

AN OBJECTION ANSWERED.

A reader takes exception to a statement made in our last issue, page 3-- The Undefined One. We say therein-- "Had Adam remained perfect--his life unforfeited and unimpaired, his offspring would have been the same (i.e. perfect), any *imperfections of Eve would not have affected them.*" An objector thinks we have erred in such conclusion, because experience teaches that children do frequently partake of the nature and disposition of their mother.

We fully agree that, *as it is*, children do partake from the mother, but our statement does not apply to present condition of things. Let it be distinctly noted that we stated as shown in the above quotation, the conditions under which we claimed children would not be affected by the mother, viz.: If the originally perfect father, Adam, had REMAINED PERFECT.

But what difference can the blemish of the father have upon the mother's influence upon the child? may be asked.

None, we answer. It would not affect the mother but it would vastly affect the unborn child and its dependance upon the mother. As we endeavored to show in our last issue, we claim that a *perfect life germ* from a perfect father could appropriate to its use and perfect development such elements of nutrition provided by the mother as would be beneficial, and could reject or pass off without injury any undesirable elements. And that on the other hand an imperfect, diseased, dying germ from an imperfect and dying father would be less able to rightly appropriate what is supplied, even if the supplies furnished were the purest and best, from a perfect mother and where the supply would be diseased from a diseased, dying mother, the influence on the already dying germ can well be surmised. It would appropriate the bad as well as the good elements, and being weakly already, would be very susceptible to injurious influences.

And this is in harmony with all known facts of science as well as in harmony with God's revelation. We remind our readers again of the illustration given in the original article, viz., the effect of the same food upon a sick person, as compared with its effect upon a comparatively healthy person--to the one it might increase the sickness, to the other promote health.

As we are upon the side of the Scriptures, we leave others to discuss it with the author of the Scriptures if they cannot see this to be clear--it seems very clear and harmonious from our standpoint.

The Scriptures positively declare the facts; we have merely coupled them together to show, any who can see them, their reasonableness and harmony. It is a Scriptural statement that *death* came through Adam, not Eve--By one *man's* disobedience death passed upon all. And again it is of the Bible, that one *perfect* man was born of one imperfect mother. He was holy, undefiled, separate from sinners--one who inherited not death and imperfection; but on the contrary, "In him *was life.*" The life, the perfection, the purity was not tainted with the imperfections of which his mother in common with others of the condemned race was a sharer. The cause of this is found in the fact that the life principle was not imperfect, but perfect--transferred from the higher plane of a pre-existent condition,--"In him was life."

Hence it is that he alone could redeem mankind. He alone could give the *ransom* or corresponding price. A perfect man had been tried as the representative of a perfect race and had sinned; had been condemned with all in him, and a perfect man alone could be the ransom. Jesus was a *ransom*, hence Jesus was a perfect man. Hence perfect men and women could have been born of Eve, as Adam's children, had *he* not sinned.

But our questioner asks, If Jesus was *perfect* why is it written that he was "MADE PERFECT through

sufferings." ([Heb. 2:10](#).) We answer that he was perfect as a man, but was made a perfect "new creature" of the DIVINE nature through or because he obediently suffered death on our behalf. This is more fully elaborated in our issue of January, '82 under the caption, "Jesus made perfect." See, also, March, '83 issue, "Perfecting the new nature."