Millennium the curse upon the serpent will not be removed, for the serpent is the type of Satan: Isaiah 65:25.

**2. Upon the woman.** This was the *judgment of sorrow and subjection*: John 16:21.

**NOTE:** The blessing of the Gospel mitigates the rigor of the law: I Timothy 2:15.

**3. Upon the man.** This was the *judgment of sorrow and toil*: Job 5:7; Ecclesiastes 2:22, 23.

**NOTE:** Work is a blessing and not a curse: Genesis 2:9, 15. It is only the curse resting upon the ground which makes man's labor vexatious and unremunerative.

**4. Upon the ground.** This was the *curse of thorns and thistles*.

**NOTE:** Like the serpent, the thorn is the natural enemy of man: Matthew 7:16. It is used in Scripture as a symbol of evil: Numbers 33:55; II Corinthians 12:7. Our Lord's mock crown was composed of thorns: John 19:2, 5. During the Millennium the curse upon the ground will be removed: Isaiah 55:13.

### **III. THE THREEFOLD SEPARATION**

The fourfold divine judgment resulted in a threefold separation: Genesis 3:22-24. Thus Adam and Eve were separated:—

#### **1. From the tree of life.**

**NOTE:** The tree of life represents wisdom: Proverbs 3:18. Wisdom personified is Christ: I Corinthians 1:24. So the tree of life was an emblem of Christ: Revelation 2:7; 22:14. Adam's body was mortal: Genesis 2:7; I Corinthians 15:44, 45, 47. Science teaches us that physical life involves decay and loss.

There was, however, a divine provision for checking this decay and loss, and preserving the body's youth. This was by means of the tree of life. It accomplished this through its sacramental value; that is, eating of this tree was symbolical of the communion of Adam and Eve with God and of their dependence upon Him, but this only because it had a physical efficacy. Physical immortality without holiness would have been unending misery.

Accordingly, our first parents were shut out from the tree of life, until by redemption and resurrection such of their descendants as accept Christ can be prepared to partake thereof. Thus, our glorified bodies will be preserved throughout eternity by eating of the tree of life which is typical of our blessed Lord Himself: Revelation 2:7; 22:14.

Physical decay and loss, which ended in the death of their bodies, began the instant Adam and Eve were denied access to the tree of life. The nine hundred and thirty years Adam lived, as also the extraordinary longevity of the antediluvians, is evidence of their wonderful natural vitality.

“If Adam had maintained his integrity, the body might have been developed and transfigured without the intervention of death. In other words, the *posse non mori* (that is, able not to die) might have become a *non posse mori* (that is, not able to die)” (Strong). In his “*Crises of the Christ*” Campbell Morgan treats the transfiguration of Christ as the flowering of humanity; he regards it as God’s demonstration of the fruition of the body—if there had been no sin.

## **2. From the Garden of Eden.**

The only way to make the exclusion of Adam and Eve from the tree of life effective was to drive them from the Garden of Eden. And this the LORD God did, sending man forth “**to till the ground from whence he was taken.**”

## **3. From the personal and visible presence of God.**

Sin separates man from God,—and it is the only thing that can separate man from God. When Adam and Eve hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God, it was because their sin with its resulting guilt and shame had morally unfitted them for personal and face-to-face communion and fellowship with their Maker. Separation from the Garden of Eden, therefore, simply sealed the spiritual separation of man from God which sin had already brought about. Henceforth, our first parents and their posterity had only a symbolical representation of Deity: the cherubim and the flaming sword placed at the east of the Garden of Eden were the visible manifestation of the LORD God. Thither the godly antediluvians came to worship and sacrifice: for there is no evidence that these primitive types of the presence and power, the mercy and redeeming grace of God, did not remain until swept away by the flood.

**NOTE:** The flaming sword (3:24) was the first appearance of that self-luminous flame which, as the Shekinah glory, rested over the mercy seat in the Holy of Holies in the tabernacle and the temple.

# **IV. THE THREFOOLD DEATH**

In connection with the prohibition to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil the LORD God said, “**In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die**” (lit. dying thou shalt die): Genesis 2:17.

This death, which was the result of sin, was threefold, viz: physical, spiritual, and eternal.

## **1. Physical death.**

*Physical death is the separation of the soul from the body.*

It includes, according to Dr. Strong, “all those temporal evils and sufferings which result from disturbance of the original harmony between soul and body, and which are the working of death in us”: Numbers 16:29; 27-3; Psalm 90:7-9, 11; Isaiah 38:17, 18; Romans 4:24, 25; 6:9, 10; 8:3, 10, 11; I Corinthians 15:21, 22; Galatians 3:13; I Peter 4:6.

**NOTE:** Some regard physical death as a part of the penalty of sin while others regard it as rather the natural consequence of sin. In either view, it seems to be clear that weakness and disease followed by death resulted primarily from the exclusion of Adam and Eve from the tree of life.

## **2. Spiritual death.**

*Spiritual death is the separation of the spirit from God.*

It includes, according to Dr. Strong, “all that pain of conscience, loss of peace, and sorrow of spirit, which result from the disturbance of the normal relation between the soul and God”: Matthew 8:22; Luke 15:32; John 5:24; 8:51; Romans 8:13; Ephesians 2:1; 5:14; I Timothy 5:6; James 5:20; I John 3:14.

**NOTE:** Dr. Strong says: “It cannot be doubted that the penalty pronounced in the Garden and fallen upon the race is primarily and mainly that death of the soul which consists in its separation from God. In this sense only, death was fully visited upon Adam in the day on which he ate the forbidden fruit: Genesis 2:17. In this sense only, death is escaped by the Christian: John 11:26. For this reason, in the parallel between Adam and Christ, Romans 5:12-21, the apostle passes from the thought of mere physical death in the early part of the passage to that of both physical and spiritual death at its close, verse 21: **‘as sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord’**—where ‘eternal life’ is more than endless physical existence, and ‘death’ is more than death of the body.”

## **3. Eternal death.**

*Eternal death is the result of spiritual death.*

It is, according to Strong, “the culmination and completion of spiritual death, and essentially consists of the correspondence of the outward with the inward state of the evil soul: Acts 1:25. It would seem to be inaugurated by some peculiar repellent energy of the divine holiness, Matthew 25:41; II Thessalonians 1:9, and to involve positive retribution visited by a personal God upon both body and soul of the evildoer: Matthew 10:28; Hebrews 10:31; Revelation 14:11.” Eternal death is the same as hell, or *gehenna*, or the second death: Matthew 10:28; see II Kings 23:10; Revelation 20:14.

**NOTE:** Both spiritual and eternal death were arrested by grace through the institution of sacrifice: Genesis 3:21; 44; Hebrews 9:22. Thus, the Coming One who was to “**taste death for every man**” saved those in the Old Testament age who through obedience and sacrifice believed in Him: Romans 3:25; Hebrews 2:9.

## **QUESTIONS FOR STUDY**

1. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the creation of man?
2. What do they teach concerning the method of his creation?
3. What do they teach concerning the unity of the race?

4. What fourfold corroboration have we of the unity of the race?
5. What twin truths are involved in the unity of the race?
6. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the constitution of man by creation?
7. What is the primary signification of the Hebrew words for soul and spirit? of the Greek words for soul and spirit?
8. What is the meaning of the terms trichotomy and dichotomy?
9. Give a general statement of the trichotomous view of man's nature.
10. Mention the Scriptural points which are believed to support the trichotomous view.
11. Give a general statement of the dichotomous view of man's nature.
12. Mention the Scriptural points which are believed to support the dichotomous view.
13. On which side of the question does the witness of consciousness stand?
14. In your judgment is the teaching of Scripture conclusive or inconclusive as to the matter? Is the subject vital to salvation?
15. State the three views as to the origin of the soul.
16. What is meant by the moral nature of man?
17. What are the essential elements of the moral nature?
18. Discuss the signification of the word conscience.
19. What is the nature of conscience? State the two views.
20. What are the constituent elements of conscience as given by mental analysis?
21. What is meant by free agency?
22. What are the constituent elements of free agency?
23. What is meant by Fatalism? by Determinism?
24. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the image of God in man?
25. What is the signification of the Hebrew words for image and likeness?
26. What were the constituent elements of the image of God in man?
27. In what does natural likeness consist? Why is it inalienable?
28. In what did moral likeness consist?
29. How is the original righteousness, or holiness, to be viewed?
30. Distinguish clearly between nature and character.
31. What two erroneous views are held as to man's original state?
32. What four things resulted from man's possession of the divine image and likeness?
33. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the probation of man?
34. What does the word Eden signify? Where was the Garden of Eden probably located?
35. Define probation.
36. Show wherein a period of moral probation for Adam and Eve was necessary.
37. What was the purpose of the primitive probation?
38. What was the probationary law?
39. Distinguish clearly between a moral law and a positive command.
40. Show wherein the primitive probation was reasonable.
41. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the temptation of man?
42. What was the instrument in the temptation?
43. Who was the higher agent?
44. In what two ways did the serpent approach the woman?
45. What was the threefold form of the temptation?
46. Trace the parallel between the temptation of our first parents and that of Jesus.

47. What Scripture passage teaches that Satan tempts Christians after the pattern of the Edenic and the wilderness temptations?
48. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the fall of man?
49. Point out five steps leading to the first sin.
50. Mention six immediate effects of sin.
51. What was the fourfold divine judgment in consequence of sin?
52. What was the threefold separation which resulted from sin?
53. What did the tree of life represent and what was its use?
54. What was the threefold death which sin caused?
55. How may the physical death of Adam and Eve be explained?
56. How do spiritual and eternal death stand related? What are some other Scriptural expressions for eternal death?

**~ end of chapter 4 ~**

<http://www.baptistbiblebelievers.com/>

\*\*\*