

# THE WORD OF TRUTH

OTIS Q. SELLERS, Editor NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1940

VOL. IV, No. 6

\*\*\*\*\*

## Table of Contents

- \* Notes on 1 Corinthians
  - \* Mechanical or Moral
- \* The Unfolding of The Secret
  - \* The Kingdom Eon
- \* Questions and Answers
- \* The Rich Man and Lazarus
- \* The Editor to His Friends

\*\*\*\*\*

## *NOTES ON 1 CORINTHIANS*

### **The Case Against Universal Reconciliation**

Some readers of this witness may feel that too much time and space is being given to the exposition of **1 Corinthians 15:20 to 23**. This passage and its context is one of most important and far reaching passages in the entire epistle. This passage is the one most appealed to by that group of people whom we designate by the term Universal Reconciliationists. For some time I have hoped for the opportunity to express myself upon this theory, especially upon the use made by them of this portion, and no better opportunity will ever offer itself than to do so in connection with the notes on this passage.

It is cause for deep thanksgiving that in many places Christian men and women are now inquiring whether the commonly accepted views of man's nature, man's destiny and future punishment are derived from philosophy and tradition, or from the Word of God. This spirit of honest inquiry is being manifested in many places. It was sure to come, and it is bound to increase. Never again will it be stifled by the convenient but uncharitable cry of "damnable heresy." This is not the middle ages and men are no longer afraid of the word *heretic*. Furthermore, they do not quickly turn against that which men say is damnable.

The great emphasis that has been placed upon personal Bible study in the past forty years has brought many men to the point where they have said, "Now, let us take up the question of future punishment. What does the Bible say?"

The moment that men honestly turn to the Bible, not to find support for some foregone conclusion, but to weigh all that is revealed there concerning man's nature and destiny, they soon form the conviction that much that is vehemently declared to be the truth has no foundation in Scripture. This has forced them to abandon the fearful Augustinian theory of eternal conscious torment. However, the abandonment of a false theory does not mean that man will at once have the truth to take its place. Often the first step in learning the truth is to abandon error. After this initial step it may take years to search out and assemble the facts upon which the truth can be established.

Some men who have abandoned the idea of eternal conscious torment beginning the moment a wicked man dies, have not been willing to patiently wait and work until a true scriptural belief has been formed. They seem to feel it a sin to be without a belief on this subject, so they have plunged at once into some opposite extreme such as universal salvation, universal restoration or universal reconciliation. These three theories are not the same, and of the three the most attractive is universal reconciliation. The reason it is so attractive is that the leading exponents of universal reconciliation hold firmly to the verbal inspiration of the sacred Scriptures, and, furthermore, they earnestly contend for the need of right division of the word of truth.

Every great system of error has some deep truth mixed up with it to which it owes its currency, and I know of no system that has as much deep and precious truth completely interwoven with as much deep, dark error as that system known as *Universal Reconciliation*, of which Mr. A. E. Knoch is the able and zealous advocate. I do not believe that there are many Christians today who can separate the false from the true in such writings as those of Mr. Knoch. This task requires definite familiarity with every word that God has spoken, and, alas, very few Christians have even attempted to gain this familiarity.

When, as the result of my studies in the Word of God, I was forced to abandon altogether the orthodox theories of man's natural immortality and the idea of eternal conscious torment, I determined to form my new beliefs out of the results of my own studies in the Scriptures. For about four years, I had no belief whatsoever as to man's nature and man's destiny. I had abandoned one position, which had not come out of my personal studies, and I determined never to adopt another position until my investigations were complete. Those who sat under my ministry knew that I no longer believed in eternal conscious torment, and some of them tried in vain to get me to assume and declare a new position. They could not understand why I did not leap from one belief to another.

My studies centered in the Word of God, but in due time I felt the need of investigating the findings of others. I determined to make a complete examination of the theories of universal reconciliation as set forth by Mr. A. E. Knoch and the literature of the Concordant Publishing Concern. Mr. Knoch was very kind, making available to me anything or everything published or written by him. This examination was not superficial, neither was it dishonest. I stood ready and was free to accept the entire theory if it should prove to be the truth. Above all things, I wanted the truth, and if universal reconciliation

was the truth, I desired to embrace it. After complete investigation I am now assured that there is no doctrine of universal reconciliation taught in the Word of God, and I would urge all who hold this theory to make a complete investigation of their position.

It must be admitted that there are many verses that can be interpreted so as to teach this. Those most commonly used are John 12:32; Romans 5:18; 1 Cor. 15:22,28; Phil. 2:9-11; Co!. 1:20; 1 Tim. 2:4-6; 1 Tim. 4:10; Heb. 2:9. But it must be admitted that there are just as many verses that can be interpreted so as to teach eternal conscious torment. Neither universal reconciliation or eternal conscious torment is the teaching of Scripture. Both of these doctrines have to be extracted out of previously extracted verses. Neither one of them will flow out of complete familiarity with the Word of God.

The passage which is before us for consideration (1 Cor. 15:20-28) is held by all who accept the doctrine of universal reconciliation to be the strongest argument for their position. The twenty-second verse is appealed to by them to prove that all men who have died in Adam will be made alive in Christ. This I admit to be the truth, but hold that this passage will have been fulfilled to the letter when the dead are raised at the end of the millennial kingdom as set forth in Revelation 20:5. The Universal Reconciliationist holds that all who are raised previous to the Kingdom are "made alive," but they hold that those who are raised at the end of the thousand-year kingdom are not "made alive in Christ." Here is a statement from the writings of Mr. Knoch.

"At the great white throne judgment no one is vivified or made alive. Hence it is passed over." *Concordant Version notes on 1 Cor. 15:22.*

The Universal Reconciliationist holds that resurrection may include "making alive," but they also hold that men can be raised and not be "made alive." They insist that those raised at the end of the kingdom will not be made alive, therefore, they insist, there will have to be a resurrection from the second death in order to fulfill the statement "in Christ all shall be made alive."

As stated before, I hold that when the resurrection takes place that occurs at the end of the millennial kingdom, all who have ever died in Adam will have been made alive in the Christ. Some who are made alive at this final resurrection will die the second death. This death is destruction, and there is no resurrection from it. Those who insist that there is should be ready with some Scripture that teaches it. Inference and deduction will not suffice.

The argument of the Universal Reconciliationist is based upon the meaning of the Greek word which is here translated made alive. The word is *zoopoieo*. (Pronounced dzo-op-oy-eh-o). They hold that this word means more than giving life - that it means "giving life beyond the reach of death, conferring immortality." If this is right, then the resurrection at the end of the millennium does not fulfill "in Christ all shall be made alive," for some who are raised at that time will die again, therefore, they are not beyond the reach of death. I have made a careful examination of this word, as it is used in Scripture, for the purpose of discovering the full and exact value that God has placed upon it, and I cannot find that God places upon this word the meaning of bestowing life beyond the reach of death. It means *to vivify* or *to make alive* and it does not include the gift of immortality or deathlessness. Let us examine these occurrences together with the aid of a concordance to the twelve passages in which this word occurs.

## Concordance to *Zoopoieo*

**John 5:21** - raiseth up the dead and *quickeneth* them

**John 5:21** - even so the Son *quickeneth* whom He will

**John 6:63** - It is the spirit that *quickeneth*

**Rom. 4:17** - God who *quickeneth* the dead

**Rom. 8:11** - shall also *quicken* your mortal bodies

**1 Cor. 15:22** - shall all be *made alive*

**1 Cor. 15: 36** - that which thou sowest is not *quickeneth*

**1 Cor. 15:45** - was made a *quickeneth* spirit

**2 Cor. 3:6** - but the spirit *giveth life*

**Gal. 3:21** - which could *have given life*

**1 Tim. 6:13** - of God, *who quickeneth* all things

**1 Peter 3:18** - but *quickeneth* by the Spirit

**John 5:21** indicates two operations. The Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them. From this the Universal Reconciliationist argues that since raising the dead involves life, the added "and quickeneth them" must refer to superabundant life. This argument is false. Resurrection is re-creation. God made man from the dust of the earth, then quickened him by breathing into his nostrils the breath of life. In restoring those who once lived to their place as living souls, two steps will be followed. They will be raised from the dead, they will be quickened.

When this passage is considered with its context it will be seen that it has no force unless it refers to something that God had done in the past, or was doing at that time. These words were spoken to the Jews, and they were familiar with the Old Testament records wherein God had raised the dead and caused them to live. None of those who had been raised from the dead had been placed beyond the reach of death. The widows son had been raised from the dead, but he died again (1 Kings 17:21-22). In John 5:21 we have a simple statement that what the Father had done, the Son would do. God had given no one immortality, so the word *zoopoieo*, which appears twice here, cannot refer to life beyond the reach of death.

**John 6:63** gives no evidence of the extreme meaning that some would attach to the word *zoopoieo*. This speaks of something that the spirit is now doing. The spirit is not giving life beyond the reach of death. All life is the manifestation of spirit.

**Romans 4:17** sets before us the case of Abraham. Since God quickens the dead, he did not consider his own body, which, so far as its procreative powers were concerned, was already dead. The verse speaks of giving life to one where life was absent.

**Romans 8:11** refers to mortal bodies, that is, bodies that are dying. We have one body, yet it is the home of God's Spirit and our own spirit. Our body does not respond to this because it is dying. But God is able to quicken these dying bodies so that they will react and answer to the call of the Spirit. The passage speaks of something that God is doing now by the present power of His Spirit. But, He has not yet given us an existence that is beyond the reach of death.

**1 Corinthians 15:22** is a restatement in different words of the truth stated in verse twenty-one. "Resurrection of the dead" in verse twenty-one is repeated and explained in the words "made alive" in verse twenty-two. What the first means, the second means also. This is the divine key that regulates the meaning of the word *zoopoieo*.

Some may ask that if these two are the same, then why the added words "and quickeneth them" in John 5:21. In John 5:21 the word for "raiseth up" is *egeirei*, while in 1 Cor. 15:22 the word is *anastasis*. The first means *to waken* or *rouse*, while the second means *resurrect* or *resurrection*. The dead at the end of the Kingdom are not just roused - they are resurrected. See John 5:29.

**1 Corinthians 15:36** gives clear testimony as to the meaning of *zoopoieo*. It is what happens to grain when it is sown. The grain must die before it is given life. This completely refutes the statement of Mr. Knoch that, "Resurrection is for the dead. Vivification is for the living or those who have been raised." (*Concordant Version notes on John 5:21*).

**1 Corinthians 15:45** tells us that Adam was made a living soul. He had no life that he could impart or give to others. The second Adam was made a life giving Spirit.

**2 Corinthians 3:6** offers no evidence in favor of the contention that *zoopoieo* means more than the bestowal of life.

**Galatians 3:21** states that the law could not give life. In fact, the law could do nothing that Christ came to do. This passage offers no aid to the argument of the Universal Reconciliationist.

**1 Timothy 6:13** speaks of what God is now doing. Every living soul is living because of God. All life is from Him. He is giving life to all (Acts 17:25). In Him we live (Acts 17:28). Those who hold the doctrine of universal reconciliation would like to make this passage a prophecy of something that God is going to do, or make it the avowal of a purpose that He will complete in the future. But the passage will not bear this meaning, for it speaks of a present thing. The same testimony is given in **Neh. 9:6**.

**"Thou, art Jehovah thou alone, Thou didst make the heavens, the heavens of heavens, and all their host, the earth and all that is thereon, the seas and all that is therein, and thou holdest them all in life, and the host of heaven unto thee are bowing down."** *Rotherharn Version*. The Septuagint Version uses the word *zoopoieo* in this passage.

If 1 Tim. 6:13 speaks of what God is now doing for the living, then *zoopoieo* cannot mean life beyond the reach of death for no one save Christ has that blessing as a present possession. He alone has immortality. And if the passage refers to the future an insurmountable difficulty presents itself. If in the future God will give life beyond the reach of death to all, then to whom does Christ give life beyond the reach of death. In John 5:21 we are told that the Father does it, and that the Son will do it also. If the Father does it for all, then the work of the Son would be useless repetition. The solution is simple. God is now doing it for all living. The Son will do it for all in resurrection. Therefore, in 1 Tim. 6:13 *zoopoieo* speaks of something God is now doing. He is not giving life that cannot come to an end, so, *zoopoieo* does not mean life beyond the reach of death. If those who are made alive are given the gift of immortality they will be beyond the reach of death.

1 Peter 3:18 tells us that Christ was quickened. The Universal Reconciliationist argues from this verse that inasmuch as Christ was quickened, and since He is beyond the reach of death, then all who are quickened are beyond the reach of death. This argument is childish. Jesus Christ is beyond the reach of death because he has immortality, not because He was quickened.

### **The Septuagint Testimony**

The twelve occurrences of the word *zoopoieo* in the New Testament gives conclusive evidence that it means "made alive" and refers to the bestowal of life. When it is used it does not signify the gift of immortality. The idea of immortality is not included in it. The *Septuagint Version* of the Old Testament gives the same testimony. There we discover just what the Jews would understand from this word when it came from the lips of Christ. It appears in Judges 21:14, 2 Kings 5:7, Nehemiah 9:6, Job 36:6, Psalm 71:20, Ecclesiastes 7:12. Its use there demonstrates that it contains no thought of immortality.

The word *vivify* means "to endue with life," therefore, *vivify* is a good translation of the word *zoopoieo*. After God made man of the dust of the earth, He breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. God vivified the man whom He had made, He endued Him with life, He caused Him to live. Man is dependent upon God for every breath that he draws, so God is now vivifying all living souls. If God would gather to Himself His breath and His spirit all flesh would perish and man would turn again to the dust (Job 34:14, 15, Psalm 104:29-30. God is not now vivifying those who are dead. He vivified them while they were living, but they are now dead. In due time the voice of the Son of God will speak and the dead will be roused and vivified. If these are placed beyond the reach of death the knowledge of that is based upon some further revelation, not upon the fact that they are vivified. For example, we know that Christ was vivified, therefore, we know that He lives. But how do we know that He was placed beyond the reach of death? Some would tell us that we know this because the word *vivify* is used in connection with Him. But we answer, "Not so." We know that death can never again touch Him because of an emphatic statement in **Romans 6:9**:

**"Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him."**

Once again let me state that I believe that the second ALL in 1 Cor. 15:22 is just as far reaching as the first ALL. All who die in Adam will be made alive in the Christ. I believe that this will have its complete fulfillment when that resurrection has taken place which occurs at the end of the millennial Kingdom. All who are raised in the three resurrections that precede the Kingdom will be given the gift of immortality. Those raised in the out-resurrection to inherit the sphere that is far above all will have immortality for they will be vivified jointly with Christ. See Eph. 2:5 where the word is *sunzoopoieo*; also Col. 2:13. Those raised at the last trump to inherit the heavens will have immortality because of an emphatic statement of Christ "neither can they die any more" in Luke 20:36. Those raised on the last day to inherit the earth will have immortality because of an explicit revelation that "on such the second death has no power" (Rev. 20:6). All these are resurrections unto life, for they do not stand in judgment.

We are told in Revelation 20:5 that the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. At that time they are raised and they live again. None of these have immortality for they all stand in judgment to see if they are to continue to live. Those who pass the judgment of the great white throne will be beyond the reach of death for death is destroyed and there is no more death.

Those who do not pass the judgment of the great white throne will be cast into the lake of fire. There will be their destruction, they will have ceased to exist.

Further arguments in the case against universal reconciliation will be presented as we go on to study 1 Corinthians 15.

(Continued, Vol. V, No. 1)

\*\*\*\*\*

## ***MECHANICAL OR MORAL***

EDITORS NOTE: It is not the practice of *The Word of Truth* to reprint articles from other publications. However, the following article is of such exceptional value that it is reprinted here. It deserves the widest possible circulation. It was published in the August, 1940, issue of *The Berean Expositor* and was written by the Editor, Mr. Charles H. Welch.

### **THE ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A MECHANICAL AND A MORAL CREATURE**

#### **Genesis 1, and 2.**

The reader will have already observed that in Genesis 1, where creation is the theme, the name under which the Creator reveals Himself is that of *Elohim* ("God,") while in chapter 2, where we enter into the realm of human activity, the name changes to *Jehovah Elohim* ("the Lord God"). It is not our purpose at the moment to enlarge upon either of these Divine titles. We are simply recording the fact that the change coincides with the transition from creation in general, to that of the responsible creature. It has been said that all creatures lower than man are "held," but that man himself is "held accountable."

The Divine government of Genesis 1:3-25 is set forth as absolute: "He spake and it was done, He commanded and it stood fast" (Psa. 33:9). The original Hebrew of Genesis 1:3 is impressive in its extreme simplicity: **"And God said, Light be; and light was."**

Even this rendering does not impress the eye as would a reading of the original, which is made more striking by the similarity of the two forms of the Hebrew verb "to be."

At the close of the record of the second day's work we read, **"And it was so"** (Gen. 1:7), and this phrase is repeated in verses 9, 11, 15, 24 and 30. Again, in verses 4, 10, 12, 18, 21 and 25, we have the repeated phrase: **"And it was good."** The appearance of light, the appearing of the dry land, the gathering of the waters, the growth of grass, herb and tree, the rule of the sun and moon, the creation of the monsters of the sea, the fowl of the heavens, the beasts, cattle, and creeping things, are all said to be "good." Light is certainly "good," but light is physical, not moral. It is impossible for the mind to conceive of the idea that light could have refused to come into being when God spoke. It would be

equally impossible to think of promising a reward to the sun for ruling the day, or of punishing the moon for causing an eclipse. In the realm of creation we are in a sphere of mechanical movement, where everything is determined, where there can be no option, no alternative, no choice. When, however, we pass from this realm of creation to the realm of human activity, we leave the sphere of mechanical determinism, and enter the sphere of moral agency, accountability and contingency. When God formed man of the dust of the ground, man had no knowledge of his own creation, and therefore, had no responsibility for the form in which he was fashioned, or for the mind and will with which he was endowed. The moment he stood upright, however, as a living soul, made in the image and after the likeness of his God, he entered into a relationship with his Creator, in which obedience or disobedience were equally possible, and in which disobedience involved a penalty. At this point we step out of the sphere of Mechanics into the sphere of Morals, where contingency is possible. It would have been impossible without altering the nature of man, for such words as "It was so," to have followed the command concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Looking at man as a creature, God could and did pronounce him to be "good" (Gen. 1:31), but, with reference to the prohibition concerning the tree of knowledge, and man's own moral nature, it was impossible for him to be pronounced "good" apart from trial and proof. Moral good cannot be ready-made; it must be acquired. The possibility of evil was incipient in the creation of a moral being.

There were three ways in which evil could have been prevented:

(1) God could have created a being who was incapable of sinning. Had He done so, the creature thus formed could never have risen above the level of a brute beast. His actions would have been governed by the promptings of instinct, and would have had no moral value.

(2) God could have created a being capable of sinning, and yet have kept him from all possible internal and external temptation. Had man been thus formed and hedged about, he would have remained innocent, but would never have been upright. He would have been innocent as an animal is innocent, but could never have been upright as a man is upright.

(3) God could have created man, and allowed temptation, and yet have prevented him yielding to it. If this had been done, the very act would have destroyed the moral nature that had been formed. Enforced goodness, coerced love, compulsory worship are contradictions. Goodness, love and worship are emptied of their essential meaning the moment the principle of compulsion enters. God can create innocent beings, but in the very nature of things, the creation of a virtuous character or a ready-made righteousness is impossible. A virtuous character cannot be bestowed by Divine fiat.

We must therefore expect, in the very nature of things, to find contingency in the second chapter of Genesis.

**"And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:16-17).**

The twofold usage of the word "determine" is an interesting example of the difference between what is mechanical and what is moral.

(1) "I am *determined* to face the wind."

(2) "Dust is *determined* to go with the wind."

In the first case a resolution is made after due consideration, a definite choice arrived at after pondering alternatives. In the second case there is no choice, and there can never have been an alternative. .

It is obviously foolish to speak of a "will," apart from the person that wills, and it is equally absurd to talk of "evil," as though it existed somewhere in the universe as a thing in itself. Moral evil cannot be "created," or come into existence, apart from moral beings who actually do what is wrong. When we discuss the existence of evil apart from the actions of those who act wrongly, we are inventing difficulties, which have no real existence. The problem of *evil* is the problem of *personality*. If a moral person, who is held accountable for his actions, transgresses a prohibition and thereby comes under a penalty, it is utterly wrong to charge the One Who lays down the prohibition and inflicts the penalty, with the creation of the evil thus punished. If such a state could be conceived, anything would be possible, and the whole groundwork of truth would dissolve. Under such conditions nothing would or could matter.

To speak of predetermined sin would be a contradiction, for sin is the transgression of a law, and a predetermined act is itself of the very essence of law. Obedience and disobedience in this case would be quite irrelevant.

In the story of the garden of Eden, we must not imagine some insidious trap, definitely placed there so that man should fall into it. We must realize, rather, that man, as a moral creature, had to be tested. In the law we read:

**"If ye will not be reformed by Me by these things, but will walk contrary unto Me: then :t will also walk contrary unto you and will punish you yet seven times for your sins" (Lev. 26:23-24).**

These words would mean less than nothing, if it had already been predetermined that Israel would in fact "walk contrary." Indeed, if it had been decreed that Israel should act in this way, then their so-called "contrary" actions would actually be in agreement with the Divine intention and sin would become an impossibility. "To be forewarned is to be forearmed," and the very knowledge of what in the natural course of things will inevitably happen becomes by the interposition of moral agency a means of falsifying such apparent predetermination.

It is possible that an objection may have formed itself in the minds of some of our readers in connection with the statement made above that evil cannot be "created." In Isaiah 45:7 we read:

**"I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil: I, the Lord, do all these things" (Isa. 45:7).**

The word translated "evil" here is the Hebrew *ra*. So far as its usage is concerned, there are about an equal number of passages where the word means "moral evil" or "sin," and where the word means "evil" in the sense of a "calamity" or "judgment." Merely to quote Isaiah 45:7 is, therefore, inconclusive. The only way to settle whether the word "evil" is used here in a moral or in a penal sense is by considering the context. We have met quite

a number of people who misquote the passage as though it read: "I make good, and create evil," instead of "I make *peace* and create evil."

Evil that is in contrast with peace is not necessarily moral evil or sin at all. It may be righteously inflicted because of transgression, as in **Amos 3: "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?" (Amos 3:6).**

The context deals with the principle of cause and effect. A bird cannot fall into a snare if there is no gin set; the trumpet cannot be blown in a city, without the people running together. And so, if there be "evil" in a city, then there must have been some just cause, for the Lord punishes sin and rewards righteousness.

We must remember in Genesis 2, that it is not "good and evil" but the "*knowledge* of good and evil" that is prohibited. Such knowledge is in itself desirable in the right persons, for we find in Hebrews 5:1 that the ability to discern both good and evil is a mark of the "perfect" *or* "full grown." Adam, however, was a babe so far as experience was concerned, and to acquire an adult's knowledge with a baby's experience meant failure. When the Tempter said, "**Your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil,**" his statement was true, even though his intention was to deceive, *for* in **Genesis 3:22** we read:

**"And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."**

Man was made "for a little, lower than the angels," though destined to be "above" them. To attempt to penetrate into the realm of spirit before the right time, is witchcraft and spiritism, and to attempt to grasp universal knowledge while still a babe is equally disastrous. Man will *one* day "know, even as he is known," but he must be willing to wait God's time.

The same thing is true with regard to the kingdoms of the world. It is the revealed purpose of God that when the seventh angel sounds, "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom *of our* Lord and of His Christ" (Rev. 11:15). On the other hand, *for* the Lord to have yielded to the temptation of the Evil *One*, to grasp this sovereignty before the appointed time, would have been the same in principle as the act which brought about the downfall of Adam. There man failed, in a garden *of* plenty, the Lord triumphed in a wilderness of want (Matt. 4:8-9).

A knowledge of good and evil really comprises the whole realm *of* knowledge. He who knows all good and all evil, knows all things. This was evidently understood in *O. T.* times, as the language of the woman of Tekoah indicates:

**"As an angel of God, so is my Lord the King to discern good and bad" (2 Sam. 14:17).**

**"My Lord is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth" (2 Sam. 14:20).**

Comparing the two passages, we see that "good and bad" and "all things *on* the earth" are synonymous.

There is a tendency with most *of* us to read the words of Genesis 2 as though they were "The knowledge *of* good and *evil*," *or* even "The knowledge *of* *evil*." We must remember,

however, that the tree represented both *good and evil*. "Good" *out of* place, and before its time, can be definitely harmful. Marriage, for example, is "honorable in all," but that which is most blessed within the limitation of marriage, is itself a sin if entered into apart *from* those Divinely appointed limits. Again we observe that "good" and "evil" are not things in themselves, but terms, which refer to the actions of particular people.

We conclude by giving, in the form of a table, a list of some of the characteristics that distinguish the sphere of **mechanical determinism** from that of **moral accountability**.

**Creation (*Mechanical*)**

Title: God.  
Pronouncement: "It was so."  
Created things "good."  
Created things "held."  
No option.  
Things or animals.  
Sin not possible.  
Faith and love impossible.  
Faith and love possible.  
"Let there be light."

**Creation (Moral).**

Title: Lord God  
Pronouncement: "Thou shalt not."  
Moral creatures tested  
Moral creatures "held responsible."  
Freedom of choice.  
Persons.  
Sin possible  
No fellowship  
Fellowship.  
"Let Us make man."

**THE END**

\*\*\*\*\*

***THE UNFOLDING OF THE SECRET***

(Continued from Vol. IV, No. 5)

The words *Joint heirs*, *joint body* and *Joint partakers* cause the unfolding of the secret to take three great steps forward. Having considered the words *joint heirs*, let us now consider the next in order of these three great terms.

**The Joint Body**

The word *joint* signifies perfect equality. We are familiar with such things as joint ownership, joint action and joint tenancy. It signifies united and equal ownership or united and equal action.

That the Church of God of the Acts period was a body cannot be denied. The believing Jews and Gentiles of that period were a body for all had been baptized into one Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13). They were also one body because they partook of one bread (1 Cor. 10:17). But it was not a joint body. There was no complete equality of the members. The Gentiles were subordinate to the Jews, for the Jews had the advantage (Rom. 3:1-2). The Gentiles were debtors to the Jews (Rom. 15:27), but the Jews owed the Gentiles nothing. The Gentiles partook of Israel's spiritual things (Rom. 15:27), but the Gentiles had nothing of

which the Jews could partake. The members had gifts differing one from another (Rom. 12, 1 Cor. 12). There was no equality in service or action. Some were apostles, but some were not. Some were prophets, but some were not. The twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians is an irrefragable witness that the Church of God was not a joint body.

The Old Testament speaks of that time when the Gentiles would be blessed with Israel, but the Old Testament contains no hint or suggestion that God would produce a joint body with Gentiles in its membership.

The Church, which is His body is a joint body. Every member has been brought into it, and is in it, on the basis of absolute equality. What one member is before God, all members are before God. What one member does under God, all have the right to do.

Every member is the peer of every other member, all members have the same rank, all bear the same titles, all are of the same quality.

If we believe this, then let us seek grace so that we will never be guilty of doing a thing that will deny it in any manner. Let us refuse to fellowship in those things that do deny it. We must repudiate the claims of any man who would tell us that he is more in the Church which is His body than other members, and we must reject the proposals of those who would attempt to foist any man upon us as such. We must earnestly strive to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

There is no other out-calling in Scripture that can be called a joint body. This is the unique character of that body that God began to form after Acts 28:28.

### **Joint Partakers**

From Acts I to Acts 10 the gospel was to the Jew only. From Acts 10 to Acts 28:28 the gospel was to the Jew first. The full statement here tells us that the Gentiles are to be joint partakers *of* the promise in Christ Jesus by means of the gospel, which Paul dispensed. This is that glorious gospel set forth in the book of Romans. It was the power of God unto salvation, but it was to the Jew first. Now it is no longer "to the Jew first." The Gentiles partake on the basis of absolute equality.

God puts more into one word than men could write in many volumes. Pressed into the words *joint heirs*, *joint body* and *joint partakers* we have the three greatest truths of the Secret.

### **Unsearchable Riches**

Paul was commissioned to preach among the nations the unsearchable riches of Christ. From this, some have concluded that this message is only for Gentiles. This is an error. The Jews living at that time had rejected one message and there was no value in going to them with another. If men will not believe "lower" truth, there is no use to go to them with "higher" truth. This was expressed by our Lord in His words to Nicodemus:

**"If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things." John 3:12.**

The Jews had rejected the message of the crucified Christ, so there was no value in going to them with the message of a higher and greater work that was founded upon the crucifixion of Christ. If they had rejected that which was clearly foretold in the Old Testament, it would be folly to go to them with a message that had no foundation in Old Testament prophecy.

The message that Paul declares in Ephesians was not hid in the Scriptures, it was hid in God. It cannot be traced back into the Old Testament for it is the untrackable riches of Christ. It was also Paul's commission to make all men see what is the administration of the Secret, which all through the eons had been hid in God.

### **Paul's Petition Ephesians**

**3:14-21.** This prayer of Paul is worthy of the most careful study, in order that we may see how an inspired Apostle prayed, what he prayed for, and what he prayed about. He asked for them such things as were essential so that they could walk worthy of the calling wherewith they were called. It is woven around such words as strengthened, rooted, grounded, comprehend, know and filled.

### **Chapter 4.**

**4:1-6.** The revelation advances as Paul takes up the question of the walk of those who are members of the one body. Doctrine and practical truth is woven together. The walk is not to be one of solemn and exaggerated self importance. It is to be one of lowliness, meekness, patience and forbearance. In this manner we are to earnestly strive to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. The unity is to be kept, not made. The Spirit has made it and no creed, confession, statement or declaration can ever improve upon it. In the unity of the Spirit there are seven distinct unities. One body, one spirit, one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all. This is the true basis of all fellowship.

**4:7-10.** In this portion verses eight to ten are a parenthesis, and verse eight contains one of the most important and far reaching statements of the Ephesian epistle. In the King James Version it reads:

**"Wherefore he saith, When He ascended up on high he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men."**

The word *led* is an interpolation that has no basis in the original. A more accurate translation would be:

**"Ascending on high He captured captivity and gave gifts to men."**

This is a statement concerning the law, and it reveals the present status of the law. Christ was born of a woman and born under the law. When He ascended on high (not heaven) He ascended to the realm in which the law originated. When the law is kept on earth it will be God's will being done on earth as in the heavens. It is erroneous for anyone to say that the law has been done away with, or to say that it has been abolished, repealed, blotted out or destroyed. Not one of these statements has any foundation in the Word of God.

The death of Christ altered the law on some points, but it was still in force and effect during the Acts period. A change in law does not repeal it (Heb. 7:12). A law that can be broken in one point or all points has not been abolished (James 2:10). The Gentiles were never given the law, and they were not placed under it during the Acts period. The law continued in force for all believing Jews until Acts 28:28. At that time Christ ascended from the heavens to a place that is far above all that is *of* the heavens. There He is seated as Head *of* the Church, which is His body.

In this passage the law is referred to as captivity. It brought men into captivity and held them in bondage. That which was given for their highest good became a curse to them. When the Lord ascended *on* high He captured captivity, that is, He took control of that which brought men into captivity.

We might find an illustration of this in martial law. There have been many instances where law and order (as they say) have broken down in a city. Of course it is not law and order that has broken down, it is men that have become lawless and disorderly. The forces of law and order can no longer control the people, so it becomes necessary for some higher power to declare martial law. The military forces move in and become both the law and the enforcers of it. The law of the city no longer functions for the rule of the military powers prevail. This does not mean that the law has been done away with, it means that it has been taken over by a higher power. It is a temporary arrangement, but the fact of it cannot be denied.

Even so it is when Christ ascended on high. He has taken control *of* the law, and it has been superseded by absolute authority vested in Him. We do not look to the law for guidance, but unto the one Lord. His will is absolute, whether it be in accord with or contrary to the law *of* Moses. This arrangement is only temporary for the time will come when the law will be written on the hearts of men *on* earth, and that law will function for man's highest good in all its perfection.

**4:11.** It is evident that in verse eleven the emphasis is placed upon men more than gifts, *yet* we must be careful here or we will make this to mean that the Lord gave titles to men, then sent these men to the saints. If the apostles did not have the gifts of an apostle, if the prophets did not have the gift of prophecy, and if the teachers did not have the gift of teaching, then they were apostles, prophets or teachers in name only, and they were as impotent as many men who assume these titles today.

These apostles were "ambassadors extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary" from Jesus Christ to the saints in the transition period from Acts 28:28 to the close of 2 Timothy. The inspired word came from their lips, as it was not *yet* written in the Bible. They performed no miracles or set forth no signs for they were not sent to do this. They ruled with inspired wisdom and spoke with inspired authority.

The prophets were proclaimers. The message had to be declared accurately. They took the unwritten message of Paul and proclaimed it by inspiration. There were no stumblings and no mistakes. They were given to men as prophets. These men dealt with the whole revelation of God.

The evangelist followed the prophet. His message was limited to the good news. They were messengers of the evangel and they captured the minds of men by their presentation of the glorious truth of the secret. Their message was inspired.

The work of the apostles, prophets and evangelists left many casualties among weak brethren. Some were upset, others were frightened. For all such, God provided pastors.

The final gift was that of teaching. These teachers spoke by inspiration. No one ever taught them, for their teaching was the gift of God. No one else taught but them during the transition period.

In order to understand these gifts we must review certain things that have already been set forth.

The most radical and far reaching change ever made in God's administrations was made when Paul announced that the salvation of God was to be sent to the Gentiles. The death of Christ is the most stupendous event in the Word of God, but it was right in the flow of prophecy. It was one more step in the unfolding of God's purposes, and it was vitally linked with all that preceded and followed it. It was not some revolutionary, unpredicted event suddenly thrust into the course of things. The death of Christ could have been no surprise if men had believed the Word.

The truth wrapped up in the statement made at Acts 28:28 was contrary to the whole flow of prophecy. It was a radical and revolutionary surprise even to those who knew and believed every letter of the Old Testament. They could expect prophecy to be fulfilled, but if the salvation of God was to be sent to the Gentiles, then no prophecy could be fulfilled until this unpropheied event was out of the way.

This statement marked the temporary cessation of God's purposes in the Church of God, and it also marks the beginning of a new out-calling. The privilege of becoming a part of this new outcalling was held out to every member of the Church of God. Those who accepted the opportunity and laid hold of the high calling found that they faced the exceedingly difficult task of readjustment. Left to themselves they could not have accomplished this, but they were not left to themselves. They did not have the seven last epistles of Paul, for the Word of God was not yet complete. The part that was lacking was the most important to them, but God made up this lack by providing them with apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. It was an act of grace upon His part.

These gifted men were given for the readjustment of the saints. This is the meaning of the word *katartismos* which is translated perfecting in Ephesians 4:12. This was not the only purpose behind these gifts. They were also given for work of ministering (dispensing) , and for building up the body of Christ.

These gifts belonged to the transitional period between Acts 28:28 and the writing of 2 Timothy. The service of these men is now superseded by the completed Word. There are those who teach, but there are no gifted teachers and no gift of teaching. The work of teaching is now committed to faithful men, not gifted men.

**4:12-16.** All growth for members of the Church, which is His body is to be in the Head. Our service is to be centered in the Head, not in the Body. All ministry for the Church which is His body is performed by Jesus Christ as the Head. He never steps out of this office in any work that He does for us. Every need of ours will be supplied by the Head.

**4:17-32.** It would be pleasant to deal with every detail of walk presented in these verses. This truth is needed, but this is not the time to present it. However, let us notice the outstanding things that are to determine the shape of our character. This reveals the practice that should be the fruit of the doctrine that has been revealed.

We are well aware of that great mass of men whose minds are empty, whose understanding is darkened and who have no share in the life that God gives. These men are forever seeking to shape and regulate the lives of others. They feel you should drink because they do, and indulge in and enjoy the things they waste their lives upon. They would put thoughts in our minds and words upon our lips, and they become very resentful when we secure some thoughts from the Word of God and begin to speak the accurate language of revelation. As a rule these are religious, and they would force their religion upon us. We are not to take the tenor of our lives from men. They must not be allowed to chart our course or set our sails. Do not be afraid to do what the world does not do. Do not be afraid to reject what men call orthodox, and do not be afraid to accept what men call heresy. We are not to resemble the religious men of this world. We are to resemble God in that righteousness and holiness that comes from the truth.

The exceedingly high yet gracious character of God's present requirements of His own is clearly revealed in verses twenty-five and twenty-eight. We live in a time when the ability to lie has become a valuable business, religious, social and political asset. To be a successful liar is a real *desideratum* in governmental spheres, and many courses in salesmanship are simply courses in the art of telling a lie successfully. Men have discovered the value of the lie in this world, and many have been forced to adopt it in order to meet competition. It is given the name of good business or salesmanship. The walk of our calling demands that we shall put away lying and speak the truth. It does not demand the impossible work of going back and straightening out every lie, but it does demand that the saint shall, this very moment, put all lying to one side and speak the truth.

The one who stole is to steal no more. This passage takes the one who stole right where it finds him and insists that stealing shall come to an end and honest labor shall take its place.

Those who live the truth set forth in Ephesians 4, 5 and 6 will discover that they are living a higher life than the law ever demanded. The law went so far as to condemn perjury, but Ephesians rebukes every falsehood and insists that the truth shall be spoken. The law forbids a man to steal, but Ephesians insists on honest labor. The law forbids adultery, but here a man is told to love his wife. Every moral precept of the ten commandments is restated with increased emphasis in the walk of our calling.

**(Continued, Vol. V, No. 1)**

\*\*\*\*\*

# ***THE KINGDOM EON***

**(Continued from Vol. IV, No.5)**

There are very few Christians who feel any obligation toward the Word of God, if we judge them from their actions. They feel obligated to defend the tenets of some traditional belief, and they will appeal to the Bible in order to do this, but they feel no need of entering into accurate knowledge of all that God has revealed. They shrink from the thought that there is need to test all ideas by the Word of God, and the idea of revising their beliefs so that they will conform to Scripture is repugnant to them.

Those who hold that the greatest fact in the universe is the fact that God has spoken, and who prize the Word of God above all treasures, do not waste time defending their own ideas and traditions. Neither do they waste time in investigating the contentions of every system to see if they can find the truth. They go direct to the source of all truth, and their only purpose is to secure the truth that God has deposited in His Word.

The man who has some definite task to perform will always welcome tools or means that will aid him to better accomplish his purpose. If he is brought to a standstill in his purpose he will seek for those things that will clear the way and permit him to go on. The student who is sincere in his purpose to master the contents of the Word of God will not retire from the task just because he has found some seemingly insurmountable difficulty, or because he finds himself in some momentary confusion from which he cannot immediately extricate himself.

The student of the *King James Version* will find in it some things, which can only lead to confusion. If these things are not overcome, progress in knowledge must come to a standstill. The phrase "the end of the world," if adopted and adhered to, will cause the greatest possible confusion and defeat anyone in their study of prophecy. The acceptance of the word *hell* as a translation of *gehenna*, *hades* and *tartaros* will cause great confusion and make impossible any true understanding of these three things.

The confused translation of the word *aion*, if accepted, will hang a veil over the Word of God that will baffle any student, and in time cause him to decide that, after all, he never really cared for Bible study. Or he will decide that the Bible is too deep for men, save only the greatest of minds. The sincere student will recognize the difficulty, and will seek for that which will lead him out of confusion and into the truth. The darkness that the *King James Version* has imposed upon the word *aion* is so thick in some places that most expositors have gladly accepted the word *age* as a translation of *aion* in many places. In the *Scofield Bible* there are some 35 marginal corrections, giving *age* as the meaning of *aion*. This gets us out of the darkness and into the mist, but if we would get out of the mist and into the full light of God's truth, we must recognize that if the word *aion* means a period of time in most occurrences, then it must mean a period of time in all occurrences. If not, then it must be left to fallible man to say where it does mean a period of time and where it means eternity. This destroys all value of an inspired word.

Furthermore, logic forces us to recognize that if a noun has a certain meaning, the adjective that is cognate to it must have the same idea in its meaning. For example, we know what the word *wood* means, therefore we cannot conceive of *wooden* meaning something made of iron or brass. The meaning of *wooden* cannot be foreign to the meaning of *wood*.

The noun *aion* cannot mean an age, and the adjective *aionios* mean eternal, something entirely foreign to it. So, if we would be led out into the full light of truth we will do well if we accept the principle that ***aion* means *eon* (a period of time)**, and that *aionios* is its cognate adjective and means *eonian*. By accepting this translation we can preserve every accuracy of the inspired original and lose nothing when we turn Greek into English.

In examining each occurrence of these two words I am attempting to show that the translation will never fail or break down in any occurrence, and that it will shed light on every passage wherein these words occur. Let us now consider the occurrences of *eon* and *eonian* in Acts and Romans.

**Acts 3:21.** The *King James Version* makes this "**since the world began,**" but this cannot be, does for *aion* not mean *world*. Scofield makes it to be "from old time," which ignores the Greek altogether. Consistency demands that we make this to read "from the *eon*," which is a brief way of saying "**from the beginning of the *eon*.**"

**Acts 13:46.** Paul and Barnabas had been speaking to the Jews. Their hope and interest was centered in living in the coming *eon*. By their acts these Jews judged themselves to be unworthy of life in that *eon*. Therefore, they will not be raised from the dead on the last day of this present *eon*, for they are not to receive *eonian* life. They will be raised at the end of the kingdom *eon*, and their fate will be that of all who reject Christ.

**Acts 13:48.** The Gentiles welcomed the opportunity that the Jews had rejected. They became possessors of *eonian* life. They will live this life in heavenly spheres.

**Acts 15:18.** Change the word *world* to *eon* and you will have the truth as to what Peter said. This is the first step before going on to discover what he meant.

**Rom. 1:25.** In this passage we have the plural. It is evident that if the singular means *ever*, then the plural should mean *evers*. But who ever heard of such. The Creator is blessed for the *eons*.

**Rom. 2:7.** The great white throne judgment takes place before the final *eon* begins. The final *eon* is that of the new heavens and the new earth. The judgment will be according to works. Those who pass the test will receive *eonian* life, or life in the final and greatest of all *eons*.

**Rom. 5:21.** The reign of sin brings death, but now grace reigns through righteousness and brings *eonian* life.

**Rom. 6:22-23.** As slaves of God we have a better expectation than those who are the slaves of sin. Their slavery will consummate in death, while ours will consummate in *eonian* life. The wages of sin is death, but God's gracious gift is *eonian* life.

**Rom. 9:5.** The plural appears here and it should read "**God blessed for the eons.**" This preserves the inspired Word; the interpretation or meaning in another matter. Our first duty is to know what God has said, then we can go on to discover what He means. It is best not to try to get both at the same time.

**Rom. 11:36.** This also is the plural, and it should read, "**To Him be glory for the eons.**" To this every believing heart cries "Amen."

**Rom. 12:2.** The present eon is evil and we must not be conformed to it. How different it will be in the eon to come. Those who are on earth in the coming eon must conform to it for it will be an eon of righteousness.

**Rom. 16:25, 26, 27.** The word *eonian* should appear in verse 25 and 26, and in verse 27 we discover the first occurrence of the double plural, namely, the eons of the eons. Thus, in one sentence Paul uses the adjective twice and the noun twice. Many years ago I was taught, and I accepted, a rule of grammar that a derivative cannot have a greater force than the parent word. When an adjective is derived from a noun its meaning is dependent upon the meaning of the noun.

In this passage Paul speaks of a secret that was hushed in eonian times, but it is now manifested by the commandment of the eonian God. He is the God of all eons.

There are those who argue that since God is eternal, *aionios* must mean eternal when it is used of God. God was God before the eons and He will be God after the eons. But since we live during the eons, we praise Him for the assurance we find in the revelation that He is the God of the eons or the eonian God.

As mentioned before, we have the first occurrence of the double plural in verse twenty-seven. This is the first of such occurrences. It should read, "**to God only wise be glory for the eons of the eons.**"

If, as some insist, the singular means for ever, then the plural must mean more and a double plural must mean yet more. But you cannot have more than "for ever." Beyond that you cannot go.

When we have examined all occurrences we will have discovered the singular, the plural, the double singular, the singular and plural and the double plural as follows:

Eon, Eons, Eon of the Eon, Eon of the Eons, and Eons of the Eons. This is one of the greatest phenomena in the New Testament, and it demands that we, like Moses must turn aside and see what this strange thing means.

## EON IN ACTS AND ROMANS

**Acts 3:21 - holy prophets since the *world* began**

**Acts 15: 18 - from the *beginning of the world***

**Rom. 1:25 - the Creator, who is blessed for *ever***

**Rom. 9:5 - is over all, God blessed for *ever***

**Rom. 11:36 - to whom be glory for *ever***

**Rom. 12:2 - be not conformed to this *world***

**Rom. 16:27 - be glory through Jesus Christ for *ever***

## EONIAN IN ACTS AND ROMANS

Acts 13:46 - unworthy of *everlasting* life  
Acts 13:48 - as many as were ordained to *eternal* life  
Rom. 2:7 -honor and immortality, *eternal* life  
Rom. 5:21- through righteousness unto *eternal* life  
Rom. 6:22 - holiness, and the end *everlasting* life  
Rom. 6:23 - the gift of God is *eternal* life  
Rom. 16:25-kept secret since the *world* began  
Rom. 16:26 - commandment of the *everlasting* God

(Continued, Vol. V, No. 1)

\*\*\*\*\*

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS*

**Question. Is it correct to speak of the age of grace? What is the difference between an age and a dispensation?**

Answer. An age (or, eon) is a period of time while a dispensation is a method of dealing. Grace is a dispensation and there is nothing in Scripture about an age of grace. There may be a number of dispensations in an age.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Question. I do not like your use of the word *orthodox* as used in your last issue. Does not orthodox mean sound in faith? Do you not regard yourself to be sound in faith?**

Answer. My dictionary defines orthodox as being "sound in the faith; hence, holding the Christian faith as formulated in the great church creeds and confessions." This excludes me from the ranks of the orthodox, an exclusion which I cheerfully accept. The task of being orthodox hampered my Bible study. The orthodox Baptist does not consider the orthodox Presbyterian to be orthodox. The heretics of yesterday are the orthodox of today. I do not claim to be orthodox, therefore I need spend no time in defending my orthodoxy. If men should call us heretics we can answer in words some what like those of Paul. "**This I confess unto you, that after the way that you call heresy, so worship I the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, believing all things that are written in the Word of God.**" See Acts 24:14.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Question. I would like some help on the chronology of the Book of Acts. What do you suggest?**

Answer. In his book on *The Apostle of the Reconciliation*, Mr. Charles H. Welch has a chapter on "The Chronology of Acts" which is a masterpiece of careful and accurate scholarship. He demonstrates that the dates of all major events in the Acts can be accurately fixed.

\*\*\*\*\*

## ***THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS***

To be able to offer my readers a treatise dealing with this subject brings a feeling of deep personal satisfaction, also thanksgiving for the grace that has made it possible. I started to write this three years ago, after about four years had been spent in weighing and considering the subject. In the past three years I have dealt with this portion of Scripture twelve different times before classes, and this has developed and seasoned the message.

There is indescribable confusion of thought and interpretation in regard to this story. Thousands of sermons have been based upon it, but none of these seem to attempt to solve the problems or answer the questions that are imposed by the penetrating study of this strange record.

Some time ago I listened to the Moody Institute Radio station and heard one of the officials ridicule the idea that this story is a parable. He attempted to prove his point by inserting the word *parabolic* before every noun. He spoke of a "certain parabolic rich man" and a "certain parabolic beggar, named Lazarus, which was laid at his parabolic gate, full of sores, moreover the parabolic dogs came and licked his parabolic sores." This treatment of the story greatly delighted those in the studio as was evidenced by their laughter. I suggest that this method be tried upon any parable in the Word of God, and it will be found that this method will show that a story is not a parable even if God calls it one.

To demonstrate the confusion of thought that exists among those of the same Institution, we read in *Moody Monthly* for September 1940 in answer to the question, "Is Luke 16:19-31 a parable," this answer from Mr. Grant Stroh of the Moody faculty.

"While it is true that it is not called a parable in the text, in view of the figurative language, how can we otherwise regard it? Surely, we cannot take it literally."

So, there it is. Moody Radio says it is not a parable, and *Moody Monthly* says it cannot be regarded otherwise. Those who choose to "believe what Moody does" will now have to choose their department, and inform us whether they believe with the Radio department or the Publication department.

This pamphlet is the third in a series on *What is Man, What is His Destiny?* The first was *What is the Soul*; the second was *Sheol, Hades and Destruction*; and now the third is presented under title of *The Rich Man and Lazarus*.

\*\*\*\*\*

## THE EDITOR TO HIS FRIENDS

\*\*\*\*Thanksgiving fills my heart as I review the grace that has been mine in connection with the printed page ministry during the past year. As the year began I announced my purpose to send forth six twenty-four page issues during 1940, and this issue marks the completion of that purpose. Furthermore, it has been my happy privilege to publish four pamphlets during the current year. The goal for 1941 is six twenty-four page issues of the magazine and eight new pamphlets. If this purpose is in harmony with God's will, His grace will be sufficient for every demand that this labor will place upon me.

\*\*\*\*The current issue is the final one in Volume 4. The six issues will now be bound in cloth, uniform with the first three volumes, and these will be for sale at \$1.00 per copy, or two copies for \$1.50. The income from the sale of bound volumes goes into the publishing fund.

\*\*\*\*I published my first pamphlet by getting a printer who knew me well to extend credit. I paid him out of the funds received from the sale of the pamphlet, and then placed the second one in print. This course has been followed up to the present time. I would call attention to the fact that I do not seek financial help in publishing of pamphlets that are to be on sale. As soon as one is paid for, the next one is put into print. Money that is sent in for *The Word of Truth* is used for that purpose and none of it is used to publish pamphlets upon which a price is set.

\*\*\*\*The article under title of *Notes on 1 Corinthians* is given first place in this issue in order to bring it to the attention of all readers. It presents the case against universal reconciliation so far as this portion of Scripture is concerned. Before me is a letter just received from a brother who formerly embraced the doctrine of universal reconciliation. He rejoices in the help that this witness has given him which has led him to see his mistake, and has caused him to repudiate the doctrine.

**End, Vol. IV, No. 6**

**End, Vol. IV.**