

and yet he now proposes to discover the "moral force" of the term by Old Testament research as to its use. Will he say that we shall be helped by this means to apprehend the "moral force" of the term "Christ"? He cannot, he dare not; and does not this plainly show that for him Eternal Life is a thought wholly apart from Christ, in that enquiry?

Further it is said: The words "Eternal Life" would convey little definite idea to us, because we are conscious of our own eternal existence. To mere mind and reason this might be the case, for reason leaves out God, but to the soul that is born of God, the consciousness of eternal existence would be no barrier to understanding what "Eternal Life" meant, for conscience connects all with God, and he would at once go beyond eternal existence, and connect the Eternal Life given him of God with God, and to him it would, to go no farther, convey the thought of God's presence, and of how this "Eternal Life" was his, and what it was in itself, as wholly beyond and outside the eternal existence of which he was already conscious. With what an unbeliever's thoughts on the subject may be, we have nothing to do; the consciousness of an eternal existence without God, may be a subject for the metaphysical discussions of scientists -- it is a strange thought to enter any believer's mind in relation to Eternal Life.

But let us turn to John 10:27, 28. Are we to believe that those of whom the Lord Jesus spoke as "My sheep," and "I give unto them Eternal Life" would not then and there go beyond consciousness of their own eternal existence? Had His words no more power, or sense, or reality in them than that? When the young man said to Him "What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life" -- had he no "definite idea" of anything but of his own eternal existence? This it is admitted he had -- "every living soul has it" -- but the young man knew he had not "Eternal Life," or he could not have asked the Lord how he was to get it. He never thought of connecting the two, for one he knew he had, the other he knew he had not. Otherwise, what sense would there have been, or need either, in his asking the Lord what he should do to inherit it -- inherit eternal existence which he had already? It is mere reason -- shallow scepticism, for Scripture plainly shows that Eternal Life is wholly apart from one's consciousness of one's own eternal existence, and has nothing whatever to do with it. If it were not distinct from it there would be no seeking after it by any. The soul in earnest with God does not connect Eternal Life with existence, but with God. It is the craving of every soul in earnest with Him -- a craving fully and eternally satisfied for every one who has Christ personally.

Eternal Life is not, to begin with, connected, in his mind, with Christ, but with our own existence. Is it not clear that Eternal Life and Christ are really two distinct thoughts in his mind?

With regard to what is said as to the Old Testament giving "glimpses of resurrection and heavenly hopes," but that "as to the judgment and penalty of sin, it did not go beyond death, i.e., the cutting off of man's life here," surely such passages as Eccl. 12:14; Psa. 139, especially verse 8, *et seq.* 55:15, 9:17, 16:10, 11, 49:14, 15, etc., 116:3-8, Isa. 5:14, Ezek. 31:16, etc., 32:27, etc., show that "the

judgment and penalty of sin" went "beyond death, i.e., the cutting off of man's life here." Indeed as to the sacrifices, are we to be told that death, mere physical death here, was the extent to which they pointed, to which anyone in Old Testament times could go as to the "judgment and penalty of sin"? That with God's earthly people, under His direct government, death was the judgment or wages of sin in cutting off from earthly blessing, no one would deny, but to say that "the judgment and penalty of sin" did not, in its scope then, "go beyond death, i.e., the cutting off of man's life here," is to deny God's Word, and all sense in them of God's judgment hereafter. Moreover if it went no farther, all from Adam downwards, including Noah, Abraham, Moses, Samuel, David, and the Prophets suffered death "the judgment and penalty of sin," and were on the same ground as Cain, Achan, Ahab, and the wicked generally. That there was a clinging to life down here, as in the case of Hezekiah, which is cited, is true enough, heavenly hopes and joys, and full blessing and pardon not being entered upon, as the finished work of Christ was not and could not be before the soul, but Scripture says distinctly "as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law," while of Gentiles it is said the work of the law is written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness [Rom. 2]. I ask, did the law give no sense of some "judgment and penalty of sin" beyond "the cutting off of man's life here"? Did "dying in his sins" "go beyond death"? Has Psa. 32 no meaning beyond life down here, and the avoidance of mere physical death? The passage quoted from Dan. 12, "and many of them that sleep in the dust of death shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt," he tells cannot be contested as referring to anything but "a life of continued blessing here on earth." Are those then who awake "to shame and everlasting contempt" to do so here on earth? Was there no hell and eternal torment for the wicked in Old Testament days? Had saints then no sense or knowledge of this? Was the mere "cutting off of man's life here" the reason that "death was thus dreaded by saints"? Mr. Raven says so, but no one who reads his Bible will agree with him.

But he goes on to say that

"in the synoptic gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) though connected by the Lord with the coming age, the testimony as to it" (Eternal Life) "does not generally go, in its scope, beyond life and blessing in this world."

He explains that he uses the word "generally," because he finds "Matt. 19:29, and parallel passages" somewhat of a hindrance to his theory, though, he says, the Lord there spoke

"not only according to what had been predicated in the Old Testament, but according to His own perfect knowledge of the fullness of the words."

But what about such passages as "These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal;" "Fear Him who after He hath killed, hath power to cast into hell;" "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." And did Abraham's bosom, in Luke 16, and the rich man in torment, not go "in its scope beyond life and blessing," or the reverse, "in this

4 Thy Precepts vol. 10 # 1, Jan/Feb 1994

world ?"

But leaving this part of the paper, which Scripture so fully refutes, we next find Eternal Life is to be known

"Eternal Life is to be known "and enjoyed in Him in the glorious scene into which He has entered as Man, in the virtue and power of 'redemption.'"

Now this, more than ever, makes it clear that the writer does not look upon Christ as Eternal Life, or upon Eternal Life as Christ, at all; it is something to be enjoyed in Him, not Himself; he says He is it, but when he comes to speak his mind about it, he speaks of Eternal Life as something to be enjoyed in Christ -- it is not Christ Himself, but something "known and enjoyed in Him." This explains really his meaning of the words "Eternal Life is in the Son." So, further on, he says,

It was ever an integral part of the Person of the Eternal Son.

Some may, perchance, take this as a great and sound admission, covering the whole question at issue; but a little thought will show it is quite the reverse. We could not speak of a man being an integral part of himself. A man is either himself or he is not. We could not speak of the sun as an integral part of the sun. So as to our Lord -- He is that Eternal Life which was with the Father, or He is not it; to say it is an integral part of His Person is to deny Himself really as being it. We are then told that Eternal Life was

such as could be connected with manhood and be imparted to men -- (the) integral part of the Person of the Eternal Son (which) could be connected with manhood and be imparted to men!

So that it is not Christ Himself that we have as Life, but an integral part of Himself; I do not think Scripture ever says Christ is "imparted" to us. And this in the teeth of such Scriptures as Gal. 2:20, Rom. 8:10, Col. 3:4, and "Christ in you, the hope of glory," to say nothing of numberless other passages to the same effect. All this is mere dissecting His Person. If Eternal Life is only an integral part of Himself, we really have not Christ Himself at all as our life, but only something that is an integral part of Himself. I am aware of what follows on the same page as to our worshipping "Him as One in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," but it is merely stating a truth of another character regarding Himself, in order to gloss over the deadly denial of His Eternal Personality as Eternal Life. Besides Col. 2:9, is not connected with our worship of Him, but with our being complete in Him. It is another instance of the loose way in which the writer quotes Scripture in order to support his new theory.

He then quotes from the *Bible Treasury* for 1867. I will here give the whole of the sentence parallel with the version he gives of it.

He says: -- "Eternal Life has been spoken of as consisting in the 'out-of-the-world heavenly condition of relationship and being,' in which the Lord was here alone in the world."

The original gives: -- "He, Christ was alone in His Person that Eternal Life which was with the Father, and was alone such in the world. Hence the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, the Son of man who is in heaven (who else was there, or even had ascended?). He was this alone. He came, Eternal Life into this world, but was alone in the out-of-the-world heavenly condition of relationship and being in which Eternal Life consists: which was before the world, not only in God, but in counsel for us, given us in Christ, manifested in Him alone in the world, and now, consequent on His being lifted up and gone out of it into the heavenly place of which He brought word, that into which we are introduced in Him."

I have given this quotation at length, in order to show how the sentence has been perverted. The original speaks of Christ as Eternal Life here below in that condition; Mr. Raven says that condition itself is Eternal Life. Any one can see the difference between the two, and what is involved. He says --

This condition has its full display and perfection in the Son as the risen glorious man out of death, in which, as Son of man, He had glorified God.

He says Eternal Life has been spoken of as this condition -- he now says this condition, or Eternal Life has its full display and perfection in the Son as the risen, glorious man out of death. This is blasphemous, for it is making out that Eternal Life had not its full display and perfection in the blessed Son when in this world as Man. And this is not an isolated statement; he repeats on the next page;

Eternal Life has its full and perfect expression according to the counsels of God in Him as the risen glorified Man with the Father.

It is as the risen glorified Man He is said to be the true God and Eternal Life.

Said by whom? Certainly not by Scripture. Scripture says, He, the Son, was that Eternal Life which was with the Father [1 John 1:2] -- He was that fully and perfectly before He became Man -- as Man, here below, He was its full display and perfection in Himself -- He came, Eternal Life, into this world, and it was in this world that He fully and perfectly manifested what He ever was before the foundation of the world, that Eternal Life that was with the Father -- in the out-of-the-world heavenly condition of relationship and being truly -- but He was as much the true God and Eternal Life when in lowly wondrous grace He lay as the Babe in the Manger, as He was before He took upon Him the form of man, or as He is now at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens.