

A SUPPLEMENT TO ELPIS ISRAEL

**TEMPTER  
AND  
TEMPTED**

*'in Elpis Israel, on the subject of the Devil and Satan, ~~ what I have said about the Devil and Satan is not so definite as I could have made it. I was not writing upon that topic particularly'*

**A Supplementary  
Exposition On  
The  
DEVIL AND SATAN  
Or  
SIN IN THE FLESH**

John Thomas 1852

Preface

**TEMPTER  
AND  
TEMPTED**

*OR THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF SIN IN CONSIDERATION TO  
THE TERMS "SERPENT," "DEVIL," "SATAN" &c.*

Was first published by Brother Thomas in *The Herald of the Kingdom*, 1852. It was reprinted in three parts in the *Christadelphian* in 1873 by Brother Roberts. It was at this time that the *Slain Lamb* was written in defence of the truth against the Renunciationist heresy which is known as the *clean flesh heresy*. We have reproduced it here from the 1873 *Christadelphian* in the hope that another generation might benefit from this stirring work. It contains numerous definitions on important aspects of the Truth some of these have been preceded by \* in the text and reproduced in a reference form in the Appendix

Martin Pilbeam

# **TEMPTER AND TEMPTED**

***OR THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF SIN IN CONSIDERATION TO THE TERMS "SERPENT," "DEVIL," "SATAN" &c.***

## **PART ONE**

THE following letter had been addressed to Dr. Thomas soon after the appearance of *Elpis Israel*: "DEAR SIR. - In your otherwise surpassingly interesting work, styled *Elpis Israel*, you speak of the agent in the original temptation as *only* an animal. You ascribe to him a high degree of mentality, without moral obliquity, making the worthiest use possible of his faculties. On this idea and the general subject, I ask-

1-Does not this subject of the temptation, as you present it, stand in utter contrariety to the testimony of our Lord: 'The devil is a liar from *the beginning*'

2-Is not 'the beginning' (Gen. i.1 ; Matt. xix. 8; John i. 1 ; and John viii. 44), substantially the same ? Or do they not refer to the earliest record of the subjects spoken of in the Scriptures? If so, has not 'the devil' a place 'in the beginning' as 'the serpent'?

3-Does not the New Testament teach that there is a Tempter, as really as a 'Christ,' the tempted?- (Matt. iv. Luke iv.) He is distinct from and out of or away from our Lord - (John xiv. 30.)

4-If such be the representation by inspired teachers, and by the 'Faithful and True' himself, how can we be safe in departing from it? or can we do thus and not act on the same principle of all error?

5-As the term 'dragon' represented anciently the Egyptian sovereignty

or sovereign (Ezek. xxix.3) as the term applied to their leading animal, the idolized crocodile, and as Egypt oppressed Israel and opposed God, does it not apply to Rome, in Revelations, as the oppressor of Israel and the church only on the same principle that 'Babylon' does?

6-As Pharaoh, the actual agent in oppressing Israel, was real as his dragon-crocodile representative, why allow 'the serpent' and 'the devil' both the precise place they occupy in Scripture?

(On some ancient coins of Augustus, Egypt was represented by a crocodile. Bochart says that Pharaoh in Arabic signifies a crocodile. Isaiah xxvii.1; li.9; Ezek. xxix.3 - (*McKnight, Ep. p. 705, Essay 8, Comp. Com.*)

An answer will be thankfully received. Your former is general and indefinite; an answer to this would be definite. Yours in the truth,

J. B. COOK."

#### ***THE DR.'S ANSWER.***

*"Jesus partook of flesh and blood, that THROUGH DEATH he might destroy that having the power of death, that is the devil"-PAUL.*

"Our worthy querist is of opinion that what has been presented in *Elpis Israel*, on the subject of the Devil and Satan, 'is general and indefinite'. That it is general, and does not go argumentatively into the support of the doctrine there exhibited is indeed the case. Nevertheless, I think that what I have set forth is sufficiently definite for the reader to perceive what, I believe, the Scriptures teach concerning the devil, in the several passages where it is alluded to. However, I do admit with my friend, that what I have said about the devil and Satan is not so definite as I could have made it. I was not writing upon that topic particularly, nor did I care to say more than was necessary to the comprehension of the general matter of the book. In treating of Israel's hope or the kingdom of God, I could not avoid saying something of *evil*, and '*that having the power of death,*' which the full fruition of that hope is to eradicate from the earth, from society, and from the moral and physical con-

stitution of flesh and blood. But I did not lay a heavy hand upon the subject, knowing how much ‘the devil’ is respected by some, worshipped by others, and venerated, in some way, by nearly all. Not that this, abstractly considered, would have deterred me from giving him his due ; for I have no favour for him, though he may approach me as a minister of righteousness, a professor of Sacred History, or an angel of light; (2 Cor. Xi. 13, 15.) I see in him only *one causing men to fall*, and an *adversary* to the truth, that is to the gospel of the kingdom in the name of Jesus. I wished to get this all-important topic systematically before the British public, as I am now endeavouring to do before the American, in *Elpis Israel*; therefore, I did not wish to offend their prejudices by being too explicit touching their idol, lest they should close the book before they got at ‘the things of the kingdom of God.’

I have said nothing that I recollect, in any of my other writings concerning ‘His Satanic Majesty.’ The time had not come, and no one sought to bring me out upon the subject. I have in past years had so many devils to contend with, that I did not care to increase their host by denying their master’s existence *in the popular sense*. But, ‘steadfast in the faith,’ I have successfully resisted the Scripture devil, and he has fled from me. - (Jas. iv.7; 1 Pet. v.5.) The *antidikos diabolos*, or OPPOSITION CAUSING (me) TO FALL, if he could, with all his satellites, are either *hors du combat*, or so used up, that they have left me free from the necessity of defending myself lest I should be devoured. They have done their worst, and no clamour that they can raise, can do more than induce me to serve them up for the entertainment of my readers by way of recreation in the severer study of the law. The time is come then, when the outcry of ‘the devil’s’ clients may be disregarded. He is, doubtless, a very ‘potent, grave, and reverend signior’ with the world, with whom it is a point of expediency not to offend him, if possible. Men, therefore, like to hear him spoken of with respect; and as the terror of him is very useful in keeping evil doers in awe, and compelling some of them to ‘seek religion,’ they do not like the fear of him diminished; and by way of recommending themselves, we presume, to his tender mercies, if he should happen to get everlasting possession of them, they make a great clamour, and persecute with hard speeches

those who see no \* devil in the Bible than *sin incarnate in flesh and blood,, and manifested in the personal, social and political works of mankind* -and no other \* Satans, than *personal and politically organised adversaries* to the righteous and the truth. But I am not careful to avoid offending 'the devil' or his friends now; neither shall I regard their conclamation. My desire is to make men hate the devil, speak un-revilingly to Satan, and to fear none but God and His Christ; whom to know is to love and to obey unto eternal life.

During my residence in London I became acquainted with a physician somewhat famous in the scientific world and a believer in the kingdom of God, who purchased a copy of *Elpis Israel*, and at the same time, presented me with a pamphlet he had published, entitled '*An Inquiry into the existence of a personal Devil*'. It consists of twelve lectures and appendix, making ninety-six octavo pages. It contains much good sense on the subject; and as far as I think its contents in accordance with the Scriptures, I shall reproduce them in these columns. In the first lecture are some very excellent remarks on the investigation of truth, which very appropriately precede the examination of the subject, and which I beg leave to introduce in this place in order to propitiate a candid consideration of what I have to say.

'Sound thinking' says he, 'that is, cultivated and well-directed common sense, applied to the discovery of the truth, either natural or revealed, has followed the rule, that *nothing ought to be believed as true unless its truth can be demonstrated by an appeal to the facts recorded in the Book of Creation, (Nature) or to the Book of Revelation' (The Bible).*

The Naturalist, that is, the student of the truths written in the book of creation, says, 'To the book of creation: if any man speak not according to this book, it is because there is no light in him.'<sup>1</sup>

The. Spiritualist, that is, the student of the truths written in the book of revelation, says, 'To the Law and to the Testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them'.

(Isaiah viii. 20).

Rigid adherence of late years by the Naturalists to the above rule in reference to the subject of natural, or creation-written truths, has been the cause of immense progress in natural science; and is it not, without any improper presumption, to be inferred, that a similar rigid adherence to this rule in matters relating to the spiritual Bible-written truths; in other words, in matters relating to the moral and religious condition of man, will be attended with equal progress?

It is a lamentable fact that, in this matter of rigid adherence to this rule of truth-investigation and truth-demonstration, 'the children' who study the things of the natural world are far in advance of, and 'are wiser in their generation than are the children' who study the things of the spiritual world.

It is from this cause that such diversities of opinion prevail among professing Christians; an evil not to be remedied, as the Romanists would remedy it, by squeezing all men's minds into one universal square, impudently called *the mind of the church*; or as Milton describes the patent uniforming process, 'starching them into the stiffness of uniformity by tradition.'<sup>2</sup> This is not the method; but the only method is to establish as binding upon all Christian inquirers the rule already recorded, that *nothing in spiritual matters ought to be believed as true unless its truth can be demonstrated by an appeal to the original Scriptures, and this to the satisfaction of every well-constituted, truth-loving mind.*

This rule once generally recognised and practically carried out, will make the candid and ingenuous all of one mind; will establish uniformity, the true uniformity of belief, one founded on the *conviction*, and not on the *suspension* of the understanding.

Sincere men of science are of one mind in regard to chemical, mechanical, and mathematical facts; this oneness having been arrived at by rigidly adhering to the prescribed rule in studying the Book of Creation. What, then, is there in spiritual subjects to prevent men pursuing revelation-recorded truths, arriving at a similar oneness of mind in regard to those truths recorded by the same Divine Mind, and guided by

the same God of order as dictated the other book of instruction?

Taking this rule as the guide, and holding the principles that revelation being 'information from God,' being a truth discovery, its truths are therefore for discovery, and that these truths are to be discovered with a certainty as great as that connected with the creation-truths, it is proposed to consider

### **THE DEVIL.**

As a consequence of being guided by this rule as it will be essential to throw behind us, and as far as possible to banish from our mental condition all the various notions that have been instilled into our minds in conjunction with the devil, by means of nurse-stories, pictures, and even by the pleasing religious romance writer, Bunyan, and by that stupendous-minded poet, Milton. The descriptions however beautiful, and the notions thence derived however strong, must be to us as inquirers after the truth as though they were not.

Knowing, however, how strong early impressions are, how constantly they obtrude themselves whenever the subjects with which they were originally introduced into the mind are brought before the view, we require to be continually on the alert lest when we in relation to the influence of mental associations are asleep, they may enter in and divert our minds from the good old way-the Law and the Testimony.

From the Book of Creation nothing can be learned of the existence of the devil.

Formerly, the miseries of the world led some to imagine and to believe in the existence of some powerful malignant spirit. The Magi taught the existence of a good and evil spirit, between which existed an irreconcilable enmity : an opinion constantly discernible in the Egyptian and Grecian mythologies, and consequently, in manifestation, traceable in the mythologies of almost all nations. The more uncivilised the nations, the ideas associated being the more absurd.

Though, as the Doctor truly says, nothing can be learned of the existence of a personal devil from the Book of Creation, yet the mythological dogma might be deduced from an observation of existing facts. *Natural evil*, such as earthquakes, floods, pestilence, famine, &c., human wickedness, and death, contrasted with *natural good*, was seen to prevail everywhere. Inquisitive brains speculating upon this would *naturally* attribute the one to an evil cause, and the other to a good one; and as these causes were manifestly superhuman, the carnal mind being unenlightened by revelation on the subject, rushed to the conclusion that the causes were two intelligent, powerful, and antagonistic spirits, one of which the author of good, they styled *Oromazd*, and the other, the author of evil, *Ahriman*. The latter became the devil of the Gentile world; and as men stand more in awe of the terrific than of the good, they invented superstitions to propitiate the devil rather than to do honour to the author of all the benefits they enjoy. This was the origin of the dogma of an omnipotent, omnipresent, and personal devil in the East; whence the nations of the West imported it when their fathers migrated to the “isles of the Gentiles afar off”. They represent him in their statuary and pictures as half goat and half man, with horns and hoofs, and forked tail, and black as soot, with a three-pronged pitch-fork in his hand! The three myths, the mythologies of the pagans, of the papists, and of the protestants, represent the object of their terror under the same form substantially;<sup>3</sup> and all of them assign to him a local habitation in what they call “hell”.

The things affirmed of the mythic Devil have been commingled with Scripture phrases, applicable only to the Devil and Satan of the Bible, and with tradition. Stripped of the former, the devil of ‘Christendom’ is essentially the devil of the Mohammedan and Pagan worlds; the latter being the sire of the devil of our contemporaries, against which we have more particularly to protest, as an existence as fabulous as ‘the immortal souls,’ or ‘separate spirits,’ of ancient and modern mesmerism bewitched. These popular fancies are all of one and the same visionary origin—the *phronema tou sarkos*, THE THINKING OF THE FLESH, termed in the common version of the Scriptures, ‘*the carnal*

*mind*', which Paul avers is 'enmity against God, and unsubject to His law.'- (Rom. viii. 7.) Hence its thoughts are not God's thoughts, and its conclusions, in every particular at variance with His. Show me an opinion, a principle, or an article of faith, originated by the carnal mind, or agreeable to it, and I will prove it to be false by the law and testimony of God. Creation's book, interpreted theologically by speculators, ignorant of the ideas revealed in 'the oracles of God', the word of the apostles and prophets, is the source of all the foolish notions which have perverted the public mind in regard to religious subjects. We must purge ourselves from these upon all topics, that of the devil among the rest, if we would bring our thoughts into harmony with the thoughts of God.

The mythic devil-dogma of the Gentiles, I have said, has been combined with tradition. Between Oromazd and Ahriman, that is, between God and the Devil, say the Orientals and their disciples of the west, 'there is an irreconcilable enmity'. This doctrine of 'enmity' is a truth handed down from Noah, to go no farther back, and misapplied. The irreconcilable enmity is that which God said He would put between the serpent and the woman, and between the woman's seed and the serpent's seed; that is, between the serpent-adherents of falsehood and the righteous constituents of the Bride; and between the chief of the political organisation of the serpent community and the great Captain and Husband of the Bride. - (Gen. iii. 15.) These are the two great parties into which mankind were to be divided, and between whom there was to be irreconcilable enmity, until one or the other of them should be exterminated from the earth. The two chiefs are the heads of each contending party, contemporary with each other upon the earth-contemporary at the bruising of the heel of the one, contemporary also at the bruising of the head of the other: *two* adverse POWERS *incarnated* in two irreconcilably hostile organisations of mankind. The people of the east, though 'become vain in their imaginations, and darkened in their foolish hearts,' still retained this tradition derived from their ancestors, when with a 'mind void of judgement', they fabricated their theory of Oromazd and his enemy Ahriman. They did not retain God's knowledge in its purity, but perverted it, and turned it into a my-

thology of the devil.

The believers in the devil of the Gentiles could do no more than they have done towards explaining the origin of the world's miseries. The thinking of the flesh attributed their origin to the God-hating malevolence of a personal devil, existent before the formation of man; the Bible, on the contrary, refers them all to SIN as their cause, and to divinely appointed EVIL as *the punishment of sin*. The popular notion is a clumsy effort of the carnal mind to explain things too high for it; and the Scripture testimony it adduces to sanctify its absurdity only exposes it to contempt. It tells us that this pre-existent immortal devil was "Lucifer, Son of the Morning!"<sup>4</sup> Would anyone that understands the prophets be so infatuated as to dream of proving the pre-Adamic existence of the devil by such passages as this? The record concerning Lucifer is part of a prophecy of the overthrow of Nebuchadnezzar's dynasty by the Medes and Persians, commencing with the beginning of Isaiah xiii., and ending at verse 27, inclusive of the next chapter. Lucifer is Belshazzar, who was so named 181 years before his fall, because he was the *light-bearer*, or sun, of the Chaldean heaven. The prophet, in vision, seeing him prostrate as a "carcase trodden under feet", exclaims, "Is this *the man* that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms, that made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof?" How dark must that mind be that can press a prophecy of the fall of a man from the throne of a Pagan empire into the service of demonstrating the existence of a personal devil before the creation of man upon the earth! What absurdity is too great for the credulity of the carnal mind after this !

## The Bible Doctrine of the Devil is its teaching concerning sin.

*The Bible doctrine of the devil is its teaching concerning sin.* This is certainly an important subject, and one which it is desirable everyone should understand. The Gentiles do not understand the teaching of the Scriptures concerning sin; it is impossible, therefore, that they can know anything about the devil and Satan exhibited in the testimony of God. \* *Sin* is the synonym of *devil* in the text we placed at the head of this article ; I do not mean it to be inferred, however, that I hold that the word *sin* is the meaning of the words *devil* and *Satan*, wherever they occur in the English version of the Scriptures. The words '*devil* and *devils*' occur about *one hundred and twenty times* in the English Bible, but they are by no means invariably represented by the same word in the *original* Scriptures. Two distinct words are used; and in *eighty-two* passages of the one hundred and twenty, the word employed is quite distinct from that which, in the remaining thirty-eight; and the above text among the number, is the representative of the word devil in the common translation. In the eighty-two texts the word is *daimon*, and its derivatives, which ought never to be translated *devil*, either in the sense of a personal devil or of sin. Of these eighty-two, only four belong to the writings called the Old Testament, in which it is *devils* and not *devil*. In the thirty-eight passages, the original word is *diabolos*.

Now, if the word *devil* be the correct rendering of *diabolos*, it is certain that it cannot be the proper interpretation of *daimon*; and, consequently, to render *daimon* by devil must lead into error. I do not, therefore, affirm that *sin* is synonymous with *devil* and *devils* in those texts which have *daimon* for their representative in the Greek; but that where the original is *diabolos*, the *radical* idea is sin. I conclude, then, that distinct Greek words being used in the eighty-two texts, and the thirty-eight texts, the ideas represented in the two classes are distinct, although rendered by the same word in English; and that, consequently, all arguments in relation to the Devil, as derived from the eighty-two,

would be deceptive and of no weight, because the devil is not referred to therein at all.

The thirty-eight texts in which *diabolos* occurs are: Matt. iv. 1, 5, 8, 11; xiii. 39; xxv. 41; Luke iv. 2, 3, 5, 6, 13; viii. 12; John vi. 70; viii. 44; xiii. 2; Acts x. 38; xiii. 10; Ephes. iv. 27; vi. 11; 1 Tim. iii. 6, 7, 11; 2 Tim. ii. 26; iii. 3; Tit. ii. 3; Heb. ii. 14; James iv. 7; 1 Pet. v. 8; 1 John iii. 8, three times in this verse; Jude 9; Rev. ii. 10; xii. 9, 12; xx. 2, 10.

In our prefatory text, the words are *ton to kratos echonta tou thanatou, toutesti, ton diabolon*: 'the having the power of death, that is, the devil.' *Ton echonta* is masculine to agree with *diabolon*, not because the thing having the power of death is a male, but because the word by custom of the Greek tongue is in that gender. The thing having the power of death is *it* not *him*; unless by *prosopopeia* the *it* is converted into a person, as in Rom viii.13.9 (*kath hyperboleen harmartolos*, pre-eminently a sinner). This *diabolos*, or devil, whatever it may mean, the apostle says, *Jesus came to destroy*. It is, therefore, not an immortal devil, but one, which will, sooner or later, be annihilated by the power of Jesus, the Woman's seed. To destroy the devil is to take away the devil from the world; that is, to take away the sin of the world: hence, said John the Baptist concerning Jesus "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world." This is the mission of Jesus, to take away every curse from the earth; (Rev. xxii. 3; xxi: 5) and certainly when this is accomplished, *diabolos* and all his works shall be destroyed.- (1 John iii. 8.)

Now to accomplish this great work of destroying the devil and his works, Paul says, Jesus became flesh and blood, therefore subject to death like his brethren, that he might die. I can understand this if the devil mean sin; but on the hypothesis that *diabolos* means the Gentile devil, I confess I can see no sense in it. Why should Jesus become flesh and blood to destroy such a devil that the world believes in? Why should he become mortal to conquer the immortal devil? - The devil which men suppose is to torment their species with fire and brimstone, in all eternity? Will anyone of his-friends make this mystery intelligi-

ble, if they can? If the devil to be destroyed be such an one as is supposed, Jesus ought to have appeared in the nature of angels, and not in the weakly nature of the seed of Abraham. He would then have been strong and invulnerable; and an overmatch for the foul fiend perhaps; though if mere strength were required, I see not why the angels could not have given him his quietus thousands of years ago. But no. The angels, even all the hosts of them, could not, and cannot, destroy *diabolos*, or the Bible-devil, which torments our race, upon the principles laid down by eternal wisdom. This *diabolos* is the thing that has “*the power of the death,*” which subjects all the living to corruption. It has this power now, even over the saints, though the King of Saints is no longer holden of it. It will retain this power till their resurrection, when they will be subject to its control no more. It will still, however, retain its hold upon humanity for a thousand years longer; but when that long period is accomplished, the rest of the dead, who are to inhabit the earth for ever with the saints and their king, will be extricated from its deadly embrace; for “*the last enemy, DEATH, shall be destroyed*”. Ah! Death is the last enemy; yes, and the first enemy was sin, who introduced it into the world; for “the wages of sin is death.” Here are cause and effect face to face. Human tradition makes the popular devil the first enemy and the last, the Alpha and the Omega of all their woes; but not so the Bible, *sin* was the first, and death will be the last; because sin being taken away, death, its penalty, will be abolished as a matter of course. As far as possibility is concerned the matter might be reversed. If death were taken away and not sin, sin would then be immortal, *diabolos* would live for ever- a result, however, that cannot be; because it was to prevent the immortality of sin on the earth that the flesh and blood called Adam and Eve, were expelled from Paradise. Gen iii, 22, 23. sin must be destroyed. This is a victory that must be obtained before God can with honour to Himself abolish death. But the destruction of sin has a deeper meaning than simply putting down rebellion. \* *Death cannot be abolished so long as SIN exists in the flesh;* for “the body is dead because of SIN”, Romans viii. 10. it is the physical principle within us that makes us mortal.

## PART TWO

\* THAT *diabolos*, rendered *devil* in the common version, is SIN, appears from the expressions of Paul in various parts of his writings. He says 'that having *the power of death is diabolos*'. The power of death is that which causes death. In a venomous serpent the *to kratos*, or power of death, is in its fang or sting. Remove this, and the most deadly reptile is perfectly innocuous. It has lost its power, not of locomotion, but of inflicting death. So if the power that makes death work strongly within us could be removed, we should never die. It is that *power*. Paul calls *diabolos*. It is not death; but the death-producing power, which is in every man, young and old, saint and sinner; therefore *diabolos* is in every human being.

\* Having ascertained, then, that the power of death resides in *diabolos*, if we can ascertain what is the death power, we, at the same time, learn who or what *diabolos* is. Let us, then, ask Paul a few questions. Thus, 'venerable brother, you have said that *diabolos* hath the power of death; will you kindly inform us what that power is'? Readily. It is death's sting, and *that sting is SIN*, which is strengthened in its workings by the law of God, which is contrary to it.-(1 Cor. XV. 55, 56.) 'Why do you triumphantly inquire, *O death, where is thy sting?*' Because, in speaking of the mortal and corruptible body common to all the saints, putting on incorruptibility and life, I saw that the sin in our flesh, which stings us to death, would be extracted, and the body consequently healed; and that, although we had been severely wounded in the heel, so to speak, we should recover, and so cheat death of many victims. In other words, in the case of Christ's brethren, they would get the victory over him, and verify the saying, 'Death is swallowed up in victory;' You have said that '*the body is mortal because of sin*' (Rom. viii. 10, 11); pray how does the body get quit of this deadly principle, so as to be pronounced victorious over death?' In two ways, according to the believers acted upon; *first*, by resolution into dust, and reorganisation thereof into a body made incapable of decay by the creative Spirit of God, in the hands of the Lord Jesus. This is resurrection life. And *secondly*, by an instantaneous change wrought in living flesh and

blood by the energy of the Spirit, which will destroy the sin-power or sting, which gives place to *that which hath the power of life, that is, the Spirit.* 'But if the Spirit have the power of life, how is it that Jesus styles himself *the life*?' 'And so he is;' for as the Father hath life in Himself, so He gives also to the Son to have life in himself.'-(Jo.v. 26.) The Spirit, which 'imparts life because of righteousness,' is placed at the Lord's disposal 'that he should give eternal life to as many as God has given him.' (John xvii. 2.) The spirit-life, therefore, of the saints is hid with Christ in God; and when he who is their life shall appear, then shall they appear with him in glory.' (Col. iii. 3, 4.)

'*Sin in the flesh,*' then, and the *Spirit of God,* are the two antagonistic principles to which human nature is amenable in the present and future states. The former hath the power of death, and is termed *diabolos* ; the latter hath the power of life, and is styled '*the Lord the Spirit.*' -(2 Cor. iii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 45.)

\* Human nature is styled '*sinful flesh*' (Rom. viii. 3), and Paul speaking of himself as sharing therein, says, 'In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.' -(Rom. vii. 18.) Sin in the flesh, then, is a very evil thing. It is that principle which works within us what is no good in thought and feeling; and these workings, the apostle styles 'the motions of sins'-*ta patheemeta toon hamartioon*-the physical and mental emotions, which, when yielded to, work transgressions of the law of God. So that when a man is tempted, he is not tempted of God, nor of such a monster as the Gentile Devil; but as the apostle says, 'Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it will bring forth sin; and sin, when it is perfected, bringeth forth death'-(James i. 14, 15) This is the philosophy of temptation, so to speak. Man is made up of certain desires. He desires what he sees, hears, feels, tastes, and smells; in other words, he desires the gratification of his senses. There is nothing *essentially* evil in this. The evil lies in their *inordinate* gratification. Now, between the ordinate or regular and inordinate or excessive, God has placed His law. He has said you may desire, but you may not inordinately desire ; or if you do, you may not gratify that desire contrary to My law, under penalty of death. Abstractly, there was no harm in picking up sticks on Saturday;

but when God said ‘Thou shalt do no manner of work on the seventh day,’ this abstractly harmless thing became a high crime against heaven, and brought forth death to him who perfected the desire to gather on that day. Thus the divine law defines what is irregular, and therefore not to be done, by those who would enjoy the favour of God.

Now, if God had given no law to His people (and He has given law to none else), they would not have known what He deemed regular and what excessive, what right or what wrong. In truth, there would have been no such distinction. There would have been neither virtue nor vice; and the only course would have been for a man to follow his instincts. In this there would have been no sin; because 'sin is the transgression of the law;' and where there is no law, there can be no transgression. Had the Lord God not forbidden to eat, there would have been no sin in Adam's eating of the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of good and evil. The pleasantness of the fruit in Eve's sight, the appreciation of its goodness for food, and a desire to be as wise as the gods or elohim, were things in harmony with the nature God had given them, and which He pronounced 'very good;' but when He said ‘Ye shall not touch the tree under penalty of death,’ there was a law given that made the gratification of that nature sin. Hence, it was as true of them as of the apostle, who says ‘I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust (inordinate desire) except the law had said ‘Thou shalt not covet.’ They coveted, being enticed by their own lust, which drew them away from the Eden-law. The desire to eat was conceived within them, *by the suggestion from without, setting the flesh to think and reason without subjection to the given law.* The thinking and reasoning in harmony with their nature alone, was sophistry, and led them to conclusions in direct opposition to the divine law; had they allowed the commandment to guide their reasoning, they would have reasoned logically, and God's thoughts and ways would have been approved, and cheerfully acquiesced in. But the reverse of this was the fact; and sophistry led them in the way of death, as it has all their posterity ever since.

‘By the law is the knowledge of sin’; therefore, those who are ignorant of the law do not know when they sin. This is the case of those

‘without law;’ who are consequently under ‘times of ignorance.’ Nevertheless, they sin though they know it not; and sin and ignorance work death, and ‘alienation from God's life’ (Eph. iv. 18) for ‘the wages of sin is death,’ and renewal unto life is by knowledge. (Col. iii. 10.) Thus, sin had the power of death in Adam's case, and in that of all his descendants. There was no sin in the terrestrial system till he ate. The serpent could not sin, because no law was given to it; and where there is no law there is no sin, and can be none. \* Sin entered the world, *not by the Serpent*, but by Adam, as it is written, ‘Sin entered into the world *by one man*, and death by sin ; and so death penetrated into all men, because in him all sinned’. (Rom. v. 12.)

Adam's nature was animal; very good of its kind, as was the nature of all the other creatures. These did not sin, yet they returned to dust whence they came. So probably would Adam, if he had been left to the ordinary course of things as they were. But he would not have returned to dust if he had continued obedient. He would doubtless have been ‘changed in the twinkling of an eye,’ on eating of the Tree of Life. But, being disobedient, his sin determined his fate, and that of the creatures. It doomed them all to death according to law, and ‘nature’ unchanged was permitted to take its course. This sin became the death-power; for had there been no sin, there would have been no death. Though death *could* have ensued without sin, it *would not have been permitted* to do so; but desire being conceived for an unlawful object, this unlawful desire enticed to a forbidden action; the enticement was yielded to, and shame and fear, the evidences of guilt, resulted. \* Thus a new mode of thought, the sophistry of sin, took possession of human nature, and *caused it to fall*. Sin reigned, and Adam obeyed it in the lusts of his body, yielding his members instruments of unrighteousness to sin. The sophisticated thinking of the flesh gained strength, and became in him and his posterity the rule or law of their nature. This is termed in Scripture ‘*the law of sin*,’ the presence of which, within him, every man may know by the passions or ‘motions of sins,’ at work there to bring forth fruit unto death. Because of this, it is also styled ‘*the law of sin and death*,’ to which the flesh or humanity is subject. Cain was conceived under the activity of this law of nature; hence it is said to have been *ek*

*tou poneerou*, from evil, that is, from sin. This was his origin. Had he been begotten before the tempest arose in his parents' nature, which caused them to fall, he would not have been a murderer. But like produces like, and sin in activity produces pre-eminent sinners. The storm of passion had subsided, and a repentant mind had been established, ere Abel was conceived. When he was born he was welcomed as 'from the Lord,' and though born of sinful flesh, he did not derive his origin under the impulses of transgression, but in parental reconciliation to the divine law. Thus, these two sons were the one from the evil, the other from the good; that is, of the devil, and of the Lord.

\* The word sin is used in two senses; first, to represent that combination of principles within us, which in excitation is manifested in passion, evil affections of the mind, diseases, death and corruption. They are called sin because their manifestation was permitted as the consequence of transgression. And this is the second sense of the word; as it is written, 'sin is the transgression of law.' Transgression was the effect of *the unbridled inworking of humanity*; and when the transgression was complete, or 'finished,' that inworking and its result were *BOTH* styled *sin*.

This unbridled inworking yielded to is licentiousness, and excessively deteriorating to flesh and blood. It degenerates the human organisation, and produces what is observed in the barbarous and savage races of mankind. Man left to himself can never improve; but must always get worse and worse, because his nature is subject to 'the law of sin and death' which is degenerating in its operation. \* The only real antagonist to this law is *divine truth* - 'the word of the truth of the gospel of the kingdom.' If this can be made to take root in a man's heart, it becomes there a rule of thought and action, incessantly antagonising 'the law of sin.' This rule is termed '*the law of the Spirit of life*.' Between these two laws there is a deadly enmity; for 'the law of the spirit of life' is '*the law of God*;' and the other law, the law of sin, is rebellion against it. God's law is from without; sin's law is born in us. The law of God is implanted by *reasoning the mind into conviction of his testimony alleged*. It is the gospel transferred from the prophets and apostles to the believer's heart, and is contrary, in every particular, to 'the thinking of the flesh,' which is sin thinking within us. Now men the

least fleshly can understand these things best. Hence Paul was well skilled in the matter. 'I find' says he, 'a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God according to the inward man'- the '*new creature*' formed within him by God's knowledge; 'but I see another law in my members '- the law of sin ' warring against the law of my mind'- the law of the Spirit -' and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.' A man in whom the truth has no place cannot understand this; because he is subject to only one of these laws, namely, the law of sin and death. His experience and that of the apostle do not agree. It is only the true believer who can sympathise with the apostle - he with whom the truth is most active: he can discern the evil of his nature most acutely. It is such a man can exclaim with Paul: 'O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death' - from this law of sin and death to which my body is subject? There is but one man that can deliver, even \* Jesus Christ the Lord, who partook of flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy this law of sin and death from the body, that is, *diabolos*. Paul fully aware of this, therefore, thanks God in prospect of it. And there he leaves it in the patience of hope, continuing 'for his mind' the mode of thinking erected within him by the truth, as opposed to the unenlightened thinking of the flesh, subject to the law of God; but, for the flesh, to the law of sin.' This is the wretchedness of our case, that however approved of God for character, our flesh, because still subject to the 'law of sin,' or 'law of nature,' in the language of 'philosophy,' is still burdened by that innate power, or *diabolos*, which reduces to death, corruption and dust.

\* But how does Jesus, through his death destroy the devil? I could not answer this question if by 'devil' is to be understood the Gentile devil. But the devil Paul refers to in Hebrews, is 'that having the power of death,' which we have seen is sin. The question, therefore, is *How does Jesus, through his own death, destroy sin?* By making his life-blood an offering for sin, which offering is perfected by his resurrection; as it is written, 'he was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.' Now this sacrifice of Jesus becomes sin-destroying in every one who believes the gospel of the kingdom preached in his name; and is sprinkled with his blood in being baptised into him. All

the past sins of such a believer are cancelled or forgiven: and there is engrafted in him a principle, even *the word believed*, called 'the law of the Spirit of life.' which in the remission has 'made him free from the law of sin and death;' so that sin no longer reigns in his mortal body that he should obey in the lusts thereof. He is 'made free from sin' as the sovereign of his mind and actions; and has become the servant of God, whose will it is his study to learn and obey in all things; thus bringing forth fruit unto holiness, the end of which is everlasting life, when he shall be planted in the likeness of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Such a resurrected man is like Jesus, incorruptible and immortal. The power of death is no longer in him, but thoroughly eradicated from his nature, which is then 'equal to the angels: ' and as he is then, so will all the brethren of Jesus be freed from *diabolos*, and, therefore, subject unto death no more.

But though at the resurrection of the just, *diabolos* be destroyed to this extent, it is still strong and rampant in the rest of mankind, and consequently has then yet to be eradicated from among them: for it is Christ's mission to destroy *diabolos and the works thereof*, in other words, to take away the sin of the world. This is his honour as the result of his obedience unto death.

## **CHRIST'S MISSION IS TO DESTROY**

### ***THE DEVIL AND HIS WORKS***

The first part of the work is to *restrain sin*, apocalyptically styled *binding the Dragon, the Old Serpent*; who is designated also by the words *diabolos* and *satanas*; the former being rendered *devil*, and the latter left untranslated. The last part of the enterprise is *to destroy sin*; so that thenceforth there shall not exist upon the earth a single man having *diabolos*, or 'that having the power of death' in his nature; that is, that all the inhabitants of our planet, without exception, shall be incorruptible and deathless. The restraining of sin, or *diabolos*, is to be effected a thousand years before its destruction; the destroying process consummating the work of the millennial reign.

The sin-power in an individual man, uncontrolled by the law of God, is strong for evil and ferocious as a beast of prey. It converts a man, as the phrase is, 'into a devil;' and permits him to stick at nothing. The works of such a man are 'adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation's, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; the doers of which, the apostle says, 'shall not inherit the kingdom of God.' The Gentile devil cannot be fabled to do worse than this. Now when, instead of one such a reprobate, there are two hundred millions of the like associated together in one community, the power of the evil is increased so many million times. The increase of the power does not alter *the nature* of the evil: it is still sin in the flesh, having the power of death, and, therefore, *diabolos*. Now, what things that community of sinners wills, contrives, and does, are the *works of sin*, termed by John *ta erga tou diabolou*, 'the works of *diabolos*.' These works are civil and ecclesiastical institutions, styled in the Scriptures, 'things in the heavens, and things in the earth, visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers' They are political aggregations of the works of sin, or *diabolos*. In short, everything that is not of the seed or truth of God is a work of sin, and destined finally to be destroyed. The institutions or polity of the two hundred millions are a fair and just representation of the character of the vast majority of them, and, therefore, of their nationality. \* The individuals being sinners, and for the most part desperate ones, the community they constitute is pre-eminently *diabolos*, or SIN POLITICALLY INCORPORATE. The excessive wickedness of such a body politic is illustrated by the Inquisition and the Popish priesthood-associations of adulterers, thieves, murderers, idolaters, and blasphemers; hypocritical pretenders to piety, but as 'earthly, sensual, and devilish' as their own 'devil' is supposed to be. Now, a community like this, with an Emperor, Pope, and ten kings at the head of it, is represented apocalyptically by a Dragon with Ten Horns; and to show its sin-origin, *sin's symbol* is associated with it, and it is styled '*the, Dragon, the Old Serpent;*' and to show, furthermore, its antagonism to God and His people, it is termed '*Diabolos and Satan.*' In the aggregate it is represented in Daniel by the *image of a man* which Nebuchadnezzar saw, in his dream. This man-image is *Diabolos*

and Satan in the climax of Sin's power, glory, and wickedness; and styled by Paul, *ho anomos*, THE LAWLESS, whose manifestation is the result of the energy of the adversary, which is not fully developed until the near future. When the pre-millennial autocratic empire foretold by Ezekiel shall be fully organised, the SIN-MAN, perdition's son, will stand God-defiant within the walls of Jerusalem. This sin-power, called the devil and satan in the English version, is 'that having the power of death' manifested in full political and military array. And, who shall bind this strong one? There will be no power on earth equal to the enterprise. Britain and the *United States*, (notwithstanding their present professed adhesion to Washington's foreign policy, too antiquated for the terrible future) will, on the principle of self-preservation, contend against him. But, their efforts will be vain. The binder of the Sin-Man must from heaven descend, as the apocalyptic angel, having 'great power,' symbolised by 'a great chain,' and 'enlightening the earth with his glory.' When He appears he will strike him such a blow on the feet as to send him maimed, halt, and crippled to the west. After this blow, which is the battle of Armageddon, by which Jerusalem and Israel's land are delivered, no more is heard in Scripture of the Dragon; for, deprived of the dominion of the east, the sin power can no longer be represented by 'the Dragon.' What remains is *diabolos and Satan*, the Sin-Adversary, represented by 'the Beast, the False Prophet and the Kings of the Earth, with their armies;' styled in Matthew, *diabolos kai hoi angeloi autou*, anglice, 'the devil and his angels,' but properly the *sin-power and its messengers*, or agents. These are the broken 'pieces' of the Man image, which the Sin-Binder will have to reduce to powder subsequently to the fracture of its feet.

We see from these hints that *diabolos*, or 'that having the power of death,' appears in divers parts of Scripture in a sort of personal manifestation. The personality, however, is not that of a single individual; but *the personification of a power* in man, and in society antagonist to God and His people. Treating of sin in the flesh, the apostle speaks of it reigning, deceiving, and slaying its victims. While sin has the power of death, he says the strength of that power is the holy, just, and good law and commandment of God. That is, sin would have had no power to

work death in a man for coveting, if the law had not said ‘Thou shalt not covet.’ It is manifestly good not to covet anything that is your neighbour’s; therefore, the law that forbids it is a good law. But, if there had been no such law given, to be covetous would not be punishable with death and exclusion from the kingdom. Hence, the apostle says, \* ‘the good law was not made death unto me; but it made sin appear sin *working death in me*; that sin through the commandment might become pre-eminently A SINNER.’ In the common version *kath’ hyperboleen hamartoolos* is rendered, ‘exceeding sinful.’ This is a version, but not a translation of the words. *Hamarloolos* is ‘one who deviates from the path of virtue, a vicious person, a sinner;’ consequently ‘depraved, sinful, detestable.’ It is a substantive; not an adjective, as rendered in the English version; and, therefore, ought to be translated as above.

\*Now this exceedingly great sinner, Sin, working death in man, the Scripture styles *diabolos*: and it may be pertinently asked, *why is it so called?* The following I conceive to be the reason. The attribute most characteristic of sin’s character is *deceitfulness*; as it is written, ‘Exhort one another daily lest any of you be hardened through the *deceitfulness* of sin;’ ‘Sin taking occasion through the commandment *deceived* me;’ ‘Eve being deceived was in transgression;’ and ‘The Serpent beguiled her through his shrewdness.’ Eve being deceived, the Serpent’s part in the transaction was finished. He held no conference with Adam, who, the apostle says, ‘was not deceived.’ Sin, the Seducer, approached him through Eve, whose eyes were open to evil. Sin incarnate in Eve was Adam’s tempter. ‘With her much fair speech she caused him to yield, with the flattering of her lips she forced him.’ She gave him of the tree, and he did eat; and eating, fell. Thus *sin caused him to fall in casting him across the law line*; and, therefore, it is called *diabolos*. For *diabolos* is a noun derived from the verb *diaballo*, which is equivalent to the word *trajicio*, to throw, or cast over, or across. *Diaballo* is from *dia* and *ballo*, to throw, cast; and in the perfect passive, to be thrown, or cast down. *Diabolos* is one who casts over the line, in a scriptural sense, by misrepresentation and subtlety, which is lying. Hence, *diabolos* stands for slanderer, accuser, and whatever else may be af-

firmed of sin. This is the proper signification of the word, and intelligible to every one; its improper meaning is *devil*, and understood by none. *Sin is the devil of our planet*; which few, perhaps, will believe, being so much in love with it, and delighting in its pleasures wherever they can be found. Gentile superstition is terribly afraid of its devil; but it loves sin dearly, and serves it in all its ungodly lusts. The Scripture saith, however, '*he that committeth sin is of the devil*,' - he is a child of sin; 'for the devil sinneth from the beginning' - sin transgresseth ever. This is the unhappy lot of the entire world, composed almost exclusively of the children of sin. Therefore, the apostle saith, 'Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.'

### **PART THREE**

We have ascertained satisfactorily, because scripturally, as it appears to me, that the thing styled in the Greek New Testament *diabolos*, and rendered devil in the English version, is sin in the flesh. He that 'walks according to the flesh' serves sin. '*diabolos*, or the devil. \* The mortal body is *the body of sin*,' or sin incarnate, which with its affections, lusts, and transgressions, is styled '*the Old Man*;' than whom no imaginary devil can be more wicked and defiant of God and his law. The Old Man, in his individual, social, and political manifestations, is the *diabolos* or devil of the New Testament *mystery*, (Tim. i. 16.—The New Testament is the exhibition of *the great mystery of godliness*.) and treated of accordingly. Destroy the ascendancy of the sin-principle of the flesh over the thoughts and actions, and you have a moral development of the New Man; and then eradicate it from the flesh by the Spirit in a resurrection or transformation to eternal life, and you have the New Man in combined moral and physical manifestation, '*isangelos*,' 'equal to an angel.'- (Luke xx. 36) There is no sin in the flesh of the angelic nature, therefore, it cannot die. No element of it has 'the power of death,' so that *diabolos* exists not in angelic society. The devil has no place there. Being nothing in their nature causing them to transgress, or *cross the line* of the divine will, there are no *ta erga diabolou*, works of, sin, among them. But all is just as God would have it, and it

would be so here but for the disturbing principle called sin. Eradicate this, and 'the will of the Father will be done on earth as it is in heaven,' that is, in angelic society.

From what I have set forth on this subject, our worthy friend will see that I do not speak in *Elpis Israel* of the agency in the original temptation as *only* an animal. If there had been nothing in the constitution of the original nature of man impressible by the suggestions of the serpent, there would have been no *internal* response to the *external* enticement. That internal something was not essentially evil; because, though possessing it, Adam and Eve were pronounced 'very good.' It is not evil to admire the beautiful and to wish to possess it; to desire to gratify the taste, and to aspire to the wisdom 'of the gods,' or Elohim: but all this becomes evil when its attainment is sought by crossing the limit forbidden of God. The seeking to attain, by crossing the line, Paul teaches, was the result, not of innate wickedness, but of deception. The serpent beguiled Eve. Had she been certain of the consequences she would not have transgressed. She had no experience of evil. It might be a very agreeable thing for anything she knew, and highly promotive of happiness. God had warned her of danger in the pursuit of knowledge through disobedience; but then, if they were *to go back to the dust*, that is, to die, what was the meaning of that Tree of Lives? Did not God mean something else? If they crossed the line in relation to the Tree of Knowledge, could they not eat also of that other Tree, and live for ever? There seemed to her mind to be an uncertainty about returning to the dust, *when she lost sight of the law*. This was 'the weakness of the flesh.' There was no uncertainty of consequences so long as she thought God meant what He said; but being deceived on this point, and so made doubtful of it, she ventured to experiment, But however doubtful of what might be, if she had adhered strictly to what God had said, she would still have continued 'very good.' 'Weakness,' both mental and physical, is an *original* element of *animal* nature; as 'power' is of the angelic. Adam's nature was 'very good' as an animal nature: but still it was weak, and, therefore, deceivable and terminable. This weakness is founded in the unfitness of air, electricity, blood, and food, to maintain organised dust or flesh, in life and power forever. The

life principles being weak, the flesh is weak in all its operations, mental and physical. The life of the angelic nature or spiritual body is not manifested on animal principles, but by the direct action of God's Spirit on dust, so organised as to be adapted to its operations. It is, therefore, strong. When Adam's weak nature began to think and act independently of the divine law, its weakness, before an undefiled weakness, became evil in its workings and deteriorating in its effects; and acquired the name of sin from its having brought forth sin, or transgression of law.

\* The undefiled weakness of the flesh, enticed and deceived by sophistry from without, is in few words, the definition of the original temptation. The law of God was weak through the flesh (Rom. viii. 3), and not through the strength of the serpent. Had the flesh been strong, the serpent would have been powerless with all his sagacity. But the weakness, thrown into a ferment by serpent subtilty, became beguiling, and the beguiling subtilty, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived them, and *by it*, slew them.- (Rom. vii. 11) What I have said about the serpent in *Elpis Israel* stands as it was. I have affirmed neither more nor less than what Moses and the apostles say. 'It was more subtle,' or acute, 'than any *beast* of the field which the Lord God had made.' It is generally supposed that the serpent was employed by the devil to beguile the woman. 'It cannot be doubted' says Calmet, 'but that by the serpent we are to understand the devil: who merely employed the serpent as a vehicle to seduce the first woman.' This teaches the existence of an invisible devil before the serpent. The Bible, however, does not teach this. *Diabolos* had no existence before the formation of man; but the serpent had. Moses gives not the slightest hint of the existence of a devil before the creations of the sixth day. The serpent first; then man; afterwards, woman; and lastly, *diabolos*, or devil. This is the scriptural order of their manifestation, the revelation in the flesh of the incitant to transgression, or *diabolos*, being coeval with the Fall. Man existed before the devil, and will flourish in eternal glory after his destruction, when sin and all its works are eradicated from the earth.

*In answer to Mr Cook's second question :-*

“The beginnings” of Gen. i. 1; Matt. xix. 8; John i. 1 & 8 , 44--are manifestly not all the same. The “beginnings” of Genesis, Matthew, and John i. 1, have relation to the creation week; but that of John viii. 44, to the conversation of the serpent with Eve, and the murder of Abel. The fall was probably several years after the creation week; and Abel's murder certainly many more. Father *diabolos* was not a murderer before he brought our first parents under sentence of death. It was then he slew them by the commandment. The beginning referred to in this text is the *apo kataboles kosmou*, or foundation of the world, laid in its sin-constitution. --(Gen. iii. 14-21). Jesus is there, talking to the Jews of their father, sin, whose servants they were. They regarded themselves as the freeborn descendants of Abraham; but he told them they were bondmen to their father, sin. ‘Whosoever committeth sin is sin's *doulos* or bond servant.’ He offered to make them free of this yoke by the truth. ‘I know,’ says he, ‘that ye are Abraham's seed, but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you.’ This murderous disposition constituted them the seed of *a living father*, as well as of the dead Abraham; for Jesus says ‘I speak what I have seen with my Father, and ye do *what ye have seen* with your father.’ Here was a question between them of fatherhood. Jesus claimed to be seed of Abraham and God; while he charged them with being seed of Abraham and sin--they were in other words, *begotten* of sinful flesh, while he was begotten of God, sinful flesh being the matrice of both parties. They said ‘Abraham is our father,’ or begetter; but Jesus objected to this, because they did not do the works of Abraham; showing that he was speaking, not of lineage, but of sonship based on disposition and character. They contended for purity of lineage - that their fatherhood was not of Gentile idolaters, but Jewish believers in God, which constituted them children of God. Jesus charged them with doing the deeds of their father, which they understood to mean of their Gentile paternity; for they said ‘We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God.’ They considered that purity of descent from Abraham constituted them children of God, without regard to character; but Jesus taught them that ‘the flesh profiteth nothing.’ If men would be ‘the

children of God, being the children of the resurrection,' it was by being like Abraham in faith and obedience, which they were not; but being sin's bondmen, he said to them, in the words of the 44th verse, substituting Paul's definition of *diabolos* for 'devil,' 'ye are of the father, sin, and the lusts of your father (the lusts of sinful flesh) ye will do. Sin was a murderer from the beginning (or from the fall) and caused not to stand (*hesteken*) in the truth (or law) because the truth is not in it. When sin uttereth a lie, it speaks of its own things; for it is a liar, and the father of it.' This is perfectly intelligible. All men are sin's children who are born of blood, of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man ; and they continue such until they 'become sons of God' by becoming Abraham's seed, through Jesus as the Christ.-(John i. 12, 13 ; Gal. iii. 26-29.)

From what I have said under this head, our good friend will perceive that I teach that the devil or *diabolos* had a place in the beginning as really as the serpent, and that place was in the flesh; while the serpent was somewhere not far off the woman and the tree.

I come now to Mr. Cook's third inquiry,

\*(The Temptation of Jesus)

'Does not the New Testament teach there is a tempter as really as a 'Christ' the tempted?' In reply to this I remark, that in the case of Jesus, *diabolos* and *satan* were both concerned. When he was filled with the Holy Spirit he was led - Mark says 'driven' - by the Spirit into the wilderness *to be tempted*, or properly, *to be put to the proof* under sin, *hypo tou diabolou*. Their nature was his nature; for the 'children of God being partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same.' -(Heb. ii. 14.) Hence, he was sent forth '*in a form of sin's flesh*' - *en homoiomati sarkos hamartias* (Rom. viii. 3), and thus God made him sin (that is flesh and blood) for us (2 Cor. v. 21), and on account of sin, gave judgement against sin in the flesh of Jesus.

The testimonies show that Jesus was '*under sin*' as a man under a burden. He groaned under it in painful travail. While among the wild beasts of the wilderness (a similar situation to the first Adam's), he felt the danger and desolation of his situation and the cravings of a long protracted fast. He ate nothing all this time, his life being sustained by the Spirit; and at the end, became very hungry. Luke terms this 'being forty days put to the proof under *diabolos*,' or sin; that is, in his case, under the perturbation of weakened flesh and blood. This was before the adversary came to him. His nature was severely tried during this period; and it remained to be seen whether his flesh, thus weakened, would stand in the truth; or like Adam's, seek present gratification by transgressing the divine law. The end of the forty days appears to have been the prepared crisis of the trial. At this juncture one came to test him. Jesus styles him, as he termed Peter, '*Satan*,' that is, *adversary*. This individual, probably, was an angel; for angels were concerned in the matter, as appears from the testimony. Christ's visitor was evidently a person of scriptural information; and as he appeared as a tester at a time especially prepared for the trial, I have no doubt he was sent by the same Spirit that led Jesus into the wilderness, there to be put to the proof. I conclude then, that he was 'an angel of light,' not shining with brightness; but appearing as a friendly man, well instructed in the Word.

Now Luke attributes what this concealed adversary suggested to *diabolos*, or one causing to transgress, but in this case without success for they were suggestions to Jesus under the workings of sin's flesh, seeing that 'he was in all things put to the proof according to 'the likeness' without offence.' The visitor, though styled 'devil,' was not *diabolos* within, as in our case, but an excitant thereof in 'the likeness' or sin's flesh; therefore, his sayings are recorded as those of *diabolos*. Jesus being begotten of God, as was Adam the first likewise, and not of the will of sin's flesh, the promptings to transgression *did not proceed from within*. In this, the form of sin's flesh he assumed, differed from the form we possess. The prompting's in our case do often proceed from within. In the two Adams they came from without- from the serpent in the one case, and from the angel of light in the other. These oc-

cupied for the time the position of the then as yet unbegotten *diabolos* relatively to their flesh, till the lust they might excite should by the strength thereof bring forth sin, when their personal missions would be terminated, and sin enthroned as the conceived *diabolos* of the form, or likeness of sin's flesh.

In the second Adam's case the testing adversary failed to move him from the stand he had taken of absolute obedience to the will of God, whatever might ensue. He appealed to the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, but all without effect. The law of the Spirit of life within him was too strong for these appeals. He extinguishes their effect by the word of faith, which was his shield, and emerged from the trial undefiled. The tester of his allegiance then left him; and whatever perturbation may have been excited, it subsided into the peacefulness of a conscience void of offence toward God.

The Serpent because of his agency in Adam's temptation, became the symbol representative of the evil he had done in the unconsciously immoral use he had made of what he knew by observation, and was able to express in speech. It would be very injudicious to rush to the conclusion that, because the serpent and the angel of light stood related to the two Adams as the *diabolos*, or that causing to err, therefore, whenever the word *diabolos* occurs, it means the serpent or angel of light. If it did, it by no means follows that it would signify the devil of Gentile 'organised theology,' which is as dissimilar from them as they are from one another. Christ was not put to the proof by a serpent, nor by the serpent; nor was Adam by an angel of knowledge, nor by the angel of light, who offered his suggestions to Jesus. They were both probed to the quick; but by *provers* suitable to the times, place, and circumstances around them.

But, though the proving agents in the trials of the two Adams have never experimented upon any others of our race, Christ's brethren stand related to a power, styled *ho peiradzoon*, which is rendered in the English version, 'the tempter.' - \* (1 Thes. iii. 5.) By reference to the passage it is manifest that the tempter alluded to there was not an invisible

devil, but a persecuting power under which the disciples lived in Thessalonica. They were suffering persecution when Paul wrote to them for their encouragement. 'Let no man,' says he, 'be moved by these afflictions: for yourselves know that we are appointed thereunto.' He then refers to what he had told them before, and not them only, but all others; that 'it is through much tribulation that they (the baptized) must enter the kingdom of God.' But he reminds them that they are not alone in their trouble, but are 'suffering like things of their countrymen,' that Christ's brethren in Judea had of the Jews. This saying reveals the power as that of the Gentile authorities in Thessalonica, who, stirred up by 'lewd fellows of the baser sort,' were carrying into effect as far as they could 'the decrees of Caesar,' with all the pains and penalties annexed against the refractory. - (Acts xvii. 5-8 ; 2 Thess. i. 4. 5.) These were torture, imprisonment and death, which served to *prove* their inseparable devotion to the doctrine of God's kingdom, for which they suffered. These 'persecutions and tribulations' might be avoided upon one condition, which was offered to them by the enemy - if they would renounce the faith, and burn incense to Caesar's image. This was the temptation offered to them by the tempting power. If they yielded to the temptation, they saved their lives, but lost 'God's kingdom and glory.' Fearing this result in some cases, Paul says "I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labour be in vain."

In the case before us, \* the tempter was *the imperial pagan Roman power*, styled in the apocalypse, 'a Great Red Dragon, and the Great Dragon, the ancient Serpent, the surnamed *diabolos* and the *Satan*.'- (Rev. xii. 3, 9.) The Dragon, or Serpent, was the symbol of the Roman sovereignty selected by the Romans themselves as representative of its imperality. Chrysostom, who flourished in the 4th century, says that 'the emperors wore among other things to distinguish them, silken robes embroidered with gold, in which *dragons* were represented.' Gibbon also says, speaking of the procession of Constantine from Milan to Rome, 'he was encompassed by the glittering arms of the numerous squadrons of his guards and cuirassiers. Their streaming banners of silk, embroidered with gold and shaped like *dragons*, waved

round the person of the emperor.’ The emperor Constantine speaks of the dragon as the symbol of Pagan Roman sovereignty in his epistle to Eusebius and other bishops concerning the rebuilding and repair of churches, ‘Liberty being now restored’ says he, ‘and *that dragon* being removed from the administration of public affairs, by the providence of the great God, and by my ministry; I esteem the great power of God to have been made manifest even to all.’ Moreover, on the testimony of Eusebius, we are informed, that a picture of Constantine was set up over the palace gate, with a cross over his head, and under his feet ‘the great enemy of mankind, who persecuted the church by means of impious tyrants, *in the form of a dragon,*’ transfixed by a spear through the midst of the body, and falling headlong into the depths of the sea. Hence it is evident that the species of serpent called the dragon was as much the symbol of the Roman power as the lion is of the British at this day. The Romans probably borrowed it from Egypt, which had become a province of their dominion. When an independent monarchy under the Pharaohs, its majesty was represented by ‘the Great Dragon, that lieth in the midst of his rivers.’ The annexation of so ancient and renowned a kingdom was very likely celebrated by the adoption of its ancient symbol into the Roman heraldry. Hence, the Roman dragon is styled ‘*the ancient serpent,*’ or the Egyptian. (Rev. xi. 8.—The great city, or Roman emppire, is here figuratively styled Egypt.)

Whether God in His providence influenced the governments of the world to represent their several sovereignties by peculiar symbols, I cannot say; but that He has adopted them in His word when treating of their policy and destiny relatively to Israel and the saints, is beyond all question. The Egyptian *serpent*, the Assyrian *lion*, the Persian *ram*, the Macedonian *goat*, the French *frogs*, &c; are all examples that He has done so. The adoption by the Romans of the serpent, styled in the prophets, ‘the piercing serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent; the dragon that is in the sea,’ (Isaiah xxvii. 1) as the symbol of the sovereignty that rules the imperial territory, is singularly appropriate. Its scriptural fitness is seen in the fact, that ‘all the power of the enemy’ with which God's people have had to contend on the arena of prophecy, *originated* in the sophistry of the serpent; and is found civilly and

ecclesiastically organised in the ancient and modern imperial dominion of the Roman earth. This power has ever been the *adversary* of Israel after the flesh and spirit, and of the truth, since the Holy Land became a Roman province; and will so continue to be 'until the Ancient of Days shall come, and judgement shall be given to the Most High; and the time comes that they shall *take* the kingdom, and possess it.'- (Dan. vii. 22, 18) It, is not only their *adversary* in making war upon them, as a people who will hereafter seize upon its dominion; but when it gets them into its clutches, it endeavours to turn them from the faith, and to compel them to embrace its own superstition, and so cause them not to stand in the truth. It is, therefore, a power *causing to cross the line*, or to transgress the divine law, that is, a *diabolos*, as well as THE ADVERSARY, or, *ho Satanas*. It is for this reason the Spirit has 'surnamed' the imperial serpent, in the words of the English version, 'the Devil and Satan,' or more particularly, 'the surnamed Devil and *the Satan, ho kaloumenos diabolos kai ho Satanas*.

Dr THOMAS.

<sup>1</sup> Homo, naturae minister et interpres, tantumfacit et intelligit quantum de natura ordine re vel mente observaverit; nec amplius scit, aut potest.—Bacon.

<sup>2</sup> Milton's Prose Works Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing.

<sup>3</sup> In Levic. xvii. 7, and 2 Chron. xi. 15, the word "*devils*" is *seirim*, rendered *demaimonai* by the Seventy, and signifies *he-goats*, which were worshipped by the Hebrews in Egypt and Palestine, after the example of the Egyptians. They were adorned as the representatives of *satyrs* or *wood-demons*, supposed to resemble them, and to live in deserts. In Isaiah xiii. 21, speaking of Babylon, the prophet says: "Satyrs (*seirim*) shall dance there;" that is, he-goats shall do so. The Egyptian he-goat worship was adopted by the Greeks and Romans, who adored him as the representative of Pan, the prince-demon of the woods, and principle of all things. Pan is described as a monster in appearance, having two small horns on his head, a ruddy complexion, and flat nose, with the lips, thighs, tail and feet of a goat. "It is improbable," says Parkhurst, on the word "*sahir*," that "the Christians borrowed their goat-like picture of the devil, with a tail, horns, and cloven feet, from the heathenish representation of Pan the Terrible." Thus the devil of the vulgar superstition was dug out of the grave of Paganism by the early corrupters of Christianity, the charnel house of "all the abominations of the earth."

<sup>4</sup> Isaiah xiv. 12. Alluding to the devil a writer says; "The height of capacity in Lucifer only increased the fall of that Son of the Morning."

## Appendix

	Page
<u>The Bible devil is:-</u> <i>sin incarnate in flesh and blood,, and manifested in the personal, social and political works of mankind</i>	4
<u>The Bible satan is:-</u> the <i>personal and politically organised adversaries</i> to the righteous and the truth.	5
<u>The Bible doctrine of the devil is its teaching concerning sin.</u> <i>Sin is the synonym of devil .</i>	11
<u>Sin is a physical principle within us:-</u> <i>Death cannot be abolished so long as SIN exists in the flesh;</i> for “the body is dead because of SIN”, Romans viii. 10. it is the physical principle within us that makes us mortal.	13
<u><i>diabolos</i>, rendered <i>devil</i> in the common version, is SIN</u> It is death's sting, and <i>that sting is SIN</i> , which is strengthened in its workings by the law of God, which is contrary to it.- (1 Cor. XV. 55, 56.)	14
<u>Human nature is styled ‘<i>sinful flesh</i>’ (Rom. viii. 3).</u> and Paul speaking of himself as sharing therein, says, ‘In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.’ -(Rom. vii. 18.) Sin in the flesh, then, is a very evil thing. It is that principle which works within us what is no good in thought and feeling; and these workings, the apostle styles ‘the motions of sins’ the physical and mental emotions, which, when yielded to, work transgressions of the law of God.	15

Sin entered the world,

*not by the Serpent*, but by Adam, as it is written, ‘Sin entered into the world *by one man*, and death by sin ; and so death penetrated into all men, because in him all sinned’. (Rom. v. 12.)

Page

17

Definition of the original temptation

The undefiled weakness of the flesh, enticed and deceived by sophistry from without, is in few words, the definition of the original temptation

26

The Law of Sin

Thus a new mode of thought, the sophistry of sin, took possession of human nature, and *caused it to fall*. Sin reigned, and Adam obeyed it in the lusts of his body, yielding his members instruments of unrighteousness to sin. The sophistical thinking of the flesh gained strength, and became in him and his posterity the rule or law of their nature. This is termed in Scripture ‘*the law of sin*,’ the presence of which, within him, every man may know by the passions or ‘*motions of sins*,’ at work there to bring forth fruit unto death. Because of this, it is also styled ‘*the law of sin and death*,’ to which the flesh or humanity is subject.

17

The word sin is used in two senses:

first, to represent that combination of principles within us, which in excitation is manifested in passion, evil affections of the mind, diseases, death and corruption. They are called sin because their manifestation was permitted as the consequence of transgression. And this is the second sense of the word; as it is written, ‘sin is the transgression of law.’ Transgression was the effect of *the unbridled inworking of humanity*; and when the transgression was complete, or ‘finished,’ that inworking and its result were *BOTH* styled *sin*.

18

Sin in the flesh made to appear sin by ‘the transgression of the law.

‘the good law was not made death unto me; but it made sin appear sin *working death in me*; that sin through the commandment might become pre-eminently A SINNER.’ In the common version *kath’ hyperboleen hamartoolos* is rendered, ‘exceeding sinful.’ This is a version, but not a translation of the words. *Hamarloolos* is ‘one who deviates from the path of virtue, a vicious person, a sinner;’ consequently ‘depraved, sinful, detestable.’ It is a substantive; not an adjective, as rendered in the English version; and, therefore, ought to be translated as above.

Page

23

The Mortal Body

The mortal body is *the body of sin*,’ or sin incarnate, which with its affections, lusts, and transgressions, is styled ‘*the Old Man*;’ The Old Man, in his individual, social, and political manifestations, is the *diabolos* or devil of the New Testament *mystery*, and treated of accordingly. Destroy the ascendancy of the sin-principle of the flesh over the thoughts and actions, and you have a moral development of the New Man; and then eradicate it from the flesh by the Spirit in a resurrection or transformation to eternal life, and you have the New Man in combined moral and physical manifestation, ‘*isangelos*,’ ‘equal to an angel.

24

The law of the Spirit of life

The only real antagonist to ‘*the law of sin*’ is *divine truth* - ‘the word of the truth of the gospel of the kingdom.’ If this can be made to take root in a man's heart, it becomes there a rule of thought and action, incessantly antagonising ‘*the law of sin*.’ This rule is termed ‘*the law of the Spirit of life*.’ Between these two laws there is a deadly enmity; for ‘the law of the spirit of life’ is ‘*the law of God*;’ and the other law, the law of sin, is rebellion against it. God's law is from without; sin's law is born in us.

18

Jesus Christ the Lord, who partook of flesh and blood,  
that through death he might destroy this law of sin and death  
from the body, that is, *diabolos*

Page  
19

The Temptation of Jesus.

28-30

How does Jesus, through his death destroy the devil?

the devil Paul refers to in Hebrews, is 'that having the power  
of death,' which we have seen is sin. The question, therefore,  
is *How does Jesus, through his own death, destroy sin?* By  
making his life-blood an offering for sin, which offering is  
perfected by his resurrection;

19

SIN POLITICALLY INCORPORATE

Individuals being sinners, the community they constitute is  
pre-eminently *diabolos*, or SIN POLITICALLY INCORPO-  
RATE. The excessive wickedness of such a body politic is il-  
lustrated by the Inquisition and the Popish priest-  
hood-associations of adulterers, thieves, murderers, idolaters,  
and blasphemers; hypocritical pretenders to piety, but as  
'earthly, sensual, and devilish' as their own 'devil' is sup-  
posed to be. Now, a community like this, with an Emperor,  
Pope, and ten kings at the head of it, is represented apocalyp-  
tically by a Dragon with Ten Horns; and to show its  
sin-origin, *sin's symbol* is associated with it, and it is styled  
'*the, Dragon, the Old Serpent;*' and to show, furthermore, its  
antagonism to God and His people, it is termed '*Diabolos and  
Satan.*'

21

The Thessolonian Tempter I Thes iii : 5.

the tempter was *the imperial pagan Roman power*, styled in  
the apocalypse, 'a Great Red Dragon, and the Great Dragon,  
the ancient Serpent, the surnamed *diabolos* and the *Sa-  
tan.*' - (Rev. xii. 3, 9.) The Dragon, or Serpent.

31

Sin the exceedingly great sinner styled *diabolos*.

Now this exceedingly great sinner, Sin, working death in man, the Scripture styles *diabolos*: and it may be pertinently asked, *why is it so called?* The following I conceive to be the reason. The attribute most characteristic of sin's character is *deceitfulness*; as it is written, 'Exhort one another daily lest any of you be hardened through the *deceitfulness* of sin;' 'Sin taking occasion through the commandment *deceived* me;' 'Eve being deceived was in transgression;' and 'The Serpent beguiled her through his shrewdness.' Eve being deceived, the Serpent's part in the transaction was finished. He held no conference with Adam, who, the apostle says, 'was not deceived.' Sin, the Seducer, approached him through Eve, whose eyes were open to evil. Sin incarnate in Eve was Adam's tempter. 'With her much fair speech she caused him to yield, with the flattering of her lips she forced him.' She gave him of the tree, and he did eat; and eating, fell. Thus *sin caused him to fall in casting him across the law line*; and, therefore, it is called *diabolos*. For *diabolos* is a noun derived from the verb *diaballo*, which is equivalent to the word *trajicio*, to throw, or cast over, or across. *Diaballo* is from *dia* and *ballo*, to throw, cast; and in the perfect passive, to be thrown, or cast down. *Diabolos* is one who casts over the line, in a scriptural sense, by misrepresentation and subtlety, which is lying. Hence, *diabolos* stands for slanderer, accuser, and whatever else may be affirmed of sin. This is the proper signification of the word, and intelligible to every one; its improper meaning is *devil*, and understood by none. The Scripture saith, '*he that committeth sin is of the devil*,' -he is a child of sin; 'for the devil sinneth from the beginning' - sin transgresseth ever. This is the unhappy lot of the entire world, composed almost exclusively of the children of sin. Therefore, the apostle saith, 'Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. 1John ii : 15.

## NOTES