

# The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 275

## 3rd Quarter 2016

### In this Issue

Page 2 Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 3 Who was the Serpent?	Brother Edward Turney
Page 4 Bible Redemption	Brother William Ellis
Page 5 The Importance of The Virgin Birth	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 7 Wrested Scripture Straightened Out and Re-set	Brother A. H. Broughton
Page 9 The Body of Sin	Brother Edward Turney
Page 9 Meekness	Extract - "The Christian Observer"
Page 10 Poem – "He Is Coming"	from "The Rock"
Page 11 At The Breaking of Bread	Brother Glover
Page 11 A Word of Wisdom	A Brother
Page 12 Christ and Melchisedec	Extract from "The Quiver"
Page 15 Non-Muslim Muslim and the Jihad Against the West	Bosch Fawstin
Page 18 "So Death Passed Upon All Men"	Anon
Page 19 The Way of The Inquisitor	Anon
Page 19 Jesus Died To Declare God's Righteousness	Brother H.C.Gates
Page 21 Choice And Action	Brother Harvey Linggood.

-----

**Please note: We wish to apologise for an error in our last Circular Letter. In our index we included "The Way of the Inquisitor" as being on page 17; however this was changed at the last minute and "Jesus Said..." in put in its place. Shortly afterwards extra copies were printed in which this mistake in the index had been corrected, so a few of you will have correct indices. - Russell.**

-----

**Joel 2:30-32.** "And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the LORD come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the LORD shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the LORD hath said, and in the remnant whom the LORD shall call.

### -----

## Editorial

The need to forgive is an important factor in our lives. There can be no lasting happiness, no peace of mind, contentment or joy without a truly forgiving heart. One day the disciples came to Jesus and asked Him to teach them how to pray and immediately after giving them the 'Lord's Prayer' He went on to say, "If you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you. But if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."

And then in the 18<sup>th</sup> chapter of Matthew's gospel at verse 21 we read that Peter came to Jesus and said, "Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Up to seven times?" Jesus said to him, "I do not say to you, up to seven times, but up to seventy times seven. Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants. And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand talents. But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. The servant therefore fell down, and worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt." In this parable we notice that the person who owed the debt asked for forgiveness and the debt was forgiven - immediately and utterly. And neither was it a question of forgiving seven times or even seventy times seven, but pardon should be immediate and unlimited; this is surely our loving duty.

Jesus not only taught this duty by precept, but also by example; though faced with ingratitude, contempt, and the approach of the cruel, ignominious death on the cross, He continued His life with acts of kindness and His highest joy and constant service was in alleviating human woe and thousands could have borne testimony to His tender compassion and healing power, yet He was the victim of the malice of His enemies. Human nature at its worst clamoured for His blood, "pierced His hands and His feet" - those hands which had so often ministered to the wants of others - those feet that had walked unlimited miles to preach the gladdest of all tidings, the Gospel of the Kingdom of God; yet even in His dying moments on the cross He cried, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

Before Jesus was taken up into heaven He gave the Apostle the commission to "go into all the world and preach the gospel beginning at Jerusalem." Why begin at Jerusalem? Was it because it was at Jerusalem that He was murdered and He wished to give them the first offer of mercy and forgiveness? I am sure it was.

Shortly after Jesus' resurrection "the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith (Acts 6:7), but there were still some who strongly opposed this new teaching and there was one disciple of Jesus, Stephen by name, with whom they disputed "And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spoke. Then they secretly induced men to say, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God. And they stirred up the people, the elders, and the scribes; and they came upon him, seized him, and brought him to the council. They also set up false witnesses who said, "This man does not cease to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place and change the customs which Moses delivered to us." The council believed these false witnesses and gave Stephen the chance to speak for himself before passing sentence. However, when they had heard what he had to say, "they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed at him with their teeth." Then they cast him out of the city and stoned him. And the witnesses (presumably those throwing the stones), laid down their clothes at the feet of a young man named Saul. And they stoned Stephen as he was calling on God and saying, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Then he knelt down and cried out with a loud voice, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep. (Acts 7:54-59).

But what of this young man named Saul? He was known as "Saul of Tarsus" a Pharisee "brought up at the feet of Gamaliel" who was perhaps the most eminent teacher of the law at this time. Saul felt it was his duty to stop the spread of this new teaching by any means the law allowed. We read of him in the opening verses of Acts chapter 8, "Now Saul was consenting to his (Stephen's) death. At that time a great persecution arose against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles. And devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him. As for Saul, he made havoc of the church, entering every house, and dragging off men and women, committing them to prison." Again in the opening verses of the next chapter we read, "And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem." A man in authority who was feared by the disciples and yet Jesus saw another side to Saul; a side which showed kindness and goodness! And so while on the road to Damascus Saul was stopped by a blinding light above the brightness of the sun and he fell to the ground "and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against

the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.”

This Saul who had been so cruel to the followers of Jesus became the Apostle Paul who worked hard to serve Jesus and teach the gospel and spread its message, not only in the land of Israel but also in neighbouring countries as far away as Rome and Spain. He suffered much and knew what it was to be persecuted; he was imprisoned, beaten, suffered shipwreck, hungered, stoned and left for dead but revived, yet never lost his faith in Jesus who had forgiven him.

Paul’s upbringing “at the feet of Gamaliel” studying the Law of Moses and all the teachings of the Torah, which approximates to our Old Testament scripture, placed him in a unique position to enlighten others, and though he wrote some “things hard to be understood” he explained that the gospel was preached even to Abraham (Galatians 3:8), and how the sacrifices were connected to the one great sacrifice of Jesus, and how all such matters were linked together to form the gospel as we know it today. But above all, Paul the Apostle could exhort “be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you (Ephesians 4:12).

In the end Paul was able to say with all confidence “For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. 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 me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.” (Timothy 4:6-8).

With love to all, Russell Gregory

---

## Who Was The Serpent?

Dr. Adam Clarke was perplexed with the serpent. He writes: “Who was the serpent? Of what kind? In what way did he seduce the first happy pair?” These are questions which remain yet to be answered. The whole account is either a simple narrative of facts, or it is an allegory. Again, “if it is an allegory, no attempt should be made to explain it.” We are surprised at this remark coming from such a learned and independent mind. An allegory is designed to instruct, or it is nothing worth; and we ought to do our best to comprehend it.

The Apostle Paul, in Galatians, says, “this Agar is Mount Sinai, in Arabia.” It also appears to us correct to say this serpent is the sensual desires of the flesh. The colloquy between the woman and the serpent is just the sort of experience common to mankind when wavering betwixt a known command and an inclination to break through the self-denial and restraint which are required to keep it. When Adam and Eve had actually transgressed they were the serpent just as much as the Pharisees whom John and Jesus styled serpents; and all their posterity, strictly speaking, are “the seed of the serpent.” It is only when Christ comes into the world, in the nature of this seed, but God’s Son, that “seed of the woman” is seen.

The fact that many of the serpent’s seed are adopted into the family of “the woman’s seed” helps rather than hurts this view of the case. Viewing the matter as an allegory, the prostration of the serpent and his eating the dust would be understood to answer to the moral and legal degradation of Adam and Eve.”

Brother Edward Turney (1874)

## Bible Redemption.

BIBLE redemption is presented to us under three heads or essential points, which must be clearly understood and distinguished before the scheme as a whole can be discerned. These points are – 1<sup>st</sup>, those to be redeemed; 2<sup>nd</sup>, the redeemer, and 3<sup>rd</sup>, the ransom or price.

First, those to be redeemed: Those embraced in the Divine scheme are the descendants of Adam, one and all, himself included; because all, without exception or distinction, were involved in the sin and

consequences of one transgression. The consequences of one transgression are defined by the sentence, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

In the absence of any scheme of redemption, it is manifest that Adam and all his posterity would have returned to, and eternally remained in dust. There was no eye that could pity or power that could save from the just sentence of Almighty power.

The only one that could meet the case of the guilty pair was the Almighty Father Himself. His goodness, power, and wisdom were equal to their circumstances. He therefore devised and resolved upon a plan whereby He could be just, and the Justifier of everyone who accepted of His favour. The evidence of the Father's determination to redeem is found in the statement He made before passing sentence, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent." While in making coats of skin to cover them, He illustrated to their senses how He would effect their redemption. The promise given, and the illustration of its fulfilment in covering them with the skins of animals, which He either slew himself or caused to be slain, clearly shews that redemption was not simply a promise, but a promise typically fulfilled. It seems fair, therefore, to conclude that in these transactions the Almighty typically redeemed the human family, so that they henceforth stood before Him as covered from their transgression. He did not any more look upon their nakedness, but upon their coverings, which had been worn by innocent victims, whose blood had been shed for them. The Redeemer, therefore, was none other than He who caused the animals to be slain, and made their skin into coverings for the transgressors of His law.

This brings us to the consideration of the ransom. The typical ransom was the life of a lamb or lambs without blemish or spot. The real or antitypical ransom was the Lamb of God, or, as expressed by Peter, in writing to his brethren, "Ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you." The ransom must be the property of the ransomer or redeemer, otherwise the purchase could not be effected. It behoved Jesus, therefore, to be the exclusive property of His Father in the matter of disposing of Him in any way He pleased. That such was the case is demonstrated by the pre-ordaining promise of a son given at first, and by the repeated after amplifications of it, detailing the time, manner, cause, and place of His birth, not one of which could have been either arranged or accomplished by any other being but the Almighty Himself. Jesus was not His own father. He did not preserve Himself from the jealousy of Herod; He did not educate Himself; He did not please Himself nor keep His own interests before His Father's. The ransom being neither a dumb animal, which knew nothing of the reason for which it was put to death, nor silver and gold, but a living, intelligent man, who had during His whole life pleased His Father, He could not be put to death by His Father as an act of justice. No clause in the Mosaic Law, or any other, commanded a son to die simply because his father wished him. Jesus Himself said, I have power to lay down my life. He did not lay down His life reluctantly as a matter of duty, but, as a freewill offering. He delighted to do His Father's will, because He knew that nothing short of His voluntarily giving up of His life could put away sin, or atone for the guilt of the first man. While Jesus had absolute power to allow or prevent men from taking His life from Him, He had no power to raise Himself from the dead. This was an act of favour on the part of the Redeemer similar to the act of His begetting in the womb of Mary. Hence, the Father said to Him on the morning when He raised Him,

"Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee." These three steps form the three-fold cord by which the Almighty kinsman has perfected His scheme of redemption, viz., His promise of a seed or Son to the woman. His word, or promise, made flesh when a child was born, and His begetting from the dead of this Son, who is consecrated for evermore the only name through whom any son or daughter of Adam can obtain redemption from sin and all its consequences, and become heirs of the eternal life promised before the foundation of the world.

Redemption is a gift. We cannot suppose of a compulsory gift. The Father was not compelled to give a son; neither, after having one, was He compelled to give Him up to death nor, after being dead, was He compelled to raise Him up again. These separate acts of favour have one source – the favour of God. Jesus Christ was not compelled to give Himself up to death for us. He freely gave Himself. Compulsion implies the power to enforce a demand. If the Father had compelled Jesus to give Himself up, or even backed His expressed will with a threat in case of non-compliance, the value of His self-sacrifice would have been destroyed. The act of Jesus, therefore, was a free-will offering. Jesus could neither demand nor compel His

Father to raise Him from the dead. To demand is to assert a right. This Jesus could not do, inasmuch as He voluntarily gave up His life for those who deserved to die. While lying in the grave, He lay there in vindication of His Father's honour, and for this voluntary act of submission, God has exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name, that every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that He is the Lord (possessor of the earth, with all its peoples and nations) to the glory of God the Father. From what has been written, it is manifest how God can be just, and also the Justifier of everyone who believes in Jesus as His ransom for the salvation of His sons who have rebelled against Him. He will not compel men to be saved any more than He compelled Jesus to die the just for the unjust, but He wishes the salvation of all, and has given ample evidence of power to do all His good pleasure.

Concerning this matter, the Apostle says "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit – that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." The last phrase in this quotation illustrates the perfect character of God's scheme of redemption. God is reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." The world is in trespasses, but God does not impute them. This shows that they have been sacrificially removed, and that all that is accessory on the part of the world is, to know what He has done, and accept of His reconciliation. For He hath made Him sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. The elliptical phrase "Made Him sin," has given rise to the idea that Jesus Christ was made sin by being bora of a woman. A more unreasonable construction of the Apostle's words could scarce be conceived. Human nature is not sin; neither is it a sinful thing to be born; and, besides, it was after Jesus had passed with success through trial that he was made sin. This clearly shows that He was made an offering for sin, or a sin-offering, but to have made Him sin in the manner supposed, would have defeated the purpose for which He was born.

Brother W. Ellis

---

## **The Importance of The 'Virgin Birth'**

We know that Jesus was the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary and we must never overlook the significance of this matter. Having God as His Father means that Jesus' life was not passed down from Adam but direct from God. Mary was a descendant of Adam and this ensured that Jesus was "made like unto His brethren" (Hebrews 2:17), that is to say that He had a physical body made of flesh and blood just like His mother and all the rest of the human race - but the "life of the flesh is in the blood" (Leviticus 17:11) and as the foetus makes its own blood which never mingles with the mother's blood, there was no possibility of the life in Mary's blood being passed down to Jesus. So we can say with assurance that neither Jesus' life nor His blood came from Mary.

Let us now further compare and contrast these two Sons of God from scripture:

Adam received his life from God at his creation.  
Jesus received His life from God by begettal.

Adam transgressed God's commandment and served Sin as a master.  
Jesus always did His Father's will and never served Sin.

Adam by sinning was in bondage to Sin.  
Jesus was never in bondage to sin.

Adam, through transgression, became alienated from God.  
Jesus was never alienated from His Father.

Adam's descendants are all concluded under sin.  
Jesus was not concluded under sin.

We see then that Adam once had the same standing as Jesus inasmuch as he too, was a Son of God, and sinless; but he lost that position through transgression of God's law. He forfeited his life and became a servant of Sin – as Jesus said, “No man can serve two masters.” (Matthew 6:24) and as Paul explains, “Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?” (Romans 6:16). ‘Sin’ is personified as a ‘master’ or a ‘King’ reigning over his servants - and servants receive wages; “the wages of sin is death.” (Romans 6:23).

### **The First Sin.**

The one sin of Adam meant that his life was forfeit, or under sentence of death, and he should have died in the day he transgressed God's commandment. But God in His mercy, provisionally covered over that first sin when the animal was sacrificed in Eden allowing Adam to continue his life under new circumstances outside of the Garden of Eden. It is surely obvious that had Adam died in the day of his transgression his life could not have been passed down to us and we would never have lived. However, we also see that the life Adam then passed down to his descendants was a life under sentence of death, or as Paul expresses it, “concluded under sin” (Galatians 3:22). Our life then, is as Adam's life - under forfeit to Sin as a master.

We see from this that Jesus, because of the virgin birth, had an unforfeited life, a life not in bondage to Sin, not concluded under sin, in fact, a free life.

Herein lays the importance of the virgin birth.

### **Freedom From Sin**

This freedom Jesus has promised to the faithful. John 8:34-36, “Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.” Free as the sons of God by adoption, no longer servants of sin. This is the work of God in Jesus – to give this freedom to the faithful that they may abide with Jesus for ever. Freedom from condemnation as Paul tells us in Romans 8:1, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.”

So the one sin of Adam brought all into subjection, concluded under sin - not as a punishment for something we did; not as a curse for something Adam did, but for the purpose of a blessing in God's plan of redemption and salvation in Jesus Christ, “that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.” (Galatians 3:22).

The purpose then, of the Virgin Birth was to produce a man who was personally free and uncondemned and therefore in a position to offer himself as a sacrifice. All we have considered here are legal matters consequent upon the Law of Sin and Death (Roman 8:2), from which we have been freed.

Unless Jesus had received His life direct from His Father He could not offer it back to His Father to “take away the sin of the world” as John the Baptist said at Jesus' baptism. (John 1:29). Nor “give His life a ransom for many” (Matthew 20:28), as Jesus said of Himself.

But Jesus was rejected as the Son of God by the Jews in authority in His day, refusing to be enlightened as to their position. Jesus said, “This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world and men prefer darkness,” and again, “Except I had come and spoken unto them they had not had sin”, showing that enlightenment brings responsibility. But when we become enlightened and responsible we find that what God requires initially is not strict obedience to a legal code, as the Jews thought and sought to their sorrow to observe, but faith in the promises made to the fathers. When we learn what these are and what faith involves, we find that we are under the law of (the) sin and (the) death and ready to perish.

If anyone thinks he can obtain forgiveness and salvation by good works he is doomed to failure.

If Jesus had not been the Son of God there would have been no salvation for us.

If Jesus had not lived a life of perfect obedience before His sacrifice there would have been no salvation for us.

If Jesus had not given Himself as the sacrificial Lamb of God there would have been no salvation for us.

If Jesus had not risen from the dead to be our Mediator and High Priest at God's Right Hand there would have been no salvation for us.

Jesus means of birth, His manner of life, His willing sacrifice in place of Adam, His resurrection by His Father, are all essential steps ensuring salvation for the faithful.

Let us be thankful and respond as He asks, that we "love on another as I have loved you".

Brother Russell Gregory

---

## **Wrested Scripture Straightened Out and Re-set Job 15:14.**

**"What is man that he should be clean, and he which is born of woman,  
that he should be righteous?"**

We will first show to what end this passage had been wrested. In "Elpis Israel," page 127 it is written:-

"Hence, the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean. It is therefore written, 'How can he be clean who is born of a woman?' 'Who can bring a clean thing out of unclean? Not one.' 'What is man that he should be clean? And he which is born of woman that he should be righteous?' ...This view of sin in the flesh is enlightening in the things concerning Jesus. ...Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there."

Now, we will examine the Book of Job and see if "sin-in-the-flesh" is there to be found, or what exactly Job and his friends meant when they used the words 'clean' and 'unclean.'

It should be obvious at the outset that the saying of Eliphaz in Job 15:14 is a pair of parallels - that the second phrase expresses the same as the first - according to the practice of the Old Testament poetical writers: as that "man" means the same as "he which is born of a woman," and, "should be clean" means the same as "should be righteous."

By following ideas which run through the book of Job we shall find that in understanding the word 'clean' as meaning 'righteous' we shall not err; but if, on the other hand, we understand by the word 'clean' a freedom from that "sin-in-the-flesh" (which according to Christadelphian literature exists in the physical flesh, and therefore existed in the flesh of Christ), we shall be putting into the mouths of the speakers an altogether foreign idea merely in order that we might take it out again.

Such a method of "understanding" Scripture is capable of inventing the wildest notices, and is altogether without excuse.

Please produce your Bible at this stage, and after a reading through of the Book of Job, or an examination of it afresh, according to the need and discretion of the reader, let us notice here the "thread" of the discourse, as it bears upon the words 'clean' and 'unclean.'

First then, the commencement of the story is in Job 1:1. "Job... was perfect and upright;" God witnesses to this fact in 1:8; and after the first tribulation God again declares of Job that he still "holdeth fast his

integrity.” (2:3). After the second tribulation had come upon him, God again testifies that “in all this did not Job sin with his lips.”

Job is perplexed, and asks “Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery.” (3:20).

Eliphaz, the first speaker, answers him; “Whoever perished, being innocent or where were the righteous cut off?” (4:7,8), and he then proceeds to tell of a “spirit” that passed before his face in the visions of the night, and which said, “Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall man be more pure than his Maker?” (4:17). But still Job asserts his integrity: “Cause me to understand wherein I have erred” (6:24); and again, “my righteousness is in this matter.” (6:29, margin.)

Then Bildad speaks and says: “Doth God pervert judgment? ...if thou wert pure and upright... He would awake for thee... God will not cast away a perfect man.” (8:5,6,20.) And Job returns answer: “I know... but how should man be just with God?!” (9:2,) and, “thou knowest that I am not wicked.” (10:7).

Ehen Zophar refers to Job to that statement of his (“thou knowest that I am not wicked”) and puts it in these words “Thou hast said... I am clean in thine eyes” (11:4). (Here we meet with the word ‘clean,’ and we can easily understand what Zophar means by it, because of the prior statement of Job to which he refers.

Next comes the answer of Job to Zophar in which he says: “Who can bring a clean thing out of unclean?” (14:4). Eliphaz replies with the words quoted at the head (15:14).

Bildad supplies another parallel in 25:4 – “How then man be justified with God? Or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?” (Here it will be seen that just as “man” is equivalent to “he that is born of a woman,” so according to the speaker himself, “clean” is equivalent to “justified with God.”

Job answers this by “till I die I will not remove mine integrity from me; my righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go.” (27:5,6.) Here let us pause to notice again that it is still “righteousness” that is meant by “Cleanness” in this Book of Job, the perfect and upright man.

Finally, the “three men ceased to answer Job, because he was righteous in his own eyes” (32 :1); he “justified himself rather than God.” (32:2.)

Then Elihu speaks, and he again uses that word ‘clean.’ “Thou hast spoken... saying, I am clean, without transgression, I am innocent; neither is there iniquity in me” (33:9). This is the same as saying, “Job hath said, I am righteous” – also by the same speaker. “I am clean” is again paralleled for us by “I am righteous.” (34:5).

And here I conclude, for if anyone by this time fails to understand that by the use of the word “clean” God, Job, Elihu, Satan, Zophar, Bildad, and Eliphaz all understood, “righteous” and if he cannot see that nowhere throughout the Book is the “sin-in-the-flesh” doctrine once imagined, then I am sure that no words of mine will help him to understand the Scriptures.

A.H.Broughton

---

## “The Body Of Sin.”

This is a phrase of Paul’s, and it deserves to be studied.

The connection of it is as follows: “Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed - or rendered powerless - that henceforth we should not serve sin.” Romans 4:6. What is this body of sin; is it our natural body of flesh and blood?

We answer in the negative. The literal living body is just as powerful for sin after baptism as it was before; all its inclinations exist still, every impulse which leads to transgression is present as long as the body lasts in health and vigour.

But "the body of sin" is rendered powerless; crucified; put off as "the old man with (all) his deeds." What is this? We understand the apostle to mean by "the body of sin" or "the old man," the former character and standing in Adam. This is put away by the Christ's ransom as soon as applied to the head and heart. A living body is capable of producing 'the old man' or 'the new' according to circumstances, but the living body itself is neither the one nor the other.

To talk of putting the new man upon the old, as if the two could be conjoined, is unmitigated nonsense. "The old man" must first be "put off" from the literal person, and then "the new man" must be put on. A character bad in the sight of God is cast away, and a character good in the divine estimation is assumed. These constitute the old man and the new man. It is preposterous to contend that a man's real body is "the body of sin" Paul speaks of, if it were, how in this present time could it be said to be "rendered powerless?" The apostle's expression is evidently figurative; his language in this instance will not admit of a literal construction.

Brother Edward Turney

---

## Meekness.

From the Scriptures we find that meekness was the chief characteristic of the great author of our religion. "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep before his shearers is dumb, so He opened not His mouth." "Take my yoke upon you," said He, "and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart." It is to the meek, the humble, and the poor in spirit, and to those alone, that divine illumination is promised . . . "The meek will He guide in judgment, the meek will He teach his way." "He that hateth his brother is in darkness even until now."

When the Apostles grew angry, and were ready either to strike with the sword, or to call down fire from heaven upon the adversaries of Christ, - "ye know not," said their meek and peaceable master, "what spirit ye are of; my kingdom is not of this world." And, if the person of Christ is not to be defended by violent means, neither was His Gospel to be propagated in a spirit of violence. "For the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men - apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves," etc. The Apostles were to "speak the truth in love." That regeneration, the necessity of which they were to affirm, consisted much in laying aside the fierceness of nature, and putting on "the meekness and gentleness of Christ." "Ye were sometimes (or once)," said the Apostle, "disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and passions, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." "But now ye put off all these: anger, wrath, malice, evil communication out of your mouth," "be ye kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you."

In perfect conformity with these passages, the works of the flesh are described to be not only adultery, etc., but likewise emulation, wrath, strife, envying, heresies, and such like; and with these the fruits of the spirit are contrasted, which are "love, joy, peace, long suffering, meekness, faith, patience, temperance;" terms clearly designating that subdued; state of the passions for which I am pleading . . . I am aware it will be said that the doctrines of religion are so important they must be contended for with zeal, and even also with warmth. I grant the truth of this observation, but in doing so I would most carefully guard the admission. The warmth which is to be used in this case is, in a great measure, the warmth of love. It ought chiefly to arise out of a tender and affectionate solicitude for the very person against whom we contend. Now, if we feel that love, we shall be careful not so much to excite his prejudices, or to affront his pride, by exposing him; as to gain him by the very candour, as well as kindness, of our conduct, and thus to render him a brother. With what care did Paul accommodate himself to the prejudices of the Jews, "becoming all things to all men, that by all means he might save some." When he was converted he laid aside the spirit of the persecutor; he was no longer the man of wrath and violence, he was "gentle even as a nurse cherisheth her

children.” Zeal for doctrine is easily learnt. Some, it is to be feared, having been throughout their lives, violent and contentious, and having adopted new tenets . . . continue to exercise their old temper while contending for the new subjects. They were impatient, forward, conceited, or fiery, before they had learnt these doctrines; they are no less so afterwards. Their Gospel has merely furnished them with a new topic, in the discussion of which the same unhallowed passions may be habitually indulged . . . I value the doctrines of Christianity. They are, in my mind, of inestimable worth; when rightly received into the heart they form in a man the very temper which I have endeavoured to describe.

What can more effectually teach humility meekness, and patience, than the knowledge of our unworthiness, and of our redemption by Christ? What can have a greater tendency to calm the turbulence of our minds than the exercise of prayer . . and meditation on the glories of the celestial world

Extract from “The Christian Observer.”.

---

## HE IS COMING.

HUSH! a strain - seraphic music -  
Bursts upon the eager ear;  
Herald brightness, swifter swelling,  
Hope without alloy foretelling  
He is coming.

Through the clouds, and through the shadows,  
Through the mist of many a tear,  
Angel voices break triumphant -  
Waiting nations watch expectant:  
He is coming.

See! the dawn o'er time's dark mountains;  
See prophetic ages pass;  
On beyond to-day's brief sorrow  
Beams a bright transcendent morrow:  
He is coming.

Shout, O shout, the joyful tidings,  
Let it ring to earth's far poles :  
O'er life's surging sea of sorrow  
Let it echo and re-echo  
Till He come.

From The Rock.

---

## At The Breaking Of Bread.

WE are met again around the table of the Lord. We must all feel that there is a deep necessity for our thus meeting together. It is more than human nature could bear to always stand face to face with the enemy. Intercourse with the world has a chilling influence on the heart of a believer. We, therefore, need hours of respite - times of seclusion - when we can be shut out from the world, and shut in with Christ, and one another. In our thus gathering together, each one by his presence brings a little fire with him, and thus

mutual warmth is promoted, which could not otherwise be secured. We need, so to speak, to come into a different atmosphere where the air is pure and invigorating, that so our spiritual strength may be renewed.

In partaking of these emblems we are reminded of those significant words of the apostle, "He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death." Had Jesus been in the position in which some represent Him to have been, these words could not be true. Were He under condemnation from His birth, He must have been already in a state of degradation, and therefore there could have been no scope for humbling Himself. If His life was already under forfeiture, pray, what manifestation of obedience could there have been in His laying it down? The apostle's words, therefore, entirely disprove such a theory respecting the Christ. Jesus saw that the accomplishment of His Father's purpose - obedience to His Father's will - and the salvation of sinners necessitated His death, therefore, out of supreme deference to His Father's will, and deep love for the sons of men, He freely gave up His life a ransom for all, even despising the shame of so ignominious a death as the death of the cross. We must also remember that this humiliation and obedience constituted the basis of His present and future exaltation. Because He stooped so low, the Father has raised Him so high, even exalting Him to his own right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, far above all principality and power. Because He was obedient in all things, even unto death, the Father raised Him from the dead, and will give Him the heathen for His inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession, in the age to come.

Dear brothers and sisters let us not forget that the same principle of divine procedure obtains with regard to ourselves - that God does not bestow His favours irrespective of character. It is true that He gives the present life with its attendant blessings without regard to character; for in the universality of His goodness He causes the sun to shine and the rain to descend on the evil as well as on the good. But there was a necessity for this in the first instance, since man could not render obedience until he had an existence; yet, inasmuch as on the part of the ungodly, there is no appreciation of His goodness - no response of gratitude - no rendering of obedience in return, God has decreed that they shall ultimately and eternally perish; plainly proving that it would be altogether out of harmony with the plan of divine wisdom perpetually to bestow His favours on such conditions. In the creation of man God contemplated His own glory as well as the happiness of His creatures. That glory can only be secured by their faith and obedience; God has therefore made their future and eternal well-being contingent on the same. Therefore, meeting as we do, around this table, in hope of eternal life in the kingdom of God, let us never forget that incorruptibility of being will be bestowed on the basis of incorruptibility of character.

Brother Glover.

---

## **A Word Of Wisdom.**

"NEARLY four hundred years ago, an aged pastor, who had been driven by the persecutions of his British fellow-Christians to Holland, accompanied a little band of pious adventurers, to the number of one hundred and twenty, to Delftharm, where they were about to embark for New England, in America. Several of them were members of his flock, who had been induced to sell their estates, and go in search of a new home, where they could enjoy an unfettered conscience and worship God without molestation. Before their separation from the rest of their brethren at Leyden, this holy man, the Rev. John Robinson, assembled his flock, to observe a day of fasting and prayer, and took his leave of the Christian pilgrims in the following touching and admirable exhortation:-

"Brethren,- We are now quickly to part from one another, and whether I may ever live to see your faces on earth any more, the God of heaven only knows; but, whether the Lord has appointed that or no, I charge you before God and His blessed angels that you follow me no farther than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ. If God reveal anything to you by any other instrument of His, be ready to receive it, as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry, for I am verily persuaded The Lord hath more truth yet to break forth out of His Holy Word. For my part, I can sufficiently bewail the condition of the Reformed Churches, who are come to a period in religion, and will go at present no farther than the instruments of their

reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; whatever part of His will our God has revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it; and the Calvinists, you see, stick where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things. This is a misery much to be lamented, for though they were burning and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God, but, were they now living, would be as willing to embrace farther light as that which they first received. I beseech you remember it is an article of your Church covenant that you be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written Word of God. Remember that, and every other article of your sacred covenant. But I must here withal exhort you to take heed what you receive as truth; examine it, consider it, and compare it with other scriptures of truth, before you receive it, for it is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-Christian darkness and that perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.”

Such was the parting exhortation of the father of the Independents, nearly four centuries ago, to the pilgrim fathers of New England. The degeneracy of the Wesleyans from the principles of their noble founder has been paralleled in the history of Independency. Let the modern Independents - people, pastors, and professors in colleges - ponder and blush before this wisdom of their pious progenitor!”

The foregoing is an extract from an article entitled, “A history of opinions concerning the death of Christ,” which appeared in the Christian Examiner of December, 1853, edited by the “Rev.” J. Panton Ham, a name, I dare say you are familiar with; but the remarks of the old pastor were so good and so suitable for all Bible readers, and especially for Christadelphians at this period in our history, that I have sent them to you, hoping they may be interesting. - I remain, yours affectionately.

A Brother.

---

## **Christ And Melchisedec.**

“For this Melchisedec, King of Salem, a priest of the Most High God.” That which is especially worthy of notice here is, that Melchisedec is the first instance we have of a person specially set apart for the office of the priesthood. Sacrifices, as we know, are part of an aboriginal institution, commencing with the expulsion from Paradise, and surviving the desolation of the deluge. But the persons who offered up the victims in the earlier ages of the world were not priests, that is, were never consecrated to such an employment as a distinctive office, but only performed this, as they did other religious services, in their proper capacity, as heads of families; and, of course, by the act of sacrifice expressing their faith in the great Atonement. Here, however, is the case of one who, though a king, ruling among his neighbours as a king, appears before us as solemnly designated to the office of the priesthood; is regarded by Abraham as entitled to all the prerogatives pertaining to the holy office; is allowed to claim a fixed proportion of the spoils taken from the enemy, not because he is King of Salem, but because he is the priest of the Most High God. All this adds to the eminence of Melchisedec’s typical priesthood. He is not one of a line of priests succeeding to the office in a certain family order. He is not one invested with authority by the hands of others, acting under the prescribed rules of any ecclesiastical authority. But he is one who, long before the Levitical priesthood had any beginning, stands alone in a strange country, challenging homage from the greatest saint of antiquity, as an ordained priest of God.

In all this we see at once certain resembling features to the priesthood of Christ. He is not descended from any family line of priests. He receives no imposition of hands from men designating Him to the sacred office. Yet there rest upon Him the tokens of a holy consecration. The opened heavens testify to the indwelling in Him of the power of the Lord’s anointed. The Spirit of the Lord without measure is given unto Him, and when He had made His soul an offering for sin, and when He had borne the sin of many, and when He poured out His soul unto death, believing souls did homage at the foot of His cross, and, exercising faith in the great oblation, said, “Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.” And then observe one office of the typical high priest which is here mentioned by the apostle, “Who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him. “Surely, this is a work which specially belongs to the true

Melchisedec. Benediction seems never to have been off the lips of Christ. With promises of blessing He opened His Sermon on the Mount; with hands of blessing He called little children to His embrace; with uplifted voice of blessing He was borne away on the ascension cloud; and when He shall come again to welcome, and claim, and receive His own, His language to them will be, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

Yes, blessing was the first act of the Redeemer, after He had gone back to heaven. Unto you, first, God having raised up His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you, and never will He lay down that glorious prerogative till we are blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Him. Especially will Christ bless us thus after our return from the slaughter of the kings; after victories obtained through His grace over all the potentates and powers of evil. Then, like the Melchisedec of old, will He come forth to meet us as we are laden with spoils, saying to us, "Come in, thou blessed of the Lord, wherefore standest thou without? Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." But observe another act of Melchisedec noticed by the apostle, namely, his receiving a portion of the spoils: "To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all." No question will be raised here as to the offering spoken of being a dedicated religious offering to God. Melchisedec was too rich to need any gift for his own use, and it were an affront to Eastern hospitality to suppose that it was offered as a compensation for his kindness to Abraham and his company. The gift was plainly what the apostle's argument seems to make it - a recognition by Abraham of God's hand in his recent successes - a recognition regulated in amount by some traditional standard of the proportion of our goods, which God had a right to, and governed as to the mode of offering by the consideration that it should be directly set apart to the Divine service. Abraham evidently recognised the principle that every man was bound to give of his substance towards the maintenance of a national worship. He had a church in his own house. He commanded his children and his household after him that they should keep the way of the Lord. But leaving to individual or sectional effort to accomplish what it may.

\* \* \*

To a priest by whose personal ministrations Abraham could not stately profit, he yet gave a tenth part of all. Nor is this reference less noteworthy in its bearing on the general subject of almsgiving, and the proportion of our substance which belongs to God, and which is not at our own disposal at all. Under the gospel we have no binding rule upon the subject. Faith worships by love, and love does not want rules. But there is something in this dedication of a tenth part of their property to religious objects by good men of old time which, to say the least of it, is very striking. You will hear people say sometimes, "This dedicated tenth was part of an abrogated Levitical code; was, in fact, a mere form of Jewish poor law." Here we have proof that it was no such thing. Four-hundred years before the law was given Abraham sets apart his tenth for Christ; whilst a hundred and fifty years later, but long before the giving of the law, we have Jacob vowing a vow to the Lord, "Of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto Thee." How carefully the same holy practice - especially after any great successes - was kept up by David and Solomon, and what a lasting blemish is made to rest on the fame of the good Hezekiah for that he returned not unto the Lord according to the mercy which he had received, I need not stay to recite! The practical lesson is one which we can all draw for ourselves. "Honour the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase. If we have been prospered in the work of our hands; if we are returning after a victory over many foes, and hindrances, and difficulties; and if, above all, Christ, our great High Priest, is meeting us with tokens of His benediction, and favour, and grace, let us give Him a part - and a liberal part, too - of these our captured spoils. Let one strength, one grace, one outstretched arm, be acknowledged in our deliverances, testifying that on earth we would lay our successes, even as in heaven we shall lay our crowns, at the feet of Him who is "ordained a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec."

But the parallel between Christ and Melchisedec is pursued further in relation to the mysterious circumstances of their descent. This Melchisedec is declared to "be without father, without mother, without descent; having neither beginning of life nor end of days!" Now, as Melchisedec was a veritable human person, these words cannot of course be understood in their strictly literal sense. Nor does the usage of Jewish phraseology require that they should be so taken. The expression "without father, without mother," implies no more than that there has been no record of the person's individual genealogy preserved. The point is insisted on in relation to Melchisedec's claims to exercise the functions of the priesthood. According to the Levitical rules, such a failure in the family history would have been fatal to him. It was fatal to some who had got into the priest's office in the time of Ezra, concerning whom we read, "These sought their

register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found: therefore, were they, as polluted, put from the priesthood.” Having no descent preserved, they were reckoned us “without father, without mother.” In a similar way we are to explain the language that Melchisedec had “neither beginning of life nor end of days,” that is, that no account has been handed down to us of the time when his office began, or when it ended. Of Moses, of Joshua, of David, and other eminent types, we have such accounts, but none of Melchisedec. He starts up on the page of the sacred record as one exercising the mysterious functions of a royal priesthood, shrouding beneath a veil of impenetrable obscurity all the antecedents of his history, as well as all that relates to the end of his days. The bearing of all this on the apostle’s argument with the Jews we may see at once. He wished to show that Christ’s was absolute, independent, self-originated and eternal priesthood. He owed it to no law of human successions at all. So far otherwise, His human genealogy would have been an insuperable bar to His priestly claims sprung, as He was, from the tribe of Judah, a tribe which, by law, was excluded from the office. His claim therefore, like that of this mysterious priest in Abraham’s time, must have been of some higher and unknown origin. The consecrating unction must have come upon Him direct from heaven. In Him the successions of Aaron’s line were set aside. He was made of God, a high priest according to the order of Melchisedec. And yet let us not fail to notice, in passing, the subtle beauty of adaptation which lies enfolded in these inspired words. See how the very language which we can apply to the typical Melchisedec only with the limitations of a Jewish gloss, may be applied to the true Melchisedec without any limitation or any gloss at all. For, in relation to the great mystery of His incarnation, is He not “without father.” In regard to His proper and essential Godhead, is He not “without mother.”? Did not Isaiah teach that He was without descent, when he said, “Who shall declare His generation?” And when Micah says, “Whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting,” does he not testify that He has “neither beginning of days nor end of life”? Thus, in relation to Christ’s priesthood, we may take the sublime description of our text in all its length, and breadth, and depth, and height. That priesthood has no beginning of days, and till the elect of God shall be gathered in, it shall have no end of life. He is the Alpha and Omega. He is the ancient of days. He is the mighty Father of eternity. “From everlasting to everlasting Thou art God.” “Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.”

And this brings us to the last point of the comparison here instituted - namely, that the priesthood of Melchisedec was an intransmissible priesthood; that he had no successor in his office; that a sort of typical perpetuity is attributed to his ministrations because there was no mention in Scripture of the time when they ceased. “Made like unto the Son of God, he abideth a priest continually.” And in all this, argues the apostle, He is a fit representative of the true Melchisedec who does abide for ever; who has an unchangeable priesthood; who, in all the might and prevalency and sovereignty of an unshared mediation, ever liveth to make Intercession for us. He is a priest for ever, and a king for ever, and an intercessor for ever; with none second to Him, and none like; with none to co-operate, and none to come after; with no interruption, and no pause. One is our High Priest, and His name one. There is the same blood to cleanse there always was; the same voice to plead there always was; the same emblem of sacrifice is ever in the midst of the throne; and the same censer is still in the hands of the Holy One to receive the prayer of saints. “He abideth a priest continually.” Such are a few points of parallelism between Christ and Melchisedec on which the apostle claims our confidence, and rests the title of Christ to our eternal gratitude. Gathering up the argument in a few words, we may observe: In that Christ hath provided the means whereby God may be just, and yet the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus, He is the King of Righteousness; in that He is our peace, and hath made our peace, and dissipated all trace of displeasure from the Eternal Father’s countenance, He is the King of Peace; in that He hath prepared us an altar, provided a lamb for our sacrifice, ordained a priest to slay - altar, sacrifice, and priest all being found in Himself - He is “Priest of the Most High God;” in that He can challenge all the finite intelligences, whether of earth or heaven, to declare the fathomless mystery of His generation, He is said to be “without father, without mother, without descent;” in that He is now gone back into heaven, in that He now lives a priest on the throne, in that all the prerogatives and powers of an endless life are being now employed on behalf of all who will put their cause into His hands, He is said “to abide a priest continually.” And now, what more shall we say? What can we say more to add to the security and comfort of those who worship at the true tabernacle? Our Melchisedec is before the throne. He is exalted there to be a Prince and a Saviour; to give repentance, to scatter pardons, to send down gifts, to encourage faith, to strengthen the tempted in their conflicts, and to uphold the despairing in their fears. The proper scope and tendency of all our recent commemorations has been to show that the whole mediatorial life of our Lord, whether on earth or in heaven, was meant to assure our hearts before God. The cross and the sceptre, the grave and the throne, the fainting and the Almightyness, all that of humanity was kind and pitiful, all that of Godhead was infinite and supreme, must equally and alike conspire to stay our souls on Christ and His

work. That work is perfect. None can succeed to, and nothing can supplement, the ministrations of our great Melchisedec. For, as our salvation has been purchased for us by Him, who is both King of Righteousness and King of Peace, so the application of that salvation to us is entrusted to that priest of the Most High God, whoever liveth to make intercession for us, and who, to defend, to sanctify, to save, to bless, “abideth a priest continually.” Amen.

Extract from “The Quiver.”

---

## **Non-Muslim Muslims and the Jihad Against the West**

My name is Bosch and I’m a recovering Muslim. That is, if Muslims don’t kill me for leaving Islam, which it requires them to do. That’s just one of the reasons I’ve been writing and drawing against Islam and its Jihad for a number of years now. But fortunately for us, Islam hasn’t been able to make every Muslim its slave, just as Nazism wasn’t able to turn every German into a Nazi. So there is Islam and there are Muslims. Muslims who take Islam seriously are at war with us and Muslims who don’t aren’t.

But that doesn’t mean we should consider these reluctant Muslims allies against Jihad. I’ve been around Muslims my entire life and most of them truly don’t care about Islam. The problem I have with many of these essentially non-Muslim Muslims, especially in the middle of this war being waged on us by their more consistent co-religionists, is that they give the enemy cover. They force us to play a game of Muslim Roulette since we can’t tell which Muslim is going to blow himself up until he does. And their indifference about the evil being committed in the name of their religion is a big reason why their reputation is where it is.

So while I understand that most Muslims are not at war with us, they’ve proven in their silence and inaction against jihad that they’re not on our side either, and there’s nothing we can say or do to change that. We just have to finally accept it and stop expecting them to come around, while doing our best to kill those who are trying to kill us.

Another problem with Muslims who aren’t very Muslim is that they lead some among us to conclude that they must be practicing a more enlightened form of Islam. They’re not. They’re “practicing” life in non-Muslim countries, where they are free to live as they choose. But their “Islam” is not *the* Islam. There’s no separate ideology apart from Islam that’s being practiced by these Muslims in name only, there’s no such thing as “Western Islam”.

Non-observant Muslims are not our problem, but neither are they the solution to our problem. Our problem is Islam and its most consistent practitioners. There is nothing in Islam that stays the hand of Muslims who want to kill non-Muslims. If an individual Muslim is personally peaceful, it’s not because of Islam, it’s because of his individual choice, which is why I often say that your average Muslim is morally superior to Mohammad, to their own religion. The very rare Muslim who helps us against Jihad is acting against his religion, but that doesn’t stop some among us from thinking that his existence somehow means that he represents more than himself.

The only reason we’re talking about Islam is because it doesn’t mean peace. Islam wasn’t hijacked by a “small minority of extremists” on 9/11, it was hijacked by a very small minority of moderates whose embarrassment in being associated with such an immoderate religion leads them to engage in moderate truth telling about it, proving their irrelevance as allies.

In addition to these politically active moderates, when you see well-assimilated Muslims in the West, you’re not seeing Islam in action, you’re seeing individuals living up to the old adage, when in Rome, do as the Romans do. They’re essentially post-Islamic Muslims who have rejected Islamic values and have embraced Western ones. But since the process of their assimilation was implicit – as it happened naturally by their exposure to Western, i.e., pro-life, values – both Muslims and non-Muslims alike prefer to

generously give Islam some credit for it. But a good Muslim, by our standards is a bad Muslim by Islamic standards. Objectively good human beings, who identify themselves as Muslim, give Islam a good face, one far better than it deserves. This only gives us a false impression about what it is we're facing, with just another excuse not to face it. And this leads to our acceptance into our culture of stealth jihadists who have figured out how to say what we want to hear, while they scheme behind the scenes to further Islamize the West.

Islamic Fundamentalism.  
Islamic Extremism.  
Totalitarian Islam.  
Islamofascism.  
Islamnazism.  
Political Islam.  
Bin Ladenism.  
Radical Islam.  
Militant Islam.  
Islamism.  
Jihadism

We didn't use terms such as "Radical Nazism", "Extremist Shinto" and "Militant Communism" in the past. "Militant Islam", "Political Islam", etc., are redundant terms. Our pretending otherwise has proven disastrous. Thousands of American lives, both civilian and military, have been sacrificed because of policies predicated on the myth that "Islam means peace." We didn't try to reform Shinto or Nazism during World War II; the major changes in those cultures took place only after we thoroughly de-militarized them.

And it's no accident that Western analysts of Islam who are most informed about Islam are also most critical of it, while those least informed are least critical. But then there are those who, in their study of Islam, have become so enamored with their subject that, instead of sticking to what Islam is, they often write about what it isn't, what they hope it might be. They seem preoccupied with doing their part to save Islam from those who have allegedly corrupted it.

The Muslim world is where the true meaning of Islam can be found in practice. Islam – not any alleged deviant form of it – means misogyny, censorship, anti-Semitism, homophobia, wife-beatings, beheadings, honor killings, pedophilia/"child marriages", murdering infidels, etc. This is evil, and Islam sanctions every bit of it, but we've been told that we must respect "one of the world's great religions" because it's a religion. Following 9/11, the only thing George W. Bush knew about Islam was that it was a religion, and that apparently was a good enough reason for him to exonerate it as he did. And his advisor on Islam, David Forte, told Bush exactly what he wanted to hear, that "Nothing this evil could come from religion." But 9/11 did come from a religion. Whatever else 9/11 was, it was an act of faith.

And Bush saying "Islam is peace" shortly after 9/11 gave the enemy a gift they couldn't have foreseen. Here was the one man who was charged to defend America from their attack and here he was defending the very ideology that motivated the attackers. Honesty is the best policy in general, and when it comes to war, it's a moral imperative to find out the truth, to tell the truth and to act on the truth, no matter what sacred cow is killed in the process. And so a big part of why nearly 3,000 victims of jihad on 9/11 haven't been avenged is because of respect for religion, even for a religion that calls for our destruction.

Muslims who really care about Islam are part of an organized effort to spread Islam, and I sometimes refer to this collective effort by Muslims as "Organized Islam." No matter the means involved, Muslims working towards a more Islamic world want the same thing the jihadists want. This organized effort includes Mosques, Muslim organizations, Muslim individuals writing books, blog posts, etc. And they all invariably engage in anti-Western, Anti-Israeli propaganda, at the very least.

I often hear that we should be working with the Muslim world. Working towards what? As Ayn Rand writes, "In any collaboration between two men (or two groups) who hold different basic principles, it is the more evil or irrational one who wins." Any time we spend "working" with a culture that calls for our destruction, we are working towards our own destruction, consciously or not.

While it's true that jihadists don't represent most Muslims, they do represent Islam. But then why don't most Muslims engage in jihad? Like in any culture, heroes are a small minority, and that goes for Islamic culture as well. The jihadists are Islam's heroes; they are the ones most dedicated to following Allah's commands and they're celebrated in the Muslim world for it. They are also the only ones to whom Islam guarantees paradise. And their rarity was made even clearer when we learned that only the pilots of 9/11 knew it was a suicide mission. Our enemy knows that it's tough to get even hardcore Muslims to sacrifice their lives for Islam, but they don't want us to know that. Just as they don't want us to know that behind their boast that they love death is the fact that they hate life.

And while Muslims who blow themselves up in order to kill non-Muslims are a small minority, Muslims who would explicitly condemn them are an even smaller minority. And while I think that Muslims are mere sheep to their Jihadist wolves, there are also too many Muslim cheerleaders for jihad. How many Muslims celebrated 9/11? Far too many. Even in my own lax Muslim upbringing in America, there was an omnipresent anti-Semitism and misogyny. Some members of my family admired Adolph Hitler, who I refer to as "Islam's Favourite Infidel." Regarding misogyny, the birth of a girl became a day of mourning for Muslim women in my family; they understood the suffering this girl would endure under Islam, even in America.

Though we say we've been at war for over ten years, we haven't even begun to fight the war the way we should be fighting it. And those calling for a change within Islam during this war would be surprised at how much Islam can be changed through an honest war on our behalf. You can't make a violent religion like Islam non-violent by argument, only by greater retaliatory force against state sponsors of jihad terrorism.

The future of Islam and the well-being of Muslims is said to be of importance to us. Post – 9/11, the defence of our culture, our values, our very lives has been optional, but our defence of Islam has been absolute. It began with Bush's "Islam is peace" and it continues with Obama, who said in his Submission Speech in Egypt in 2009, in front of members of The Muslim Brotherhood, "I consider it part of my responsibility as president of the United States to fight against negative stereotypes of Islam wherever they appear." If only he felt the same about America.

We can't be both for Islam and for ourselves. This enemy is fully on their own side and fully against us and they've made themselves believe that they're the good guys and that we're the bad guys, and our actions have done nothing but turn their hatred of us into an ever-deepening contempt. Before we see the enemy for what it is, we need to see ourselves for what we are. Only then can we, with full moral conviction, make them pay for what they've done and move us towards victory.

Our problem is not "Islamophobia", but Islamophilia. It is this uncritical, uninformed, absolute defence of Islam by Western elites after 9/11 that I refer to as Islamgate. It's a scandal for the ages that few involved would ever admit to being part of.

I care about the truth. I care about Western Civilization. I care about myself, my loved ones and my friends. I care about life. And that's why I don't care about Islam.

Our altruistic concern for the future and wellbeing of the Muslim world has come at the expense of American lives and treasure. We've placed the wellbeing of "The Muslim World" above our own self-defence. We've placed today's Big Lie, "Islam means peace", above the truth we need to act on. We've placed the lives of Muslim civilians above the lives of our soldiers, placing them in absolutely unnecessary danger in order to protect innocent (or even guilty) civilians. Our Rules of Engagement might as well be renamed the Golden Rules of Engagement, as our soldiers have been forced to treat the enemy the way we'd like to be treated. And the enemy takes full advantage of that, as they do of all of the policies our morally vain politicians have concocted. We need to shift the focus onto our own well-being at the enemy's expense for a change.

We've tried everything since 9/11 except real war. War is the answer to Jihad.

So who cares about Islam? Muslims, Jihadists, Islamophiles, Leftists who naturally side with anti-American ideologies, guilt-ridden fellow travellers who think America is usually in the wrong, and religionists who believe any religion is better than none.

But since Leftists and Islamophiles usually know very little about Islam, who truly cares about Islam? Those who are at war with us.

In the end, I care about Islam and the Muslim world as much as the Muslim world cares about America and the West. This is war. We can't be on both sides. I'm not rooting for Islam or the Muslim world.

I'm rooting for us. Bosch Fawstin. December 2011

-----  
**Joel 1:29, 28.**

“And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit.”

-----  
**“So Death Passed Upon All Men . . .”**

**Romans 5:12**

If death means death, what is meant by “We have passed from death unto life” in John 5:24?

Is natural death a bar to Eternal Life?

The wages of sin is death. Is this a bar to Eternal Life?

Is there a difference between death, sleep, and perish?

The passing of the sentence of death is revocable; salvation is the lifting of the penalty, because it is impossible for one to obtain salvation whilst under it. The Gospel call is to come out of Adam in whom we all die, into Jesus Christ; to flee and escape for one's life before the sentence passed can be executed. If Lot had remained in Sodom, he would have died with the Sodomites; if one remains in Adam he will die with the Adamites.

Death under condemnation is to perish in death, and death under no condemnation is to sleep in death, they present two different features.

The death Jesus died was a ransom paid: it was not wages received. By this clause He legally died – the Just for the unjust, the sinless One for sinners.

Death under the penalty of the law, and the common death of all men, i.e. natural death, passed on Adam at creation, must not be confused.

No name given

## **The Way of the Inquisitor**

It is this untrammelled search that has revealed, and is still revealing, the rotten foundations of many religious beliefs; it is the spirit of Popery which says you shall read this, but you shall not read that. “O,” but the inquisitors cry, “evil communications corrupt good manners.” Verily that saying is a wise saying; but whoever had his good manners corrupted by an earnest examination of earnest views of the Bible? As of yore, the inquisitor is always gentle and has a tender conscience: he could gag your mouth; smash your pen; burn your writings; forbid the world to read them, or even to look thereon; then light a fire for your own

special purgation and refinement, while from his chair he devoutly assured you of his mental sufferings through your “crooked ways” and that he should over “preserve for you a tender spot in his heart.”

But enough! Works rather than words: deeds rather than creeds! “By their fruits ye shall know them.”

Anon

---

## **Jesus Died to Declare God’s Righteousness**

One of the reasons which Christadelphians give for the sacrifice of Christ is that He died to declare God’s righteousness. If it is asked further what was this righteousness of God which was declared, the answer is given that God was righteous in condemning man to death. John Carter puts this view very briefly in the words – “Jesus shared the mortality that has come by sin, and then in a voluntary death exhibiting that the mortality was a righteous appointment of God.” (“Christadelphian,” April 1956).

**We quote other Christadelphian writings: - from “Redemption in Christ” by W. F. Barling:-**

“How did the crucifixion declare God’s righteousness? In that Christ possessed a nature under condemnation of death, so that there was no violation of justice in his death. It was not wrong for him to die, so his voluntary death declared God’s righteousness in not waiving the Edenic sentence unconditionally.

**And from – “The Blood of Christ.” By R. Roberts:-**

“The death of Jesus was just, because, as Son of Man (John 3:14) he was under Adamic condemnation, and thereby God could lawfully require him to die. In his death Jesus declared God’s righteousness so that God, while remaining just to his own decree, could thereafter be the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.” “It pleased God to require the ceremonial condemnation of this sin-nature in crucifixion in the person of a righteous possessor of it, as the basis of our forgiveness.

He was born that he might die, as the first necessity in the case; for thus was the righteousness of God to be declared, and sin condemned in its own flesh, as the foundation of all the goodness to come afterwards.

...he was the very nature condemned in Eden, and therefore wrong was not done when he was impaled upon cross.

...he bore our condemnation in his own person, as much as any of us, necessitating his death before he could be purified from the curse.”

**Also from “Epistle to the Romans” by John Carter.**

“We see him on the cross. He is there according to the determinate counsel of God. He is there because he is obedient in all things, even to the death on the cross. Was it right that he should be there? Who will say it was not? It was right he was there because he was a member of a race that was mortal, dying because of sin. His submission to it was a voluntary declaration that God was righteous in involving all in death. The righteousness could only be exhibited by the willing submission to death of one in that position. Could the voluntary death of a sinner have exhibited the righteousness of God?...

He must be of God’s providing, because only thus can the two things necessary be obtained. The one who dies must righteously die, must voluntarily die, and yet be sinless that resurrection might follow.”

The sequence of ideas underlying these quotations could be summarised as follows:-

Adam was condemned to (natural) death  
All mankind are likewise condemned to (natural) death.  
This includes Jesus for he was descended from Adam.  
Jesus, therefore, in spite of his sinlessness, was likewise condemned to death.  
His death was an exhibition of what was due to sin.  
His death declared God was righteous in condemning all – including a sinless man – to death.  
God was thereby vindicated.

This summary shows the view to be singularly lacking in logic. Firstly, how was the death of Jesus by violence an exhibition of the natural death due to men? Secondly, how does the death of a sinless man declare God to be righteous in condemning sinners to death? Thirdly, how was God just or righteous in requiring the cruel death of sinless Jesus in order to vindicate Himself?

The view is not only lacking in logic, it is not found in scripture and is a perversion of justice and righteousness. The death of Jesus declares God's unrighteousness rather than otherwise.

Now the only verse which speaks of Jesus "declaring God's righteousness" is Romans 5:25 which reads as follows:-

"Whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God."

This is the only verse. Somehow the meaning given in the quotes from Christadelphian writers must be found in this verse. We ask the reader if he can detect the doctrine that Jesus in dying declared that God was righteous in condemning all (including himself) to death? Where is it? Can anyone find it? We cannot. The verse says nothing at all about God being righteous in condemning mankind (and Jesus) to death. We challenge anyone to show where the verse teaches such things.

What then does the verse teach? Firstly, we must remark that it is useless taking a verse out of its context and putting a construction upon it which is quite foreign to the general idea of the verses. Verse 25 is part of a lengthy argument extending from verse 20 to verse 28. This is seen when the two verses are quoted:-

Verse 20 – "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

Verse 28 – "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."

The subject then, is justification – it is by faith and not by the deeds of the law. The word "justify" is closely related to the word "righteous;" in fact, we find the words used interchangeably in many versions. To be "justified" is the same as being "declared righteous."

Let us follow the sequence of thought from verse 20 to verse 28 –

- v.20 No man is justified by works of the law.
- v.21 Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested.
- v.22. This is righteousness by faith, not by works.
- v.25. All have sinned (works of law could not put this right).
- v.24. But justification is free to all because Jesus has brought redemption (release from sin's grasp).
- v.25. God has set forth Jesus as a mercy seat (not the Mosaic system). The faith required is in the efficacy of the blood of Jesus. Jesus has declared or manifested God's (way of) righteousness to be by faith (v.22.) not of works.
- v.26. God is righteous (just) in declaring men righteous who have faith in Jesus Christ.

It had been thought that a man could be righteous by carrying out the works of the law. Paul says this was not so. God has another and better system of righteousness which He has declared and disclosed in Jesus. It is a system of righteousness by faith. Jesus is the true mercy seat. It is His blood (not that of

animals) which is efficacious. Men must have faith in that blood, that sacrifice. The death of Jesus was the declaration or manifestation of this way of righteousness – God’s righteousness. The apostle makes the further point that this declaration (at this time) involved the passing over of the sins of previous generations – for which there was no adequate sacrifice until Christ came.

The verse in question (v.25) has nothing to do with declaring God was just in condemning mankind to death. It shows God’s righteousness to be concerned rather with the manifestation of his love and forbearance in providing a means of release from sin’s grasp and in passing over the sins of Israel. His righteousness is a system of faith not of works of law. This is what Jesus declared.

Christadelphian writers have done violence to this verse and completely reversed its meaning.

Brother H. C. Gates

---

## Choice And Action

Following upon the many blessings and curses as listed in Deuteronomy 28, we have recorded in chapter 30 verse 15:

“See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.” As we know, these blessings and curses were set before the children of Israel during their wilderness journey under Moses. But it was not very long after, under the leadership of Joshua we read in Joshua 24:22, many who must have remembered Moses had to make a choice:

“And Joshua said unto the people, Ye are witnesses against yourselves that ye have chosen you the Lord, to serve him. And they said. We are witnesses.”

Not many generations later Israel had fallen badly as we read in 1 Kings 18, during the time of Elijah the prophet, we will look at verses 21 and 39:

21: “And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word.”

39: “And when all the people saw it, they fell on their faces: and they said, The Lord, he is the God; the Lord he is the God.” They had decided, but more was required of them. Choice needs to be followed by action. In the majority of cases these words need to be associated with each other. Choice without action means little. Verse 40:

“And Elijah said unto them. Take the prophets of Baal; let not one of them escape. And they took them: and Elijah brought them down to the brook Ki-shon, and slew them there.”

From birth to death choice plays a large part in all humans during their natural life. In our very early stages it is our parents who have to decide many things for us. But as we proceed through the many stages of development, as children, then on to out teens until we become of age, men and women by which time the responsibility becomes ours to choose and act according to our choice. This applies not only to our natural life, but also to our Spiritual Life. In the case of the former it can relate to our aim in life, our trade or profession which we wish to follow but at the end it is death which takes its toll. Disaster, however, can take its toll as so often when a partner in life or business has a different aim. But in the case of our Spiritual life, according as to how we choose, the result can be a full and satisfying one in the Kingdom of God. In having to make our choice in this case we refer to the Book of Books whose Author is God.

Examples abound in the Scriptures of individuals who made a choice and followed with action. Some were good, others made for material gain were a disappointment. I now will briefly look at a few examples; many cases more than one person was involved in having to make a choice and to take action.

ADAM and EVE. God provided the subject for the decision. OBEY or NOT. Genesis 2:9, “And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.” Verses 16 and 17,

“And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

This prohibition was fully understood as we see from chapter 3 verse 3, it was indeed as God had said, pleasant to the eyes, good for food, to be desired, as is wisdom; but this tree held a prohibition, “Thou shalt not eat of it;” disobedience meant death. God is not mocked. Eve's choice, her action, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. It may not have occurred that they fully realized what the penalty meant, possibly until they had seen the animal slain to obtain skins for their covering. They had tasted of God's provision in Eden; they were alive and in what is often referred to as in a condition of paradise, having natural life. What more did they want? They were turned out but still lived. The tree of life was still in Eden but beyond their reach unless God provided a means whereby they could obtain forgiveness. This God has done through His love for man. John 3:16:

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

The tree of life still exists. Revelation 22:2:

“... and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life...” In our consideration of choice we now move on to look at Abraham and Lot. Terah, who lived in Ur of the Chaldees, was the father of Abraham, Nahor and Harran. From ancient records it appears the inhabitants of this area worshipped idols, as is seen in Joshua 24:2. In no way is it to be thought that Abraham was engaged in this idol worship; he no doubt was looking for something more satisfying. Harran also had a son, Lot. All remained at the family home. External writers give the impression that they were well off having much cattle and goods. After Harran died it seems Abraham cared for Lot. But a call came to Abraham to leave his home and father, as seen in Genesis 12:1 & 4:

“Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred ..... unto a land that I will shew thee,” “So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him, and Lot went with him.”

We see from these verses that Abram departed. He acted. Indeed it seems that when he and Lot departed they took with them cattle which they must have divided, along with some of their employees, and they prospered, so much so, that they could not continue together as a single unit. It is then that we see the difference in their choice and actions. Abram believed God that he and his family would be blessed. Lot, it seems, when they had to divide, chose material advantage and acted accordingly. Genesis 13:8:

“And Abraham said unto Lot, Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, and between my herdsmen and thy herdsmen.” Verse 10 “And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan that it was well watered everywhere...”

Very attractive for cattlemen. But where did it end? In Sodom, where he became a householder, as it appears from Genesis 19:2. Surely he had made a wrong choice. Very little more is heard of Lot after Sodom and Gomorrah. What finally happened to him we are not told. But he was very unpopular with the people of Sodom, as shown in verse 9 of chapter 19:

“And they said, Stand back... this one fellow came in to sojourn, and he will needs be a judge... and they pressed sore upon the man, even Lot, and came near to break down the door.”

Next we move on some hundred years or more, to when the Children of Israel were settled in the Land, to the time of the Book of Ruth. The story of Ruth is well known among most Christians, by whom it is looked upon as a great love story; but on further consideration, we can find much more in it than just a love story. From the early chapters of the Book of Ruth we are told that there was a famine in the land:

“...and a certain man of Bethlehem-judah went to sojourn in the country of Moab, he, and his wife, and his two sons.” It was not long before we read Elimelech, Naomi's husband died and she was left, and her two sons. What was she to do? We shall soon see that a wrong choice as to action was made: but we shall see that because of maybe mother realised she had brought about something which was wrong and other things declared by God to be unacceptable for the Children of Israel. As was customary at that time, the parents played a large part in the question of suitable marriage partners for their children as is still the practice in our own country, among many of the immigrants who live in England. Naomi, in her distress among other things at the time, may have overlooked two things. Deuteronomy 7:3,

“Neither shalt thou make marriage with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son.”! Speaking, of course, of foreigners. Deuteronomy 23:3.

“An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord even to their tenth generation...”

The two sons of Naomi were married to Moabite women, even as Solomon in later times took wives of those he chose among the various nations, many of whom worshipped idols, and in some instances he built them places for their idols. In Nehemiah 13:26 we are told:

“Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things... even him did outlandish women cause him to sin.” Solomon, sad to say, however, is not among those listed in Hebrews 11.

But to return to Naomi and her daughters-in-law; she must have often spoken to them of the God of Israel and the many laws and practices in force among the people of her own land. Knowing of these things may have been the reason she suggested they stay in Moab, among their own race, when she returned to Israel as she was about to do, having heard that the famine was over. For even if she was still of a childbearing age it would be many years before any further sons she might beget when she did return to Israel. Far too many years to wait for them to grow up, and replace Mahlon and Chilion, their husbands who had both died. Ruth 1:10 & 11, “And they said. Surely we will return with thee unto thy people. And Naomi said, Turn again my daughters; why will ye go with me? In other words. Think again, my daughters. They did. Having made their final choice, they acted differently. Orpah relented, which meant she turned her back on Naomi and the God of Israel, but Ruth's choice and action was very different. Naomi said to her, in effect, See your sister has decided to go back to her own people; you do the same and marry one of your own. Ruth 1:16,

“And Ruth said, 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.” Verse 17, “Where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried ... if ought but death part thee and me.” Verse 19, “So they two went until they came to Bethlehem...” Can we imagine the joy of Naomi? And the lesson for us - Orpah, a Gentile, returned to her people and we hear no more of her in the Scriptures. Ruth, also a Gentile, in her day accepted the God of Israel, went along with her mother-in-law, and what blessings, she received we well know. In due time Ruth begat Obed: and Obed begat Jesse: and Jesse begat David. Ruth 4:16, out of Naomi's sorrow (call me Mar-a) what joy:

“And Naomi took the child, and laid it in her bosom and became nurse unto it.”

We now turn to Ruth chapter 3, where we come to the early stages of the climax of events; the harvest must have been nearly over and preparations would be in hand for the gathering of the labourers who would, along with their employer, rejoice and partake of a feast prepared for them: shall we say a form of thanksgiving to God. Naomi, knowing what would normally take place/ carefully instructed Ruth how to go on. I gather there would be rejoicing, dancing etc., among those employed: I notice that it was the period of gathering in the barley harvest, being one of the ingredients used by the brewing industry today. Naturally,

after a while of eating and drinking, some would want to rest. Boaz, the master was among those seeking rest. That which is next recorded would today be a source of scandal among some, but not so in this case, for we read Naomi had carefully instructed Ruth, and Ruth took notice, and heeded her mother-in-law's advice. Ruth 3:5 & 7,

“All that thou sayest unto me I will do...” “And when Boaz had eaten and drunk and his heart was merry, he went to lie down at the end of the heap of corn...” When he woke, what alarm! A woman was there at his feet. Ruth 3:9.

“And he said. Who art thou? And she answered, I am Ruth, thine handmaid: spread therefore thy skirt over thine handmaid; for thou art a near kinsman.” Verses 10 and 11, “...Blessed be thou of the Lord...” “Fear not; I will do to thee all that thou requirest.”

This was not just a request to redeem lands as was the permitted and dutiful custom of the day. The phrase “spread thy skirt over thine handmaid” had a far deeper meaning. There had to be an heir provided to succeed to the land. It involved marriage, as we see in chapter 4. Another kinsman was unable to redeem the land on behalf of Naomi and take to wife Ruth. Today, when a full Jewish marriage is performed, I understand the man throws off his Talith, or robe, over his wife and covers her head with it, which signified that from then on he took responsibility for all her needs.

Brother Harvey Linggood.

---

### **Alabaster Boxes Of Human Sympathy.**

Do not keep the alabaster boxes of your love and tenderness sealed up until your friends are dead?

Fill their lives with sweetness. Speak approving, cheering words while their ears can hear them; the kind things you mean to say when they are gone, say before they go. The flowers you mean to send for their coffins send to brighten and sweeten their homes before they leave them.

If my friends have alabaster boxes laid away, full of fragrant perfumes of sympathy and affection, which they intend to break over my body, I would rather they would bring them out in my weary and troubled hours, and open them, that I may be refreshed and cheered by them while I need them.

I would rather have a plain coffin without a flower, a funeral without an eulogy, than a life without the sweetness of love and sympathy.

Let us learn to anoint our friends beforehand to the burial; post-mortem kindness does not cheer the burdened spirit.

Flowers on the coffin cast no fragrance backward over the weary way, and the odours of which have no sweetness for the dead.