

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 117

November 1989

In this Issue:-

Page 2. Editorial	
Page 3. How Long?	Brother Albert Woodhouse
Page 4. Jesus said....	No. 5. Brother Russell Gregory
Page 5. Qumran A.D 70 - 1988	From Mount Zion Reporter
Page 6. Extract from "An Introduction to the Principles of Bible Numerics" by Ivan Panin	
Page 8. Extract from "The Holy Bible Wholly True"	Winkle Pratney
Page 9. If the Blind Lead the Blind	Brother Phil Parry
Page 17. God our Help	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 18. Man in Space	No name given

Editorial

Dear Brethren and Sisters and Friends, Greetings in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

This month there are two articles about Bible numbers. It is not possible for those of us without knowledge of Hebrew and Greek to check the many claims made by some scholars, and it is hardly surprising to find that there are those, who, having made a study of this subject, have been "carried away" by the marvels they have found and claimed more than is warrantable. However, even if we have certain reservations about some of the alleged claims, there is still a vast amount to appreciate, especially for those who find a fascination in mathematics, and it may be, that in this computer age, someone will yet come forward with unique proof of the Divine Authorship of the Scriptures for all the world to see.

Thank you for your letters.

Brother Hayden and Sister Edith Price write to "Thank all who make a contribution to the C.L., and for the effort you all make toward the understanding of the Word. We are always waiting to receive it. With affection and love to all in the Truth."

And from Brother Phil Parry, after writing at length about our concern for Christadelphians, he sums up, "There is a fear that we are getting too involved with Christadelphians and rejecting other sects who at least believe that Jesus was something more than a condemned man... I feel sure we have given them (the Christadelphians) all the consideration and patience which was necessary and if after this time they cannot see the need for, or the importance of a right understanding of the Atonement... and their lack of desire to know, then... we think it would be advisable to leave them alone to their own pursuits, their own magazines and literature which do not allow expression of our scriptural views, and confine ours to the doctrine believed and taught by the Nazarenes and if at all possible make no mention of even the name Christadelphian... My view is that none will hear unless God is working to that end on their behalf, but we have to use the opportunities afforded us in spreading the Gospel message and casting our bread upon the waters."

I, for one, am in complete agreement with Brother Phil. For many years the Nazarene Fellowship have endeavoured "to show compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way," but Christadelphians have shown a willing blindness and credulity for believing things which are in diametrical opposition. We have tried to bring the issues into the open so everyone can decide

for themselves whether or not Jesus had to die for Himself, supposedly being born under condemnation; rather, that He was holy, undefiled and gave Himself as a sacrifice for us. Perhaps now it is time we should, as Brother Phil says, leave them alone to their own pursuits. Your views, please.

Russell Gregory.

HOW LONG ?

How often do we ask this question? It can be said with certainty, we have all asked it. Even in the time of our Lord His disciples asked Him, "Tell us, when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world?" (Matthew 24:3). Jesus made it very clear that it was not for His disciples to know exactly when He would make His appearing. "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." (Matthew 25:13).

From the moment of the shutting of the eyes of the faithful at the very moment of falling asleep, time becomes, for them, none existent. Whether it be for a few moments or for many years, the moment of awaking from sleep and seeing the Master in all His Glory, not a moment of lapsed time will have been registered in the minds of those who take part in the first resurrection.

"Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall all be changed." (1 Corinthians 15:52).

Although Jesus Christ made it quite clear that no man would know the day nor the hour; "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only (Matthew 24:36), He did, however, make it clear that just prior to His manifestation there should be signs, and as the days draw nearer to His appearing the seeing eyes of the faithful will recognise that they must make every effort to be prepared for His return. "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." (Luke 21:28).

The Christian of this present age has a distinct advantage over the early Christians, the simple reason being that the believers in this present time are in a position of witnessing the actual fulfilment of prophecy spoken of by Jesus, and all the Holy men of God.

Those who remember the early years of this century know there has been a vast increase in crime and violence, and a deterioration of moral standards. Not that the people were all God-fearing; far from it, but there is a great contrast between then and now. Put it another way; man has reached the ultimate in depravity and if it is allowed to continue much longer it can only result in one thing - complete destruction.

If we think of an avalanche; it begins in a small way by the snow shifting, which in turn gathers more and more snow with it and, all increasing in momentum, it builds up in size as it races down the mountainside destroying everything in it's path. This is what this present world is heading for: complete destruction.

Also in these latter days there is another manifestation that has reared it's very ugly head, and that is pollution. We are talking, of course, of man-made pollution which, unlike natural pollution, can hardly be dealt with by nature. This man-made pollution is brought about by man's greed for wealth, for he will go to any lengths, it seems, to serve the 'god of gold', even to the extent of destroying this wonderful and beautiful creation of God. Fool man does not care that he is destroying that which gives him the essentials of life; air, water, earth, all provided by God, all essential for existence. Whether he

likes it or not, man will have to do without cars, road transport and aircraft which are the main factors causing pollution.

Many may throw their hands up in horror and say, How can it be possible for civilisation to carry on without modern means of transport? But we don't have to go back many years to when man was managing without these 20th century inventions. In fact, going back to the years before the industrial era man was able to breathe clean air, which, the way things are going, could soon become a thing of the past.

Pollution is continually in the headlines these days. The word pollute means, to be foul, to defile, to contaminate, and we hear politicians talking a lot about what should be done and what they are going to do, but as usual, it is all talk and very little action to counteract the dangerous and destructive effect that pollution has upon the world.

Idolatry takes on many guises. The image of wood, stone or metal worshipped by ignorant and primitive peoples is replaced by the god of money, the god of gold. In this so called Christian country there are many people living on the bread line while others are so wealthy.

Unlike the fictitious hero, Robin Hood, who robbed the rich to give to the poor, we have the reverse where the legal system allows and even encourages taking all one can get from everyone you can thus making the wealthy more wealthy and praising them for being so successful in life.

“Do not rich men oppress you?” But “hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love him?” James 2:5.

But before the Kingdom comes “For then shall great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened... therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh.” Matthew 24: 21,22,24.

Brother Albert Woodhouse.

Jesus said...

No. 5.

“Martha, Martha, you are anxious and troubled about many things; one thing is needful. Mary has chosen the good portion, which shall not be taken away from her.” Luke 10:41,42. (R.S.V.)

This is the occasion when Jesus was at the house of Lazarus, Mary and Martha and Martha was preparing the meal for her guests. There were others present, too, and it would seem that all but Martha were listening to Jesus, while she alone was preparing the food.

It was the custom in those days for the chief guest to be given the choicest food and the largest portion, and, naturally, Martha was anxious to do the best she could for all present, especially for Jesus, her chief guest.

But when Martha asks for her sister, Mary's help Jesus turns the whole situation around. Jesus knew that Martha was doing her very best for Jesus in her capacity as hostess but He explains to her that Mary has chosen the 'good portion' by listening to the gospel He was 'serving.'

I think the lesson for us is that we are here at Jesus invitation and are His guests. He is the Provider, not only for Mary but for all like her, of that “good portion, which shall not be taken away.”

“I am come that they might have life (our present life), and that they might have it more abundantly (eternal life - that good portion).” John 10:10.

“The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and He knoweth them that trust in Him. Nahum 1:7.

Brother Russell Gregory

QUMRAN A.D.70 – 1988

Most of us remember the excitement shared by most Bible lovers, of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the caves around Qumran off the Dead Sea in Israel between 1946 and 1956.

During the last year more finds have come to light which again confirm God’s promises. “A land flowing with milk and honey.”

The following is from the Mount Zion Reporters JUDAH ‘89 magazine issued for July 1989:-

“A 2,000 year old clay flask containing apparently rare balsam oil used in antiquity for perfumes and for anointing kings has been found in a cave at Qumran in which Dead Sea Scrolls were uncovered. Despite the passage of two millennia in the desert, the oil is still fluid and had largely retained its original chemical composition. The two openings of the flask, filled with some 50-100 grams of oil, were sealed by films of oil which had hardened in antiquity, preventing the air from entering. The flask was found last year by archaeologist Joseph Patrich of the Hebrew University. Patrich is conducting a survey of the Judean Desert caves, including those where scrolls were found some 40 years ago. The flask was buried in a three-foot deep pit and wrapped in palm leaves for protection. Announcement of the find was delayed until chemical analysis indicated the nature of the oil. Balsam was one of the most precious spices of antiquity and was grown... in the Ein Gedi and Jericho areas, At Ein Gedi, excavations have revealed a perfume workshop with ovens and vessels, and remains of a balsam orchard are also visible...”

From an earlier issue of the above magazine, before a large area of the Negev was handed back to Egypt, the following is also an extract, but what has taken place since we do not know:-

“THE NEGEV as a POWER PLANT. A series of major projects are to be launched in the Negev shortly by the Energy Ministry, the aim is to turn the desert into a power plant for the nation. The Negev may be poor in many resources but it is rich in energy. There is the sun, there is oil shale and there is wind. Whatever the source of energy, if it is there, we will find it, so says Moshe Shahal. The biggest single project is the building of a \$26,000,000 five megawatt power station to burn oil shale. It is estimated there are some 10 million tonnes of shale in the Negev, enough to supply electricity for the next 50 years. Most of it is close to the surface... The ministry is also to invest \$Millions in experimenting with wind turbines. Finally, \$500,000 is to be spent in a hunt for Uranium and other mineral ores following indications that such deposits exist.”

Our thanks to Brother Harvey and Sister Evelyn Linggood for sending in the articles above.

An Introduction to the Principles of Bible Numerics

Values of the Hebrew and Greek Alphabets

The Bible is written in two languages: The old Testament in Hebrew (the few chapters in Chaldee being for numeric purposes the same as Hebrew); the New Testament in Greek. Both these languages have this unique peculiarity; they have no separate symbols for numbers, corresponding to our modern Arabic figures 1,2,3, 4,5,6,7,8,9,0. In their place they make use of the letters of their alphabet; so that each Hebrew and Greek letter stands also for a certain number, called the Numeric Value of the letter. Thus the Greek 'α' standing for 1, the numeric value of 'α' is 1. The letter 'κ' standing for 20, its numeric value is said to be 20. As each word consists of letters the numeric value of a word is the sum of the numeric values of its letters. The numeric value of a sentence, paragraph, chapter, book, or volume, or library, is the sum of the numeric values of the words of which they consist.

The following are the numeric values of the two alphabets by means of which these numeric values, the Greek and Hebrews performed their numeric operations.

But in Scripture an additional system is made use of for the purpose of numeric construction of the text – that of Place Value

HEBREW			GREEK		
Place Value	Numeric Value	Value	Place Value	Numeric Value	Value
1	1	2	1	1	2
2	2	4	2	2	4
3	3	6	3	3	6
4	4	8	4	4	8
5	5	10	5	5	10
6	6	12	6	7	13
7	7	14	7	8	15
8	8	16	8	9	17
9	9	18	9	10	19
10	10	20	10	20	30
11	20	31	11	30	41
12	30	42	12	40	52
13	40	53	13	50	63
14	50	64	14	60	74
15	60	75	15	70	85
16	70	86	16	80	96
17	80	97	17	100	117
18	90	108	18	200	218
19	100	119	19	300	319
20	200	220	20	400	420
21	300	321	21	500	521
22	400	422	22	600	622
----	-----	-----	23	700	723
253	1495	1748	24	800	824
			----	-----	-----
			300	3999	4999

The Place Value of a letter in Scripture, whether Hebrew or Greek is the number of the place the letter occupies in the alphabet. Accordingly in the Hebrew the place values and the numeric values of the first ten letters are the same. And the same is the case with the first five letters in the Greek. But the eleventh Hebrew letter does not stand for eleven, but twenty. Accordingly its numeric value is 20, but its place value is eleven; the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet, the twenty-second letter stands for 400. Accordingly its numeric value is 400, but its place value is 22. The same applies to the Greek alphabet. Its sixth letter stands for 7; this is its numeric value, but its place value is 6.

The value of a Hebrew or Greek letter or word is the sum of its numeric and place values: Thus the value of Ἰησοῦς , Jesus, in Greek is 975, of which the numeric value is 888, and its place value is 87.

The Hebrew numbers 6 and 90 are not in the Greek; and the Greek numbers 500, 600, 700, 800, are not in the Hebrew. All the other numbers are common to both alphabets.

Omitting then the duplicates, there are twenty six numeric values used in the alphabets of the Bible languages: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, 700, 800, their total being 4,095, or $7 \times 3 \times 3 \times 5 \times 7 \times 13$.

It is the purpose of this paper to show that an elaborate design of sevens, nines, and thirteens, combined with fives or each other, runs through the 26 numeric values, with their sum 4,095. But since 4,096, the one neighbour of 4,095 is $8 \times 8 \times 8 \times 8$, and produces eights as its factor, a scheme of eights is also displayed by these 26 numbers. And as 4,094, the other neighbour of 4,095 is $23 \times 89 \times 2$, a multiple of twenty-three and eighty-nine, schemes of 23 and 89 are also seen running through these 26 numbers. As for the purpose of this paper it is more convenient to treat factors below five as merely auxiliary, we have here seven schemes of 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 23, 89.

4,095 then is 585 sevens (Feature 1); the numbers up to 100 have 595, or $7 \times 5 \times 17$; those over 100 have 3,500, or 7×500 (Feature 2). Of the latter those over 500 have 2,100, or 7×300 ; those from 200 to 500 have 1,400, or 7×200 (Feature 3). The latter are in their turn divided thus: The two middle have 700, or 7×100 ; the two extremes have 700 (Feature 4). As the factors of 700 are 7,2,2,5,5, with their sum 21, or three sevens, they give Features 5 and 6. Every seventh number, 7,50,300, have for their sum 357, or 7×51 , leaving for the others 3,738: Now, 357 is $7 \times 3 \times 17$, or $89 \times 2 \times 2 (-1)$; 3,738 is $7 \times 3 \times 89 \times 2$, or $89 \times 2 \times 3 \times 7$.

This division is not only by 3 sevens (Feature 7) but it produces also 2 eighty-nines (combined once with seven). The sum of the figures is 21, or 3 sevens (Feature 8); that of the factors 89, 2, 2 is also 21 (Feature 9). And as the 26 Numeric Values are 2 thirteens, every 13th number, 40, and 800, gives 840, or $7 \times 3 \times 5 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$, itself 120 sevens (Feature 10), with the sum of the factors 21, or 3 sevens (Feature 11); leaving for the others 3,255, or $7 \times 3 \times 5 \times 31$; this division is by $7 \times 3 \times 5$, or 105. Lastly: the sum of the figures of the 26 numbers making up the sum 4,095 is 126, or $7 \times 9 \times 2$, the combination of nine with seven (Feature 12). The scheme spoken of above as running through these Numeric Values are seven, as shown below (Feature 13) and the sum of the numbers forming these schemes, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 23, 89, is 154, or $7 \times 2 \times 11$, (Feature 14). This enumeration of the features of seven, as will presently be seen, is not exhaustive; but as the chance of their being undesigned, a mere coincidence, is already one in 4,750,000,000,000, a most elaborate design of sevens is thus seen to be running through these 26 Numeric Values.

by Ivan Panin.

The above is just a small sample of a great study which is available. It is included here just to wet the appetite of some who may care to go into it further. If there is sufficient interest from readers more can be reproduced in these pages and, in the meantime, here are a few examples of how these principles work out throughout the Scriptures:

Russell.

Extract from “The Holy Bible - Wholly True, by Winkle Pratney.

Just the very first sentence of the Bible: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” (Genesis 1:1) . That’s the way it comes out in English, in the Hebrew it is exactly 7 words. The 7 words have exactly 28 (7x4) letters. There are 3 nouns (God, heavens, and earth). Taking the letters of these, substituting their number equivalents and adding them up, you get a combined total of 777 (7 x 111)! There is one Hebrew verb - created. It’s total numerical value is 203 (7 x 29). The first three words contain the subject with exactly 14 (7x2) letters, likewise the other four are the object with exactly 14 letters. The Hebrew words for the two objects (heaven and earth) each have 7 letters. The value for the first, middle, and last letters in the sentence is 133 (7 x 19). The Numeric Value of the first and last letters of all the words is 1393 (7 x 199); the value of the first and last letters of the first and last words of the verse are 497 (7 x 71). The value of the first and last letters of each of the words between is 896 (7 x 128). And so on, and so on.... in this verse alone there are 30 different features of 7. I have listed only 11 of them! The chance of this happening accidentally is 1 in 33,000,000,000,000.

And now an example from the New Testament: Matthew 1:1-11. The vocabulary has 49 words (7 x 7). 28 words begin with a vowel (7 x 4), the remaining 21 with a consonant (7 x 3). 7 end with a vowel, 42 (7 x 6) with a consonant. The 49 words have 266 letters (7 x 38). Out of the 266 letters, 140 are vowels (7 x 20), 126 are consonants (7 x 18). Also of these 49 words, 14 occur only once (7 x 2), 35 occur more than once (7 x 5), 42 are nouns, 7 are not. These remaining common nouns have exactly 49 letters (7 x 7). Male names occur, in all, 56 times (7 x 8). The names of only 3 women appear in the passage, and the Greek letters of their names add up to 14 exactly!

The whole Bible is like this. Every paragraph, passage and book in the Bible can be shown to be constructed in the same marvellous way... you can’t pull even one word out without damaging the whole pattern. So the Bible carries within itself a self-checking, self-verifying protection factor. If a person comes along and says, I don’t like this one, the whole pattern falls apart. This cannot be found in any other religious ‘holy’ book. You can put any test you like on this book and nothing is even in the same category, not even in the same class. It is God who has spoken in history, and that is why He says, “My Word is quick and powerful and it is sharper than any two-edged sword.” Only the 66 books of the Scriptures bear this divine seal. No other work of man in any language even faintly resembles the intricate structure and design of the Bible. The fact remains, only an Infinite Mind could have devised the Book of books

Extract from “The Holy Bible - Wholly True, by Winkle Pratney.

Let The Blind Lead The Blind

A few weeks ago I came upon a Christadelphian magazine dated August 1926 and edited by C. C. Walker; it must have been sent to me at some time by our late brother Fred Pearce of Newbridge. On page 357 I came across the heading entitled “Questions and Questions” and I was extremely saddened by the exposition of ignorance and dishonesty expressed by both Robert Roberts and his successor, C.C.Walker and which has consequently blinded, from the year 1873, their own converts. It commenced as follows:

“Over fifty years ago, namely, in 1873, certain wrong ideas concerning the nature of Christ and of His sacrifice were introduced which are briefly defined in Robert Roberts “An Autobiography” pages 333 to 335 and in the “Proposition” quoted below:-

Questions and Questions

For the consideration of all who believe the Renunciationist theory, as defined in the following “proposition” as here stated.

That the body of Jesus did not inherit the curse of Adam though derived from him through Mary; and was therefore not mortal, that his natural life was “free”; that in this “free” natural life he “earned eternal life” and might, if he had so chosen, have avoided death, or even refused to die on the cross, and entered into eternal life alone; his death being the act of his own free will, and not in any sense necessary for his own salvation; that his sacrifice consisted in the offering up of an unforfeited life, in payment of the penalty incurred by Adam and his posterity, which was eternal death; that his unforfeited life was slain in the room instead of the forfeited lives of all believers of the races of Adam.”

This is the display of ignorance and dishonesty to which I made reference earlier. It is a grotesque misrepresentation of certain right ideas concerning the nature and sacrifice of Christ as defined by Edward Turney to which Robert Roberts took offence because he did not have the decency to listen to one who could handle the word of God more skilfully than he, and with greater humility.

This is not a true definition of the so-called Renunciationist Theory but a distortion of what Edward Turney said and what members of the Nazarene Fellowship have been saying ever since.

Allow me to answer some of the false charges. We believe it is true to say that the body of Jesus did not inherit any curse from Adam, neither do any of Adam’s descendants; I have read nothing about any curse of Adam becoming hereditary through physical descent, neither have any Christadelphians, and I challenge them to find it in Scripture. All we inherit from Adam by physical descent is natural corruptibility which was a fixed law of Adam’s being at his creation from the dust of the ground. Genesis 2:7; 1 Corinthians 15:45-49. The truth therefore is that Adam was a creature capable of dying if left to himself and barred from the “Tree of Life.”

Now the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith states in clauses IV and V that Adam was created a natural body of life very good in kind and condition and he was placed under a law, and that the continuation of this natural life was contingent on obedience; Adam broke this law and was adjudged unworthy of (and here is the contradiction wresting of the Scriptures) immortality. Wrong! It should have read “unworthy of continuation of natural life, therefore guilty of death, i.e. judicial death.” Adam’s natural life therefore was forfeit and all in him, on the federal principle, as defined by the inspired Apostle Paul in Romans 5:15-21; also 6:1-13? The condemnation was of sin committed by Adam as a person under law, a person who was capable of keeping that law, therefore the flesh of Adam could not be condemned as inadequate in any way, it was the disobedience which was condemned - transgression of law; therefore the condemnation is not a fixed principle in the flesh, but a passing of the judgement of God upon Adam for his sin and which Paul describes as the “Sin of the world” and which “Sin of the world” John the Baptist declared Jesus the Lamb of God had come to take away.

No doubt Adam saw in the slain lambs in Eden what should have happened to him and his wife - the substitutes for their own judicial deaths by blood-shedding regarded it as God’s typical redemption, until His Son, the antitypical Lamb of God - the substance, gave His life willingly for the life of the world and a ransom for many. John 5:25-26, “Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming and now is when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. (Surely this refers to those who by enlightenment realised they were dead in Adam and who, by hearkening to the voice of the Son of God, were baptised and passed from death to life). “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.” Verse 28 speaks of another class altogether, “All that are in the graves”, for Jesus speaks of this in the future tense, but in verse 25 He uses the present tense; superficial readers are quite apt to miss the point. In verse 25 He is speaking of those who by enlightenment as a result of hearing His voice, and by a symbolic death into His, pass from death to life, being born again, not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever.

Can we have greater confirmation than the words of Jesus, John 5:24? “Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from “death” to “life”“. How can this be possible if the “condemnation” is a physical fixation of the flesh? It is not possible; only by physical death, and this is what Christadelphians are expected to believe to remain in fellowship.

What therefore can baptism mean to them, or what can it do for them? Absolutely nothing if they persist in the erroneous theories of their originators that the condemnation is a physical part of the flesh. Neither do the words of Paul in Romans 8 have any meaning or effect for them, because only natural death in accordance with their own admission can free them from under the law of sin and death - so, in effect, and by their own admission, they are not in Christ at the present time; for Paul declares plainly, “for there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made us free from the law of sin and death.” “If the Son therefore shall make you free ye shall be free indeed.” John 8:36.

Now to return to the proposition as distorted and defined by the Editor of the Christadelphian magazine 1926. In regard to the accusation that Christ was not mortal, it depends on what meaning is being attached to the word by the Editor. If he means “not corruptible” for “not mortal” then we must deny emphatically that the Nazarene Fellowship believe that Jesus was not corruptible. But if the word “mortal” means “subject to death by law,” as we believe it does, then most certainly Christ was not mortal. Unfortunately the word is used too loosely by so many as meaning corruptible. Jesus was as much subject to corruptibility as Adam was, without Divine intervention; but Jesus was not in the loins of Adam, when Adam forfeited his life by disobedience, although it is true to say his flesh was in the loins of Eve as the seed of the woman. But unless that seed is fertilised it cannot produce a man. We know therefore that the seed of Mary was not fertilised through the Adamic life, that is, by any descendant of Adam, but it was fertilised by the overshadowing power of God. Had it been otherwise, the life of Jesus would have been under forfeit and useless for the purchase of those who were in bondage to Sin as a Master, unto whom Adam sold himself and all in his loins. This is what is meant by “free life” and it is obvious to anyone with a little of what we call common-sense that you cannot purchase anything with someone else’s money and class the article you have purchased as your own property. Therefore it was necessary that before God could redeem Adam He had to give the equivalent of what was forfeited, and that was a life - a natural life, and this life must needs be God’s property; hence the words “God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life.” “Ye have been bought with a price even the precious blood (wherein is the life) of Christ, as of a lamb without spot and without blemish.” We must emphasise at all times that God is the Redeemer and Christ’s natural unforfeited life is the redemptive price, not his sinless character; He could not very well sacrifice the latter. Now let me emphasise that the penalty incurred by Adam was not Eternal death, as the Editor so falsely charges us with saying. There is no such thing as Eternal death; the experience of death is less than a matter of seconds as the person becomes inanimate or lifeless and ceases to exist. Let me add also, that the penalty was not incurred by Adam’s posterity, but they were sold under sin, or into the bondage of sin, by Adam’s act of disobedience, and if not extricated from that position when enlightened to it, could expect only the wages of Sin (as a Master) which is death.

The finest exposition and discourse on this subject is found in Paul’s epistle to the Romans chapters 5 and 6, and if when reading you think of Sin as a Bond-master unto which Adam sold his posterity, you will be able to understand it, but you will not understand it if you regard it as personal sin of which he is speaking. Paul says “But thanks be to God that ye were the servants of sin” (as much as to say, you are not now in that position). Why? “For ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness...” “For the wages of sin is death but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” You see now the helpless position of all Christadelphians; a position which these two former editors have tried to maintain by their dishonest and ignorant misrepresentation of the teaching of the Nazarene Fellowship and of the form of doctrine to which Paul made reference.

The editor goes on to charge us with the statement that Jesus earned eternal life in this free natural life. This is entirely false, as we have always believed in the words of Paul quoted earlier that “eternal life is the gift of God” and cannot therefore be earned by anyone. However, we do say that in the purpose and fore-knowledge of God, Jesus, God’s Son, was appointed heir of all things, and by His obedience to the will of His Father maintained His integrity and Sonship, and because He laid down His life willingly, not as a command, but in order to confirm the promise in Eden and the promises made to the fathers. God highly exalted Him and gave Him a name above every name and this necessitated the gift of eternal life.

This should answer the editor’s query:

1), “Could the covenants of promise have been brought into force without the death of Jesus as testator?”

2), if not, how could Jesus without dying have obtained his portion of the covenant? seeing the promises (to Abraham) were “to thee and thy seed,” which, says Paul in Galatians 3:16, is Christ, and the promise to David was “I will establish the throne of His kingdom for ever.” (2 Samuel 7:13).

3), Jesus being included in the covenants of promise, and the covenants being of no force without his death, did He not in this sense, in dying, die for Himself, as well as for all others interested therein?

4), Jesus tells us (John 10:18) that He had received a commandment from the Father to lay down His life, by submitting to be crucified. If Jesus had disobeyed this command would he not have committed sin? If so, could He have been saved? How was it possible, then, that He could enter eternal life alone?

5), And seeing his obedience unto death (Philippians 2:9) was a necessity to His own acceptance with the Father, did He not in this obedience, obey for Himself as well as for the joint heirs (Romans 8:17)? And seeing that obeying in this case was dying, did He not in dying, die for Himself as well as for His brethren? (Other questions will bring it closer than this.)

6). Jesus, in speaking of His death, says, “For this cause came I unto this hour” (John 12:27); further, that “the Son of Man is come to give His life a ransom for many;” further, that this was the will of Him who had sent Him, and whose will He had come to do. He was introduced to Israel as “The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29) “by the sacrifice of Himself” (Hebrews 9:26); and Paul testifies that He was made a little lower than the angels expressly for the suffering of death (Hebrews 2:9). Does it not appear on the evidence that the very work He was sent into the world to do was to die? Could He have “earned eternal life” without doing the work the Father sent Him to do? If not, could He “earn eternal life” without dying? If not, is it not a violation of the wisdom of God for anyone to speak of the possibility of His claiming eternal life before His death, and entering into the enjoyment of it alone?

7). Peter testifies that “Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh” (1 Peter 3:18 & 4:1). What flesh was this? Was not this the flesh of His brethren? (Ephesians 5:30 & Hebrews 2:16). If so, was it not “mortal flesh”? And if “mortal flesh”, was it not as much under destination to die as the mortal flesh of all men? If not, how can it be the flesh of “the children”?

I must stop here to comment on the phraseology used by the editor as he is not rightly dividing the word of truth, but re-phrasing it to suit his own theory. He says “Was not this the flesh of the brethren?” We say “No, it was not the flesh of His brethren as this would imply that His Father was Joseph, and as the children were “Sin’s flesh,” Jesus was not “Sins flesh” but “God’s Flesh,” the quality of the flesh being the same as that of the children, but the ownership different.

This is precisely where Christadelphianism has gone wrong from its commencement, and also the doctrine of Roman Catholicism and all such who embrace the doctrine of original sin. Unlike Christadelphians, Rome could see that if Christ’s sacrifice were to be of any merit to man’s redemption and salvation He must needs be free of condemnation and as they believe, like Christadelphians do, that this was a physical principle pervading the flesh, they invented what is known as the “Immaculate Conception.”

Edward Turney did not need to invent theories; he found that by reading and rightly dividing the word of truth, the Divine Plan of salvation was as clear as day, and therefore, with these premises right, he was able to discern the Lord’s body, the body God prepared. But here we have an editor, a so-called

intellectual, who has passed the investigating stage in regard to religious truth, threshing like a drowning man in desperation to prove to us by all the quotations from scripture, whether in context or out of context, rightly applied or distorted, that Jesus was a corruptible man, that He had sin in His flesh, and sin could not be condemned in this flesh if it did not exist there.

These are the threshings of a man who does not understand Paul's discourse to the Romans and thinks that because he does not understand, it is impossible for any one else to.

The Nazarene Fellowship believe Jesus was of the same nature as Adam when created, and this was corruptible nature like the animals, and termed by God as very good nature. The editor says "Sin had to be condemned in the nature which transgressed." (He has his own view as to how?). Nevertheless, sin was committed in the very good nature, therefore if the editor persists that sin had to be condemned in the body of Jesus, then the body of Jesus must of necessity be very good, which brings all Christadelphians face to face with the fact that there was no sin in the very good nature of Adam though he was a sinner and therefore there can be no sin in the nature of Adam's posterity, neither in Jesus. Sin is abstract; transgression of law and not in any way the free propensities of the person; who can use them for good at all times as did Jesus.

The editor has shown his weakness and unskilful handling of the word in this and many other of his works. C. C. Walker admits himself in the magazine to which I am answering "Questions and Questions" that something Robert Roberts said should never have been said, and would be omitted from the next issue, as it was in the heat of the moment. Perhaps he thinks he has the right to interpret scripture to suit his preconceived theories; certainly he does not read the scriptures properly at times, as for example Question 4. Jesus tells us that He had received a commandment from the Father, to lay down His life, by submitting to be crucified etc. Jesus tells us? Jesus said no such thing in the way Robert Roberts phrases it. In the very discourse of Jesus in John 10 we find nowhere that He is under any command to give His life. In fact, His words convey to us that He is a willing party to this act of laying down His life for the sheep, "and therefore for this doth my Father love me."

Let me quote again the words of the editor. Question 6. "Does it not appear on the evidence that the very work He was sent into the world to do was to die?" Of course it was. No one agrees more with this than the Nazarene Fellowship. Unfortunately the editor's views on the reason, not only conflict with ours, but cannot be substantiated by the scriptures. His views are that Jesus was commanded to submit to crucifixion as a demonstration of what was due to "sinful condemned flesh" and in this manner it was condemned. So in effect he asks us to believe that sin was condemned by sinners, wicked men who were pawns in the hands of God for carrying out this ignominious act of torture.

Then we are told by some present day Christadelphians that there is an absence of the Love of God in our current literature! How much Love of God does this clause in their statement of faith convey?

In John 10:18 Jesus is not talking of a command of God to lay down His life. He is speaking of the power to lay it down. "No man taketh it from me - I have power" - there is no power in a life already forfeit, or in a condemned person. Jesus' life was "free" unforfeited, therefore powerful to effect redemption. Who says so? "This commandment (authority) have I received of my Father." Jesus was left in no doubt that it was His Father's will that none should perish, but should all turn to him and live, and for this purpose He caused Him to be born of His handmaid Mary, not in order that He might have "condemned nature" (A Christadelphian term), but exactly the opposite - the means by which He could be the equivalent price for man's redemption. This is the only reason that can be found in the scriptures for the virgin birth. The Christadelphian version makes Him more than a mere man, it makes Him part man and part God in order that He might have super human power to be obedient in all things. How therefore can a "God-man" be tempted in all points like as we are? It is you, dear editor, who is the Renunciationist; it is you who have denied that Jesus came in the same quality of flesh as the "children", the same flesh as "His brethren." You have exhausted yourself with the written quotations from the scripture to prove, unnecessarily to us, that Jesus was corruptible, but unfortunately you add to these quotations meanings that are not there. And so, in Question 8 you say, "Is not our destination to die an inherited physical law in the flesh, resultant in the first instance, from the sin of Adam, and therefore called sin? If not, in what sense has death passed upon all men?" We answer, Certainly our destination

to die if Christ remain away, is the result of an inherited physical law of corruptibility in the flesh, but it is definitely not the penalty for sin, and neither is it called sin, and did not commence from the sin of Adam, but at his creation.

Paul says so and I believe him. Why don't you? I am afraid the late editor cannot now answer this question, but those who have followed his cunningly devised theories are in a position to oppose the Apostle Paul, if they dare to. Even the Law of Moses does not appear to educate the editor in the true meaning of sacrifices for sin. And not even the reading of Isaiah 53:6 to 11 are any help to him for he interprets according to his own pre-conceived ideas which convey to us his belief that sin was implanted in Jesus by the hereditary means of His birth of a woman and by allowing Himself to be crucified; this was how our sins were taken away. But how can our sin have been taken away in the body of Christ, when we were not yet born, if sin is a physical fixation in our flesh? An absolute impossibility; but we can well understand its possibility in 'the legal sense as Paul explains it in Romans chapter 5.

Re Question 19, John testifies that Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2) and this reaches backward before Christ's time, as well as forward; as is evident from Paul's statement that Christ died "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament." On what ground is Adam to be excluded from the scope of this provision? Did not the coats of skins provided in Paradise (Genesis 3:21) convey an intimation that sins could be covered? Is it not evident from this consideration that Adam's condemnation, as well as ours, rested in Christ? To this we answer. Yes, in the way that God chose to do it, namely at the time that Jesus was impaled on the cross, and in the way the High Priest, under the law of Moses, laid his hands on the head of the innocent animal and transferred the sin of the person to that animal before shedding its blood. This does not mean that the animal was condemned, for, in fact, the sacrificial animal had to be, according to the law, clean, without blemish, and a male. If it had been otherwise it would have been rejected together with the person who offered it. The High Priest also would have been guilty of breaking the law if he had offered it, for he had the greater responsibility. But the editor, and also present-day Christadelphians do not mind at all that they put God in this guilty position by declaring Christ to be "unclean", "condemned nature", a "Sin-Body", "sinful flesh", "sin-nature", "as unclean as those He came to save," etc.

I marvel that the editor should connect Adam with the coats of skins as effecting his salvation, seeing that the B.A.S.F. states that Adam was adjudged unworthy of immortality and sentenced to return to the ground from whence he was taken, a sentence which defiled and became a physical law of his being and was transmitted to all his posterity. When was the sentence of unworthiness of immortality lifted? When was Adam ever redeemed if the condemnation was a fixed physical sentence in his flesh? How could the coats of skins from the slain lamb be a typical covering for sin if this sin was in the physical flesh? The scripture declares "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin." If Adam's sin was remitted by the shedding of blood and the putting on of the coats of skin, should he not have been released from the penalty of sin which you say is natural death? Should he not, as we believe, have been once again in the position of legal justification by the merits of Christ's sacrifice, and by a restored probation of morality be accepted of Christ at His appearing and kingdom? You seem to imply that he should, but your premises make it an impossibility; you have changed Adam's nature once; and in order to remove the condemnation which you say is in the flesh, you must of necessity change it back again, and accept our view.

The Christadelphian view-point leaves God out of things in respect of accounting a man a sinner by disobedience and also accounting a man righteous in accordance with certain conditions to be met. It is Law which governs both positions, and as disobedience to God is transgression of His Law and is termed "sin", so obedience to His Law is termed "righteous", but neither of these terms affect or activate the flesh, but remain in the conscience of the person responsible or amenable to that Law, and are therefore abstract.

Adam was in the same position as a murderer who has been sentenced by a judge (representing the law) to death by hanging or guillotine or shooting or whatever method used. This does not change the criminals flesh; he is already corruptible and destined to die a natural death because God created man this way, like the animals "very good". But it changes his moral and legal position as soon as he commits murder; he knows he is guilty of what the law requires, and that is "judicial death." Adam was also in

this position when he sinned, therefore what he needed to be saved from was “judicial death,” the taking of his life; a substitute was found in the foreknowledge and provision of God - Jesus Christ - foreshadowed in Eden and in the Law of Moses, as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. Jesus took this away but He did not take away our personal sins. We who were once in bondage to “Sin” as a master, but who have been released by the giving of the ransom price and become God’s servants, are amenable to His Laws and can sin against Him; these are sins which Jesus did not take away, but nevertheless He is our advocate and can plead on our behalf as He is a High Priest who can be touched with the feelings of our infirmity because He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin; a proof that we are capable of complete obedience if we make the supreme effort as Jesus did. He has left us an example that we should follow his steps.”

The Christadelphian view is that Adam carried his condemnation for 930 years to the grave, this being the penalty for his sin. But how, in the words of Islip Collyer, can God forgive sin and yet exact the penalty? The editor also asks, “Is our sin in Adam un-taken away in Christ? The Christadelphian view and answer must be “Yes”, because we still have “sin-in-the-flesh”, a physical fixation of condemnation which, according to them, and logically so, can only be removed by death, that is, “physical death.”

The only proper and scriptural alternative is to accept what the Apostle Paul says in Romans 6:1, “What shall we say then? Shall we continue ‘in Sin’ (Not ‘to sin’) that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us that were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise, reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

All in the present tense.

The sense of this last verse (11) has been altered in the B.A.S.F. and made to read as follows: “Reckon yourselves to be dead to all manner of sin.” The Apostle does not say this and he does not mean all manner of sin - he means that when a bond-servant to sin has associated himself with the death which Jesus died, (which was by blood-shedding), sin had no more claim on that servant. (See Romans 6:16-18 & 20-23.)

As I pointed out earlier, we must always keep in mind that Paul is referring to Sin as a Bond-master and to Sin’s bondservants as those who, by one man’s disobedience, were constituted sinners, and not actual sinners, because they were not even born when God concluded them all under the one sin of Adam. And the reason God did this was so that by the one act of righteousness, by Jesus Christ in giving His life as a ransom price His free gift could come upon all men unto justification of life, accounting them as righteous, a new creation - as saith the scripture “If any man be in Christ he is a new creature.” Hence Paul in Romans 7:5 could say, “For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.” Why? Because the law of itself could not give life, as the person had to be first redeemed and see and acknowledge Christ as the substance of the typical offerings before works could be accounted as righteous.

Therefore Paul could say “As touching the righteousness which was in the law he was blameless.” So do not give us any more unscriptural hash that no one could keep the law other than Jesus Christ. “When we were in the flesh” says Paul, was he not in the flesh when he spoke these words? Of course he was. So therefore he must have been speaking of a legal status whereby he could pass from one to the other, and this is exactly the case. Paul had passed from under the “sin constitution” as a result of knowing the law and the true reason for Christ’s death, which Paul rejoiced in as being a substitutionary death for himself that by faith and symbolic death into the same .he could be made free from the “law of

sin and death.” Do we need any further proof that sin is not a physical fixation in the flesh? Did not Jesus explain to Nicodemus how a man could be born again without entering again his mother’s womb? You who believe in sin as a physical fixation in the flesh are about as wise as Nicodemus before he asked Jesus the question “How can a man be born when he is old...?” John 3:3,4)

Much has been written on Paul’s epistle to the Romans by members of the Nazarene Fellowship, especially chapter 7 in which Paul says some things which are difficult to understand, especially with the minds biased by sin-in-the-flesh theories. Dr Adam Clarke deplored the fact that the established church, through the teaching of a certain Pope, had fallen into the same erroneous teaching of sin-in-the-flesh as taught by Christadelphians from the time of Robert Roberts’ clash with Edward Turney. A certain sect known as the Pelagians were accounted as heretics for opposing this view, nevertheless they were absolutely right in holding that view even as we of the Nazarene Fellowship are. The question for Christadelphians to answer is “Have the beasts of the field sin in the flesh?” “Have they condemned nature?” If they have not, then Robert Roberts was wrong when he declared in “The Visible Hand of God”, “it required what men call a miracle to depress to the level of the beasts that perish the noble creature made in the image of the Elohim.”

The beasts were declared by the Creator to be very good at creation, so also was Adam. How then could he be depressed to something possessing the same nature? If you can believe this to be possible, it is obvious you can believe any invented theory of Robert Roberts.

Should you not therefore examine your true position and do something to rectify it before it is too late? Have you, or have you not “died unto sin”? We of the Nazarene Fellowship believe like Paul “that whether we live we live unto the Lord and whether we die (fall asleep) we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord’s. For to this end Christ both died and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.”

Romans 14:8-9, “Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.” How then can the natural death of a saint be condemnatory in the sight of the Lord?

How indeed could the flesh of Jesus be classed as sinful or “condemned nature” in view of Christ’s discourse with His disciples in John 6:- “For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world... I am the bread of life... I am that bread of life... Your Fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead... This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die... And the bread that I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world... Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.”

Can one partake of the flesh and blood of Christ in symbol or otherwise if it be “sin contaminated” and not be guilty of touching the unclean thing? Why be led any more by blind guides and their doctrine? Have you a desire to do God’s will irrespective of the sacrifice that entails? Jesus said “My doctrine is not mine but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him.”

Robert Roberts spoke too much of his own volition and contradicted his own writings and statements, and because a humble man like Edward Turney began to know of the doctrine as a result of a desire to do God’s will, Roberts thought the worst and regarded it as an effort to topple him from leadership. Nothing could have been further from Edward Turney’s mind. We only wish Dr Thomas had been alive at the time, for we are persuaded that he was the type of man who would have agreed with Edward Turney’s views because we have evidence that he did at one time express them himself.

“If the blind lead the blind.” At least you are wise enough to know the result of this.

Brother Phil Parry.

GOD OUR HELP

All mankind's history is full of war, war and war again. What is often forgotten is that, in the end, it is not soldiers, not armaments, but God who decides the outcome of battles. He does not necessarily intervene in any spectacular manner - He rarely does - but from the human point of view little seemingly trivial things, such as a hail or a thunderstorm, or even the glare of the sun blazing into the soldiers eye and thus putting them into a disadvantage against their opponents, these apparently minor events often have decided the battle.

Let us consider a few instances where God, by His intervention, won decisive battles for His people, the children of Israel. There are two good examples found in the book of Joshua. Now the Israelites were just about to enter the holy land. They were to be a forerunner of the Kingdom of God and had they kept to the covenant made under Moses, the world's history might have been a very different one. So it will be readily understood how essential it was that these battles which, remember were God's battles, should be really decisively won, once and for all. They were forerunners of the yet future battles when the Lord Jesus Christ, with His saints, will conquer the kingdoms of this world.

The first example was the fall of Jericho when her walls just fell down flat. What conquest could have been simpler? It was probably an earthquake, but whatever it was it is not ours to ask how God brings about a thing. And this was soon followed by another even more decisive battle against a whole confederacy of opposing armies: the time when the sun and the moon stood still for a whole day. First the Lord cast great hailstones on the armies opposing Joshua. Then it was that that unique miracle happened to give Joshua time to do the mopping up operations before they could re-array themselves.

Another case of God using the forces of nature. These were the only recorded miracles where God actually intervened in the courses of the heavenly bodies. It is the cause of much speculation among scientists who do not recognise that the beginning of wisdom is to know God. Nobody knows how God does it; all we need to know is that He did it. However, astronomical records confirm that if we add the time of Joshua's 'long day' as it is now referred to, to the time delay at King Hezekiah's time when the sun dial of Ahaz went backwards, these two delays just about add up to a twenty-four hour day. A good example to show God's power and prerogative to intervene with the laws of nature to fulfil His supreme purpose.

We next come to what we read early on in the first book of Samuel. The Israelites had just suffered a major defeat when the ark was taken. This by itself was the result of their sinful living. The ark, however, was not to the Philistines benefit. They suffered all kinds of plagues and misfortunes and were only too glad to get rid of it. Then we read how Samuel gathered the children of Israel together at Mizpeh, and after sincere prayer and admission of their guilt by the Israelites, there was a battle where God decisively intervened by means of a great thunderstorm. From this time forward, not all at once, there were still setbacks, but Israel gradually gained the upper hand over the Philistines.

Finally, we move forward to the reign of Hezekiah. The king of Assyria had just taken captive the ten tribes of Israel - again the result of their own sins - and conquered some cities of Juda. Everybody expected Jerusalem to fall next. But man's thoughts are not God's thoughts. And did the children of Israel need to fight? No! They lost not one single man. God did it all for them; when they looked in the morning, they were all dead men.

Before we conclude let us consider an example of our own time. We all remember the disaster of Dunkirk when the British expeditionary force was trapped and a large part of it got out, though many did not make it. Now from the human point this was due in part to Hitler's folly. There were plenty of tanks ready to wipe out the entire British force, but Hitler, in his madness, insisted that the air-force should do it. However, because of prevailing cloud conditions, the air-force had to stay grounded while the tanks had to stand there inactive, not allowed to move. How many realise the hand of God in this, by means no more complicated but a cloudy sky?

And what about us? Do not the angels of the Lord encamp around all that fear Him? And this includes us. Not by spectacular miracle during this age before the return of the Lord, but nevertheless, we can be sure that in difficult situations, when we trust in the Lord, there are invincible powers helping us and keeping us from sinning, at the same time giving us the necessary wisdom to deal with the situation.

Let us close with the closing by Jude:-

“Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.”

Brother Leo Dreifuss.

Man in Space

Go back, go back, O earthbound man
The heavens are My domain;
Ye seek for cities in the sky,
But seek them all in vain.
Your place is on the earth, O man.
Thou art but clay alone?
'Twas I in Eden placed you there
To make of it your home.
My plan, O man, is not in space,
Nor regions up above;
I made your race for you to grow
In Grace, in Truth and Love.

Go back, go back, ye earthbound man,
And read the Bible true:
The heaven's My Throne, I rule all things;
The earth is given to you.
The habitation of the sky
Is not for mortal man;
The hope of everlasting life
Is allowed for in My Plan.
I will reveal My secrets all.
I gave the first man birth.
In My good time I'll show to men
I am LORD of Heaven and earth.