

**SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY**

**ANTHROPOLOGY**

**DR. E. C. BRAGG**

# ANTHROPOLOGY

## Table of Contents

### A. The Origin of Man

1. Man's origin considered negatively (Evolution)
  - a. Arguments against it; the unaccounted-for gaps
  - b. The two million or more species
  - c. The pure guesswork in all evolutionary teachings
  - d. The fruit of the teaching of evolution
2. Man's origin considered positively from the Scriptures
3. Man as a race.

### B. The Constituent Elements in Man

1. The Dichotomous view (only two parts)
2. The Trichotomous view (the three parts)
3. The chart of the Tabernacle - God's intended type of Trichotomy

### C. The Origin of the Soul Since the First Creation

1. The pre-existent theory (metempsychosis)
2. The creation theory (insufflation)
3. The traducian theory (traduction)

### D. The Eternality of the Human Soul

1. The spontaneous sentiment of all mankind
2. Theological proof
3. Moral argument
4. The universal hunger and instinct for immortality
5. The Scriptural proof

### E. The Personality of Man

1. Intellect
2. Sensibility
3. Volition

### F. The Moral Nature of Man

1. Conscience
2. Freedom of will

## G. Man's Original State as Created

1. Man's physical condition
2. Man's moral condition
3. The image of God in man

## H. Probation

1. The nature of Adam's probation
2. The limitations of Adam's probation

## I. The Fall of Man

1. The temptation of man
  - a. The devil's side of the temptation
  - b. Eve's side of the temptation
  - c. Adam's side of the temptation
2. Adam's fall
3. The effects of the fall
  - a. Spiritual death
  - b. Physical death
  - c. Eternal death
4. Adam's separation
5. The fourfold judgment for man's first sin
  - a. Upon the serpent
  - b. Upon the woman
  - c. Upon the man
  - d. Upon the ground

## J. The Tabernacle in the Wilderness

## K. Tripartitism or Trichotomy

## L. Trichotomists Teach Dualism

## M. What is Wrong with their Theory

## N. Scriptural Proofs of Trichotomy

## ANTHROPOLOGY

The doctrine of Anthropology is the doctrine of man - his origin, destiny, and redemption. It is interested in the Scriptural presentation of man's divine origin, his composition, his spiritual state, and his redemption. It seeks the answer from the Scriptures as to the questions of man's beginning, the why of his condition now, and the where of his going.

### A. The Origin of Man

It is only natural that man, who is capable of knowing himself, should come to ask the question, "Where did I come from?" It is only natural that the Bible should answer that question. Nowhere outside of the Bible is the question adequately answered. Unconverted man has sought to answer the question of man's origin by purely natural mechanical forces and pure guesswork.

#### 1. Man's Origin Negatively Considered

This is the so-called scientific theory of man's origin. Having rejected any supernatural account of the origin of man, men have sought for some natural answer to the perplexing question. It must be remembered that the theory of evolution is contrary in total to the Biblical account. There is no possible reconciliation. It is easy to understand then that evolution is a concoction to avoid the biblical account of man's creation. It is man seeking another origin other than God. It is primarily atheistic. It is the preference of brute ancestry to Divine ancestry. This can be seen by the following quotation by a noted evolutionist, W. P. Barbellion:

"How I hate the man who talks about the 'brute creation,' with an ugly emphasis on the word 'brute.' As for me, I am proud of my close kinship with other animals. I take jealous pride in my Simian ancestry (Simian means monkey). I like to think I was once a magnificent hairy fellow living in the trees and that my frame came down through the geological ages of time, via sea jelly and worms and amphioxus fish, dinosaurs, and apes. Who can exchange these for the pallid couple in the Garden of Eden?"

This shows his preference. Evolution claims man's body came to him through an infinite number of evolutions from the lower forms to higher forms through inherent forces from sea jelly, through all the forms of fish and animal life, through monkeys apes, gorillas, and then to man. Today, many evolutionists have given up the dead and monkey ancestry on man's family tree and say now the monkeys came down on a parallel family descent. His complex mind came from the simple nervous impulses of lower forms of life; and his moral nature came from the simple rudimentary signs of moral sense in animals, such as the skull of the dog, when caught doing wrong. All this evolved over vast geological ages covering hundreds of millions of years, as by some authorities, and thousands of years by others.

Evolution is not a science, but a theory, a hypothesis, or guess. Prof. Conklin, an evolutionist, declares "Evolution must ever remain a theory." The theory of evolution concisely stated, according to LeConte, is, "A continuous progressive change according

to fixed laws and by resident forces." Clarence Darwin wasn't the first to propound it, for Lamarck presented it sometime before Darwin. Huxley, a successor to Darwin, declared, "It is clear that the doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of creation. As applied to the creation as a whole, it is opposed to that of direct creative coalition. Evolution, if consistently accepted, makes it impossible to believe the Bible." This is what we mean when we charge evolution with being atheistic.

Carl Bogt said, "Evolution turns the Creator out of doors." There can be no such thing as "theistic evolution." Both evolution and the Bible cannot be true. By the former definition of evolution, man originated by:

a. Continuous progressive change. The process of making man from lesser forms should still be going on all over the world today.

b. According to fixed laws. That is to say there can be no change in the method. If it was going on 10,000 years ago, it should still be going on today. It couldn't have been one thing until it made a man, then change to mere development of man now.

c. By resident forces; not outside interference; all must come from within. However great the change made, it is all from within. The theory of evolution, trying to explain the origin of man, does not tell where any of the material came from which man evolved. It makes a number of notable failures in explanation down the family tree since then. Briefly stated, and summing up the various vague descents of man by Darwin and all the other evolutionists, we get a composite picture like this:

The first life on this planet (its origin a mystery) was an Amoeba cell, a simple life cell. This is traced to a little more complex snail-like creature, than some forms of worms, then through some fish stages, finally becoming amphibious, and learning to breathe air instead of water, and leaving the water, the tadpole stage, it enters a frog-like existence. This isn't a fairy tale but serious scientific presentation which becomes something on the order of an alligator, then a tree-climbing possum, which evolves into a lemur (monkey to you), then ape or gibbon, then chimpanzee, then man.

Here is the ascent of man from beginning to end, in which he moves freely into the water and out and in and out, some three or four times. He has about seven different kinds of tails in his ascent; and without any aiming point or design, by pure chance he winds up a man. Can that be scientific?

There is a world of arguments against evolution outside the Bible. There are any number of true scientists who admit the pure unadulterated guesswork involved in the theory of evolution. Even its most ardent advocates admit it, yet would brand a man as an ignoramus and a benighted soul who would dare to disbelieve it. For now here are a few arguments against it:

a. The notable unaccounted-for gaps.

1. The first and greatest is the gap between the non-living and the living. The real origin they set out to find is merely pushed back further and unexplained. Spontaneous generation has long since been explored and isn't believed by any competent scientist anymore. One theory went so far as to assert that life came to this planet on a meteor from somewhere else (Sir William Thompson). Kant, the

great philosopher, said, "Give me matter, and I will explain the formation of the world; but give me matter ONLY and I cannot explain the formation of a caterpillar." Huxley said, "Of the causes which led to the origin of living matter, it may be said that we know absolutely nothing." In the Encyclopedia Britannica he says, "The chasm between the non-living and the living the present state of knowledge cannot bridge."

2. The next great gap is between the vegetable and the animal kingdom. There is not a missing link half vegetable and half animal. The gulf between free-moving, self-propelling, self-determining creatures and vegetables is un-bridged.

3. The next gulf of real size, leaving out the gulf between species, is that of the highest form of animal life and man. If evolution is, "a continuous process according to fixed laws," there should not just be isolated cases of half man and half beast, for a deformed person should be born sometimes, which wouldn't prove evolution but work contrary to it; but there should be millions and billions of intermediate creatures. In truth, there shouldn't be species at all, but gradual graduations all up the line of ascent.

Between man and animal there is the gap of man's intelligence, his moral nature, and his act of worship. How could those come to him out of brute ancestry? Concerning these gaps, Dr. Alfred R. Wallace, the associate of Darwin, said, "There must have been three interpositions of Divine and supernatural power to account for things as they are. There is a gulf between matter and nothing; another between life and the non-living; and a third between man and the lower creation - and science cannot bridge any of them." Evolution is supposed to explain origins, and yet that is what it fails to do. It starts out by a failure to tell from where force and matter came. It just takes their existence for granted and attributes them to a first cause. Farther down the line it fails to explain the origin of life. Its greatest exponents admit its failure to explain the gap between vegetable and animal life. This new power of locomotion, feeling, etc., Mr. Wallace says, "It is completely beyond any explanation by matter." Throughout the major divisions of all nature and its origins, evolution is confessedly ignorant. It doesn't even pretend to account for them. We cannot help asking, "What is the value of and why should we believe a theory of origins which admittedly is unable to account for the origin of matter, force, life, animal kingdom, and the species, and even man?"

b. The second argument against evolution is the two million or more known species. If evolution were true, there would be no species at all but one hodge-podge of creatures in all stages of advancement. The very clear-cut lines of species are a proof against evolution. Darwin wrote, "There are two or three million species on earth - sufficient field, one might think, for observation. But it must be said today, that, in spite of all the efforts of trained observers, not one change of a species into another is on record." (*Life & Letters*, Vol.3). Where then is the basis for the foundation law of Darwin's theory, that is, the so-called "Law of Natural Selection"? This was, to explain it all: when mating, the animal always selected the best; this improved the evolutionary line. It just isn't so.

The evolutionist tries to hold to two antagonistic laws here as in some other similar cases; they are: the law of tendency to depart from its ancestral types, and second, a tendency to hold tightly to all its peculiarities and transmit them to its offspring. These two tendencies just couldn't exist in the same creature. The former is just not so, for everywhere in nature there is the stubborn clinging to original instincts and peculiarities despite even man's efforts to improve for his use. Luther Burbank sought by every conceivable means to develop a new species but never succeeded in crossing the barrier of species, only to develop new varieties in the same species. Every variety artificially developed, if left to itself, always tended back to the original stock; and many times an artificial variety, instead of reproducing at all, proved as sterile as the laughable mule. The Bible statement is still true: each produces after his kind.

c. The third argument against evolution is the pure guesswork it contains. Rather than an explanation of the origin of man, it is merely a patchwork of every man's guess against his brother's. This is plainly seen in every essay on evolution; just note the various words denoting speculation; Prof. Clodd wrote, "The absence of facts forces us to confine ourselves largely to suggestions and probabilities" ("Making of a Man").

Prof. Henry Fairfield Osborn, head of the American Museum of Natural History and who was formerly a leader in the field of evolution, wrote – "The mode of the origin of life is a matter of pure speculation" (*The Origin and Evolution of Life*). Then he sets forth five theories or "five hypotheses" of the origin of life. But he started by the admission, "It's just pure speculation." Where is your science - Darwin in his works on evolution used such words as, "It may be supposed," etc., over eight hundred times. In the first chapter of only 36 pages he used suppositional, 12 different words, over 100 times such as: "I think, I suppose, we must assume, it might, well might be," and all through "believe" in but 100 pages, 40 times.

Note the time element used by evolutionists. When guessing at the age of man upon the earth, their guesses range at some 7000 to 4 and some 20 billion years apart. The Lickie's, father and son, vary from 1 to 3 million years. Myers says that the Stone Age was not thousands of years, but millions of years ago. M. Rutot says man is 139,000 years old; Osborn, 500,000; James Geikie, 200,000; Croll, 980,000; Townsed, 6,000 (he is nearer, anyhow). Is this the science which is supposed to throw out the Bible story of creation, which accounts for the moral nature of man for a patchwork of guesses and hypotheses which is not proven, can't be proven, and never shall be proven?

d. The last argument we shall consider is the fruit of the teaching of evolution. The third law upon which Darwin based his evolutionary theory is "the survival of the fittest." If the evolutionist were true to his theory, he would demand that all cripples and weaklings should be both sterilized and, where possible, killed. It wouldn't build a hospital nor take care of its aged and infirmed. Therefore, this is a continual plea for euthanasia, falsely defined "painless, happy death." But the literal Greek is "eu"- "well"- and "thanatos" – "death", so "well or better dead." Hitler taught and practiced that, as did Stalin and every other despotic ruler.

It was this philosophy, pressed to conclusion, which led Nietchie into the German philosophy of "the German superman" and "German Kulture," which produced World

War I and World War II. It breaks down every restraint for law. Teach a boy or girl that he is a glorified brute, not responsible to God or man for his actions, and you train a criminal and an anarchist. America's crime wave and low moral ebb can be traced to two things: the failure of the church and the modern teachings in our school of evolution and immoral sociology, and now in the last years, "the outlawing of God, the Bible and the Ten Commandments and any religion or morality from all public schools.

## 2. Man's origin considered positively

(From the Scriptural account Genesis 1:26-2:7) In the creation of all the other constituents of the home God was preparing for man, there is the word of power going forth from God calling them into being, "Let the earth bring forth," and merely the creative willing into being of the animal kingdom. When He would make man, there is not merely speaking him into being; but there is solemn consideration and counsel, which bespeaks the important place he is to fill. It breathes the message of man's awful destiny as head of all earthly creation and in his relationship to God. He is separate from all other creation as not evolving from it, but as a separate, distinct creation of God. The word 'bara' or create in Genesis 1:17 signifies an absolute creation distinct from all other creations. The Scriptures could not say it in any other way to make it plainer. The Scriptural picture of man's creation holds man up in a high and lofty position as coming full-bloom from the hand of his God and responsible to Him.

Man is the consummation of God's creative power, containing in his body the proof of the Scriptural statement, Genesis 2:7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." (It is of interest to know how Moses knew 3,500 years ago that the body is made out of the same elements as make up the ground, unless he wrote by inspiration.) Man's material element is clearly separated from the spiritual; he is both "of the earth earthly and of the heaven heavenly" with a body fashioned from the earth and with a spiritual nature breathed into his nostrils of God. Evolution would have man coming entirely of dirt, ignoring or positively denying the Scriptural addition to man's personality: "The spirit of man that goeth upward" from "The spirit of the beast that goeth downward" (Ecclesiastes 3:21), back to the God who gave it.

This man is accountable to God. Here then is the picture from the Bible as to the origin of all there is of man: God fashioning his body into a mature fully developed man from the dust of the ground, and then breathing into him the spiritual nature and life. It teaches the immediate creation of Adam just as graphically as it does the immediate creation of Eve.

As to the time of man's origin, it is well to remember that Archbishop Ussher in his Bible chronology was not inspired, so there is no dogmatical stand on the part of theology for 6,000 years of the history of man. It could be a little longer or shorter. True science of geology is coming to the front to give some proofs that the time of man's arrival upon the earth is not much over that date. From the study of generations it isn't hard to prove the time of the flood as the new beginning of the race. There should be many more people upon the earth if it could be proved that man is older than he is here.

### 3. Man as a race

The Biblical account of man's creation is further proved by the unity of the human race. As there could be no such things as species if evolution were true, so man wouldn't be a race if evolution were true. Instead of a clear type, no matter the color, there would be a heterogeneous conglomeration of all kinds of types. Neither chance nor a multiple beginning would give the same result of one type. It is the clear teaching of Scripture that man is one race, Acts 26:26 - "Hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell upon the earth." It is the very basis of our salvation. As we all died in Adam, every man received a fallen nature from Adam, so all are included in the atonement of Christ, who died for all and became the Federal Head of a new race (Romans 5:12,19). There are a number of evidences from science, which prove the unity of the human race:

- a. Language. Comparative philology shows that most of the languages of earth have a common origin. There are so many points in common.
- b. History. In tracing the great movements of the races of earth, there is the gradual leading back to a common origin somewhere in central Asia.
- c. Psychology. There is a common mental activity among all men. They possess the same mental and moral characteristics. There is a unity of the traditions and myths among all nations no matter how barbarian or isolated from other men, nor how far back they are traced.
- d. Physiology. All races are fruitful one with another - same body temperature, same diseases, same pulse frequency, same composition, and bodily make-up, and same blood. (This is the real basis for the determination of species or "kind," fertility in reproduction.)

### B. The Constituent Elements in Man

The teaching of monism, (a unochotomy) that man is essentially a unit without any difference between soul and body, is erroneous. The Scriptures certainly teach that there is a material part to man and an immaterial part. There is a part of me which somehow can, in a manner of speaking, stand off and contemplate the body. The material part of man is the body, and the immaterial part is the spirit and soul of man. This can be readily seen from the account of man's creation in Genesis 2:7. Here is the distinct formation of the dead body - (or it could be only sensual life, similar to all organisms, or cellular life) merely mass, without any human life or personality - the molding of his bodily shape. There stood the senseless frame, and there God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. This is the spirit nature of man - the candle of God in the soul of man, the part of man that contacts God. "And man became a living soul." When God put this spirit of life in man, there was awakened the third element of man; "he became a living soul." This is the medium between the spirit and the body, a third element joining the two.

Such are the teachings of all the Scriptures. There are two parts of man's constitution: material and immaterial, body and the generic name for both soul and spirit, "soul." "Fear not him which is able to destroy the body but is not able to destroy the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matthew 10:28). The word "soul" here is used in its multiple senses to signify both soul and spirit as that immaterial part of man which

survives the death or destruction of the material part of man or the body. This brings us to the consideration of various views concerning the essential elements which are in man:

### 1. The Dichotomous view

This view holds the duality of man - that spirit and soul are one and the same thing, that man isn't a trinity but just two parts. They base their view upon the many passages, which use the word 'soul' to signify all of the immaterial part of man, such as the one considered above. It is true that soul is used sometimes to signify this part of man and sometimes spirit. In the light of two or more passages clearly separating them these passages must be considered as merely using the term soul or spirit in a plural sense to signify the whole immaterial nature of man. Such are the terms "Lose your soul." Soul here must mean all of the immaterial part of man in contrast to death of the body. (Also the usage of "spirit man" in Ecclesiastes 3:21 for all of man's immaterial or spiritual nature.)

### 2. The Trichotomous view

This view holds to the triune composition of man and is the one which is the teaching of the Scriptures - that man is made up of spirit, soul and body, each a real unity. The body is the tabernacle of the soulish nature of man, and the soul is the tabernacle of the God-inbreathed spirit of man. It is this spirit of man that contains the primary image of God in man, since "God is Spirit." The soulish, or immaterial nature, is made up of the soul of natural life of man, and the spirit is the highest part of man's nature, where he is supposed to contact God.

No matter, the many passages where one word or another is used to denote both spirit and soul, there are some passages which irrefutably teach the Trichotomous view. How can any other theory be held in the light of Hebrews 4:12 - "For the Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow." How could it be taught plainer than that the immaterial part of man is composed of soul and spirit as separate entities, while the material part is spoken of as joints and marrow, organs of motion and sensation? The Word of God is able to pierce or separate and take apart each element of man's constitution: spiritual, psychic, and corporeal, as the priest of the Old Testament dissected the sacrifice and offered it separately upon the altar in order to discover any secret blemish. So likewise is the passage in I Thessalonians 5:23 - "And I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." With the body man is world or sense-conscious (with the five bodily senses); with the soul man is self-conscious; and with the spirit man is God-conscious. Man is like the Tabernacle in the wilderness. The outer court is the place where the congregation gathered from without. The holy place was the place of ministry for the priest. But the most holy place was where God abode and met man.

### C. The Origin of the Soul since the First Creation

There enters here the question of the origin of each individual soul of man born into the world since the creation of the first soul of man in Adam. There have been three theories advanced to explain this question.

#### 1. The Pre-Existent Theory (Called Metempsychosis, and basis for the error of "Transmigration of the Soul.")

This theory comes down from ancient times and has found some exponents even in modern times. It holds that all the souls were created at one time and are reincarnated in each birth. It is supposed to answer the perplexing question of 'Why one is healthy and another is sick; why one is born wealthy and another poor (the disparaging differences in conditions in different lives)?' It is supposed to explain instincts and the soul's possession of unlearned knowledge. It is supposed to explain the strong depravity of the natural man, upon the theory that pre-existent life, having welded strong chains of preference toward evil, affects this life. This theory is objected to on the grounds of our having no knowledge of that previous life. Christ remembered His pre-existence. It is also rejected on the absolute absence of any Scriptural proof, being contrary to the general trend of truth.

2. The Creation Theory (Called "Insufflation Theory," Dr. Chas. Hodge, Systematic Theology Vol.2 p 70, 1940 - taught it). This theory holds that each soul is immediately created at birth and joined to the body. The advocates of the theory quote verses, which speak of God as the author of life, those which made God the Creator of the soul. Those same verses, however, give God as the Creator of the body. They make the human parents to be nothing but the author of the body and God the author of the highest part of man. This throws the charge against God of directly creating evil, if this soul He creates is depraved. This would teach that man is not a race, but all are in immediate creation at conception or birth, and denies inherited guilt.

3. The Traducian Theory (Tertulian called it "The doctrine of Traduction.") This view was first propounded by Tertulian and later by Augustine. It holds the immediate creation of the whole human race in Adam, both soul and body, and passed on by natural propagation, the souls being only mediate created by the power of God as He upholds all His laws of nature. This theory alone accords with the Scriptural teaching of Adam as the head of the race, not merely body, but our nature. Thus we partake of his fallen nature, not only a sin-marked body. Only once did God breathe into man the breath of life. This shows the marked mental and spiritual characteristics handed down from father to son. Those are not bodily elements but soulish elements.

### D. The Eternality of the Human Soul, or the Endlessness of Man's Existence.

The term "immortality of the soul" is not strictly theological, for the term "immortal" has to do with the body. The soul has never been mortal but immaterial. Only the body can be immortal and mortal; the soul is never called immortal in the Scriptures, but they do teach its endless existence. Many doubt the eternal existence of the wicked but very few indeed the

eternal existence of the righteous. Yet the Scriptures are plain on that score. The same word is used of both the righteous and the wicked in Matthew 25:46 - "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." This would make everlasting life or existence a gift of redemption rather than a state of man's existence. Like the existence of God upon which the eternity of the soul depends, the eternality of human existence is incapable of natural proof. Like God's existence, the Scriptures nowhere seek to prove, but always assume and accept it. But there are some philosophical proofs:

1. It is the natural and spontaneous sentiment of all mankind. It has never been denied except by philosophers on speculative grounds. It is the universal intuition, as can be proved by every religion and tradition.

2. The teleological proof. There is in the consciousness of every man the manifest impossibility of fulfilling all that the soul is capable of in this life. There is everywhere the feeling of limitations and boundaries imprisoning the soul, keeping man from fulfilling the fullness of his capabilities. To suppose that its career is ended by death is to think of work begun but never ended.

3. The moral argument. There is the feeling of the need of a more equal distribution of rewards and punishment. There are too many injustices in life, which have no recompense commensurate to the crimes. Some righteous suffer while some ungodly prosper. There must be another life after death where right and justice prevail and life's inequalities are amended.

4. There is the universal desire for immortality. The God who placed it there must have made the reality to correspond to it, according to "the law of correlation." This could be called the argument from analogy. There are the arguments of the chrysalis and the butterfly and of the 80,000 varieties of seeds, each preaching the message of life after death. As William Jennings Bryan put it, "If the Father deigns to touch with divine power the cold and pulseless heart of the buried acorn and to make it burst forth from its prison walls, will He leave neglected in the earth the soul of man made in His own image?"

5. It is the clear teachings of the Word of God. Every admonition of our moral responsibility to God, every warning of judgment, every promise of heaven, every statement of salvation, is based upon the fact of man's endless existence. The imperative of the Gospel is that man is an endless creature with two possible eternal abodes in eternity, heaven and hell, with his moral state the conditioning factor as to which he shall go. His endless existence or immortality is not a gift of redemption but of creation, Ecclesiastes 3:11 - "He hath set the world (eternity) in their heart"; also verse 14, "I know that whatsoever God doeth it shall be forever." All His creative works are eternal. Science says energy is indestructible and that matter cannot be destroyed, only changed. The Scriptures speak of the eternality of every creature having personality: the unfallen angels, fallen angels, the devil, and man. The passages are too numerous to give them all, but here are just a few things:

a. There is no doubt in the minds of the majority of the endless existence of the righteous but only of the wicked. They try to twist the word "everlasting" (aionion) into meaning "age-lasting," signifying only a definite period or age with a definite ending. The word is never used this way, and no one but

someone with an ax to grind would ever think of any other meaning than forever. But the usage in the Bible tells us what the word means: it is used 72 times in the New Testament, 44 times used in the phrase "eternal life," or "everlasting life." There is no doubt that life is never ending. Once it is used with the word "habitations," signifying our future home in glory, and that must mean endless. Once it is used with "weight of glory" as our reward for enduring afflictions for Christ, and the word must mean endless.

Once it is used with "the house not made with hands" eternal in the heavens. It must mean endless here. The very contrast here is between our present, mortal, lifetime bodies and that immortal, endless body, so for some 11 or 12 more times where the sense is indisputable, of "the redemption of Christ" (eternal salvation) and of the Holy Spirit, and we know He is eternal, and of the priesthood of Christ; 59 times in all where the indisputable meaning is endless. And so for the 13 remaining times used concerning the suffering of the lost in hell, can the meaning be other than endless, without end, ceaseless? God gives the meaning in II Corinthians 4:18 - "While we look not on the things which are seen but the things which are unseen, for the things which are seen are temporal (literally, for a season), but the things which are unseen are eternal." In Matthew 25:46 the same Greek word "eternal" is used for life and for punishment.

b. One more place, Revelation 14:9-11, a new expression, "forever and ever," literally, "unto the ages of the ages." They say that is merely a Hebraism of superlativeness as Lord of Lords. Not so. The expression is used twelve times in Revelation: eight times of the reign, duration, or glory of Christ and God, Revelation 11:15.

## E. The Personality of Man

The distinguishing characteristics of man, which make him man, separated by an impassable gulf from the animal creation, may be summed up in the term *person*. All other earthly creatures are things. Theirs are only blind impulses and successive impressions. Brutes do not know; they only feel. It has been called "instinct." The three attributes of personality, which reside in God, also reside in man.

1. Intellect or Reason. By this we mean that man's knowledge and reasoning powers go beyond the sphere of sense knowledge. His is to know all the relative pronouns: what, where, why, when, and how. He meditates, which no brute can do. He uses his knowledge to reach different conclusions. He knows truth and falsehoods. He knows not merely by instinct or sense perception but by mental processes, which the brute does not possess (Cerebration and Self-consciousness).

2. Sensibility. By the joint operation of reason and will, man can love and hate. The brute can do neither. Love is more than desire; it is more than blind attachment. It is the perception of the good or beautiful or desirable and the embracing of the same. The brute cannot love as we know love, nor hate as we know hate. They may have ferocity and violence and a kind of aversion from some mere sense perception, but they cannot have malice (the consciousness of one's own feelings with discriminations).

3. Volition or Freedom of Will. A moral nature which knows right from wrong, which feels a strong compulsion for the right and warning of the wrong, and a freedom to choose which the whole being shall follow (Self-determination), these distinguishing attributes which make a man a person and not an animal are essential to humanity. They make him a social creature desiring company. They make him feel duty, feel obligations, and recognize truths. They make him man and not a thing.

#### F. The Moral Nature of Man

Man is not just a mechanical robot without knowledge of moral principles or power to choose his course of actions in regards to moral principles. He has a part of his being which fits him for choosing right or wrong actions. This moral nature is not a separate element as body, soul, and spirit are not separate faculties, such as intellect, sensibility, and volition, residing in a separate function; but rather the moral nature resides as a mode of being within all the natural nature of man. Like the mind of man, using the brain to get more out of it than mere mechanical neuron reaction like a computer. The mind is man's soul using the physical brain, so mind and soul are synonymous. Likewise, the spirit in man is not physical or resident in one particular department in man, but resides throughout man's soulish nature. This knowledge of right and wrong, with strong feelings for right and wrong and the necessity to choose the one or the other, is the strongest part of man's moral nature - the conscience. Only one who can rightly be called a person can be said to be a moral creature, and so the Scriptures teach that God has placed all personalities, whether heavenly or earthly, under moral law or moral government.

He has endowed them with a moral nature, angels and man, which makes them responsible to His moral government. This moral government contains the eternal distinctions of right and wrong and carries distributive justice. These moral principles are eternal, under every age and form of religion. We under grace feel the same need of conformity to moral excellence as those did under law. This moral law of right and wrong is written somehow, somewhere on the moral natures of men with indelible ink and corresponds to the same moral law laid down in the Bible.

1. This moral nature contains first the conscience. Shakespeare aptly called conscience, "The worm, conscience which be gnaws the soul." Conscience is an accompanying knowledge working in the entire personality. It is not a separate faculty but all the faculties brought to bear on the subject of right and wrong. As to what it is and just how it is located or works is the same mystery as confronts us in the contemplation of the soul. It works in the intellect to know the right from the wrong. It says, "This is right" and "That is wrong"; it says, "You ought to do this" and "You ought not to do that." It declares whether we are conforming to the moral law or not. But it does more: it has judiciary power; it condones the right and condemns the wrong. Conscience must be a built-in attribute in man's God-created spirit as a regulator, like his moral law written in the heart. Paul teaches in Romans 2:14-16, these two, conscience and God's Moral Law, are God's monitors and inner judges, making man a moral being. There are three different cognitions of conscience: (As seen plainly in Romans 2:14-16)

- a. The perception of right. (Within the intellect)
- b. The sense of duty, the feeling of obligation, (sensibility and emotion) which seems to be located in the emotions or sensibility.
- c. The conviction of merit and demerit within the volitional faculty. It is the sense perception of conscience of well-being and happiness for doing the right, and a sense of fear and misery with the doing of the wrong.

All three of these act simultaneously in the one act of conscience. No wonder then that when a man sears his conscience and sins against it until it loses all value as a working part of his being, he has no sense of obligation or duty to do right. He has lost the faculty of discernment. You might just as well try to get a deaf man to tell different notes to the scale or a blind man to tell you the colors of an object. The conscience is not infallible, for it may be seared and perverted. The New Testament speaks of some having a good conscience, signifying that others can have a bad conscience - called a "heart purged from an evil conscience" in Hebrews 10:22, and "a conscience purged from dead works" in Hebrews 9:14; a seared conscience as with a hot iron (seared or burned with hot iron finally makes it calloused) I Timothy 4:2; "a conscience void of offense toward God and man" Acts 24:16; "A defiled conscience" Titus 1:15; "A pure conscience" I Timothy 3:9; or "A good conscience" I Timothy 1:5. A good illustration of the working of the conscience may be traced in Genesis 42:21.

2. The second element of man's moral nature is the freedom of will. Whether there is any consciousness of it or not, with every cognition of conscience there is the exercising of choice. There is no such thing as neutrality of the will upon any subject. With every presentation of duty or obligation, to reject it is to choose. To refuse action is to choose not to act. The freedom of the will is necessary to moral government. A being without freedom of will cannot be subject to rewards and punishment. If there is no other choice and a man is fatalistically made to do the wrong, then how can he be responsible? The very thought of responsibility is linked with man's freedom of choice. This is why we punish the sane criminal while we hospitalize the maniac who hacks to death his wife. We treat the criminal with penal justice and punishment commensurate with the crime, while we pity and try to make the maniac comfortable in a safe place.

One is strict justice while the other is mere precautionary measures of mercy. That within certain spheres of action man has freedom of choice is clearly the teaching of the Scriptures and of experience, and further that he is responsible morally for the choice he makes - Joshua 24:15, "Choose you this day whom ye will serve"; and Isaiah 66:3, "did choose their own ways, and their souls delighted in their abominations." There are a number of problems, which arise over the question of the freedom of the will. There are the teachings of the Scriptures of the hardening of the heart and the enslavement of sin. How can a man be a bond-slave of sin, yet be a free moral agent?

Let us consider it logically:

- a. First, we must note that every choice along a single line gives an added bent to all the thinking, the affections, and even to the will itself to follow that same line in the future. This is how character is molded. The constant choice in a single line gives permanency to that line and becomes a state after a while and sometimes gives such bent that freedom to choose another course is impossible by the very

nature of things. Absolute freedom of will was Adam's before the fall, but now is only theoretical as sin has given such inclinations as to make man choose the wrong unless led by grace to choose the right.

b. The soul has the power to choose between motives, and these motives direct the will itself.

c. The will may make a contrary choice even where the permanent bend of character makes it impossible to carry it out, as when Paul said, "To will is present with me." Even though he added "How to perform (perfectly complete it in action) that which is good I find not" (Romans 7:18). Not by single choice can man change his moral nature. His freedom of choice toward the righteous and holiness of character is only operative to changing his character by the Gospel.

d. Continued choosing of a line of action will enslave the man to that line; thus man can become the bond-slave of sin while the will is free. John 8:31-36; Romans 6:15-23.

## G. Man's Original State as Created

There is much that we cannot know of the perfection of man as he came from the hand of God - of his physical perfection, his moral likeness to God, his wonderful mental make-up. What can we know of the state of Adam, who could walk with God in open face-to-face fellowship? Since the fall, every human being who comes into the presence of the personal God or the radiance of His throne is immediately stricken as a dead man. "Our God is a consuming fire." Even our state in redemption cannot tell us the fullness Adam enjoyed, for our worship is not in that same open fellowship which Adam enjoyed, nor have we received the fullness of our redemption and our glorified bodies. There are some intimations from the Scriptures of Adam's state and some necessary ideas we can form.

1. Man's Physical Condition. The Pelagian and Catholic ideas of man's creation are at variance with the Scriptures. They teach that man was created all right but without the mature, developed mental and moral faculties, that he was created an infant in mind and character. The plain inference from the Bible account is that man must have been created with a mature body, in perfect manhood, with a mind fully matured in knowledge, with a moral nature having full rectitude. He was not an infant in mind, body, or moral responsibility, but in every sense of the word a full, mature man. His mind wasn't blank to receive impressions but contained full knowledge necessary to start his responsible duties as keeper of the garden and father of the human race. The Pelagian theory is to get around the teaching of original sin and depravity.

2. Man's Moral Condition. Like his physical being, man was not created in a moral vacuum, without a mature, moral nature. He wasn't created indifferent to righteousness. As man couldn't have a mature, mental nature without possessing full mental habits of knowledge, so man couldn't have a perfect, moral nature from God without having habits of righteousness. A moral creature must be either holy or sinful, never halfway in between. Adam, therefore, was not created halfway in between, with the ability to become either righteous or sinful, but was definitely created in one or the other state. To claim he was created sinful is absurd, so he must have been created fully righteous. And, contrary to the Catholic and Pelagian ideas, the child born now is not born neutral, blank,

but is born in sin with a depraved nature which causes it to will wrong as soon as freedom of the will can be exercised.

The two primary proofs of Adam's mature condition in body and mind are seen in his possession of comprehensive language. He could name all the beasts. Second, God made a complete, mature woman for his wife and Adam appropriately named her Eve, the mother of all living.

3. The Image of God in Man (the most important consideration). There is a two-fold sense in which man is made in the image of God. In the looser sense it could be said to consist in the spiritual properties, which make him a person - such as intellect, sensibility, and volition. This natural likeness man could not lose without ceasing to be man. Though affected by the fall and sin, still this portion of his nature bears the resemblance to God. It is the basis of the warning against slaying man in Genesis 9:6 and the wickedness of cursing man in James 3:9. It is the elevating conception of man. Though he is not what he once was, he bears still the grandeur of his destiny. Berbard says, "It cannot be burned out even in hell."

In the stricter sense the image of God in man is in holiness. It is here that man bears God's image in the Garden of Eden, had it erased in the fall, and restored in redemption. This holiness is the holiness of nature, not just habitual holiness of acts but of state. Adam was innocent in that he had no experience of evil, and his whole being was bent toward the right. In his nature he was made in God's image in that he was made upright. Such portions of Scripture as Ephesians 4:23-24 and Colossians 3:10 tell what the image of God means in the stricter sense. There is not merely the spiritual likeness in personality but in moral integrity. The image of God consists in "true holiness." There it is said to be in righteousness and knowledge (Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10). This knowledge as a part of holiness is the true perception of God in His beauty, excellency and glory. Adam could, with this moral and holiness of perception, look out upon all creation and see God everywhere. Nature mirrored God to him, and all that he saw called forth more love and devotion and worship of God. The whole creation was a cathedral where anthems of praise ascended constantly to God and called forth the worship from Adam. Here is perfection of knowledge; true wisdom is to know God and love and fear and worship Him as God. God intended all nature to reveal His love and name to His creatures. James Henry Thornwell says, "This is holiness as it irradiates the understanding. This knowledge of God in the creature is the perfection of knowledge. Science, until it reaches this point, does but fumble. It misses the very life of true knowledge; it is only a learned and pompous ignorance." (Collective Writings, Vol. I, p 237, 1901; Presb. Pub., Philadelphia, PA).

This holiness of knowledge was accompanied by rectitude of disposition. It was conformity to moral right. The law of obedience to the moral law was the rule of Adam's life. It wasn't merely an automaton's obedience which knows no other course. We see that from Paul's statement which said that "Adam was not deceived" in the first transgression. He knew perfectly the right and the law of obedience, even though he did not know the results of transgressing, as far as comprehending them. He had no experience of evil. That there is a difference between the moral government of the angels and their creation may be inferred from the Scriptures in that they are never declared to be made in the image of God. There is an entrance by man into God's works and self and enjoyment of Him, which bears the stamp of God's image. God enjoys fellowship with Himself in the

blessed Trinity and in all His works. Angels adore and worship but not in the fellowship reserved for man.

This holiness of character of Adam was natural to his nature and not a subsequent addition by grace. It brought about a harmony of all his faculties, a walk in harmony with God, and perfect fellowship with God. But this holiness was not indefectible. He was liable to fall. It was not a static state from which no apostasy could be made. This shall be the consideration in the subject of probation. Man was made mutable in his holiness. He was capable of ever-increasing improvement in holiness.

It is in this portion of man, made in the image of God, where the fall has wrought the greatest havoc. It is here the image is the most effaced. Whatever of this image, which still remains is located in the conscience and moral law written upon the soul; but how much of the harmony of soul with God and holiness of nature remains? We shall have occasion to refer to this question again in considering original sin and the extent of depravity in the human nature.

## H. Probation

After God had made man, Genesis says, "He planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there He put the man whom He had formed." I do not know how long Adam walked in communion with God before he was put on probation. God made a special place where the test was to take place. He intended man to have every advantage to take the right course and obey the direct command of God. It is interesting to note that Adam failed God in his testing in the best surroundings that Divine love could provide, while "the second Adam," Christ Jesus, obeyed God and stood the test in His temptation amid the worst possible surroundings that could be imagined - in the wilderness of Judaea, without food and water for forty days. Adam had plenty of water from four rivers and every kind of fruit from every tree of the Garden but one. Through the first man's disobedience we received the loss of Eden, but through the second Adam's obedience we are restored to Eden, but here is the fact of man's probation or testing. He is put upon probation hinging upon his obedience to a direct command of God.

1. The Nature of Adam's Probation. When God made man with freedom of will, it is evident that He did not intend for him to stay in his pre-Edenic innocence forever; but it was inevitably in His plan for man to be put under test. This was for the confirmation of man's loyalty and devotion to God as his sole portion and of his perfect obedience and the law of his life. God never intended man to stay immortally as he was before he was put under probation; and neither was it the plan of God that he should remain forever under probation. As failure brought ruin and depravity to his nature, the inference is clear that obedience, and constant obedience, would have brought him out from under probation and rewarded him with both eternal life and confirmation in holiness. This is the very reason for the probation, not just the divine satisfaction over man's obedience, but the molding into permanent holiness of character. This is the necessity for probation.

Adam's holy nature must be transformed into holiness of character by the exercising of free choice in obedience. Holiness of nature was his by creation, but holiness or character was to be his by choosing the pathway of obedience. This could not be accomplished without the alternative of evil also being present, so that choice would not be without an alternative. Man must choose the right, while fully conscious of the wrong.

This and this only is freedom of choice. This explains the reason why the testing commandment was not on the moral law, or based upon a moral precept. It couldn't be based upon the negative. "Thou shalt not kill, nor steal, nor lie." With these there would be no real temptation presented, for there would be no appeal to Adam's holy nature. But with the probation resting upon a plain direct commandment, which carried for its authority and compliance only the fact that God had commanded it, the test was clearly understood. The battle was over wills. Whose will shall be the law of my life; God's or mine? There is but little doubt but that Adam would later have been also given that fruit. There couldn't have been anything poisonous or obnoxious about the fruit, but it was chosen of God to present the test of obedience.

2. The Limitation of Adam's Probation. We do not know how long Adam walked under probation before he fell. The account in Genesis seems to imply that Adam was made and put under probation before Eve was created. It is very reasonable and almost a moral necessity to believe that if Adam had resisted the temptation and stood the testing, there would have been a positive reaction in his moral nature leading by successive obedience into a confirmed state of holiness whereby it would have been impossible for him to fall. This follows both from reason and Scriptural intimations. This is the very essence of our hopes for eternity - that obedience and faithfulness now in acceptance of Christ, and following Him here for the short period of our lives, will bring eternity of indefectible holiness later. God's justice would demand that if failure to stand the test would bring a confirmed unholy sinful nature, a depraved, bent, crooked nature, then obedience and successful compliance with the test would have the opposite effect. We shall see next that this had to be the case. Also we do not read of the angels, which kept their first estate, ever again being tempted to fall. They are called "holy angels" and "elect angels."

There is one more very necessary thought in connection with Adam's probation. It contains the very essence of our salvation and the only provision whereby we can be saved through the obedience of another. We lost our Eden through the disobedience of one man, and we gain it back by the obedience of another. It is only through this provision of grace (Romans 5:12-21). Not only was the probation limited by time, but it was also limited in person. This answers some very perplexing questions. If Adam had obeyed, what about those born of him? Would each successive child have to stand the test all over again? No, for Adam was not only standing there as a man, but as *Man*. The whole human race was in Adam for the test. Under a dispensation of law, each man stands or falls by himself, but in an economy of grace it is to rest upon a representative; so in an economy of works in the Garden, Adam was the representative of the whole human race. They were to all be tried in him. We share his ruin; the sin that made him an alien made us all aliens.

How many there are which criticize this provision of federal headship. Had Adam been true and maintained his integrity, we would have inherited life and glory through him by natural birth; and no one would have dreamed of criticizing the plan of God's goodness in such a provision of grace. The difference in results has nothing against the principle. But this provision which made Adam our representative is the only provision by which we can be brought back to God. Otherwise, the whole race might have perished without any recourse. Each man, even had he been born like Adam was created, with innocence and a holy nature, would have had to go through the same probation; and who can say how many, if not all, would have fallen the same way with the bad example

before. Some might have stood longer than others, but the vast majority, if not all, would have fallen. Sin under such circumstances would be hopeless. There would be no redeemer who could die for each individual a million times over. If we couldn't fall or sin in another, neither could we be redeemed in another. This is the guilt of the whole world. The angels have no such federal headship; theirs was an individual probation, and their failure involved them in a ruin without hope of restoration. They did not fall by reason of a federal representative but as individuals, therefore no federal head could take their penalty and save them.

The truth of this imputation of sin by the sin of one man upon the whole human race, and that we were in Adam and partook of his condemnation, is a clear teaching of Scriptures and the very heart of the substitutionary work of Christ. As I was in Adam and sinned in him and fell in him and died in him, so by the very same covenant of grace I was in Christ and died in Him, tasted hell with Him, and in Him, and was raised in Him. As Adam was the federal head of the dying, sinful race, so Christ is the new head, the second Adam of a living, holy race - Romans 5:11-21. The identity of Christ as the second Adam and His federal position is also taught in I Corinthians 15:45-47.

## I. The Fall of Man

### 1. The Temptation of Man

The whole story of man's temptation and fall in Genesis 3 is not an allegory nor symbolic language, but the straightforward relating of historical events under the inspiration of God at the hands of Moses. This can be readily determined by the whole tenor of Scriptures teaching a fallen state of man and the many specific references throughout the whole Word of God to this first sin.

Who was the agent in the temptation? Genesis 3:1 states it was "the serpent, the most subtle beast of the field." Here was a dumb beast being used for man's downfall, as a dumb beast was used by the angel of the Lord to save Baalam from his downfall. I do not know how much man in his original state knew of animal lore and their means of communication. I do not know why Eve was not surprised to hear from the serpent. Baalam was not surprised to hear the ass speak; he was so mad at it. Behind the literal serpent in the Garden, however, there was another serpent. You read about him in Revelation 12:19 - "That old serpent the devil." Evil was already present in the world. Satan had already fallen. Now he wishes to involve man in his own ruin. His approach unto Eve is descriptive of Satan's wisdom. He knew not to approach as a "roaring lion"; that would have driven her to God; but he picks the most "subtle" beast of the field, probably the most beautiful, and chooses a well-picked line of suggestion without any attempt at compulsion. Here is the secret of the saints' victory over Satan's temptations: *He cannot force you to do anything: He can only suggest and paint wrong pictures.* Don't let the devil use your heart's wall for a screen to project his insidious moving pictures of appearing himself. He approaches the woman and not the man and not the two together. Here may be seen also in the temptation the difference between probation and temptation. God tests but only Satan tempts. A test is the proving of a quality, but a temptation is an allurements to evil. Hence God tests all His saints, but "God tempts no man, neither is He tempted with evil."

a. The Devil's side of the temptation. From the story here in the Garden of Eden may be learned much of Satan's stock-in-trade in temptation. Herein is the Scriptural injunction, "We are not ignorant of his devices." It is wonderful that God has recorded the whole story so that we might be instructed and warned.

1. He throws doubt upon God's Word - "Yea hath God said."
2. He feeds her vanity by a presumed ignorance of the God-given warning so that she may correct him and enlighten him.
3. He then denied what he formerly questioned - "Ye shall not surely die."
4. He throws doubt into her mind as to the goodness of God. He intimates that God is holding out on her. He is keeping back some fruit she really should have and needs. "God knows that when you eat it you will be like Him." God knows you need it and is keeping it from you.
5. Promises an intellectual and moral enlightenment, knowing good and evil. The human mind is so constituted by God as to desire to know.
6. Last of all, he used his old stock in trade, the thing that caused his ruin, and he knew it would hers, if she listened to him--"Ye shall be as gods," or RV, "Ye shall be as God." He put a false ambition in her heart to be as God.

b. Eve's side of the temptation. Temptation always comes to man in a three-fold guise. The devil's temptation of Christ in the wilderness had the three elements that this temptation had. You will find the order in I John 2:16, "For all that is in the world the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." So Christ's temptation:

1. To satisfy the body's natural appetite at the expense of the soul and His mission in this world. This is the lust of the flesh.
2. The temptation on the mountain. This is the chronologically second temptation. Matthew, because of the purpose of his gospel, gives the temple temptation second; but Luke is the chronological gospel. Here the eye gate is used to tempt. Satan showed Him the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. This is the lust of the eye. Matthew is presenting Christ to the Jews as their Messiah, promised in the Old Testament.
3. The third is on the pinnacle of the temple, and there lies, hidden in a subtle manner behind it, the pride of life. It wasn't merely to tempt God by throwing Himself from the temple presumptuously, but had hidden in it the meaning of being presented in a spectacular way to the worshippers of the temple in the courtyard below. If Christ were to come that way instead of meek and lowly, Israel would have received Him. They shall receive the anti-Christ because he shall come with a big mouth and with pomp, but as like unto Eve, the devil dares to suggest doubt of God's Word and quotes it to Christ.

Another illustration of this three-fold method of temptation is seen in the case of Achan in Joshua 7:21. It closely parallels that of Eve. Achan saw, lusted, and took. Eve's steps to ruin may thus be traced:

- a. She listened to the slanders of the devil against God.
- b. She doubted His Word and altered it- "neither shall ye touch it."
- c. She doubted His love, believing the serpent's lies that God was withholding a needed fruit.
- d. She lingered near the tempting fruit.
- e. She looked at what God has distinctly forbidden.
- f. She lusted after the forbidden fruit.
- g. She disobeyed God's expressed commandment and partook of the fruit.

Now note the trinity of evil:

- a. She saw that the fruit was good for food--"Lust of the flesh."
- b. She saw that the fruit was pleasant to the eyes--"Lust of the eyes."
- c. She very much desired what would make one wise--"Pride of life."

2. The Fall of Man. We read that Eve partook of the fruit and then gave to Adam and he partook; thus man took himself out of the prescribed limits set by God and disobeyed the expressed commandment of God. According to I Timothy 2:14, Satan had succeeded in deceiving Eve completely, but Adam was not deceived. He went into the transgression with eyes wide open, knowing that he was disobeying God and counting the cost, deliberately choosing the wrong because of his great love for the woman God had made for him. He didn't want to be separated from her. II Corinthians 11:3 tells us that "Satan beguiled Eve," but no such statement can be made of Adam. Thus man chose his own way without respect unto the will of God. God was not to be the chief good of his Life.

### 3. The Effects of the Fall

#### a. The Immediate Effects:

1. The opening of their eyes, signifying a knowledge of sin. Was this an asset or a liability? It was the promise of the tempter; but instead of being godlike by the opening of their eyes, the first thing they saw was their own shame and nakedness. They were not blind before; they saw before they fell, but their relations to God and each other being different, they saw differently. Recognition of sin brought the sense of shame, expressed first toward one another, then toward God. They attempted to hide themselves.
2. Fear. This was a new thing for man. "I was afraid." Here is a sense of guilt and the recognition of the carrying out of the sentence God had pronounced.
3. An effort at self-vindication, Adam blamed the woman, despite the fact that he was not deceived; she blamed the serpent.

b. The Judicial or Penal Effects of the Fall. A three-fold death passed upon all men, Genesis 2:17, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

1. Spiritual death. This is the primary death that man suffered in the day he ate of the fruit. It is the soul separated from God. Death is primarily separation. Death is as mysterious as life. The closest definition of death is the separation - in physical death, separation of body and soul, in spiritual death, the separation from God. It is this death, "dead in trespasses and in sins," which allows the Scriptures to speak of the physically living as dead. It is the divinely imparted spiritual life of God in the Spirit of man gone out. In this sense it is said of the Christian that he should never die, John 11:26. Physically, Adam began to die the day he sinned, but it wasn't consummated until 930 years later. It is the soul of man made in the image of God, made for God, and made to receive its life from God, cut off, separated from God; therefore, it can be said of it, "It is dead." This is the part of man, which is to be God-conscious, but being dead, its faculties cannot perceive God.
  2. Physical death. All of the diseases and pains to which man is heir in the fall may rightly be put under this heading of physical death, with the final consummation in literal death. Man becomes a dying creature with death always at work in his body. It is the separation of the soul from the body.
  3. Eternal death, or "the second death." This is the eternal separation of man from God and all that pertains to God's happiness and holiness. It is the lake of fire and brimstone. It is the natural consummation of spiritual death (Revelation 20:15; 21:8). It is the wicked person forever confirmed in iniquity, cut off forever from its source of joy and blessedness, confined in segregation with like kind, suffering spiritually, mentally, and physically the eternal penalty of its own godlessness.
4. Adam's Separation
- a. From the tree of life. Whether the tree of life had only sacramental value as a symbol of the life that would be man's as the eternal life of God, or whether it was truly an elixir of life - containing what the scientists would like to find, a death-arresting food - is not revealed. The Scriptures do not go into detail. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil must have been sacramental, or symbolic; the tree of life need not be, but might have been. However, the very fact of the placing of the cherubs with the flaming sword at the gate to Eden was to keep man from the literal tree and evidently some necessary ingredient that would produce immortality in the body (Genesis 3:22-24). It was a blessing that Adam should not have physical immortality in his present state.
  - b. Separation from the Garden of Eden.
  - c. Separation from the visible presence of God.
5. The Four-Fold Judgment for Man's Sin
- a. The judgment upon the serpent, called in theology, "the curse of degradation." The changing of the serpent from upright to crawling, groveling position; fear between woman and the serpent; but behind the serpent, final judgment upon

- the serpent's serpent, Satan, Genesis 3:15. See Micah 7:17, unremoved in the millennium.
- b. The judgment upon the woman, of sorrow, and of judgment; mitigated by grace. I Timothy 2:15.
  - c. The judgment upon the man, of sorrow and toil.
  - d. The curse upon the ground, its barrenness, its thorns, and thistles, the necessity to labor for sustenance. It is natural that fallen man should not live in an unfallen creation. It groaneth and travaileth in pain awaiting the redemption (Romans 8:22). Read carefully Romans 8:18-23 of the groaning creation made subject to vanity (i.e. lack of fulfilling its created purpose because of the fall of its lord in Adam).

J. The Tabernacle in the Wilderness (for pilgrimage), (Mishkan, "dwelling-place") The Holy Spirit's intended type of Christ's perfect humanity and deity; His tripartite humanity, therefore, ours since "He took our nature and tabernacled among us." (John 1:14; Exodus 25:8) This is God's intended illustration, or type, to display His dwelling.

#### K. Tripartitism or Trichotomy

1. Man is a Tripartite Being (Composed of spirit, soul and body).

From this chapter title it is seen that we hold to the TRICHOTOMOUS viewpoint. This has been the psychological riddle for 3000 years. Here we need the light of Revelation more than anywhere else. It won't do to follow the light of natural reason or science. I am afraid the biblical psychologists have followed the unsanctified guesses of the scientists rather than the light of Revelation, making too many concessions to their ignorances rather than the "thus saith the Lord." Even our Theologians have done likewise. There is no doubt at all that the Bible teaches a form of Dichotomy, or better a dualism; i.e., that man is made up of the material and the Spiritual. Yet, the secular psychologists have denied that also; why follow them in the Trichotomy? We believe that, though Trichotomy is more obscure, it is still taught in the Scriptures. Only the regenerated and especially the "Spiritual Ones", the "Pneumatikios" are conscious of this tripartite makeup. There are two objections to Trichotomy:

- a. This answers the accusation of the dualists; or objections "We are not conscious of any division between soul and spirit." I say we are i.e. the Saved - "We are conscious of the strivings of two wills, etc. (Galatians 5:17) The secular psychologists use this same argument to prove their "monism." Only one part = all physical. "We are not conscious of any division between soul and body." No, not the natural man (the unsaved); he lives in the materialistic realm entirely, until the Holy Spirit begins His work. Certainly, then he is awakened to another part of His being worth saving, and even of a higher part which was dead before.
- b. It has been further held by the dichotomists that no serious Bible doctrine is affected whether one holds the dichotomous or the trichotomous view. This is not the case. I cannot conceive how anyone can arrive at a clear understanding of Paul's theology without trichotomy. The atonement through Christ is not seriously

affected, but Christian victory is. Wise and sanctified men have contended for both views, nevertheless we consider it important in both Christian Psychology and Pauline Theology as an explanation of the conflict in the believer's victory over the flesh, and the doctrine of the resurrection.

2. Definitions - The root Greek words from which we get trichotomy and dichotomy are - in both "temne" which is "to cut" and in dichotomy "dicha" equaling "in two" and in trichotomy "tricha" equaling "in three." Another method of terming them is tripartite vs. bipartite, Trism vs. dualism. While the most of modern theology is Dichotomous, most of the early church and all of the Eastern church was trichotomous. In the time of Christ all the Jews were trichotomous; Josephus 1:1-2; Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, John of Damascus, Titian, Clement Alexandrinus. In fact, no writing of the earliest church Fathers contains any idea of dichotomy. It was only as the Western church became prominent that dichotomy was taught at all. Strong, in his *Systematic Theology* even quotes from some evolutionists to prove his dichotomy (p. 486). Leslie Olshausen well says on I Thessalonians 5:23 quoted in *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, p. 915--"It is indispensable, under a purely historical view, to acknowledge the triple division of human nature as a doctrine of the apostolic age (and in agreement with our own belief)." In fact, it follows that many points of Christian Doctrine can be made intelligible only by assuming the distinction between spirit and soul.

#### L. How the Dichotomists Teach Their Dualism

There is a lot of truth in dualism, and it rightly emphasizes the truth that man is not just materialistic. There is a part of man which outlives the tomb, which goes not back to the dust, but to the God who gave it. The Bible over 450 times differentiates between the soul and the body, so this truth needs emphasizing. Man is made up of a physical or materialistic part and a spiritual, immaterial part. A part of man is not based upon the physical laws of nature, not fed on the same food from dirt. In this sense I am dual. Soul and spirit are as closely joined and related and mystical as to comprise a seeming entity. After death, the soul and spirit are still inseparably linked and acting jointly. Only the Word of God is sharp enough and powerful enough to divide between the two (Hebrews 4:12-13). There is but one argument worth considering of the dichotomists, i.e. the many times where the two terms, soul and spirit, are used interchangeably, so they argue, they are synonymous. Most, call it the double aspect theory - the Spirit is the soul looking Godward; the soul is the soul looking man ward, but the same entity, just two aspects of the same thing. I grant you that the two terms are used generically to indicate the spiritual or immaterial part of man. This is common to all language. The generalizations, however, are never to interfere with, or to interpret the specific texts; the general portions are to be interpreted by the specific, not vice versa. With all doctrine, the doctrine of the resurrection is generalized throughout the Bible until we get to the specific teachings of the latter part of the New Testament, where we have the two resurrections mentioned in Revelation 20; there is taught that there is a 1,000 year difference in time between them.

## M. What is Wrong with this Theory: (Of Dichotomy)

1. It proves too much by trying to use this argument, "Interchangeable usage of soul and spirit for the immaterial part of man shows they are the same." You can prove unichotomy or monism by that same argument. Just one part of man, for the soul of man is used for the whole man, body and soul in many places. (Acts 27:37) "We were in all in the ship, 276 souls," but bodies, too, not disembodied ghosts. This an idiom of speaking, called synecdoche - "A part for the whole," inclusive not divisive; as "man" for all mankind, takes in women, also; as "100 head of cattle;" as "many mouths to feed;" as the whole science of zoology - generic terms, feline, for the cat family, yet takes in lynx, lion, tiger, tabby, etc. You can call a Persian kitten a feline, without losing its other distinctions, so soul and body are used interchangeably, yet no dichotomist would say, "They are synonymous." The many times they are used generically for the whole will not mitigate against the few specific times each is used to divide. This generalization especially in the Old Testament usage of "spirit" is further seen in using the term for animals, yet no real theological dichotomist will make the animal dual as man (as in Ecclesiastes 3:21).
2. If man is only dual, how different is he from the animals? They have a rudimentary soulish activity. The difference is not in degree as evolutionists advocate, but in kind. "Who knoweth the spirit of the animal that goeth downward, and the spirit of man that goeth upward?" (Ecclesiastes 3:21, spheres different.)
3. How is man made in the image of God? God is Spirit. Soul is only postulated of God anthropomorphically, even as a body is, in a theophany. The image is spiritual, not soulish. (Genesis 2:7 shows that man's soul is to enable his God in-breathed spirit to express itself in his God-fashioned body.)
4. The word for flesh, "sarkinos" and "sarx" is used interchangeably for the body and the old man, old nature. Yet there is no mistaking Paul's meaning, and the two are not synonymous. Is it strange then that soul and spirit are so used?
5. Paul distinctly proves the Spirit's sphere of activity is not in the flesh (soulish realm), but in the pneuma, spirit, (Philippians 3:3) so whole "walking in the spirit, not in the flesh."
6. Note all dichotomists must per force distinguish between the operation of soul and spirit while denying any real separate entities. (They are saying, "Only two sides of the same thing," yet separate spheres in the New Testament). We shall see more of what is wrong with dichotomy as we study the Scriptural proofs of trichotomy.

## N. Scriptural Proofs of Trichotomy

We shall see that the many times soul and spirit are used interchangeably does not mitigate against the few times where a definite difference is taught between the two. Paul is the great revelator of the pneuma (spirit). It wasn't until the new creation in Christ Jesus, and the believer was taken out of the realm of the flesh, and put into the spirit that there was any need of the God-given Revelation of the tripartite man.

Definition - Let me state first of all what I mean by trichotomy. I cannot hold to the definitions of some of the great trichotomists. I must part paths as thoroughly with them, as I do the monists who deny any soul or the dichotomists who confuse soul and spirit as one teaching dualism. I part paths with the vague dualists and many other trichotomists. They hold:

1. Man consists of body or matter
2. Animal life, or some call it "vegetable life," in common with the animal and this is soulish life
3. Then spirit, connected with God. I cannot ascribe to the belief that all of man's rational, emotional, and volitional life is seated in spirit.

I rather believe that all these personality qualities are seated in the soulish nature. The vitalizing principle of life in his body, that mysterious thing called life in every cell of his body is not to be confused with his soulish nature. In the animal when the principle of life leaves the body it dies. In man, the body continues to die for days and weeks after the soul has departed. (I teach that the soul animates the whole body, yet if an arm is amputated a part of the soul is not lost). The ascribing to the spirit all the rational functions of the soul is not Scriptural; it has a higher function connected with God, and lies in death in the sinner, until quickened by the Holy Spirit in regeneration. The death of the body does not destroy soul or spirit, but both are seen active and conscious in the slain witnesses, souls under the altar in Revelation 6:9-11. The soulish life is related to life in the body and self-consciousness. The spirit of man is endowed with a different set of attributes with which man was to be related to God, in communion, worship, and "seeing God."

### Proofs of Trichotomy

1. Using the very same text the dichotomists use, Genesis 2:7. Here there seems to be three parts to man's creation. First, there is the forming of the materialistic part of man - his body - from the "clean dust of the ground." (Not the mud, as the evolutionists sneeringly carp). The Hebrew has the idea of molding as a potter, the vessel (Job 10:9), Genesis 3:9 - "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." God made this molded clay figure, a senseless physical man. It must have had vegetable life but no soul. Then we read, "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives." The Hebrew is not singular but plural. Many think only for the Hebrew idiom of moral excellency, but, I believe, it was for the plurality of lives with which he was endowed, his soulish life and his spiritual life. Man was certainly made to live on two planes, sensual life and spiritual life. Then, "Man became a living soul." Note three things - "God molded, God breathed and Man became." God made a body, God in-breathed a breath-spirit into man and the union of the Spirit with the body became a living soul. Spirit and body have naught in common; spirit could not live in body alone, at least this kind of body, gross earthly body. The communion, the link, the life between was the soul of man.

Tertullian well says, "The flesh is the body of the soul, and the soul is the body of the spirit." Justin Martyr says, "The spirit resides in the soul-house, as the soul resides

in the body-house." In Adam there was a perfect blending of the three into one harmonious unity; God pervading all, glorified in all, with none of the spiritual strivings we experience.

The body was to be ruled by the soul (Paul, "Master your own vessels.") and the spirit was to rule the soul, and God the Holy Spirit was to rule our spirits as the "Father of Spirits." This is proved from Proverbs 20:27, where this God inbreathed spirit or breath is called, "The candle of the Lord." "The Spirit of man is the candle of the Lord, searching all the inward parts of the belly" (Rotherham--"Searching all the chambers of the inner man."). 'Belly' is used by metonymy for the soul of man the inner life of man as Christ said (John 7:38-39) "Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." This verse in Proverbs shows that the spirit in man was to be God's candle guiding, searching, and regulating the soul of man. This, the new spirit, or pneuma in man, does when he walks after the spirit so as not to fulfill the lusts of the flesh. We shall see that this is the heart of Paul's doctrine of the saints' victory in Christ. The new pneuma created of the Holy Spirit, rules instead of the soulish nature, so not psukikos (soulish) but pneumatikos, (spiritual). How is this possible in dichotomy, "Walking after the spirit, and not fulfilling the desires of the flesh" (Soul Galatians 5:16)?

2. Continuing from this story in Genesis, I find a further proof of the trichotomist viewpoint. God told Adam, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Genesis 2:17). This was not a spiritualization by God, figurative language, but real death. If language means ought, that very day of transgression a part of man died. We ask, "What part?" His soul?" - No, it began to die that day, but not consummated for 930 years. "What part then? - God has said, "Surely die" and I know he did die - not of man.

The candle of the Lord went out in darkness. That part of man God intended for "a habitation of God through the Spirit," where God was to reside, died. Here is one of the great truths of Scripture reiterated again and again, the natural man is dead. Death and darkness reigns supreme in one department of his being. Paul calls it, "Dead in trespasses and in sins." (Ephesians 2:1 and "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth;" I Timothy 5:6). Jesus said, "Let the dead bury their dead" (Matthew. 8:22, that cannot be physical or soulish death, but Spiritual Death.)

Where in the natural man, the unconverted man, is there God-consciousness, the faculties to know God, see God, love God, and worship God? Jesus said, "They that worship God must worship Him in Spirit," not soulishly. For Paul said, "The natural man (Gr. soulish man) cannot know the things of God for they are spiritually discerned." What did he mean? The natural soulish man is dead in that realm of spirit, and has no faculties with which to lay hold of spiritual things. The paralysis of death lies over all those God-given faculties within, "The spirit of man which was to be Candle of the Lord." The Bible terms them "natural man," what they are by only natural generation; Jude 10, "Brute beasts" or "irrational beasts" and then Jude 19 reveals what the natural man is, "These be those who separate themselves, sensual" (Roth-mere men) (Lit. psuchikoi - soulish ones). Then he defines what he means, "Having not the spirit." (Omit the definite article "the" not in the Greek text - "Having not spirit.") Death reigns there.

Be careful not to fall into the error of conditional immortality here. Death is never annihilation, but disorganization, and disintegration. The dead fallen man, still has spirit, but wrecked and ruined by the fall until it ceases to function as "the candle of the Lord." God calls it "dead." Here is the need of the new birth; Jesus demanded, "Ye must be born from above;" "Or ye cannot see the kingdom of God." There can be no comprehension. Why? Because that part of man with all those spiritual faculties died in the day Adam fell, and is dead in all Adam's posterity until touched by the Spirit of God into newness of life. At natural birth a new nature is born, new faculties to lay hold of physical life. Many, even of the dichotomists, are ignorant of what salvation really is; not the re-education, reformation, and whitewashing of the old nature; but the impartation of a brand new nature, "New creatures in Christ and this new creation has new faculties and can "see the kingdom of God," yea - "see God." It is not physical or soulish, but Spiritual (John 3:6) "That which is born of the spirit is Spirit."

3. Before we go further into this argument, let us consider a few other Scriptures. Note: the prayer of Mary under inspiration (Luke 1:46-47). Here there is a clear intimation that the spirit can only act upon the body through the soul. "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior." Here the change of tense signifies the spirit first conceived joy in God, and communicating with the soul roused it to magnify God. This is expressed through the song she sang, by the bodily organs of mouth and brain (Like the candle of the Lord). This is as good a place as any to bring in the truth: "With the man is world-conscious, with the soul he is self-conscious, and with the Spirit he is God-conscious," (first stated by C. A. Auberlon). Even the dichotomists use some such formula for a distinction between soul and spirit. i.e., man ward vs. Godward, while denying any distinction.

4. This naturally brings up another Scripture (Jude 19) "These be they... sensual (Cr. soulish) having not spirit." Or Paul - (I Corinthians 2:14) "The natural man (soulish man) receiveth not the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them." He doesn't have the right set of faculties in working order, for in that part of his tripartite being death reigns," therefore, he cannot see the Kingdom of God;" the very part of man's being created by God to lay hold of the things of God, to see God, worship God, is dead. Only in the resurrected saint, quickened by the Spirit of God, are these faculties back in tune with God. Now he can "worship God in the Spirit" (Philippians 3:3) and "see God" (John 3:3-6) That is neither physical nor soulish; it has to be man's spirit, his newly created spirit within his natural spirit.

5. Further deduced from these truths is the Scripture very embarrassing to the dichotomists - I Corinthians 15:44, etc. The two kinds of bodies of the saints, the one we have now - the image of the earthly, the same psuchikos or soulish body; then the one we shall get in the resurrection, the image of the heavenly, the same pneumatikos or spiritual body. The first has the idea that the motivating principle of life and expression is the soulish life. The second is that the motivating principle of life and expression will no longer be the soul, but the new creation, the pneuma. Paul says, "No longer flesh and blood, since it cannot inherit the kingdom of God." If there is no difference in soul and spirit, as the dichotomists maintain then what is the difference in these two bodies? Let them answer that one if they can! If so, then Paul is dealing in tautology when he calls one body soulish and the other spiritual; one with soul principle controlling it, the other with spirit. As Scofield says, "To assert, therefore,

that there is no difference between soul and spirit is to assert that there is no difference between our mortal and our resurrected bodies;" (see his footnote on I Thessalonians 5:23, p. 1270, *Scofield Reference Bible*, old edition).

6. Paul is the greatest revelator of the pneuma in man. The deeper truths of the believer as taught by Paul are a riddle if man is not tripartite. His revelation of the two natures of the believer, of some believers as sarkikos, fleshy, carnal, and walking after the flesh; and others as pneumatikos, spiritual, walking after the spirit; also of the warfare in the believer depends upon trichotomy. This is a truth growing out of all we have considered, theretofore, Paul is the great revealer here. It is the truth that at salvation God did not patch up the old nature, nor straighten it out, but completely set it aside as crucified with Christ, assigning it to death in identification with Christ on the cross, so that when Christ died, I died (Romans 6:1-11; Colossians 3:1-4; Galatians 2:20, etc). And God implanted in me a new creation, born from above; making me a partaker of the divine nature called by Paul pneuma, after the pneuma, Hagion, (The Holy Spirit) Who quickens it. These two natures then are at war one with the other (Galatians 5:16-17). They are diametrically opposed the one to the other, since one has a corruption and death at work in it (Romans 8:6, 13; Galatians 6:8). This is called by Paul, "sarx" or "flesh." The other, the new creation has life as its principle, holiness as its fruit, (Romans 8:6; Galatians 6:8) and is called "pneuma" or "spirit." The pneuma is holy and delights in the Law of God (Romans 7:22, (inner man) 1:4), but the flesh mind is at enmity with God and not subject to His law (Romans 8:7), these two have contrary wills, affections, principles, desires, thoughts, and fruits. How will the dichotomist explain them? He must perforce allegorize them, robbing them of Paul's meaning. Let me illustrate—(Augustus Hopkins, *Strong's Systematic Theology*, Judson Press, Phil, PA; Vol. 2, p 486.) Strong, following the double aspect theory of the dichotomists – "...The pneuma (spirit) is man's nature looking Godward and capable of receiving and manifesting the pneuma Hagion; the psuche (soul) is man's nature looking earthward." But Paul makes this new deposit "created in the image of God in true holiness," so impossible of corruption. The dichotomists would have their incorruptible seed of the Holy Spirit, vacillating, first Godward then the same entity earthward, and warring all the time within itself rather than with another contrary entity. How untrue to all Paul's great revelation!

7. Now to consider the two plainest portions, each in itself enough to clinch the fact that the Bible teaches trichotomy instead of dichotomy. The first is Hebrews 4:12. "For the Word of God is quick (living) and powerful (energetic-actively at work-effectively at work) and more cutting than any sword with two blades, piercing (piercing, cutting through to) even to the dividing asunder (Cr. division, or separation - line of separation) of soul and spirit (where is the separating line if same entity?) and of the joints and marrow," and tells us why--"to judge the thoughts and intents of the heart" (reflections and conceptions of the heart) purposes and motives; Berkley, ponderings and meditations, Lit.-- "critic of the heart." "Joints and marrow" has given a lot of trouble to the interpreter. Conybeare makes it but figurative language, but rest of the verse isn't so, neither is this. This is a picture of the Word of God doing what the priest did in the Old Testament as he dissected the sacrifice to search for flaws. We now know that the marrow is the blood builder, here the red corpuscles are manufactured, and God says, "The fear of the Lord is health to thy navel and marrow

to thy bones," the umbilical cord, source of all life of the fetus, and marrow the regimenting course of the life stream; "Fatness of the bones" for good life. Since the bones form the marrow, it would seem soulish life from the physical body. Verse 13-- "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest (without disguise) in His sight, for all things are naked (no covering) and open (no hiding) unto the eyes of Him with whom we must make account." Let us ask this question - "How is this text ought but nonsense under the teaching of dichotomy?" If the test of the livingness, the ability to work or its energy, and the test of its extreme sharpness of the Word of God is its ability to divide to the line of demarcation between soul and spirit, if there is no line between soul and spirit, but they are one and the same thing? Dean Alfred was the first to try to escape this dilemma and Wuest follows him by trying to make the Greek text only mean a penetration into two things, but why name both if there is but one? The Greek text demands that the sharp Word of God does lay bare (vs. 13) each soul and spirit by penetration, but it also lays bare the line of demarcation between the two to separate the spiritual from the soulish (How necessary this latter is if our worship is to be spiritual and not carnal, or soulish).

8. The second and most conclusive is I Thessalonians 5:23 - "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly and I pray God your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord, Jesus Christ." Note: there are two different Greek words for wholly and whole here; the first "wholly" (olotoleis) here the only time in the N.T. equals "through and through" (As Luther translates it, Lit. - "the whole of each of you, or every part of each of you," the idea is "completely" so the diaglett, "entirely," but it has the idea of "penetration"); the second "whole," (olokleron) carries the idea of "complete coverage," all of the man, no intrinsic part omitted. Rendering it "The very God of peace sanctify you through and through and altogether, a sanctification that misses no part," and a preserving of them blameless, the whole man, nothing omitted and to make sure he names each individual part, separated, with a separate conjunction "and" between each, and to doubly make sure adds the definite article in the Greek before each, "preserve the whole man, the spirit, and the soul, and the body." How could Paul say it more emphatically, or if he wished to teach trichotomy, how could he have said it more plainly? The dichotomy folks build their doctrine of dualism on all the generalizations, and then like Vincent, say Paul here is using poetical language. Note: Not as we say, "body, soul and spirit" from outward, inward, but "spirit, soul, and body" from inward, where God begins His work in creating a new spirit in the regenerated, then outward to purify and sanctify the whole man. First, God clears up the spirit or spring or fountain of life, then the streams.

This then is the distinction to which we shall adhere, i.e., man as a tripartite being, made up of spirit, soul and body, as harmonizing with all the Scriptures, and explaining the Pauline doctrine of the believer. These two last Scriptures are of more value in formulating a doctrine of the Biblical psychology of man's nature than all the Old Testament generalizations where spirit and soul are used interchangeably to designate the immaterial part of man's nature.