

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 248

March/April 2011

In This Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 2	Enoch and Elijah	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 3	Then cometh Jesus from Galilee...	Brother S.G.Hayes
Page 4	Why The Cross was Necessary for Salvation	Brother Herbert Taberner
Page 7	On The Genealogy of Jesus Christ	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 11	Behold I make all Things New"	Brother Phil Parry
Page 18	The Law of Sin and Death	Brother F.J.Pearce

Editorial

In the final prophecy given to Daniel he was told by the angel Gabriel that "there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." Naturally he asked, "When shall these things be?"

This is a question we should all like to know the answer to. Indeed, the disciples of Jesus asked a similar question in Matthew 24:3 - "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world (age)?" But the angel told Daniel, "Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand. (Daniel 12:9,10). And neither did Jesus give a precise answer to His disciples question but He did give them some indications regarding the things we should look for - "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. All these are the beginning of sorrows." (Matthew 24:4-8).

With the distress and trouble we see in the world today we are sure we are fast approaching the times "when these things shall be" and we long for Jesus to come and restore the kingdom to Israel. But how can we "be not troubled" if this is only the "beginning of sorrows"? It is surely true that God hates "man's inhumanity to man"; and that "the wicked shall do wickedly," and He is determined to put an end to it.

God is Love and we must never lose sight of this, and no one can make a mockery of His love for His creation and live. We have been promised that "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." (Romans 10:13) and we are continually being encouraged to put our trust in Him.

It seems that as more and more tragic events unfold, so people will become more and more divided, either for God or against God; some saying that if God really exists and is a God of love then He would not allow such dreadful things to happen, while on the other hand, those who put their trust in God look to Him for the answers - but the answers they find will never satisfy the sceptics that these are righteous judgments of God. Hence there can be no agreement between those who turn to God and those who reject Him.

But God has given us free-will for the purpose of building our characters. Jesus said, "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit". (Matthew 12:33). We choose to do what is good and to love one another, and in this Jesus gave us the supreme example "that ye love one another as I have loved you", or else we can do what we think is going to be best for us in the short term; get what we can for ourselves, for our families, for our local communities, for our country, and be prepared to fight to keep what we have because others might take it from us. While it can

be seen that to love as Jesus loved is the better way, it is not easy to put ones whole trust in God as He did. Knowledge, understanding and faith are called for and this is what God asks of us, and the reward is beyond compare.

Can we, like the Apostle Paul “count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus” (Philippians 3:8), and look forward with hope, as he did, to receive “a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give... to all them also that love his appearing.”? (2 Timothy 4:6).

Christ is coming! let creation from her groans and travail cease,
Let the glorious proclamation hope restore, and faith increase.
Christ is coming! Christ is coming! Come, Thou blessed Prince of Peace.

Earth can now but tell the story of Thy bitter cross and pain;
She shall yet behold Thy glory when Thou comest back to reign.
Christ is coming! Christ is coming! Let each heart repeat the strain.

With Love in Jesus to all. Russell.

Enoch and Elijah.

What is Revealed About Them?

The following article is intended to clear up some misunderstandings concerning these two faithful people. To the majority who believe in an immortal soul going to heaven, their record presents no difficulty. They just read into it that both of them have gone to heaven. But such is not the case in view of John 3:13. “And no man hath ascended up to heaven...” So what do we know about them?

All that follows is not my explanation, but I owe it to the late Mr Armstrong, an American publisher of a magazine entitled “The Plain Truth.” He was the founder of an organization by the name of “The Church of God.” They hold a lot, but by no means all, of the truth. They do however, recognize the error of the doctrine of heaven-going. Like us, they look forward to the return of Christ and God's Kingdom to be established on this earth, not in heaven. In his magazine there appeared an article many years ago concerning this subject, which seems to me as good a scriptural explanation as is possible with our limited knowledge.

The Case of Elijah. Comparing Scripture with Scripture there is a very similar parallel in Acts 8:26 to the end, especially verses 39 and 40 where we read about the spirit having caught away Philip. The main difference is that we are told that Philip was taken to Azotus, whereas we don't know where the spirit took Elijah. Certainly not to heaven, for some seven years later we find Elijah having written a letter to king Jehoram rebuking him for his sinful conduct. According to the dated margin of my Bible, Elijah's being taken by the spirit dates 896 B.C. (2 Kings 2), and his letter to Jehoram (2 Chronicles 21:12) around 889 B.C. An interval of some seven years, approximately. Nothing further about Elijah is revealed thereafter.

The Case of Enoch. All we read in Genesis 5:24 is “And Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him.” We don't know where to, but again, not to heaven, in view of John 3:13. Not even David, the man after God's own heart, is in heaven (Acts 2:34), nor yet Daniel, the man greatly beloved to whom it was said (Daniel 12:13) “for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.”

Now the Hebrew word for “took” is “*laqach*” which is translated in many different ways, but the most common one, occurring some 793 times is “take (away).” This by itself does not convey a lot to those who do not read heaven-going into it. So let us see what we read about him in Hebrews 11, the famous chapter about faith. In Hebrews 11:5 we are told that he “was translated that he should not see death.” And to find out about the meaning of “translated” in this context we turn to Colossians 1:13, “...who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son...” So here is the answer. The kingdom of his dear Son, as we have all learned by God's love and mercy, is certainly not in heaven, but will be here on earth. And note well the translation applies to us - “translated us,” we read. We, if we hold fast until the end, have already been translated into His kingdom. It reads “hath translated us.” And back to Hebrews 11, Enoch was translated that he should not see death. Now we, who have accepted Christ and have been baptized into Him, have all been translated, but we still die the natural death, unless the Lord returns before then. So the death spoken of here is the death for sin which all in Adam die. So this is how Enoch and many more, including ourselves if we keep faithful, have been translated.

Incidentally, the wording “hath translated us” is another proof to show that, subject to our remaining faithful, we have already been judged worthy, hence no need for a mortal resurrection followed by judgment.

I hope that these thoughts will prove helpful to all who are wondering about what happened to Enoch and Elijah. May we be among those who remain faithful to the end and be found worthy to meet these two and many more, and have the real meaning of these passages explained if we are wrong.

Brother Leo Dreifuss.

“Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptised of him. But John forbade him...”

In submitting to the baptism of John, who was his forerunner Jesus voluntarily surrendered himself to what was a national requirement at the time, not because he needed washing, but because of his desire to fulfil to the uttermost the righteousness required of him. The use of the plural in the Lord's saying, “Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,” we would suggest referred to himself and John the Baptist. The ‘others besides’ who flocked to John's baptism were transgressors, and were baptised confessing their sins. Jesus had no sins to confess nor any defilement to wash away. He was not in their position, and John, knowing this, might well express surprise that Jesus should come to him for such a purpose. If the Baptist had looked upon Jesus as a defiled one, needing to be washed, it is scarcely conceivable he could have addressed him as he did. But some of our modern scribes consider themselves better informed on the point in question than our Lord's forerunner, who was specially sent to prepare his way. However that may be, for our own part we are satisfied from the testimony that Jesus was not defiled, and that John could have held no such idea concerning him. A theory which can resort to such an argument in order to support it must indeed be in desperate straits.

John's baptism was the ‘baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,’ and at the same time he made a public proclamation to the people, saying, ‘repent, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand;’ or, more literally rendered, the words are, ‘repent, for the royal majesty of the Heavens has approached.’ ‘John verily baptised with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.’ Acts 19:4. ‘That he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptising with water.’ John 1.51. These are the words of Paul and John, and they define the nature and intention of the baptism then practised. From all this it is clear that John's baptism had reference to repentance on account of personal transgressions and not to defilement inherited from Adam, and also that it was made the occasion of announcing to the nation of Israel that their long expected Messiah was then in their- midst. The confession made by those who were baptised was a confession of sins actually committed,

and not a confession of being under sentence of death for Adam's sin. In submitting to it the sinless Jesus, who had nothing to confess, nor any defilement from which to be cleansed, rendered an act of obedience to an existing institution, and thereby typified his own death, burial and resurrection.

The conclusion therefore is, that the baptism of Jesus did not prove him to be physically unclean, any more than his circumcision proved him to be unclean, but that both ceremonies were typical of events concerning himself in the relationship he bore to the rest of mankind. The question, 'Was it not the existence of sin in the world which gave rise to such ceremonies?' seems very unnecessary and admits only of one answer. Of course if sin had not entered into the world no expiatory offerings or sacrifices would have been required, and consequently no ceremonies enjoined which were in any way typical of them. But, admitting this, we entirely fail to see how it furnishes any proof that he who was destined to cleanse the world from sin must himself be unclean in order to effect that object. In our judgment it proves the very opposite, and necessitates the coming of such a Redeemer as the Scriptures describe Jesus to be, that is to say, one who was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners.

It is asked, 'If Jesus was in the same position as Adam before the fall, how is it he was not freed from all ceremonies which owed their origin to the existence of sin?' In reply, we say, Jesus was not in all points in the same position as Adam before the fall, though he was equally required to develop obedience under trial. His nature was the same, but the circumstances under which he was placed were different, owing to the introduction of sin and death into the world. It is admitted that Jesus stood related to the law of sin and death, but the question is, in what way? The relationship which he bore to it was not that of one who was under it either by inheritance or by actual transgression, but that of one who being himself personally free from that law was able to redeem those who were involved in it both constitutionally as well as by actual offences. Had Jesus been born of the will of the flesh he would, like all the rest of mankind, have been under sentence of death and powerless to save, but being the only-begotten son of God, after perfecting obedience under trial, he could, by the sacrifice of himself, redeem the death-stricken race of Adam. This then is the reason why Jesus was not freed from all ceremonies which owed their origin to the existence of sin.

Again, it has been asked, 'Why was washing necessary to the priests under the law?' Because they were transgressors of that law, and therefore required to be made ceremonially clean before they could minister before the Lord, or typify him who was without spot and blameless. Such being the character and nature of Jesus, he did not need his flesh to be washed before being anointed as a priest, nor did his compliance with the ordinance of baptism furnish any evidence that his flesh was unclean on account of Adam's sin, as already explained.

In conclusion, we remark that it does not follow that because orthodox commentators are wrong on some points, as for instance 'the eternal Sonship' of Christ, they are therefore untrustworthy on all and not to be regarded. However much they may be sneered at by those who deem themselves so much wiser than their fellows, orthodox commentators have by their knowledge of language and reasoning, shed a good deal of light on many parts of scripture, and the Bible student whose only object is truth will gladly avail himself of their researches and accept light from any quarter. But for the labours of such the probability is that to this day the English reader would be destitute of a copy of the Scriptures in his mother tongue.

Brother S. G. Hayes 1874

Why The Cross was Necessary for Salvation

What is Salvation

It is well known fact that all animals, human or otherwise, must inevitably die (one exception recorded in the scriptures is that of Enoch, who was translated "that he should not see death". But this exception goes to prove that God can alter this rule at His will.) There will be, in the future, others who will not die, but who "shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump." (1 Corinthians 15:52) at the return of Jesus.

We are told in John 5:6 that “God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” Also we read “I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live,” (John 11:25) “I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly” (John 10:10). See also Luke 9:56 etc.

Thus we see that salvation is a saving from (or out of) death. Believers from the beginning of the creation, who have died, are not reckoned as having perished, for they are all written in God's Book of Life (Phil 4:5; Rev 5:5, etc.) and they will take part in a resurrection at the appointed day (compare the statement of Jesus “God is not the God of the dead, but of the living” to prove to the Sadducees the certainty of the resurrection.)

Why does man die?

Paul tells us clearly (Rom. 5:12) “By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” This one man was, of course, Adam (verse 14) who, by eating of the forbidden fruit, transgressed God's law, and as a consequence was expelled from the Garden of Eden, “lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever” (Gen 5: 22). To this day the tree of life is withheld from us and we die. Our own individual sins do not constitute the cause of our dying (for otherwise there would be no infant deaths) nor can our own righteousness bring about everlasting life, “For there is none other name (but Jesus) under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” (Acts 4:12).

The qualifications of a Saviour

A) The Saviour must be a man.

Since it is mankind which is guilty of sin, it would not be right, even according to man's view of justice, to inflict the penalty on some other animal or creature. Scripture takes the same view, for in it we read (Heb 10:4) “It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins.” But how can we know that human blood (under certain circumstances) may accomplish this? Well, it is laid down in God's plan of salvation which began to operate in the very earliest days, and we may understand some of it by studying His word. If we turn for a moment to the first pair who sinned we can see some of the principles involved.

After their transgression, Adam and Eve immediately became conscious of a feeling of nakedness which they sought to overcome by wearing aprons of fig leaves, As a mere bodily covering no doubt these served their purpose, but evidently they were not approved by God, who made coats of skins and clothed them, their consciousness of nakedness and of guilt thereby becoming dulled or non-existent. (We may here remember the words of David “Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered.” Psalm 52:1) But in order to cover them with skins it had been necessary to cause the death of some animal, or animals and here we see a principle of salvation coming to light. The penalty of Adam's transgression was death in the day that he ate of the fruit. Adam did not die that day, but some animal did. Now we read in Revelation 12:8 about the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; an obvious reference to Jesus (see Revelation 5), and so we see that the animal slain in the Garden of Eden was but a representative of Jesus - a token payment - a promise that in due time someone should come who by his death, would pay in full the price of Adam's transgression.

It is not surprising that this person had to be a male when we consider the following:-

a) The law in Eden was given to Adam when he was the sole human on the earth. We are not told whether it was later expressly given to Eve, but undoubtedly she understood the law to be binding upon her also (Genesis 5:5). At any rate, Adam was the responsible party though not actually the first to transgress.

b) Eve was formed from Adam's rib and can still be regarded as being “in Adam” or part of Adam, or, as he himself said, “bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh” (Genesis 2:25), and in the same way that Levi is said to have paid tithes in Abraham (Heb. 7:9), so also Eve may “be said to be in Adam.

c) God called their name Adam (Gen 2), thus showing again that the man was responsible, and that the actions of Eve were done in, or under, his name.

B) The Saviour must be an Israelite.

This may not have been necessary for the salvation of the Gentiles, but for the Jews it was vital that he should be of their race, for they were under another law or system of laws, with its own benefits for adherents thereto and its own penalties for infringement. For some offences the penalty was death. Now, we read in Deut, 27:26, "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them." and in James 2:10 "For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Therefore the children at Israel needed to be redeemed from the death penalty - even those who might not have committed sins worthy of death, and to do this their redeemer must also be under the same law.

C) The Saviour must be sinless.

Obviously a man under the sentence of death cannot be bought back by someone under the same sentence, and so it is necessary that the redeemer should be guiltless.

D) The Saviour must have a life to give.

It is obvious that a man cannot be said to give his life for someone else if he is bound to die in any case. Therefore a redeemer must possess a life which cannot be taken from him without his consent.

E) The Saviour must be willing.

It would not be just to exact from an innocent person the penalty due to a sinner but if the innocent one willingly offers to die in the place of the sinner then there is no injustice.

How Jesus fulfilled all these conditions.

A & B) Jesus was the son of Mary who was of the tribe of Judah. The law recognised Joseph, the husband of Mary, as the father of Jesus, but Joseph was also of the tribe of Judah.

C) There are many references which testify to the absolute sinlessness of Jesus.

For example:" "For such an High Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners." (Hebrews 7:26). "For He hath made Him to be sin (sin-offering) for us, who knew no sin." (2 Corinthians 5:21). "For Christ also hath once suffered for sin, the just for the unjust." (1 Peter 5:18). "He was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." (1 John 5:5).

D) Adam was the first Son of God (See Luke 5:58); Jesus, though not a new creation was the only begotten Son of God, for although He was born of Mary, His life came direct from God who was His Father. For this reason He is called the second wan (1 Corinthians 15:47) or last Adam (1 Corinthians 15:45). As Jesus had a life unforfeited by -transgression he had the right to eat of the Tree of Life like the first Adam before his transgression. Jesus himself said; "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself" (John 5:26). "I lay down my life that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself, I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of My Father."(John 10;17) "I am the way, the truth and the life (John 14:6).

E) His voluntary submission to His Father's will was as complete during the sufferings on the cross as throughout the whole of His lifetime - "I lay down my life for the sheep" (John 10:15). "I lay it down of myself (John 10:18). "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." (John 15:15). "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt." (Matthew 26:59).

Why the Cross?

It was His Father's will that Jesus should endure the sufferings of the cross, and so we conclude that those sufferings must have been absolutely necessary. A natural death (i.e. one due to old age or 'natural causes') would not have sufficed. Most of us die a natural death, but this is not the penalty of sin, as even innocent babies die. The wages of sin is an inflicted death from which we are saved by belief in Jesus who, though Himself sinless, took our punishment upon Himself. Thus, by His sacrifice, we have been permitted to have life (through Adam, whose life was spared on account of that sacrifice) and those who are accounted worthy will later receive life more abundantly, (see John 10:10).

Paul states that “without shedding of blood is no remission” (i.e. of sin) (Hebrews 9:22 also Leviticus 17:11). This was in relation to the Law of Moses which pointed forward to Christ (Col. 2:17 etc) and the principle still applies. Therefore the mode of death of the Saviour necessitated the shedding of His blood.

The Jewish method of execution was by stoning, but under the Roman law which was in force over the Jews at the time of Jesus, the method was crucifixion. Now, whereas it may be possible for a man to be stoned to death without the shedding of blood (by a blow on the head, for example) the crucifixion of Jesus made the shedding of blood a certainty, for His hands and feet were pierced in order to nail Him to the cross. (Much more blood was spilled later when His side was pierced with a spear).

But since the blood shedding could have been brought about some other way there must be some other reason for the use of a cross. Paul explains the reason to us in Galatians 5:10-14. As has been mentioned before, the Law of Moses contained a curse “for everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” It is written in Deut. 21:25 and quoted in Galatians 5:15 that “cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree.” By His suffering on that wooden cross Jesus took upon Himself that curse (of death) which the law held over the Jews, and by this means He redeemed the Jews from that curse “that the blessings of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith” (Galatians 5:14).

“O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God” - Romans 2:55.

Brother Herbert Taberner

On The Genealogy of Jesus Christ

Have you ever considered the miracle of Jesus’ genealogy?

In the Scriptures we are given the genealogy from Adam to Jesus. It is widely accepted that this covers about 77 generations but it is not altogether straightforward as one or two names are missing from or added to some of the records so we have to consider these in order to find the complete picture.

Who but God could have named those earliest people when there were so many thousands, even millions of other genealogies which could have been followed? Many are started and followed for a short time, perhaps five or six generations, but only one is followed throughout the Scriptures to Jesus, and, to prove a point, this is divided into two genealogies from David’s son Solomon to Joseph on the one hand, and from David’s son Nathan to Mary on the other. We shall see why in due course.

We also find some unexpected events as we shall see as we look at some of the people involved. So let us very briefly trace some of the history of these people.

It was Adam and Eve’s third son, Seth, who was next in the chosen line leading to Jesus, their first son Cain having murdered his brother Abel. After this tragic event we read that Adam “begat a son in his own likeness, and after his image; and called his name Seth”. Continuing the account in Genesis 5 we see that Seth begat Cainan, who begat Mahalaleel, who begat Jared, who begat Enoch. Of Enoch it is said “Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him.” But before God took him he begat Methuselah and other sons and daughters but our line follows Methuselah who lived to be nine hundred and sixty-nine years old, the oldest recorded age of anyone. Methuselah begat Lamech, who begat Noah. And of Noah we read “Lamech lived an hundred eighty and two years, and begat a son: and he called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the LORD hath cursed”; and if we turn to Genesis 8:21 we can read of how God had earlier cursed the ground because of Adam’s transgression. However, before the curse was lifted we have the flood and God gave the reason for this in Genesis 6:5-10 - “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the

face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them... But Noah found grace in the eyes of the LORD. These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God. And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.”

Noah’s son Shem was next chosen in the line of Jesus’ ancestors but whereas we have followed the first born son in each generation since Adam’s third son, Seth, we now once again find it is Shem’s third son, Arphaxad, who is chosen. Then we again follow the first born of each generation – Arphaxad begat Shelah who begat Eber, who begat Peleg, who begat Reu, who begat Serug, who begat Nahor, who begat Tera, who begat Abram. So far the record above is taken from 1 Chronicles chapter 1, which agrees with Genesis 10:2-5; however we note in Luke’s record Cainan is added between Arphaxad and Shelah (see Luke 3:36).

Abram, whose name was changed to Abraham, eventually had eight sons. God had promised him he would become the father of many nations but time went by and Sarah passed child-bearing age, so in Genesis 16:1 to 4 we read, “Now Sarai Abram’s wife bare him no children: and she had an handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name was Hagar. And Sarai said unto Abram, Behold now, the LORD hath restrained me from bearing: I pray thee, go in unto my maid; it may be that I may obtain children by her. And Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai. And Sarai Abram’s wife took Hagar her maid the Egyptian, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan, and gave her to her husband Abram to be his wife. And he went in unto Hagar, and she conceived...” Thus Ishmael was born, Abraham’s firstborn of whom it was foretold that “he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man’s hand against him.” (Genesis 16:12). Nevertheless, God blessed Ishmael and he had twelve sons – “Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation. But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year.” (Genesis 17:20,21). So the record of the line through Ishmael was discontinued.

Even though Sarah was passed child-bearing age she conceived Isaac so fulfilling God’s promise recorded in Genesis 17:19, “And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant and with his seed after him.” Abraham was one hundred years old and Sarah was ninety years old when Isaac was born. And when Isaac was grown to a young man, Abraham’s faith was tested to the limit for God asked him to sacrifice his son as we read in Genesis 22. Abraham reasoned that as God had said the covenant would be established through his son Isaac, then God would raise him again from the dead. It seems also that Isaac was willing to be sacrificed for he allowed his father to bind him before he slew him. At the moment when Abraham raised his arm to strike the fatal blow an angel prevented him saying, “Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.” Seeing a ram caught in a thicket behind him, Abraham offered up the ram instead of his son, Isaac.

Isaac had two sons, Esau and Jacob, and although they were twins, Esau was born first and to him went the birthright. It seems to have been the custom that the first born should receive a double portion of any inheritance. However, this was not to be. In Genesis 25:29-34 we see how Esau sold his birthright to Jacob and later, near the time of their father’s death, when the time came for them to receive the blessing of their father, Jacob deceived his blind father and made sure the inheritance of the first born came to him. Even so Esau received a good inheritance as well as being blessed by God. His descendants are recorded for several generations in Genesis 36. They became the Edomites. Yet the line to Jesus follows through Jacob.

Jacob, whose name God changed to Israel, also had twelve sons and the families of these sons became the twelve tribes of Israel with whom God established His covenant at the time that the children of Israel became a nation under Moses leadership. (Exodus 24). Jacob (Israel) married two sisters, Leah and Rachel but also had children by their handmaids, Zilpah and Bilhah. Leah had six sons while Rachel, Zilpah and Bilhah had two each.

It was Jacob’s fourth son, Juda who was to continue the line. Juda had three sons by his wife Shua but non of these are in Jesus’ ancestry. Judah’s eldest son Er, married Tamar but God slew him because he was wicked. Juda then said to his second son, Onan that he should raise up a family to his brother, Er, as was the custom. But, we read in Genesis 38:9,10, “Onan knew that the seed should not be his; and it came to pass,

when he went in unto his brother's wife, that he spilled it on the ground, lest that he should give seed to his brother. And the thing which he did displeased the LORD: wherefore he slew him also." Juda asked Tamar to remain a widow until his third son, Shelah should be grown so that he could raise up a family to his eldest son, but when the time came Tamar realised that her father in law delayed giving Shelah to her and so she took matters into her own hands, dressed herself as a whore and seduced her father in law by whom she conceived twins, Pharez and Zarah. Pharez, her firstborn, and Juda's fourth son continued the genealogy we are following.

We continue the line - Pharez begat Hezron, who begat Ram, who begat Amminadab who begat Nashon, who begat Salmon.

Let us digress a moment. After the death of Moses, Joshua was the leader of the Israelites. On the way to the Promised Land they came to Jericho. Joshua sent two men to spy out the city and when they came into Jericho they stayed with Rahab, a harlot, who hid them on the roof top when the authorities came to search for them. For this, Rahab was spared when Jericho fell. Rahab became the wife of Salmon, and Boaz was their son.

Next let us stop a moment and look at the Book of Ruth. Ruth was a Moabitess married to an Israelite, Mahlon, a son of Elimelech and Naomi who had left Israel to live in Moab because of famine. But before we continue the story of Ruth we will refer to Deuteronomy 23:3 and 4, where we read a "Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the LORD; even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the LORD for ever: Because they met you not with bread and with water in the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt; and because they hired against thee Balaam the son of Beor of Pethor of Mesopotamia, to curse thee". Ruth was the exception and here is why... Naomi's husband and two sons all died in Moab and she decided to return home. She advised her two daughters in law to go back to their own families but Ruth was insistent - "Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God: Where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried: the LORD do so to me, and more also, if ought but death part thee and me" (Ruth 1:16-17).

This Book of Ruth tells one of the most beautiful stories in the Bible; the story of how Ruth became the husband of Boaz, the son of Rahab and Salmon. Their son was Obed, and he begat Jesse. There is a prophecy concerning Jesse in Isaiah 11:1 and 10, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots... 10. And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious." This "Branch" being Jesus.

Jesse was the father of David who became Israel's second king. King Saul, the first king, had been told by an angel that "the LORD hath sought him a man after his own heart, and the LORD hath commanded him to be captain over his people, because thou hast not kept that which the LORD commanded thee". And so God gave the Kingdom to David as we read in Acts 13:22 & 23, "And when he had removed him (Saul), he raised up unto them David to be their king; to whom also he gave their testimony, and said, I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfil all my will. Of this man's seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus."

Of the many kings of Israel and Judah, David is the only one in Jesus' ancestry.

But David was not perfect. We know he had several wives before he became king. While he was fleeing from Saul he took Abigail to be his wife, also Ahinoam and before this he had been given Saul's daughter, Michal, to be his wife after David slew Goliath, the Philistine. Eleven sons of David are named in 2 Samuel 5:14. David's greatest misdemeanour was when he committed adultery with Bathsheba and then slew her husband to try to cover it up. According to the Law he should have been stoned to death for his actions. However, God shewed him great mercy and we can read David's prayer in Psalm 51. Because of David's deep humility we read in 2 Samuel 12:13 that "The LORD also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die." Nevertheless from that time on there was always family trouble in David's house.

The first child born to David and Bathsheba died when just seven days old. Afterwards "David comforted Bathsheba his wife, and went in unto her, and lay with her: and she bare a son, and he called his

name Solomon: and the LORD loved him.” In the course of time Solomon succeeded David as the next King of Israel.

From this time on we follow two genealogies; one continuing the line through Solomon to Joseph “as was supposed,” the father of Jesus; and the other through another son of David, Nathan, whose line we shall follow to Mary.

Matthew records the genealogy from Solomon to Joseph though we see from verse 10 of chapter 1 that Joseph he is said to be the husband of Mary of whom Jesus was born and not that he was the father of Jesus. So why this genealogy? Let’s follow the history

In 1 Kings 6:11-13 we read, “And the word of the LORD came to Solomon, saying, Concerning this house which thou art in building, if thou wilt walk in my statutes, and execute my judgments, and keep all my commandments to walk in them; then will I perform my word with thee, which I spake unto David thy father: and I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will not forsake my people Israel.” Sadly, this was not the case. Solomon, who had asked for wisdom and who God blessed with great wealth, peace and prosperity, became a great king but he also became a tyrant and his reign ended in civil war with his son, Rehoboam, holding onto the smaller part of the kingdom, the tribe of Judah, with the rest of the tribes breaking away under the kingship of Jeroboam. The nation now divided was known as the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of Judah.

From father to son the kings were Rehoboam, Abia, Asa, Josaphat, Joram, Ozias, Joatham, Achaz and Ezekias. Hezekiah, as he is better known, was one of the best kings and faithful before God for “he did that which was right in the sight of the LORD, according to all that David his father did... He trusted in the LORD God of Israel; so that after him was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him” (2 Kings 18:3,5). But, “In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the LORD, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live. Then he turned his face to the wall, and prayed unto the LORD, saying, I beseech thee, O LORD, remember now how I have walked before thee in truth and with a perfect heart, and have done that which is good in thy sight. And Hezekiah wept sore. And it came to pass, afore Isaiah was gone out into the middle court, that the word of the LORD came to him, saying, Turn again, and tell Hezekiah the captain of my people, Thus saith the LORD, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: behold, I will heal thee: on the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of the LORD. And I will add unto thy days fifteen years (2 Kings 20:1-6).

It was during those extra years added to the life of Hezekiah that Manasseh was born. Sadly, we read that “he did that which was evil in the sight of the LORD, after the abominations of the heathen, whom the LORD cast out before the children of Israel.” What a contrast to his father! Moreover we read, “Manasseh seduced them to do more evil than did the nations whom the LORD destroyed before the children of Israel. And the LORD spake by his servants the prophets, saying, Because Manasseh king of Judah hath done these abominations, and hath done wickedly above all that the Amorites did, which were before him, and hath made Judah also to sin with his idols: therefore thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Behold, I am bringing such evil upon Jerusalem and Judah, that whosoever heareth of it, both his ears shall tingle.” (2 Kings 21:9-12).

While Manasseh begat Amon, who begat Josias, who begat Jechonias, things didn’t improve and because of the wickedness of Jechonias (also called Jechoniah, Jehoiachin and Coniah) God said that no descendant of his would ever sit on the throne of Israel as we read in Jeremiah 22:29 and 30, “O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the LORD. Thus saith the LORD, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah.”

It was at this time that the nation was overrun by Egypt who allowed Judah’s kings to continue as vassals paying tribute to their masters. “Jehoahaz was twenty and three years old when he began to reign; and he reigned three months in Jerusalem... And he did that which was evil in the sight of the LORD, according to all that his fathers had done. And Pharaohnechoh put him in bands at Riblah in the land of Hamath that he might not reign in Jerusalem; and put the land to a tribute of an hundred talents of silver, and a talent of gold.

And Pharaohnechoh made Eliakim the son of Josiah king in the room of Josiah his father, and turned his name to Jehoiakim, and took Jehoahaz away: and he came to Egypt, and died there (2 Kings 23:31-34).

But there were few vassal kings for we read in Ezekiel 21:26, “Thus saith the Lord GOD; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same... I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him. So ended the kingdom of Judah. Yet the ancestry continues for Jeconiah begat Salathiel, who begat Zorobabel, who begat Abiud, who begat Eliakim, who begat Azor, who begat Sadoc, who begat Achim, who begat Eliud, who begat Eleazar, who begat Matthan, who begat Jacob, who begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, the mother of Jesus.

From the prophecy recorded in Jeremiah we see that had Joseph been the father of Jesus then He could not have been the future promised King of the Jews as He claimed. This appears to be the reason for including this genealogy from Solomon to Joseph – to show that Jesus was indeed the Son of God.

The other genealogy is through from David’s son Nathan but none of these ever became kings and nothing is noted of them in history. But accurate records were kept and so we are able to name them in order from father to son - Nathan, Mattatha, Menan, Melea, Eliakim, Jonan, Joseph, Juda, Simeon, Levi, Matthat, Jorim, Eliezer, Jose, Er, Elmodan, Cosam, Addi, Melchi, Neri, Salathiel, Zorobabel, Rhesa, Joanna, Juda, Joseph, Semei, Mattathias, Maath, Nagge, Esli, Naum, Amos, Mattathias, Joseph, Janna, Melchi, Levi, Matthat, Heli, who was the father of Mary the mother of Jesus.

That Joseph was a descendant of David is confirmed for us by the angel in Matthew 1:18-20, “...the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.”

Brother Russell Gregory.

“BEHOLD, I MAKE ALL THINGS NEW”

“For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: but be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create; for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy.” Isaiah, chap 65.

This is what we are looking for, a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. A theocratic government upon the earth - When the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

Meanwhile, as we wait in confidence and assurance for this to happen, we enter another year 1973. Some people make New Year Resolutions and no doubt this is a good thing if the resolution is a good one and leads to something better. Some people may resolve to make a fresh start in improving their way of life and habits, but unless it is in a spiritual direction it will profit nothing in the end. Jesus said, “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.”

How can a man be born again? asked Nicodemus. “Can he enter the second time into his mother’s womb and be born?” Jesus answered, “Truly I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again, or from above.” John, ch. 3.

Was Jesus ever in the position of Nicodemus, i.e. in need of rebirth? Of course not; he was born from above, he was born of the spirit, the power of the Highest which overshadowed Mary. He was God’s son; he was always in relationship to his Father and maintained that relationship even to the Cross. He was always in the unique position whereby he could point the finger of authority and say, “Ye must be born again.”

This was the reason God sent his son into the world. Not to condemn it; but that the world through him might be saved. Too often we are apt to overlook the love of God in this direction. Something had been lost

and God in His love for what He had created, sent His son into the world to recover that which was lost through the disobedience of Adam. Because he was under law Adam was able to sin. He could not have sinned apart from law; therefore by Adam's disobedience sin entered into the world, and the death by sin; and so death passed upon all men in whom (Adam) all sinned. Let us not read into Paul's words ideas which are not there. Paul says sin entered the world, not that sin entered the flesh. Sin is transgression of law and is therefore abstract. Paul also says that death, as a sentence, passed upon Adam and all in him, on the federal principle. He does not say that a process of corruption was set in motion in order to carry out the sentence. In fact he says in effect that Adam was as good as dead when he actually sinned. Read Paul's words, Romans 5:15, "But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead much more the grace of God, and the gift by Grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many... Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

As far as their Statement of Faith is concerned, the Christadelphian view makes God unjust, and absolutely the opposite of His declared attributes to Moses in the Mount Sinai, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty..." Exodus 34:6-7.

For they state that the sentence passed upon Adam was one that defiled him and became a physical law of his being and was transmitted to all his posterity. A mere examination of the statement by Jesus will show that this is an erroneous view. Mark 7:15. "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him; but the things that come out of him, those are they that defile the man... For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these things come from within, and defile the man."

Let us not leave it there. These things come about because there is a law which says, "Thou shalt not..." the same law says, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbour as thyself. This means doing that which is right and pleasing to the Lord which is quite possible if a man's heart is attuned to it by exercise of the incorruptible word of God. Therefore Adam's defilement was a legal one not a physical; he rebelled against God's edict which said "Thou shalt not eat of it." The eating of the fruit did not change him physically or defile his body. It was the unlawful action which affected him legally and morally and brought him under the condemnation; he was as good as dead the moment he transgressed; it needed only the infliction of death. How was this to be carried out? The following chapters show us plainly how it would have been carried out were it not for the love, compassion and mercy of the creator in finding a substitute life, for the life, which Adam had forfeited by sin. The lamb of God.

Did not God say that he would destroy the people which he brought out of Egypt under Moses? Yet Moses prayed on their behalf even to having his name blotted out of the Book of Life. And without this condition God pardoned the people. Exodus ch. 32. If the sin which entered into the world by Adam was a tangible physical change in the flesh culminating finally in death as a penalty, how could Cain be accused of the murder of Abel? Christadelphians state that it was not wrong for Jesus to die, because he had sinful flesh. If this were true, then it was not wrong for Abel to die either.

Who are we to believe? Christadelphians, or the God of Heaven?

If by one man sin entered into the world, then Paul means what he says - it entered the world out of one man or by one man, and so the sin of Adam became the sin of the world; hence the statement of John the Baptist concerning Jesus, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." If Jesus took away the sin of the world by his sacrifice upon the cross then it could not be sin-in-the-flesh because we are still of the same flesh now as man has always been from creation.

God has concluded all under sin that He might have mercy upon all. This is what is meant by "the sin of the world." "The Lord laid on him (not infused in him), the iniquity of us all."

Men do not die as a penalty for Adam's sin. They, in fact, owe their very existence to the sacrifice of Christ, and if in addition to this they do not avail themselves of the opportunity of eternal life through the only

way to the Tree of Life (Jesus), then time and chance happeneth to them all; they die under the sin constitution in ignorance; Paul's letter to the Romans explains this so beautifully and plainly that I simply marvel that I did not see it as a former Christadelphian. But it is understandable when one realises how the writings of uninspired men with biased minds can blind the eyes to such truths. Paul shows in Romans that we are all the children of sin or sin's servants when we are born. We discover this by enlightenment. And in order to escape this position we die a symbolic death in Christ and rise to newness of life in Him. God has purchased or redeemed us and we are no longer sin's servants but God's.

“Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.”

Paul also says, “If any man be in Christ he is a new creature (or creation), old things have passed away, all things have become new.” This, undoubtedly, is the best way, the only way, to commence a life in service to God. We must become His servants before any service can count.

No man can serve two masters and this fact is what redemption is all about. We are either sin's flesh or we are God's flesh, or to put it another way; flesh belonging to sin or flesh belonging to God; servants of sin (personified as a master) or servants of God. Sin pays wages for services rendered. The wages of sin, says Paul, is death. God freely gives to His servants eternal life. They do not earn it. For they have been freely justified by His grace through faith in the sacrifice of Christ and baptism into His death. God's servants are legally justified in this manner but will not be morally justified unless they maintain their integrity to the end of their probation. They cannot give to God anything as it were, only the fruit of their lips in honour and praise to His glory.

A reading of Paul's letter to the Romans, chapters 5 and 6, would be of great benefit on this subject, especially if preconceived ideas are cast aside.

It is a lack of understanding of Paul's letter to the Romans, especially chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8, which has caused Christadelphians (of the Temperance Hall Section mainly), to reject the scriptural view of the Nazarene Fellowship that Jesus had a 'free life' and by this we mean that He was born free of the condemnation which passed upon Adam and all in him on the federal principle, that is, we were in Adam's loins when he sinned and so we were constituted sinners in him although not actually personal sinners, not having been born. Jesus was never in Adam's loins, he was a direct product of God. His life came direct from the source so that He might be free of the Adamic condemnation and able to give His life (not belonging to sin) as a ransom for the many who were constituted sinners. (Romans chapter 5).

Although born of the Virgin Mary, this did not make Him any the worse; because the flesh of Mary was never under condemnation, neither was Adam's for that matter. It was Adam's actions that were condemned because of the fact that he had a nature controlled by a brain, capable of complying with God's requirements of him. If there had been no law in Eden there would have been no transgression, for sin is transgression of Law.

If a car manufacturer produces a car and states that it is only capable of a top speed of 80 mph, would anyone condemn the mechanism if it failed to go faster than this? Of course not. Naturally one would complain to the maker, for any faults that may be found.

Adam's case was similar. God produced him capable of doing His will or opposing it. This is what we style free will as opposed to a mere automaton. Adam failed to do God's will but God could not condemn the nature; He had already pronounced it very good at creation; He condemned the free thinker, the unlawful action of the responsible person. Adam's flesh or nature was the same after sinning as it was before; it was still very good; I defy anyone to say it was otherwise. Jesus came upon the scene in the same position as Adam before transgression, to show that it was possible to do God's will and so establish the righteousness of God in condemning Adam.

Adam's character and position, after transgression were very different; he was a sinner under the penalty of death - alienated from God, become a servant of sin - sin's flesh instead of God's flesh. The difference now was his relationship; there was no difference in his flesh or nature, it was just a matter of who was its owner. In Adam's case he had sold himself to that which was the opposite of God's will, the adversary, and which was now personified as a master, 'Sin'. God did not need to defile Adam's flesh and make it worse

than it already was, as stated in the Christadelphian B.A.S.F. The condemnation was passed upon Adam as a human character, a logical thinking person, amenable to law, and God made it operative as the law of sin and death upon all in Adam's loins on the federal principle, so that the one sacrifice of Christ could also be operative upon all in the same way, but on the principle of faith, see Romans 5:6-21,

Please note. None of us were actual sinners when Christ died, we were not even in existence at that time. So why not accept what Paul explains so clearly and emphatically - that we were 'constituted sinners' but not actual sinners. Sold by Adam to an alien master personified as sin; but that by the obedience of faith in the sacrifice of Christ we can become free from sin (present tense). This was the position of those to whom Paul addressed the words in his letter to the Romans 6:17-18, "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but 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."

This is proof in itself that men do not have to die literally to be made free from sin. That sin is not in the flesh, otherwise we could not be made free and still exist as natural persons.

Why do people refuse to realise that Paul was speaking of himself as an unregenerated Jew under the law and still in bondage to sin or "in the flesh" the unregenerated state of bringing forth fruit unto death? (See verse 14 of ch 7). "For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not."

A proper and skilful reading of Paul's letters will show us that he was explaining the difference between an unregenerate person sold under sin and minding only the things of the flesh and a person who has been reborn and is subject to the law of God. The one in the fleshly state bias serving the law of sin and the other in the reborn state was serving the law of God. Paul could not have referred to himself at the time of writing, as being carnal, or sold under sin, for he had already stated in ch. 8 v. 6, "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God"

Does Paul mean the literal flesh? Of course not. He is referring to the mind of the flesh which is subject to the law of sin and death. He clarifies this by saying to the regenerated Romans, "But ye are not in the flesh." But we know that they were still flesh and blood persons. We should, as Bible students, have enough logic and common sense to realise that Paul, after his conversion, was never carnally minded, was never brought into captivity to the law of sin. No. He fought a good fight, finished the course and kept the faith. He ran with patience the race set before him, but those who are in Adam sold under sin, are not even entered in the race.

We could draw many examples from Paul's letter to the Romans where the superficial reader has taken his meaning out of the context and to some extent used the misconception as an excuse for failure to comply with God's requirements. I have heard one example misquoted in prayer at a Christadelphian meeting, "In the flesh there dwelleth no good thing." Paul did not use these words. The proper rendering of Paul's words should be, "For I know that in me (that is in my unregenerated state, prior to baptism into Christ) dwelleth no good thing, for I am not in a position to serve God with the mind of the flesh." So, far from making this an excuse for failure, whoever uses Paul's words in this way is admitting that he is still in the flesh and has not been born again and is not God's servants

Superficial reading of Paul's epistle to the Romans therefore is most dangerous to a correct knowledge and understanding of Adam's sin and the redemption and salvation in Christ Jesus.

Dr Adam Clarke, although astray from the truth in its entirety, made some very truthful observations and comments on Paul's words in Romans 7:14. He says, "It is difficult to conceive how the opinion could have crept into the church, or prevailed there, that the apostle speaks here of his regenerate state; and that what was, in such a state true of himself, must be true of all others in the same state. This opinion has, most pitifully and most shamefully, not only lowered the standard of Christianity, but destroyed its influence, and disgraced its character. It requires but little knowledge of the spirit of the Gospel, and of the scope of this epistle to see that the apostle is here either personating a Jew, under the law and without the Gospel, or shewing what his own state was, when he was deeply convinced that by the deeds of the law no man could be justified, and had not,

as yet, heard those blessed words, "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way, hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Spirit." (Acts 9:17).

"It requires but little knowledge of the spirit of the Gospel and of the scope of this epistle to see..." Thank you Adam Clarke, we hope some people will be shamed into acquiring this little knowledge of the spirit of the Gospel which the Nazarene Fellowship has been trying to open their eyes to for so many years without much success. It matters not to us by whom their eyes are opened; we are more concerned that they are opened, and would rejoice with the angels of heaven knowing it had happened.

Adam reduced his posterity to the possession of sin and they are all constituted sinners - servants of sin. In this position they are bondservants to master sin. When enlightened to the fact that this is what is meant by being in Adam, and that "in Christ" God offers redemption and eternal life on the principle of faith, it soon dawns on the individual that he must obtain release from the Adamic bondage in order to become a son of God and a servant of God, for no man can serve two masters. Wages are for services rendered. The wages of sin is death. But the gift of God is eternal life and also that which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed then unto us by his spirit" (1 Corinthians 2:9,10); through Jesus Christ our Lord.

This is a fine prospect, something to look forward to in comparison to what men can achieve of themselves, but as the way to it is so simple and plain, few there be that find it.

Was Jesus ever in Adam, sold under sin? Was he even a son of Adam? Christadelphians say, "Yes" to both questions. How then could God be said to give His only begotten son as a sacrifice or purchasing price that those who believe might not perish if Jesus did not belong to Him but was sin's bondservant? The idea is absurd.

The truth stands out; Jesus was free born, His life was free of the condemnation and He was therefore free to give it as a ransom for the many. He was a "new Adam," a "new creation" of the same flesh, or as Paul puts it, "the likeness of sin's flesh," but not sin's flesh, God's flesh; a matter of ownership not quality?

Members of the Nazarene Fellowship have been introduced into this "new man" through faith in his shed blood as the equivalent "life" instead of Adam's and all in him, by being crucified with Him in the waters of baptism; buried with Him by baptism into death that like as Christ was raised from the dead be the glory of the Father, even they also should walk in newness of life. New creatures serving God, having died unto sin and no more under his dominion. Therefore when natural death brings their probation to a close, they cannot be said to partake of the death which came by Adam's sin, for their Lord has already partaken of that for them, the just for the unjust, that he might bring them unto God. Until this symbolic death has taken place no one can say they have been redeemed, and are therefore in no position to serve God and can only bring forth fruit unto death as sin's servants. Christadelphians deny that we have redemption now, yet the Scripture is full of support for the fact that we have. Read Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, ch 2. It is an education in itself and a silencer to the sinful-flesh-mongers. "The truth shall make you free" - (Jesus). "The law of the spirit of life in Christ hath made me free..." - (Paul).

"If a man keep my saying he shall never taste of death." (Jesus in John 8:51-52). "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." (A legal status in Christ providing the name is not erased from the Book of Life). And, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him" (John 3:36). Again, "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, (or the judgment) but is passed from death unto life" (John 5:24). "For the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." (I John 2:17). "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." (I John 3:14). "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten son into the world that we might live through Him." (I John 4:9).

Where are those people placed who deny that it is possible now through Christ to pass from death to life? They are still in Adam, they still belong to Master Sin, they have been immersed into a Christ of their own conception who, according to their own Statement of Faith was as much under the condemnation as those He came to save, who, instead of being mighty to save was powerless. Such people have not even arrived at the start, much less made a start. Their own originator, Dr Thomas, for whom as a person of good intentions I

have always had the greatest respect, stated that “Redemption is release for a ransom, all who are God’s servants have been released from a former Lord by purchase; the purchaser is God; the ransom price the precious blood of the life of Christ.” How was the blood of Christ precious? The answer is plain. Because the life is in the blood and this life was never forfeited through Adam’s sin and Jesus was therefore free to offer it in accordance with God’s will as the redemptive price; a life for a life, hence the reason for his birth of the Virgin Mary. But as far as the Christadelphian view is concerned, Jesus might just as well have been born of Joseph and Mary.

You will have noticed that Dr Thomas mentioned a former lord or master, and I would add that everywhere that the Scriptures speak on the subject of redemption through Christ, the views I have expressed are endorsed; also the remarkable statement by the doctor which, I am sorry to say, became rather obscured to the superficial Christadelphian reader, by some of his other unscriptural ramblings on the subject of sin in the flesh. However we can excuse him much of this on account of being more or less on his own when trying to find truth. But his followers have had a much better chance of finding truth; but sad to say, they have discarded his more scriptural and accurate statements for the more foolish and contradictory ones, and, I might add, those also of his successor, Robert Roberts,

Many of the members of the Nazarene Fellowship have written on the subject of the sacrifice of Christ. During the life time of Robert Roberts, Edward Turney lectured successfully on the subject, much to the chagrin of R. Roberts who, in his anger and folly, wrote the most childish and blasphemous things imaginable in connection with Christ, especially from a man of so-called knowledge and understanding. More recently our Bro. Ernest Brady has written much, not for the purpose of antagonising people but to open their eyes to the facts so that they might be more enlightened to the truths. But whenever the word ‘substitution’ has been used in connection with the sacrifice of Christ, there has always been a great cry of protest from various members of the Christadelphian community. I replied to a fairly recent one from an old diehard in Yorkshire informing him that if he took the trouble to read “Visible Hand of God” ch 5, page 42, author R. Roberts, he would find the greatest support for substitution ever written. I am still waiting for his reply, but I am afraid I shall get nothing from him; perhaps the shock has been too much for him. We get a lot of protests of this kind from such people but no logical scriptural evidence to substantiate such.

All they can resort to is juggling of words and the coining of unscriptural phrases to cover up or hide from the so-called less learned of their members, those facts and evidences that would if pursued, put them in a position of questioning whether they are or are not in a false position in relation to Christ. Thus is fulfilled the words of Jesus, “Those who were entering ye hindered.”

“There was no more setting aside of God’s appointed order than there will be in the case of those who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord and shall not see death. In the case of these, the Law of God has its fulfilment in their retrospective Crucifixion with Christ emblemized in baptism into death; in the case of Enoch, the same result was reached prospectively so far as the divine purpose was concerned, and actually in Enoch’s offering of sacrifice... It is the fact of Enoch’s removal, however, that more particularly claims our attention.”

Thank you Robert Roberts. Is this why so many of your readers fail to spot your teaching of the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ. After all, you only mentioned it in passing as though this greatest action of love on the part of Jesus in giving Himself willingly as the redemptive price for Adam and all in him on the federal principle was nothing of importance! A review of what you have written however, will shew that it is of the utmost importance, and I venture to suggest that Robert Roberts could have bitten through his pen if he had realised that he had written something which was entirely in opposition to his personal views. But we must correct his view that the sentence upon Adam for disobedience was natural death. Adam was created a normal corruptible being depending upon the oxygen which he breathed, in order to stay alive. In the day he partook of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, he automatically became a sinner under sentence of death, and had not God found a substitute, this sentence would have been carried out. There is a similar case in Abraham’s offering of Isaac. Through the substitute ram caught in a thicket and slain instead of Isaac it is stated that God received him from the dead in a figure. The subsequent death (natural) of Adam was, I venture to suggest, no punishment at all. Clause X of the B.A.S.F. states that Jesus shared the death that passed upon all men by being a partaker of their nature. This is a contradiction of the Christadelphian view. They believe that the death which passed upon all men was natural death, whereas the death which

Jesus suffered (not shared) was an inflicted death by blood-shedding - in fact the actual death due to Adam in Eden. Although Jesus was free of any condemnation this was in fact the death due to the sinner. And he submitted to it willingly a life for a life, the just for the unjust.

If Christadelphians would be consistent they must admit that Jesus should have died a natural death in order to support their theory, but it is obvious that the Scriptures do not support their theories – “Without shedding of blood is no remission.”

Robert Robert’s account of Enoch has confirmed the fact that Jesus suffered the death which came by sin, by stating that Enoch associated himself with the sacrifices which were typical of the sacrifice once for all of Christ the true substance. He had died in symbol with Christ and risen to newness of life; this is the first action a person takes after enlightenment to the fact of being in Adam and in bondage to sin as a master. Once a person is dead, sin as a master can have no more dominion over that person, hence the statement of Paul, “The law of the spirit of life in Christ has made me free from the law of sin and death.” No doubt Enoch recognised this, and saw Christ in the typical sacrifice. No doubt he knew that redemption must come first before he could become a servant of God and walk with Him. So he took the necessary action prompted by his faith and by association with the death of the sacrificial lamb, died with it in symbol and rose to newness of life. The fact that he did not experience natural death would not make any difference one way or another. He died the death due to sin, although it was a symbolic one in Christ the substance. Enoch did not taste death. The scripture declares that Jesus tasted death for every man; and this cannot be said of natural death. There were other men after Enoch who had this testimony that they pleased God; they had also associated themselves with the typical sacrifice of Christ, but were not translated to escape natural death; they did not consider such an experience as being a penalty for sin but something common to the natural order of things. Although Dr Thomas believed at the time of writing on the subject of Adam’s sin, that the penalty was natural death, he did state that it did not require any change in Adam’s nature for this to happen. “Left to himself,” said Dr Thomas, “Adam would have returned to the ground from whence he was taken.” Incidentally, all Christadelphians, I think, acknowledge the fact that everything God created, including the beasts of the field, were pronounced very good.

Now let us quote R. Robert’s statement in comparison with that of Dr Thomas. On page 33 of “Visible Hand of God” he writes, “Left to himself as God had made him, he would not have returned to the ground; it required what men call a miracle to depress to the level of the beasts that perish the noble creature formed in the image of the Elohim.

What a direct contradiction of Dr Thomas’s statement, and what an absurdity to say that Adam was reduced to the level of very bad from very good; for the beasts that perish were very good, as was Adam at creation. Miracles are possible, but this was an impossibility. But we are used to such absurdities in most of the writings of Robert Roberts. Does he expect us to believe, for example, that God instituted the sacrifices just for Enoch and those who are alive and remain unto the coming of Christ? Surely they were prospective for all before Christ, and baptism retrospective for all after Christ’s death, and not just for those who are alive and remain to His coming?

If this were the case, then all the sacrifices from Adam to Christ were superfluous and meaningless. But, on the contrary, if they were valid for the redemption of Enoch, they were valid for Adam, for Abel, for Noah, for Abram, and all his seed; even as baptism into the death of Christ is valid to all who acknowledge Him as the supreme sacrifice for sin.

If ever a religious sect set out to obscure what its members believe, then the Temperance Hall Christadelphian Constitution and Statement of Faith re-adopted with slight modifications, September 14th, 1908, is an example and masterpiece.

I sent a written analysis of its contradictions and unscriptural phrases to an intellectual Christadelphian in Wales but I realised afterwards that he would not have been very well versed in the T. H. Constitution, having always belonged to the Suffolk St. Division. One can understand however the contradictions and unscriptural phrases when one reads on page 13, No. 25, under doctrines to be rejected, “That a man cannot believe without possessing the Spirit of God.”

This is an absolute negation of Paul's words in Romans 6:5-11 to which I referred earlier. Any person who knows the truth does not need a list of doctrines to be rejected; such a person is well capable of knowing what to reject, he is far too busy defending what he accepts as the Spirit of Truth. We do not have to tell people what we do not believe, but what we believe. "For as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but we have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry our Father." Romans 6.

And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God. And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose,

"For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" (Romans 8:29-34).

Only in this way and for this reason was it right for Jesus to die. It was for a good cause, the just for the unjust that He might bring us to God. It is nauseating therefore to read in Clause XII of the Temperance Hall Constitution "That He was put to death by the Jews and Romans who were however but instruments in the hands of God for the doing of that which He had determined before to be done - viz. the condemnation of sin in the Flesh..." Thus they admit that Jesus' death was not a sacrifice for us.

How could Peter describe the Jews and Romans as wicked men if they were instruments in the hands of God? God's use of Pharaoh is not a similar example. It is high time Christadelphians examined their position, before the return of Christ closes the door. Otherwise, "Ye that desire the day of the Lord to what end is it for you? Shall not the day of the Lord be darkness, and not light? Even very dark and no brightness in it?"

We of the Nazarene Fellowship are fully aware how that we have not followed "cunningly devised fables." There have been, and are now, those who judge our literature before they read all of it, or even hear what we have to say. Some of these people advise their members to ignore it or burn it. Be assured of this, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, you also can burn this in less than five minutes but eternity will not efface the facts.

A final word of encouragement from our Brother Jude's epistle, "But ye, beloved, building up of yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life. And of some have compassion, making a difference; and others save with fear pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh."

"Now unto Him that is able to keep us from falling, and to present us 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."

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen. Bro. P. Parry

The Law of Sin and Death

**"For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."
Romans 8:2**

There is, and can be only one Truth. Truth is Unity, one, the same as God is One.

Although divided upon different and varying aspects of God's Word, nevertheless almost all Christians are united in mind by the belief of one great error, which is more than probable why there is so much schism in Christendom - the error is the God-dishonouring belief of "sinful flesh" which, for Trinitarians demands the Immaculate Conception and for non-Trinitarians, an unclean Christ.

We have found over many years experience that while different sects and denominations disagree and sometimes attack each other, no one has ever throughout history been able to show from Scripture that there was indeed a change in man's flesh after the creation of Adam and Eve. We have been told by others that they "disagree" with us and that we have "wrong ideas" - but where is the proof? Why should we find ourselves in this position? Simply because Truth cannot be answered with error, but error is refuted with Truth. Hence this short article in answering to the numerous errors.

The scriptures tell us of The Law of Sin and Death; it also tells us that "The Law of the Spirit of life" in Christ Jesus" is able to free us from it.

Now we know that God is absolutely just and holds no man responsible for the transgression or sin of Adam. Responsibility is an individual matter and when by grace one becomes enlightened to the requirements of his Maker, he realises that by reason of Adam's transgression (by being in his loins) he was sold to sin legally and is therefore in a position whereby he can, by his own disobedience remain in that position - a servant of sin - or his own obedience accept redemption from that position by symbolically dying to sin in the water of baptism.

Cannot one perceive the equity and Divine justice in this marvellous scheme of God's creation? "Hear now, O house of Israel, is not my way equal?" "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" We answer by asking the question: Can one iota of Scriptural evidence be found to show that due to Adam's sin the flesh of mankind had to physically suffer unto death? This unjust theory is the means whereby millions of human beings have been, and are being deceived.

The only person who suffered physically for the death of Adam was the Son of God, and we stress the fact that He, being sinless, had no need; He willingly and voluntarily laid down His life in order to destroy the power of legal condemnation as it is in Adam.

During this present life no man suffers physically for Adam's sin, but upon a realisation of the facts, he is in the position of either becoming related to the "law of sin and death," which is the Second Death, being eternal, or to Eternal Life as it is in Christ Jesus. "For the law of the spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Romans 8:2). "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death has no power." (Revelation 20:6).

When Paul said that he had been made free from the law of sin and death could he have possibly meant natural death? If he did then he is still alive. Many teach that as a result of the transgression a change took place in the nature of Adam which rendered him incapable of continued obedience and saddled him with a body which, by reason of implanted decay, was destined to die. If this were true that man is incapable of continued obedience then Paul told an awful lie when he said, "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." (Philippians 4:13). "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God", that the "man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Timothy 3:16-17). We have numerous examples where death has been a God-sent reward for obedience in order that the evil which was to come to pass might not be experienced, e.g., King Josiah. Would this be sensible if natural death was in any way a punishment for the sin of Adam?

The shallow thinker would accept such teaching and believe such terms as "inbred sinfulness" and "sin within"; that the flesh of Adam was reduced to a polluted condition by having sin pressed into its very substance; that we are of Adam's "fallen physical flesh" - "flesh full of sin".

This is the "wrong idea" because it ignores that "sin is transgression of law" (1 John 3:4) but "where no law is, there is no transgression" (Romans 4:16) and "sin is not imputed where there is no law" (Romans 5:13). It infers that Adam's descendants suffer because of his sin, including newly born babes, those with little understanding, those who have lived in ignorance of God, etc. Is God's law applicable to such as these? God does not impute sin to them. "Man that is in honour and understandeth not is like the beasts that perish." The irresponsible person is not related to God's plan of salvation, either to eternal life or condemnation; he was created and by reason of natural decay he dies and remains in the congregation of the dead.

Knowledge by grace is that which brings responsibility, either to a relationship with the law of sin and death, which is the second death, or to an incorruptible resurrection which is the first resurrection, and “blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power.” To him, by his faith in the efficacy of Christ’s blood, this power has been destroyed, that is, as he upon enlightenment became legally alive to sin by Adam’s transgression, so he became legally dead to sin by symbolically dying with Him who paid sin’s price with His life in the blood. “Sin revived and died” (Romans 7:9). “For he that is dead is freed from sin” (Romans 6:7); “the wages of sin is death (Romans 6:23).

I have never yet met a person who has been freed from natural death; this is the experience of all by reason of being created corruptible. Is it not very obvious that the wages of sin one is freed from is the second death, a punishable judicial death, both final and eternal? This is the “law of sin and death” instituted in Eden, under which all mankind has been concluded in order that God by His beloved Son might have mercy on all.

Before Adam sinned he, being the first human being upon the earth, could not fully comprehend the awful result of his disobedience until he witnessed the suffering of the slain lamb, his eyes were then fully opened to the fact that apart from God’s provision of this sacrifice, this penalty would have been his due, literally that day, but although Adam, by the mercy and love of his Maker, did not suffer this violent death literally in that day, he did so symbolically, that he might be subjected to hope, by faith, of being redeemed by the shed blood of Christ, which the slain lamb typified.

The term, “the second death,” most certainly implies a first death, and if this first death is natural, to which all succumb, keeping in mind that “the wages of sin is death,” then it is very obvious that Christ has not freed us from it, but rather it would mean each single individual, as well as animals, pay it when they expire. Would anyone affirm that animals are sinners? Because when anyone says that men in all stages of ignorance to full enlightenment are, by the same theory they must include them.

“By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin” (Romans 5:12). This death was suffered literally by the slain lamb and symbolically by Adam, a violent judicial death, not because the lamb was a sinner, or sinful flesh, but because it was spotless, a substitute, which pointed to Jesus Christ in whom alone is redemption and the forgiveness of sins. “Know ye not that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into His death?” (Romans 6:3). Are we not required by faith to die unto sin symbolically as Christ did literally? Has not Christ destroyed the power of sin to those who abide in Him?

Paul does not say “for he that is dead is going to be freed from sin,” but rather that he is freed from sin now, and this is not personal sin, but the “law of sin and death,” which one becomes related and responsible to upon enlightenment, and under which all mankind has been concluded.

When by grace this knowledge is acquired the recipient is then entirely responsible for his own behaviour, by which he either becomes related to Eternal Life through Christ, or the Second Death by his rejection of Christ who alone is able to destroy the power of it for him. The wisdom of the Scriptures is fogged by the idea that natural death is sin’s wages. This mistaken theory is the reason why some have to label all mankind as being responsible sinners, because all men die, yet are satisfied to ignore the Scripture which tells us that “man that is in honour and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish.”

Are beasts sinners? If Christ has paid the price of sin, as the Scriptures so very plainly teach us, then does it not make it a mockery for man to pay it again by naturally dying? Does God requires double payment.

If during our natural life we live in sin, will the penalty be paid when that natural life ceases, or will it not rather be paid, as the Scriptures inform us, by being raised to suffer the Second Death? Christ has not destroyed the Second Death but the power thereof to those who abide in Him; and to those who reject Him the Second Death remains. “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, on such the Second Death hath no power (Revelation 20:6 and 2:11). This is the death to which forgiveness of sin applies, being the penalty for sin; if it was otherwise, natural death being meant, then our approach to God through His beloved Son is useless, for this has been the process of nature since creation, a process which needs no forgiveness, simply because “sin is the transgression of law” and not the widely held belief of the embodiment of corruption.

If natural death was the penalty for sin then every responsible person who dies pays the price of sin after being forgiven the penalty of it. We would remind you that sin entered the world by one man, and the price was paid also by one man, the man Christ Jesus, by a violent death. He died unto sin once, literally, as we are required also to do symbolically in baptism that we may be released from the power of the “law of sin and death” under which mankind had been concluded by reason of being in Adam’s loins at the transgression in Eden.

Adam was sentenced to a sudden death on the very day he sinned, and that Jesus suffered that sudden and violent death instead, thus freeing those baptised into Him from it. The words of the sentence are very plain and precise: “In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” We say there is no reference to prove that those words mean the process of a number of years. Rather that this erroneous belief is forced upon people by the mistaken theory of man’s fallen nature.

One may say: “all the unbaptised do not suffer this violent death, nor are the baptised free from it – sometimes they die violent death by accidents.” How can anyone confuse God’s law of sin and death with natural, or violent death by accident? An ignorant person is in the same position as the beasts that perish, he can die any death, natural, violent, commit suicide, or any other, and it will make no difference whatsoever - he will remain in the congregation of the dead. If a person in Christ dies a violent death it will not make the slightest difference to his to her resurrection, for this violent death is not the wages of sin. The enlightened person, whether baptised or not, if he falls away or rejects the Word of God, is an actual sinner and earns the wages of sin which is death, not natural death which all experience, but the Second Death, executed by God, not by accident. The Second Death is the punishment due to sinners who, after enlightenment, do not avail themselves of the opportunity of being released from the power of the law of sin and death, by reason of being, by faith and baptism, transferred to the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, or by wilful life of sin after such enlightenment.

In the words of Jesus we are told that “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 unto life” (John 5:24). If “the law of sin and death” is a law governing the physical organism of man, causing death by physical exhaustion, however do you reconcile the above statement of Jesus which very plainly informs us that a believer is not going to pass from death unto life, but rather has passed from death unto life. Is it not very obvious that the “law of sin and death” is the Edenic law which Adam transgressed, a law which mankind has been concluded under by reason of being in the loins of Adam when he sinned? (Galatians 3:22).

When a man realises this then it is by his own free will to determine whether he remains under the power of the “law of sin and death” or whether he accepts the free and unmerited gift of God, of eternal life as it is in His beloved Son – upon such the Second Death hath no power; he has passed from death unto life, “For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death (Romans 8:2). By the same reasoning the apostle Paul is able to say, “so then they that are in the flesh cannot please God... but ye are not in the flesh but in the spirit, if so the spirit of God dwell in you.” Did Paul mean they had passed from literal flesh in that statement? That he meant that it was impossible to please God whilst being literal flesh?

According to the mistaken theory of inbred sinfulness being the law of sin and death, teachers overlook the fact that Adam sinned whilst his nature was “very good” and also the fact that God could say regarding Jesus, “This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.” Yes, and he that denies that Jesus came in the flesh is anti-Christ. Is it not clear that Christ pleased God whilst He was on earth, clothed with the same flesh and all the impulses thereof as you and I? Is this not proof that the Scripture, “so then they that are in the flesh cannot please God” cannot possibly mean literal flesh? Does anyone imagine that Daniel would have been greatly beloved if the law of sin and death was the law of inbred sinfulness which rendered him incapable of obedience and was also the means of his death?

Does it not table our Creator as being unjust to shackle mankind to physical incapability of righteousness, not because of his own sin but for the sin of which he had not the slightest control over, even Adam’s? Man does not ask to be born, why therefore should he be under the sentence of judicial death as soon as he leaves the womb? Such a belief is neither just nor scriptural, and we emphasise the fact that no man except Christ ever has, or ever does, suffer for the sin of Adam.

Some would quote Romans 3:9-23, "Jews and Gentiles all under sin," to mean all are inbred sinners whether responsible or not, all sinned, in contradiction to the Scripture that "Where there is no law there is no transgression;" also that such people will die without law.

We are well aware that God hath concluded all under sin, but is there in every man that knowledge, for it is knowledge that brings responsibility, the person devoid of such being in no better or no worse position than the horse or the cow which perishes.

Then by desecration of the body which is fearfully and wonderfully made, one misapplies quotations from the 7th chapter of Romans and applies them to the apostle Paul as if they were applicable to him in his regenerated state, when it is obvious the apostle was speaking as an unregenerated Jew.

Paul said, "What I hate that I do," "the EVIL that I would not, that I do;" so to those who say it is personal sins that merit death as the wages of sin surely Paul ought to die seeing that he did evil, but why did Paul say "be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ."

When Paul said, "those things which ye have learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do, and the God of peace shall be with you," did he mean those evil things he did which he hated or was it not rather those things which were true, honest, just, pure, lovely and of good report? We are quite certain that no one can find one sin of Paul after his conversion. He knew very well that the "law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus" had released him from the "law of sin and death" and his every effort was directed in presenting his body a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable, unto God which was his reasonable service, "for ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are God's. Would it be possible to glorify God, in a body of sin and death?"

When a person delights and directs the members of his fleshly body to perform good and noble deeds, if the said members being sinful, it must be in opposition to itself unless of course it alters to a condition of righteous flesh. Such is the confusion which arises from the belief of "ingrained sin." Is it not obvious that every action of one's body is co-ordinated with mind and brain? Are the impulses and desires of the flesh sin, or is it not seen that lust must first conceive before sin is brought forth? (James 1:15). Sin is a disobedient act - in scriptural language, "transgression of law," and the law which Jesus manifested was one of LOVE, which gives weight to the statement of Paul when he said that he brought into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ (2 Corinthians 10:5).

"Inbred sinfulness," is an altogether spurious term due to the faulty conception of sin being an element of the flesh. Can we have a righteous person if the substance is full of sin? Is it not possible for the flesh to do that which is good? The terms "sin" and "righteousness" rightly belong to disobedience and obedience, two opposites by which is formed character.

When we read of a sinful or a righteous nation is this a description of the people's flesh?

By a double aspect of sin one condemns the irresponsible person to death as wages for unfortunately being born flesh whilst the responsible person, if found unworthy, is condemned to death as punishment twice - once for unblameable birth, and once, or again for his disobedience or sinful life.

It has been claimed that in Romans 7 Paul makes it plain that what he means by the law of sin and death it is an indwelling tendency to sin and the personal sins resulting there-from which bring death." Also that men in all stages of ignorance to full enlightenment in every age and country, are sinners and worthy of death. Then to cap it all they would say, "this is the 'law of sin and death,'" - inbred sinfulness producing disobedience, knowledge bringing responsibility for personal sins, judgment before Christ and death.

I have been trying to ascertain how the ignorant man can apply knowledge which makes him responsible to the "law of sin and death" if this said "law of sin and death" is a law which by reason of an indwelling tendency to sin and the personal sins resulting therefrom, claim him in natural death? Surely it is obvious that the death to which the ignorant man succumbs is not the "law of sin and death"?

This law is the penalty for sin, having its foundation or inception in the command of the Creator to Adam: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" - a command which resulted in the violent death

of God's beloved Son by Adam's transgression thereof, and also one which will result in a violent death to every enlightened son of Adam that does not avail himself of the opportunity of being released therefrom by the liberty that has been obtained by Christ Jesus.

This widely believed theory of "inbred sinfulness," "sin within," "sinful flesh," has been the means of some of the adherents thereto hating their own flesh to the extent of terribly torturing the same, and we say if this abominable theory was true, then they were justified in so doing, but rather, listen to the words of Paul; "for no man ever yet hated his own flesh: but nourished and cherished it even as the Lord the church, for we are members of His body (which was not suffered to see corruption) of His flesh and of His bones." (Ephesians 5:29,30).

If the flesh is naturally defiled from birth then it is an impossibility to defile it later – we would draw your attention to a class of people who, in Jude 8 defile the flesh.

By the logic one reveals a Creator who exacts and expects from all a response which is impossible to perform; we reply: flee such nonsense, accept God's redeeming Word and the Word made flesh as pure and undefiled, and know, as Paul did, that he could do all things through Him that strengthened him, "for this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments, and his commandments are not grievous." Oh yes they are grievous - Paul says in effect, "I have the law of sin and death within me, for what I hate that I do," "evil is present with me," "evil which I would not that I do."

Does not this make one doubt the truth of the statement when he said, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge shall give to me at that day."

Do not these words of the Apostle reveal to us that Paul had been released from the penalty of sin? Would a crown of righteousness be laid up for Paul if, at the same time he was under the "law of sin and death," and still had to pay its penalty by naturally dying?

The only conclusion one can arrive at by such mistaken logic is that the beloved Son of God, by His sacrifice, could only obtain for us punishable forgiveness, which is ludicrous!

"Misunderstood Passages," referring to Romans 8:2, is applicable to false theory of the same, due to the faulty conception of natural death being the result of Adam's sin, instead of the violent death which Christ suffered so that we might be released from its power by symbolically dying by faith to sin in the water of baptism.

"Upon such the Second Death" which will be violent, or the "law of sin and death," "hath no power," "for the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death,."

The law of sin and death is the law given to Adam, apart from which sin and death would not be known.

The law of the Spirit of Life is given to Christ, apart from which life would not be known, and that includes both natural and eternal life.

Whatever the physical constitution, there would be no knowledge of sin without law.

Sin is not "inbred;" it is not "in the flesh" - it is "transgression of law."

We conclude with a statement of Dr. Thomas: "Wrong consists not in any particular act of which we are capable, but in that act being contrary to the letter and Spirit of Divine Testimony." ("Elpis Israel." Page 92).

F.J.Pearce.