

# **The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 284**

## **4<sup>th</sup> Quarter 2018**

### **In This Issue:**

Page 1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 4	The Upper Fountain of Siloam	George Croly
Page 4	The Gospel Of The Kingdom. Part Two.	Brother J. Cameron.
Page 8	In Adam and In Christ	Brother F. J. Pearce
Page 10	A Dialogue On Faith And Works.	Brother Edward Turney
Page 12	F. Hodgkinson "Quotation"	Brother Edward Turney
Page 13	Conversation from a 'Facebook' Forum	
Page 14	The Man Born Blind	
Page 15	Gradual Apostacy	
Page 15	Death by Sin	Brother Ernest Brady
Page 17	The Nazarene Faith	

---

## **EDITORIAL**

Dear Friends, Brothers and Sisters, When we first learnt about Jesus we soon realised here was a man different from anyone else. His birth, His childhood, His reasoning with the elders at the age of twelve, then, in His thirties came His preaching of the Gospel, His many miracles of healing, showing compassion for others and finally His crucifixion followed by His resurrection. Never had there been such a person before Him or any such person since.

In my schooldays in the 1930's and 1940's we started our day with morning assembly during which we always had a hymn and prayer. And during the week there was one lesson of Religious Instruction which was only ever based on Bible teachings. Extra to this I attended a Sunday School each Sunday afternoon.

After my schooldays I continued to attend Sunday Services as well as a midweek evening Bible class. Even so it was quite a long time before I realised there was one question which was being asked time and again and which I had never heard answered or perhaps I should say that the answers I heard were inadequate and did not always make much sense to me. Neither could I work it out for myself until I had a much better understanding of the Bible generally.

And the question ? 'Why was Jesus baptised?' After all, John's baptism was for the remission of sins and Jesus had no sins to repent of and so didn't need to be baptised. That leaves us with the question, Why?

It seems to me that John the Baptist may have understood the reason when he said to Jesus, "I have need to be baptised of Thee and comest Thou to me?" However, Jesu's answer, "Suffer it to be so now for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" doesn't seem to help us find the answer. One matter that will help us is to see the difference between John's baptism which was before Jesus crucifixion, and the baptism of those after.

John's baptism was for Israelites only, i.e. for those who were already in covenant relationship with God through being Israelites living under the Law of Moses. John also realised not all Israelites would benefit from this baptism for he said to the Pharisees and Sadducees, the religious leaders who came to him for baptism, "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring therefore fruits meet for repentance:" (Matthew 3:7 and 8). They thought that being in this covenant relationship

with God was sufficient. It was not; they had skewed the law to make it easier to keep. John's baptism showed the need for obedience to the Laws as God gave it to them.

Now let us look briefly at the start of this covenant into which the children of Israel entered when Moses led them out of slavery after they had served the Egyptians for four hundred and thirty years. We find the story of this covenant is recorded in Exodus 24 and in verses 4 to 8 we read,

“And Moses wrote all the words of the LORD, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the LORD. And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basons; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the LORD hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the LORD hath made with you concerning all these words.”

The promise to be obedient was not well kept and many continued to commit sins and then offer sacrifices as required by the Law of Moses, and even this was ignored from time to time. This sad state of affairs continued for generations until the time came for God to introduce a New Covenant. It was not a matter of God changing His mind for the animal sacrifices were not sufficient to take away sin but simply to cover them over for the time being. But all was not lost for God had already promised a Saviour as we see from reading Hebrews 10:5 to 10, “Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.”

This confirms the words of John the Baptist when he said to those around him when Jesus came to be baptised, “Behold, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.” (John 1:29).

We can see from these references that all forgiveness has to be through Jesus, and God had sent His Son into the world at the appropriate time to make these changes by introducing a New Covenant. So the next step was for Jesus to start preaching the Gospel once He had been baptised.

Jesus preached the gospel for three and half years, proving His authority as Son of God by many miracles while at the same time reflecting His Father's character, full of love, so much so that He could say “He that has seen me hath seen the Father.” (John 14:9). Finally the time came for Isaiah 53:5 and 6, to be fulfilled when “He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.”

Jesus, knowing full well what lay before Him, made His way one last time to Jerusalem “For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day. But they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him.” (Mark 9:31). The night before Jesus was crucified He met with the twelve disciples at the ‘Last Super’ during which “Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. (Matthew 26: 26 to 28). The next morning Jesus was crucified and at the moment of His death, the curtain in the temple, which prevented anyone seeing into the Most Holy place, (in which was The Ark of The Covenant and the Mercy Seat), was torn from top to bottom thus signifying the end of the Old Covenant under which the Israelites had lived for fifteen centuries and the beginning of the New Covenant sanctified by Jesus shed blood. Finally, on the third day Jesus rose again from the dead and, with the New Covenant now being in place it was time for the Apostles to teach all peoples. After rising from the dead Jesus met and talked with His eleven disciples, “And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and

preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” (Mark 16:15 & 16).

Our purpose here is to answer the question, ‘Why was Jesus baptised?’ and I believe we can now see that this remarkable, outstanding man, the Son of God, when He was about thirty years of age, made the decision to establish the New Covenant in His blood for the forgiveness of sins of all who would come to Him in faith, and having made that decision, He then left home, never to return to it, and went to John the Baptist to be baptised and spent the next three and half years establishing the foundation on which the New Covenant was to be based, completing it with His sacrifice. He took upon Himself the “sin of the world” and then took it away by His sacrifice

So our answer is that Jesus baptism, declared His commitment to accomplish all these things, so doing His Father’s will; to take upon Himself the sin of the world and forgive the sins of all the faithful servants of God from the time of Adam to the time in the future when “God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away” (Revelation 21:4); it was the commencement of establishing the New Covenant whereby He took our sins upon Himself. In contrast to this our baptism is into Jesus death when we begin a new covenanted life in Him by which covenant we can be forgiven our sins when we ask in faith.

Jesus death is also referred to as a purchase in Acts 20 verse 28, “the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.” This church of God is now Jesus possession and all in it belong to Him, and to whom He says, “Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you.” (John 15:14), “That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.” (John 13:34.35).

May the love of Jesus constrain us to honour the Son as we honour the Father and worship them both in the beauty of holiness.

With love in Jesus to all our readers. Russell.

---

## **THE UPPER FOUNTAIN OF SILOAM.**

SILOAM consists of two basins or fountains, the upper one of which is a fissure in the solid rock. A flight of steps leads down on the inside to the water, and close at hand, on the outside, is the reservoir. This seems to be generally acknowledged as

“Siloa’s brook that flowed  
Fast by the oracle of God.”

The drawing of the water from Siloam in the Feast of Tabernacles (though no direction on the subject is to be found in the Mosaic Law) became a remarkable ceremonial in the latter ages of Judea.

The priest, with his attendants received it from the fountain in a golden vessel, and then, returning to the Temple, mingled it with wine, and poured it on the altar. The origin of the custom has been the subject of much discussion among the rabbins, but it is generally supposed to have originated in the verse of Isaiah (xii. 3), “With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation.” Much exhibition of popular rejoicing, with sounding of trumpets and horns, accompanied this ceremony. The whole Feast of Tabernacles was peculiarly a display of popular exultation, as it occurred in the finest season of the year, after the gathering of all the harvests; was under tents and bowers, reminding the people of the happiest scenes of the national life and was typical of the period when

earth is to be Paradise again, and Israel is to be restored for ever. The water from Siloam was drawn on every day of the seven during which the feast continued. But the most solemn outpouring was on the last, the chief day of this memorable celebration. Our Lord refers to it as prefiguring the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (John vii. 39).

The Holy Land, by George Croly, LL.D. Vol. 1 – Gleaner.

-----

God's justice is Him giving us what we deserve.  
His mercy, is not giving us what we deserve.  
His grace, is giving us what we don't deserve.

-----

## **“THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM.”**

### **PART TWO** (continued from our last Circular Letter)

Let us notice now the texts adduced by the Baptist preacher to prove the Church to be the Kingdom. Reverting to his statement already quoted, as regards “grace” and “glory,” or according to the shorter Catechism, “the kingdom of grace” and “the kingdom of glory,” it is remarkable that if there exists such a distinction, there is no mention of it in the Scriptures. We never there read of a future phase of the kingdom - the kingdom of glory - as distinguished from a present phase - the kingdom of grace. Why, therefore, make a distinction, which the Bible does not make?

Again, it is perfectly true that the disciples of Christ - the Church – are absolutely subject to His authority.

But they are never once spoken of as the SUBJECTS of His kingdom; they occupy a higher position than this, and are more than once termed the “heirs of the kingdom” - even “joint heirs with Christ” Himself. And, on the other hand, while Christ is repeatedly called the Head of His body the Church, He is never once spoken of as its king. But if the church be really the kingdom in a present phase, it is strange that there is no instance of the application of the term kingdom, to designate the body of Christ, in any clear or unmistakeable manner. The terms are in no clear instance interchangeable, as they should be if the church is the kingdom. Thus, as we have shown, the Apostles preached the kingdom, but it is never once said they preached the church. The Apostles wrote letters to the CHURCHES in various places; but we never read that they addressed any of their letters to the KINGDOMS of Galatia, or to the KINGDOMS of the Thessalonians, etc.

But this brings us to the proofs advanced on this point, which are alleged to be “sufficient to settle the question.” And it is remarkable that neither of the two passages cited expressly declares the church to be the kingdom. It is assumed, from the use of the present tense in Rev. i. 9, that John, calling himself the companion of the disciples in “tribulation and in the kingdom,” that the kingdom as well as the tribulation had an existence when John wrote the words. But the present tense does not always denote present reality. We have an example of this, out of many that might be cited, in 1 Pet. v. 1, “The elders who are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed.” Now, would anyone maintain from this passage that “the glory” had a present existence at the time Peter wrote, merely because he uses the present tense regarding three things, two of which were really in existence, while one clearly was not. True, “the glory” is spoken of as future - “shall be revealed” while in Revelation 1:9, the kingdom is not. But it is this very circumstance that explains the passage in Revelation, for Peter declares, as strongly as John, that he was a present partaker of a future blessing. And if the kingdom is expressly declared in other passages to belong to the future, just as ‘ the glory’ is in Peter’s letter, where is there any difficulty in one case more than in the other? Why should

John not speak of himself as the companion of the disciples in a future kingdom, as appropriately as Peter could call himself a partaker of the future glory?

But what is the direct teaching of Scripture as to the true relation of the “tribulation” to the “kingdom” as regards time? The answer is, the one present, the other future. In the very nature of things they cannot exist together. Thus, in Acts 14:22 - “Confirming the souls of the disciples and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must, through much tribulation, enter into the kingdom of God.” Mark, here, the entire absence of the idea that “tribulation” and “the kingdom” are in any sense co-existent, or that the tribulation is endured in “the kingdom of grace” preparatory to entering “the kingdom of glory.” But it was in the church, which, while in the present evil world, shall have tribulation.

How, then, could John and his disciples be companions in the future kingdom? Simply in being joint-heirs with Christ, the Anointed King, who, when He comes the second time, shall share His kingdom with the faithful – as Peter intimates in the passage already quoted, “When the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.”

Let us now look at Colossians 1:13, Great stress is laid on the word “HATH” - “Hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son.” The phrase “hath translated” is in the perfect tense in our English version, but the original word is not in the Greek perfect tense. There are other two verbs in this verse, rendered by the English perfect, namely, “hath made meet,” and “hath delivered.” These three verbs are all in the Aorist tense, which is indefinite in regard to time. This may be seen from the definition of the word Aorist given in any Greek Lexicon. Dunbar defines it thus: - “Indeterminate, undefined, vague, loose, indefinite (a tense in grammar), unlimited.” Dr. Moses Stuart, in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Apocalypse, page 197, says, “Homer, Plato, Euripides, Demosthenes, and others, employ the Aorist (and also the perfect) to designate with intensity the certainty of future events. Kuhner has given abundance of examples to illustrate this. §443, 2. The Aorist is even more intensive than the perfect for this purpose, inasmuch as it denotes completed action in distinction from continuance, which the perfect more appropriately attaches to itself as an adsignification. Virtually, do we find the same use of the Aorist in John xiii. 31; xv. 6-8. Whatever difficulties may have existed among critics in time past with respect to such usage, it would seem that there is now no more occasion for them.” In addition to the foregoing, the authority of Professor Alexander might be quoted, who, in his “Elements of Greek Grammar,” p. 115, treating of the Aorist, says it is employed “in speaking of a contingent action which it is wished should be done and concluded, and which the mind naturally conceives, and therefore expresses, under this particular view.”

Now, let these rules be applied to the case in hand, and observe how they operate. Stuart says, “the Aorist is used to designate with intensity the certainty of future events;” while Alexander says it is employed “in speaking of a contingent action, which it is wished should be done and concluded.” The translation of the faithful disciples into the kingdom of God’s dear Son is that “future event,” and that “contingent action.” Its certainty and its desirableness will be admitted by all, but the question now is - Can this text, after these considerations, be quoted to prove its present existence? I think not.

But not only is a different rendering possible, it is absolutely necessary to the correct understanding of the Apostle’s meaning. By the common version he is made to affirm at least one thing which is not true, namely, that the disciples were already made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. Who will affirm that meetness for the glorious inheritance can be predicated of any one while in the mortal condition? Is it moral (that is, spiritual) meetness that is intended? That is progressive all through the present life: “perfecting holiness in the fear of God.” Is it physical meetness? That is attained only in the “spiritual body,” for “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.” So self-evident is this, that Dr. James Macnigh, in his translation of the Epistles, renders the first of the three verbs by the present tense, which has practically the effect of leaving the time indefinite, “who maketh us meet for the inheritance,” etc.

Now, if Paul cannot be understood as affirming that the disciples are now made meet to be partakers of the inheritance, who will presume to say that, in the same sentence, he affirms that they have been translated into the kingdom?

Again, Paul’s words: “The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost,” are often quoted in support of the so-called spiritual nature of the kingdom.



Cobbin's note is, "His reign within." But why not rather in accordance with the coming kingdom? Thus: "The Kingdom of God, the glad tidings of whose future establishment you have believed, is not meat and drink, but righteousness," etc. The Apostle had just been writing about the comparative insignificance of meats and drinks, observance of days, etc., and he here appeals to what distinguished them as disciples of Christ, as a reason why "they should not let their good be evil spoken of," (verse 16) and adds (verse 18), "He that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God and approved of men." The King of that coming kingdom, is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, being by interpretation. King of righteousness and King of peace. The enforcement of these principles shall be productive of joy, and it is surely fitting that the joint heirs of such a ruler should seek to qualify themselves for their future position, by cultivating, in the present life, those principles which shall characterize the administration of such a kingdom. And this, rather than wasting time, energy, and temper upon the contention about meats and drinks, days, etc. Another passage, often used to prove that the kingdom is in the heart, is Luke 17:21, "The Kingdom of God is within you." That is, taking Paul's words to the Romans, just commented on. Righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, are in the hearts of you Pharisees. For it must be borne in mind that it was His bitterest enemies, the Pharisees, who "demanded of Jesus when the Kingdom of God should come." This of itself is sufficient to set aside the common interpretation. The full answer of our Lord, however, is a complete refutation. He said, "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, Lo here! or Lo there! for behold, the Kingdom of God is among you." The marginal reading substitutes "among" for "within," and is of equal authority with the text. This reply is evidently framed on the understanding that the Pharisees were expecting to see some indications of the COMING of the Kingdom. These they could not see, either in Jesus, the claimant of the Messiahship, or in the city of the great King - Jerusalem. But "the Kingdom COMETH not with observation," says Jesus; not, however, implying that when it is come it shall not be observable. "Neither shall they say, Lo here! or Lo there!" That is, they shall not have time to speculate as to whether this or that event is a certain sign of His coming, saying, Here is something, or there is something, indicating its approach; "for, behold, before you are aware of it, the Kingdom of God is among you." And, as He said on another occasion, "As a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth." Luke xxi. 35. But again, it is urged that Jesus said to Pilate, "My Kingdom is not of this world;" and that, therefore, the locality of the kingdom cannot be on the earth. This argument might be tenable if Jesus had said, My Kingdom shall not be in this world. But why should the words of Jesus be considered in the least inconsistent with the future existence of His kingdom upon the earth?

"Not OF this world" more fully describes the character of the Kingdom, considered in relation to the source of its authority and power. This is clearly intimated by Jesus in the remaining words of the verse, "If my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews." As if He had said, If my Kingdom were to be established by the same means as "the kingdom of men," then should I gather an army, and by the power of the sword, in the hands of mortal men, put down "the powers that be." "But now is my Kingdom not from hence." My Kingdom is the Kingdom of God; and it is by Divine power it shall be established. And it is only when the "Lord God Almighty takes to Him His great power and reigns, that the KINGDOMS OF THIS WORLD become the Kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ." This takes place when "the seventh angel has sounded," and at "the time of the dead that they should be judged, and rewards given to the servants of God, and the destroyers of the earth destroyed." Revelation 11:15-18.

Does anyone imagine that when the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdoms of Jehovah's Christ, they are transported to another planet, or cease to have an outward national existence on this earth? Or that they are transformed into religious corporations called churches of some particular order - Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Independent? Nay! The vision of the prophet shewed that nations as such are subjected to the rule of the Messiah and His saints. "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven . . . And there was given Him dominion and glory and a KINGDOM, that all people and NATIONS and languages should serve Him." Daniel 8:13, 14. And this "under the whole heaven," verse 27. And yet this shall be a Kingdom "not of this world," being "set up by the God of Heaven," governed by His laws, under His Anointed. Jesus gives us a remarkable illustration of the possibility of being "not of this world," and yet in this world. He said, speaking of His disciples, "The world hath hated them because they are NOT OF THIS WORLD, even as I am not of this world. I pray not that thou shouldest take them OUT OF THE WORLD, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are NOT OF THE WORLD, as I am NOT OF THE WORLD." John 17:14-16. Here Jesus and His

Apostles are in the world, and yet not of the world; and why may not His Kingdom be in this world, and yet not of this world?

The quotation from the Shorter Catechism may be safely left to the consideration of the reader, as it will be seen by comparing the clauses of the answer with the alleged Scripture proofs appended, that there is no real relationship between them. Thus while the word kingdom occurs four times in the answer, it is not once mentioned in the five proofs.

In view of these considerations, I submit that there is no difficulty in understanding that, the Kingdom of God preached by Jesus and His Apostles was the veritable Kingdom of God which had previously existed in the Holy Land, and whose restoration was predicted by the prophets. Neither is it necessary to put a figurative interpretation upon the numerous passages in the Bible where this restoration is promised; and these in the New Testament as well as in the Old. Take for example Luke 1:32, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His Kingdom there shall be no end." And Matt. six. 28, "In the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This could not have its fulfilment in the Church; for, although Jesus was exalted to His Father's throne in heaven, this is not "the throne of His glory" here spoken of. This is evident, from His own declaration as to the time when He should sit on the throne of His glory. (Matthew 25:31.) "WHEN the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, THEN shall He sit upon the throne of His glory." The throne of His glory is thus distinct from the Father's throne in heaven, and is to be occupied by Him at His second appearing. He distinguishes the two thrones in the promise given to John in Patmos, when He says, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me IN MY THRONE, even as also overcame, and am set down with my Father IN HIS THRONE." Revelation 3:21. And, again, this throne and the sovereignty to be exercised upon it by Christ and His Saints over the nations of the earth, is referred to in another promise in the Revelation. "That which ye have already, hold fast till I come. And he that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers; EVEN AS I RECEIVED OF MY FATHER. And I will give him the morning star." Revelation 2:25-28. Note that this is a promise to the Messiah in the second Psalm; hence the words of Jesus, "Even as I have received of my Father."

"Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God;" for one of its fundamental elements is, that "it shall stand for ever, and shall not be left to other people." Those who shall be privileged to inherit this Kingdom shall be made meet for it by being made partakers of the Divine nature, incorruptible and immortal. The Apostle Paul thus strikingly connects this transformation with the return of the Lord: "Our conversation (citizenship) is in heaven, from whence we also look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body." Philippians 3:20, 21. And John agrees with Paul, "We know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." 1 John 3:2. The moral power of this hope, as a purifying influence is a mighty incentive to the cultivation of that character so essential to the position of partakers with the Christ of His Kingdom and glory. John adds to the words above quoted, "And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as He is pure." And the Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, says, "Wherefore, we receiving" (not having received, as it is too commonly read, but) "we receiving a Kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear. For our God is a consuming fire." Hebrews 12:28. The past also supplies a powerful motive to holiness of life. "We love Him because He first loved us." Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins. "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." The love of Christ constraineth us, "because we thus judge, that, if one died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for all that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them and rose again."

This transformation, both moral and physical, being completed, the saints shall be honoured with a share in the administration of the Kingdom of God, with the Christ their Lord and Head. As kings and priests, they "shall reign on the earth," over restored Israel and other nations. And the question presents itself, Is there anything in such a kingdom to justify the term "Carnal," which some have applied to it? Is it

not better entitled to be called a spiritual kingdom than the Christian Church, even in its best days? And infinitely more so than the church of modern times?

And if Jesus and His Apostles preached the glad tidings of this future kingdom of God, how can modern gospel-preachers, who do not believe in such a kingdom, escape the condemnation of being “blind teachers of the blind?” And how should we, who profess to see, prize the precious privilege of “knowing the joyful sound,” and seek to rivet the attention of our fellow-men upon this glorious kingdom?

J. CAMERON. Edinburgh.

---

## **In Adam and In Christ**

**"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall  
all be made alive" - 1 Corinthians 15:22.**

This passage is very little understood because the general statement of Scripture is left out of account. The foremost reason is the preconceived idea of the fall of Adam which according to the 9th Article of Faith in the Church of England, is a physical change of nature (“Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, but it is in the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam”). Hence the following list of principles :- ‘the Justice of God's Law;’ ‘The Federal Principle;’ ‘The Death that came by man;’ ‘the Death that Christ died;’ - these and the first quotation are left to the confusion of each other.

Of course there are many ways of getting round the difficulties. Here is one: That all in Adam is like a large circle which includes every soul from Eden to the end of the 1,000 years; that all in Christ is like a small circle within the larger one. While we agree that in comparison with the whole of the descendants of Adam, the called chosen or enlightened are few in number, we have no fear in saying that this idea does not meet the case.

If “in Adam” means the physical nature which is the condemnation passed upon all men, then we are in Adam when we are in Christ, because the condemnation is with us so long as we live and even after resurrection, as we are supposed to rise with it. Here we are faced with a flat contradiction of Romans 8:1 which states that “there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,” and the words of Jesus recorded in John 5:24, “He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation but is passed from (or out of) death into life.” Two passages which prove the justice of God’s Law.

It is a general idea that natural death is the result of Adam's sin and that he paid the price 930 years after he had been typically forgiven and redeemed. Also that irrespective of his death all have to pay it individually. Then, the greatest stumbling block of all is that our Beloved Master went through such an awful and dreadful ordeal to pay the price of sin, which could have been avoided if natural death would have sufficed, and each had a part to pay before Redemption could be accomplished. Thus the death of Jesus is made to be a mere side issue in comparison with the love and justice of God and the necessity of such a loving sacrifice which Jesus so willingly save for the sin of the world.

Referring to the context of the chapter (1 Corinthians 15) we read “Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.” Not to save us from dying. First natural; if natural death is the condemnation Christ died in vain and all have perished.

Is there a difference between “dying in Adam” and “the soul that sinneth it shall die”? (Ezekiel 18:20).

Is there any difference between: -

1. The results of the death of the ignorant (Psalm 49:20; Isaiah 26:14; Romans 2:12; John 3:21),
2. The enlightened responsible (James 4:17), and
3. Those who die in Christ (1 Corinthians 15)?



How does a person get “in Christ”? Is this a physical change of nature? Can a person be in Christ before being made incorruptible after resurrection?

Here we give some evidence in harmony with Scripture: -

“For an individual cannot be in a federal person unless introduced into him” - Dr. Thomas in “Elpis Israel” - page 134 and “Baptism is the means of the present (legal) union with Christ, There is a passing out of Adam into Christ” - Robert Roberts.

Are we unreasonable to think that there is a legal union with Christ and Adam as federal heads in contrast to the physical?

How does a person become “in Adam”? Is it not upon the same principle of enlightenment and realising that we have been introduced into him by law? Have we not got to die by law to Adamic relationship just as the Jew did to the law? (Romans 7:4). Did not Paul recognise that he was alive without the law, though a Pharisee and that (the) sin revived and he died? (Romans 7:10; Romans 8:2; Galatians 2:19). While the Laws of Death and Life are over all they are not operative until we are introduced or enlightened and responsible to such laws.

Adam and Jesus are our “Doctrinal Fathers,” and only when we are cognisant of the facts are we related to the respective laws and consequences. The ignorant are not in either of these categories, and we have full confidence in the Justice of God as to His requirements. We have no doubt that no man dies because of Adam’s sin, or responsible for it (Deuteronomy 24:16; Ezekiel 18:20).

Cannot we now see that there is a big difference between God “winking at the ignorant,” who perish like the beasts, and the just punishment of those who know and obey not His commandments (Mark 16:16; Luke 19:27).

To sum up; all in Adam die as the wages of sin is the second death, and natural death will not be taken into account. All in Christ shall be made alive (Greek *Zoe*) irrespective of being naturally dead. The “all” in each case is the “all” in their respective category, with the exclusion of the ignorant. So it should be plain from all angles that this verse means exactly what it says, without any confusion or contradiction.

“Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness and His wonderful works to the children of men” - Psalm 107:8. What wonderful wisdom and Divine justice in Mercy and a glorious solution to a problem so simple which the babes can see, and yet is hid from the wise and prudent of this world.

Brother F.J.Pearce.

---

## **A DIALOGUE ON FAITH AND WORKS.**

**Thomas:** My attention has lately been directed to the subject of faith and works in their relation to eternal life, and I maintain that those persons are in error who contend that works, in any sense, are the cause or occasion of immortality.

**James:** Then am I to understand that the result of your investigation has decided you that eternal life is a gift unconditional, and has absolutely no relation to works?

**Thomas:** I will undertake to prove that salvation, or eternal life, does not depend at all on works.

**James:** As my study of the Scriptures has not led me to the same conclusion, I should like to hear how you have arrived at that conviction.

**Thomas:** Well: there are several portions of testimony which appear to me so plain as to admit of no doubt in the matter.

**James:** I am glad you propose to stablish the case by direct testimony, as that is always more satisfactory to my own mind than inference.

**Thomas:** Let us turn, then, to Paul’s writings. “Being justified freely by his grace - we conclude that a man is justified by faith.” Again, “the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus,” These passages exclude works entirely, and teach that justification, righteousness, salvation, or eternal life is of faith, “not of works, lest any man should boast.”

**James:** I have followed your quotations, taken from several verses of Romans iii. and ix., and in doing so have noticed something you have not mentioned, which conveys a somewhat different idea to what I gathered from you at first.

**Thomas:** What is that? If it will throw any fresh light upon the matter it will please me; but whatever it is I do not think it will go against my argument.

**James:** Well, however that may be, let us look at it. Did I understand you rightly that works in no sense were concerned with the gift of eternal life?

**Thomas:** Yes; that is what I mean.

**James:** And to support that proposition, you have quoted those sayings of Paul?

**Thomas:** Precisely so.

**James:** What I beg you to notice, then, is that, while you exclude works as a whole, or all and every sort of works, Paul is speaking there only of a particular kind of works, namely, the works of the law of Moses, so that the texts fail to establish your position. You will see at once what I mean. For instance: "By the deeds of the law," that is, the law of Moses, "shall no flesh be justified." Again, "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested." To prove your proposition, you must find testimony which sets aside, not merely the works enjoined by Moses' law, but all other works; for if, as you know very well, the terms of the proof are not equal to the terms of the proposition, the case falls to the ground. Your proposition excludes all works, but your proof excludes only the works of Moses' law, therefore it is not equal to your proposition; consequently, you have thus far failed to sustain your case.

**Thomas:** I confess that that view of the matter has rather surprised me, and for the moment I do not know how to answer you, because I cannot call to mind a text which does exclude all works.

**James:** I know of no such text. I believe every passage in which works are disparaged refers, as the context will show, to works of a particular kind.

**Thomas:** What about the second verse of the fourth chapter? "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God."

**James:** True; the law is not mentioned in that particular verse, neither is it in some others; but from the general context, it is unmistakeable that the deeds of the law are the only works the Apostle had in his mind. Paul's object in referring to Abraham was to show that he was justified before the law came into force; therefore his justification could not depend on the works of the law, which Jews held paramount. But this argument does deny the necessity of works in the absolute sense; for the Apostle exhorts, in the same chapter, to "walk in the steps of that faith which he had being yet uncircumcised."

**Thomas:** What were those steps of faith?

**James:** I take the passage to allude to everything the patriarch did as a sign of his faith in God, up to the time he received the covenant of circumcision.

**Thomas:** But how can we walk in those steps?

**James:** First allow me to observe that Paul is here arguing against Judaism, so that we must be careful how we introduce ourselves into the case. The object was to show that a man could, as Abraham did, walk with, that is, obey God, without obeying their law, and could be saved without it. But it by no means follows that Abraham or we could be saved without any act of obedience whatever.

**Thomas:** I perceive what you mean, and confess that it appears reasonable; but I cannot at present give up my position altogether.

**James:** No man ought to yield until he is fully convinced. But what else do you rely on?

**Thomas:** I rely on the meaning of the word gift. If eternal life is the gift of God, how can it be procurable by anything we can do?

**James:** The import of the word is not difficult to determine. The word is 'charisma', which means free gift. The question now is -

**Thomas:** Excuse the interruption; but that seems rather to strengthen my view: free gift.

**James:** Well; I was about to enquire in what sense the gift is free?

**Thomas:** I understand it to be free from anything we perform to secure it.

**James:** I cannot see how that can be the proper meaning, for the Apostle expressly declares that God will give eternal life to them who by well-doing seek it.

**Thomas:** But I do not perceive in what other way the gift could be free except the way I just mentioned.

**James:** Allow me to give an illustration. When the Queen offers a prize to be competed for by the volunteers, that is a free gift on her part; she is under no obligation to give such a gift, nevertheless the gift must be sought and won before it can be bestowed. This is quite compatible with Paul's teaching. Concerning eternal life, he says: "Now they (the Greeks in the Olympic games) do it to obtain a corruptible crown (of olive); but we an incorruptible." God was under no necessity to offer man the gift of eternal life,

it was therefore free or gracious on His part to make the offer; but that fact by no means rendered all works on our part nugatory.

**Thomas:** I am not prepared to refute what you say, but there are other things which uphold my view.

**James:** Pray, what are they? I should like to consider them.

**Thomas:** One thing is that John seems to teach that knowledge, not acts, is the key to eternal life.

**James:** Do you allude to the passage, "this is eternal life to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent?"

**Thomas:** That is the text. And it seems to me to exclude works; to know God is sufficient.

**James:** That suggests the query, What is to be understood by knowing God, and how do we know that we know Him? John's answer is, "And hereby do we know that we know him if we keep His commandments." The converse is, that if we do not keep his commandments we do not know Him. The text therefore destroys your doctrine and builds up mine.

**Thomas:** I do indeed appear to be losing ground and to have been too confident. But let me ask you how a person who had done no more than be baptized, who in fact had died, how such a person could be saved if his eternal life hinges upon continuing in well doing."

**James:** In answering your question, I feel surprised to hear you say "if eternal life hinges on continuing." There is no room for your "if;" the inspired Paul, says it does, and it is for us to reconcile that statement with any apparently conflicting statement.

**Thomas:** How then do you propose to reconcile it.

**James:** Very easily indeed. First; no one can continue in what he has not begun, and no one can continue beyond the end of life. Now Paul does not specify how long a person must continue; he leaves that to circumstances. If a man were to die immediately after baptism, it is manifest he had continued as long as it was possible. No more could be said of a man who walked worthy for fifty years. And seeing Christ says, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," the first man's salvation would be as sure as the second.

**Thomas:** Do you mean then to affirm that works are necessary to salvation?

**James:** I affirm that there can be no salvation without obedience, and that the first step in obedience is into the waters of baptism, and that all the faith in the world, without that act, is dead.

**Thomas:** To be sure, I do not believe that Paul teaches a contrary doctrine to James.

**James:** Well, Paul told the Philippians to work out their own salvation; and if as I have heard you argue, salvation and eternal life are interchangeable terms, then Paul said "work out your own eternal life" which is equivalent to his teaching in Romans; "to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, honour, incorruptibility, God will render eternal life." This well doing, which begins with the first act of obedience, is not the cause of eternal life; but it is the occasion of our receiving it. Our baptism does cause God to offer us life, but it secures to us the life he previously offered.

**Thomas:** Would you say then that we earn eternal life?

**James:** I can see no objection to that form of words. Paul exhorts us to fight so as to win; to run so as to obtain. But for God's grace in offering eternal life, all we could do would avail nothing: but He having freely offered it to us we may earn, win, or obtain it by an obedient faith.

**Thomas:** But does not that sound too much like making it a matter of wages, therefore of debt?

**James:** Not at all. Men who pay wages are under the obligation to arrange for work to be done, and when the work is done they are indebted to the doers of it; but God is under no such obligation and is indebted to no creature.

**Thomas:** Though I have not been able to prove my view nor to answer you, I am glad the conversation has been held, and I shall carefully review all you have said.

Brother Edward Turney

---

## Bro. F. Hodgkinson's "Quotation."

"I add" says Bro. Hodgkinson, Cn. p. 555 "one quotation to the heap of testimony which I have not noticed in the argument. "Paul tells us that it is appointed unto men once to die." Hebrews 9:27. "Was Jesus a man? If he was a man he was appointed unto death. This is short and easy of digestion to a dainty soul."

We reply: Some things which easily pass into the stomach are not ‘easy of digestion.’ The more “dainty” the soul, the greater the difficulty.

Where is the flaw in Bro. Hodgkinson’s bit of logic? Let us see. Is man appointed to die because he is man; or because he is a sinner? If because he is a man, then Adam was at first appointed to die. But that is not true. Life was offered to him, but by his sins death came. It was then not because he was a man, but because he was a sinner, that death entered the world. Therefore Jesus, though a man, was not under sentence to die. The Eden sentence only falls on sinners. If Bro. H. says Jesus was under that sentence, let him prove Jesus to be a sinner, and we will believe him. Adam was a man as much before as after the fall. The appointment of Jesus to die was not a natural or inherited appointment, but a sacrificial one, and for this to be efficient, He Himself must be “holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners.” A spotless sin offering on whom the sins of the world were divinely laid.

Notwithstanding all the calumny heaped on us, we are desirous above measure that all the brethren should see this glorious truth.

Brother Edward Turney

---

### **1 John 5:3,**

“For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments.  
And His commandments are not burdensome.  
For whatever engendered by God overcomes the world.  
And this is the victory that has overcome the world - our faith.  
Who is he who overcomes the world, but he who believes that  
Jesus is the Son of God?

---

### **From a facebook forum**

**Dan:** Instead of truth concentrate on love and on faithfulness...and upon freedom. Truth will follow after that. My opinion is to throw away the truth tests. Do not be protective of fellowship any more. Fellowship with anyone who says they follow Jesus without testing their understanding of doctrines. My advice about teachers is don't test their doctrines but their actions, and make sure they're not ignorant. Also don't go looking for them but make your own people study. They should know the Bible but also History. Soon new wolves will arise to try and become your leaders. That is unavoidable, but do not seek out leaders or look for teachers. If you live in peace without nit-picking about who is right, then those new wolves will have no bite. If you go looking for teachers then you will only attract people who will tell you what you want to hear, and then they will take control. James 1:5. Matthew 25:25 2 Timothy 4:3.

**Russell:** Jesus said, "the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." (John 4:23,24). Does this refer to true doctrine?

**Mike:** Russell - I certainly hope not. I think that’s a human addition and I think that doctrinally based unity is a fragile myth. If doctrinal purity is required for salvation we are all, every single one of us, completely finished. Happily we both know that we are saved by Grace alone through faith alone in Him alone. Our works and our doctrinal machinations or our denomination cannot and will not save us. We are made safe in Him by Grace.

**Russell:** Mike, Jesus said, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him." (John 7:16 - 18) . Surely this is the true doctrine.

**Mike:** Russell. Yes! A large amount of what Jesus taught doesn't make into Statements of Faith's or other doctrinal menus as those doctrines focus on differences and conversely a lot of what passes as doctrine today is simply the musings of men or a very selective view of the whole council of God. Jesus summarised the whole Old Testament into one sentence. Blessings bro.

**Mike:** I think we should not confuse true worship with "the truth". In spirit first then as a result in truth. Not a list of facts but a frame of mind and disposition of heart.

**Russell:** I am very much against any kind of Statement of Faith as they are divisive. The teachings (doctrines) of Jesus are from God and are important. In my early days of presiding as a young man I made a point of including in my prayers requests for increased knowledge of God's word; increased understanding of it and greater wisdom to use such knowledge and understanding wisely.

It must be obvious that not all of the teaching we hear can be true. My question is, can we worship God in Spirit and in truth if we continually misunderstand what we read in the Bible?

**Mike:** Russell - good question. It is the Spirit that leads us into all truth and God looks on the heart not the head so much. Who is going to determine that we do actually understand or misunderstand His word. God has asked us to dwell in unity not uniformity. It's our hearts He wants not a series of doctrines or understandings in our heads. He can change that in a moment but not a life lived in contention about doctrines and therefore away from Him.

**Russell:** Yes Mike, God does want our hearts. However, He asks us to reason with Him - Isaiah 1:18 – "Come now and let us reason together..." How are we to do this except through Bible study and prayer? He will give us the answers we seek. He will not give different answers. So why do we find different understandings amongst us?

**Mike:** Russell, I don't know. There is but one Holy Spirit that leads us into all truth (that matters) that is the indwelling presence of Jesus and our Father. There will always, always be differences and that is why we are called to live in unity not uniformity. The differences are the reason for this command. The oneness of the body of Christ is absolute and it is absolutely without division. If we see division, particularly internal division we should deeply question whether what we are looking at really is the body of Christ or even a part of it. Some put "uniformity" to a doctrinal code above Gods requirement of living together in unity. Sad really.

---

### A Man Born Blind Receives Sight (John 9)

As Jesus passed by, He saw a man who was blind from birth. And His disciples asked Him, saying, "Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" Jesus answered, "Neither this man nor his parents sinned, but that the works of God should be revealed in him. I must work the works of Him who sent me while it is day; the night is coming when no one can work. As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world."

When He had said these things, He spat on the ground and made clay with the saliva; and He anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay. And He said to him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam" (which is translated, Sent). So he went and washed, and came back seeing. Therefore the neighbours and those who previously had seen that he was blind said, "Is not this he who sat and begged?" Some said, "This is he." Others said, "He is like him." He said, "I am he."

Therefore they said to him, "How were your eyes opened?" He answered and said, "A Man called Jesus made clay and anointed my eyes and said to me, 'Go to the pool of Siloam and wash.' So I went and washed, and I received sight." Then they said to him, "Where is He?" He said, "I do not know."



They brought him who formerly was blind to the Pharisees. Now it was a Sabbath when Jesus made the clay and opened his eyes. Then the Pharisees also asked him again how he had received his sight. He said to them, "He put clay on my eyes, and I washed, and I see." Therefore some of the Pharisees said, "This Man is not from God, because He does not keep the Sabbath." Others said, "How can a man who is a sinner do such signs?" And there was a division among them.

They said to the blind man again, "What do you say about Him because He opened your eyes?" He said, "He is a prophet." But the Jews did not believe concerning him, that he had been blind and received his sight, until they called the parents of him who had received his sight. And they asked them, saying, "Is this your son, who you say was born blind? How then does he now see?" His parents answered them and said, "We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind; but by what means he now sees we do not know, or who opened his eyes we do not know. He is of age; ask him. He will speak for himself." His parents said these things because they feared the Jews, for the Jews had agreed already that if anyone confessed that He was Christ, he would be put out of the synagogue. Therefore his parents said, "He is of age; ask him."

So they again called the man who was blind, and said to him, "Give God the glory! We know that this Man is a sinner." He answered and said, "Whether He is a sinner or not I do not know. One thing I know: that though I was blind, now I see." Then they said to him again, "What did He do to you? How did He open your eyes?" He answered them, "I told you already, and you did not listen. Why do you want to hear it again? Do you also want to become His disciples?"

Then they reviled him and said, "You are His disciple, but we are Moses' disciples. We know that God spoke to Moses; as for this fellow, we do not know where He is from."

The man answered and said to them, "Why, this is a marvellous thing, that you do not know where He is from; yet He has opened my eyes! Now we know that God does not hear sinners; but if anyone is a worshiper of God and does His will, He hears him. Since the world began it has been unheard of that anyone opened the eyes of one who was born blind. If this Man were not from God, He could do nothing." They answered and said to him, "You were completely born in sins, and are you teaching us?" And they cast him out.

Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when He had found him, He said to him, "Do you believe in the Son of God?" He answered and said, "Who is He, Lord, that I may believe in Him?" And Jesus said to him, "You have both seen Him and it is He who is talking with you." Then he said, "Lord, I believe!" And he worshiped Him. And Jesus said, "For judgment I have come into this world, that those who do not see may see, and that those who see may be made blind."

Then some of the Pharisees who were with Him heard these words, and said to Him, "Are we blind also?" Jesus said to them, "If you were blind, you would have no sin; but now you say, 'We see.' Therefore your sin remains."

---

## **Gradual Apostacy.**

THE Bible was not proscribed till the fourth century - the idolatry of Popery did not commence till then - the clergy were not forbidden to marry till then. Infallibility was not claimed till the seventh century - the service was not performed in an unknown tongue before that time - purgatory was introduced then - Transubstantiation was not introduced till the eighth century. Half communion was not begun till the eleventh century. Priestly absolution and excommunication were powers not claimed till the twelfth century; nor till then was it determined that there should be seven sacraments. The sacrifice of mass, the worship of the host, and auricular confession were established only in the thirteenth century.

# Death By Sin

## **"If these men die the common death of all men..."**

So universal is the belief among Christians that natural death is the wages of sin that one almost despairs of obtaining even a hearing for, much less consideration of, the reasonable but rather less common view that in Scripture, death and death are sometimes two different things.

It is entirely true that in Romans 5:12 the Apostle Paul says "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;" and if a person elects to believe that he is there speaking of natural death and blankly refuses to consider any possible alternative, then so far as that one is concerned the matter is at an end.

There are however, some very sound reasons for thinking that we ought to go a little below the surface. Is Paul referring to the self-evident fact of the natural order, that men have died, are dying and will go on dying so long as they remain a race of corruptible creatures? Or is he explaining to enlightened believers the Divine laws which govern their relationship to God and which will determine their ultimate and eternal destiny?

If it is the purpose of this passage in Romans to establish that natural death, or corruptibility, became the law of our nature because of sin, then it must follow that before he sinned Adam must have been of a different nature, and we are back to changed nature, which as we have already seen, is an untenable view.

Here again we may call Dr. Thomas to witness, this time from *Elpis Israel*, page 72,

"The animal nature will sooner or later dissolve. It was not constituted so as to continue in life for ever independent of any further modification. We may admit therefore, the corruptibility and consequent mortality of their nature without saying they were mortal. "

There is no doubt whatever that Dr. Thomas was correct here; man as he was created and before he sinned, was corruptible and it necessarily follows that irrespective of whether or not he had sinned, either natural death must have overtaken him or he must have been delivered, as will the righteous living at the return of Christ, by being changed to an incorruptible nature.

In view of this admission by the Doctor and of the unassailable reasoning behind it, what is to become of this second unclean spirit of doctrine which has entered into possession; which affirms that the death which came into the world by sin is the common death of all men, and which is given a certificate of respectability by that same Clause III (or V) of the Statement of Faith where it says: "Adam was sentenced to return to the ground from whence he was taken... a sentence which works out dissolution and death"?

Well, then, it may be asked: If man was already corruptible, before he sinned and while still very good, what was it that came into the world by sin? Paul says it was death - was he right or wrong?

This might appear to be a very knotty problem, and so long as we are satisfied with superficialities it will remain so. It is very easily solved by asking ourselves the question:

"What was the first death of which we have a record?"

It certainly was not Adam's, even though he was the actual sinner; his death did not take place till nearly a millennium afterwards, and it is probable that many of his descendants pre-deceased him.

The answer is, the first death was that of the animal with whose skin Adam was covered. Our opponent replies that this is not stated but merely inference. Perfectly true; neither is it stated "that Adam commenced to die in the day that he sinned." This also is an inference. The former, however, has the advantage that unless we imagine that animals were skinned alive, we know it actually happened. This was not a natural death, it was a sacrificial death; a life cut short by bloodshedding. But it is what that death stands for which makes it important.

The death of a sacrifice signifies that the penalty incurred by sin was not the implantation of corruption but a violent or more precisely, a judicial death; as Robert Roberts said on one occasion, "It was typical of a violent manner of death."

This is put beyond any question by the rite of clothing the man with the skin of the victim, signifying that the death of the sacrifice was the death from which he had been delivered. He died in a legal sense when he transgressed the commandment: he was legally restored to life, after confession and repentance, with the life of the sacrifice. This principle is defined in connection with the prohibition of eating flesh with the blood. "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Leviticus 17:11.

Thus, when Paul says, "By man came death," he is speaking in what may be called a doctrinal sense, of the death which really matters; that sentence which "passes upon" all men when they become responsible sinners, and which will be executed upon such as remain under condemnation, when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, in the second death.

That this is the correct view is proved by the fact that the condemnation can be individually remitted by faith and obedience. Jesus says, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." Paul likewise: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." If the condemnation resulting from sin were natural death, then those in Christ are still under condemnation, for they are still corruptible, and both Paul and Jesus are contradicted.

If death in Scripture is always death, no more, no less, then Christ's words are falsified, because He says a believer has already actually passed from death into life. This is not "prolepsis" - speaking of what is future as though it were present; He is speaking of a death-state and a life-state which exist independently of our physical life or death.

Paul says: "Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." His use of the words "passed upon" implies that he is dealing with something in the nature of a law or sentence. Natural death is not a sentence; it is not passed upon us - we are corruptible and therefore dying because we were created so, as Dr Thomas has said.

The Bible says "The wages of sin is death." If this does indeed mean natural death then God is unjust; because those wages are paid to good and bad alike, saints and sinners. Furthermore, an additional payment is in store for the wicked - the second death. Even human law does not punish the same crime twice; is God less Just? If on the other hand, as we believe, the wages of sin is that death which one contemplates in reading God's charge to Moses: "Bring forth him that hath cursed, without the camp...and all the congregation shall certainly stone him...when he blasphemeth the name he shall be put to death" - then the ways of God are seen to be in strict accord with justice. "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer judgment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the Covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace." (Hebrews 10:28,29).

Only those who have sinned presumptuously and unrepentantly or who have wilfully withstood the grace of God ever have or ever will suffer such punishment; and such a death can truly be said to be the wages of sin.

Some years ago the force of our reasoning reduced Islip Collyer to the straits of denying that Jesus bore the penalty of sin. In commenting on this John Carter wrote one of the strangest things we have ever read. He said: "As for a full penalty of sin, this happens in the unbroken sleep of an unenlightened, unforgiven sinner." One who is unenlightened does not deserve and will not receive any penalty whatsoever. On the other hand, the death of an unforgiven sinner will not be an unbroken sleep - it will be broken by the resurrection to judgment, condemnation and the second death. That is the penalty of sin; and that is how a false theory can make fools of its professors. The sleep of a sinner is no more a part of his punishment than the sleep of a saint part of his reward.

It is utterly wrong to look upon natural death as in any sense the penalty of sin. When it cuts short a life, severs friendships or leaves a loved one desolate, it brings grief and unhappiness, but in the case of the saints or saved ones, their death is a blessed sleep from which they will awake in Immortal Glory.

We conclude that the truth is not as stated in the Statement of Faith, that the sentence on Adam was his return to the ground. This evil spirit of doctrine should be cast out and replaced by the true one; the sentence was not carried out except in symbol; if it had been the human race would never have existed at all.

Unless this is understood and accepted it is impossible to go on to the mighty truths that the mercy of God is from everlasting unto everlasting and that Jesus is the Saviour of all men - specially of them that believe.

Brother Ernest Brady

---

### **Jeremiah 29:13,14.**

“Ye shall seek and find me when ye shall search for me with all your heart,  
and I will be found of you, saith the Lord”

---

## **The Nazarene Faith**

“Without faith it is impossible to please God, for he that cometh to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.” Hebrews 11.

The expression “he that cometh to God” indicates a state of estrangement or alienation and we need to know how this came about and what it implies. The Apostle Paul says:-

“We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin.” Romans 3:9.

What does it mean to be “under sin” or to be alienated? It has nothing to do with our physical nature or our personal character; a person of the highest moral goodness is as much “under sin” as the worst sinner. In the beginning Adam was created of flesh and blood with the same corruptible nature as all other living creatures. He was placed under a law requiring obedience. He transgressed a simple command and thus incurred the penalty of sin. What actually followed and all other instances of the punishment of sin shows that this was a judicial execution. Instead, God introduced the plan of redemption and by a typical sacrifice saved Adam, and by means of the federal principle opened to man the hope of regaining by faith that which had been lost by disobedience.

In Romans 5:19, Paul shows how God regards all men as involved in the sin of Adam, “By one man’s disobedience many were made (i.e. legally constituted) sinners.” The sentence of death incurred by Adam “passes upon” all his descendants, since all who have been born from him would have perished in him if he had in fact been put to death. Adam then, is thus appointed the federal head of all who are under the reign of sin and who, if they do not repent and obey the gospel will receive sin’s wages, an inflicted judicial death, at the judgment. Sin is literally the transgression of law; however, those who have no understanding of God’s purpose are not to be held accountable. God will not punish anyone who is ignorant of His laws for not obeying them. Nevertheless sin is also personified as a king or master to whom man is in servitude. The reason for this is given in Galatians 3:22, “the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.”

Thus, it is shown that God has appointed a second federal head, Jesus Christ, and the field for the operation of the faith which is pleasing to God is the relationship of the individual to these two and how one may elect to leave the bondage of the one and enter the service of the other.

The vital element in the Divine Plan is law. God purposes to show His love for man but He will not do so at the expense of the supremacy of law. A simple exercise of unconditional forgiveness would have shown mercy, but it would not have upheld the principles of justice, law and right, which are absolute to God. They are met by the sacrifice of Christ. Under supreme law a sinner forfeits his life; death is not so much a punishment as a debt - he owes that which he cannot pay without perishing. If someone else could be found with the means to pay his debt and not perish, and providing the supreme arbiter sanctions the transaction, the sinner might be released from his debt without violation of the law.

When Jesus suffered the death He made Himself the sin-bearer, He translated into reality the deliverance foreshadowed in Eden. He literally gave His life a ransom for many, paying with His own undeserved death the debt of the race, the life of ransom for many, paying with his own undeserved death the debt of the race, the life forfeited by Adam. His death was therefore substitutionary - not in the sense that God required to be appeased by inflicting unmerited punishment on an innocent one in order that guilty ones might escape, as held by early theologians, but in the sense that when he submitted himself voluntarily to the unjust condemnation of wicked men, Jesus was knowingly implementing the purpose of God to purchase mankind back from the bondage of sin by Himself paying the price of their release. Thus, by the full and exact discharge of its claims, the law was met and at the same time the love and mercy of God is wonderfully shown in and through the Lord Jesus Christ in that he was the redemptive offering.

The Divine plan of salvation is unique; it has no parallel in the perfection with which its various factors fit together. Seeing that every descendant of Adam is born in bondage, the problem which caused prophets to enquire and search diligently and which even "angels desired to look into," was how any member of the race could bring salvation, since no man could have the means in his possession to pay the ransom. This great mystery was solved by the Almighty in bringing His own Son into the world. Formed of a woman, He was the same natural flesh and blood as all other men, but since He was directly begotten by the overshadowing power of the Highest, He was born outside the prison and was therefore in a position to redeem or release those who were in captivity. Had He derived His life from Adam through a human father, even though personally sinless it would have been impossible for His death to meet the legal claim of sin against the race. Being the Son of God, and proving Himself obedient under trial, He was both legally and morally an example of the perfect man, and in that condition He both could and did, commend the love of God towards us in that while we were yet sinners, He died for us. Thus, on the federal principle of the many covered by the one, Christ dies in the stead of Adam and us in him, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God and that we all might be one in him.

---

## **The Coming of the Son of Man**

"And there will be signs in the sun, in the moon, and in the stars; and on the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them from fear and the expectation of those things which are coming on the earth, for the powers of the heavens will be shaken. Then they will see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. Now when these things begin to happen, look up and lift up your heads, because your redemption draws near."

"Then He spoke to them a parable: "Look at the fig tree, and all the trees. When they are already budding, you see and know for yourselves that summer is now near. So you also, when you see these things happening, know that the kingdom of God is near.

Assuredly, I say to you, this generation will by no means pass away till all things take place. Heaven and earth will pass away, but My words will by no means pass away. But take heed to yourselves, lest your hearts be weighed down with carousing, drunkenness, and cares of this life, and that Day come on you unexpectedly. For it will come as a snare on all those who dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch therefore, and pray always that you may be counted worthy[to escape all these things that will come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man."

**Luke 21:25 to 36**