



THE COVENANT MESSAGE

FOR GOD, LAW AND KINGDOM

PUBLISHED BY THE FEDERATION OF THE COVENANT PEOPLE,
P.O. BOX 830, HONEYDEW, 2040, REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA.

VOLUME 55

NUMBER 5.

THE 'SEED OF MAN' AND THE 'SEED OF BEAST'

A SEQUEL TO THE DEATH OF ONE-WORLDISM

by W.G. Finlay

Editor's Note: Since the mailing of the last edition of *The Covenant Message*, Volume 55, Number 4, we have been amazed at the immediate and favourable response by readers to the main article – The Death of One-Worldism. Phone calls and letters have been received commending the article and asking if the subject of “Original Sin” could be enlarged on, for as one correspondent put it: “Original Sin” is the root cause of the guilt complex which we in Christianity have and are suffering. This complex is counter-productive and contributes in no small measure to the cringing and ever-apologising attitude of our nations in relationship to other people. And so, in compliance with the request of so many, we present another look at the subject from a different angle.

“Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man, and with the seed of beast” (Jer. 31:27).

An old Roman proverb once taught – “Call a man a dog, and he will be a dog” – to which one may add – “Call a man a guilty and depraved person and he will feel guilty and depraved, and feeling both guilty and depraved, he will act accordingly.” An un-named modern philosopher has said that “The closer one gets to the Truth, the further one gets from orthodoxy” and as one begins to apply reason to one’s religious convictions and begins to analyse early historical developments within the Christian era, the philosopher’s words begin to take on a new meaning. Consider

for a moment the statement by Chrysostom, the fourth century Archbishop of Constantinople when he said: “Great is the force of deceit provided it is not excited by a treacherous intention” or Eusebius, the Bishop of Caesarea who stated that he would omit in his historical works whatever might tend to discredit the Church, and he would magnify whatever might contribute to the glory of the Church. Dean Milman once wrote: “It was admitted and avowed that to deceive into Christianity was so valuable a service as to hallow deceit itself.”

To many, these few quotes from churchmen will be rejected as pure fantasy – as unworthy of any Christian teacher and totally at variance with the Way provided by the Lord Jesus Christ. One wonders how the same people react to the following New Testament statements spoken by Paul, the founder of Christianity when he said: “. . . being crafty, I caught you with guile” (2nd Cor. 12:16) or when he said that whatsoever is done should be done to the glory of God (1st Cor. 10:31) and then in Romans 3:7 stated that the truth of God “hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory.” This, of course, is part and parcel of orthodoxy which certainly makes one wonder just how far from the Truth Christians have been led in pursuit of man-made doctrines and church-created rituals!

As has been mentioned in previous articles Tertullian, the second century church father, once preached that religion, by its very nature, “required the active subversion of reason – the belief in the irrational because it is irrational . . . belief is the primary fact. There is nothing

further . . . to be ignorant of everything outside the rule of faith is to possess all knowledge . . .” Now, “reason” which Tertullian contended should be subverted by religion, is the principal faculty which distinguishes man from the animal kingdom and as must be obvious, to do as Tertullian suggested namely to subvert reason, would be to approximate the condition of the brutes of the jungle. Strangely enough, this is precisely what Jeremiah wrote as would be the condition within the house of Israel and the house of Judah in the days wherein the LORD assured that He would build and plant them again.

The “Seed of Man”

As it was promised that the time would come when the house of Israel and the house of Judah would be sown with the “seed of man”, it would serve at this point to note the Hebrew words which have been translated as “man” in English and the meaning of those original Hebrew words. There are four principal Hebrew words translated as “man” in the Bible and are (1) Adam (2) Ish (3) Enosh and (4) Geber — all of which have their own particular meaning, although the translators have seen fit to translate them all simply as “man”.

The first occasion in which the English word “man” appears is of course, in Genesis 1:26 — “And God (Elohiym) said, Let us make man (Adam) in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man (Adam) in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.” In the Hebrew text, the word “Adam” in these verses appears without the article and merely indicates the creation (Heb. *bara*) of a person whose physical attributes were characterised by the ruddiness of his complexion or, as Dr. James Strong states in his Concordance, “to show blood (in the face) i.e. to flush or turn rosy.” So then the word “Adam” was descriptive of that creation’s appearance — a feature which is entirely missing when one considers verse twenty-four in that first chapter which describes the human species, as distinct from the animal and reptilian, as the *chay*, the “living of the earth”. However, Adam in verses twenty-six and twenty-seven are described by the name given them which shows that there were others than the White or ruddy race at some uncalendared period in time.

As is plainly recorded, Adam (the White or ruddy) was created male and female at the same time which of course was necessary if they were to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth. This feature is absent when one comes to the second chapter in Genesis which cannot, despite theological arguments to the contrary, be taken as merely a reiteration of the first chapter. The

Bible record does not say what happened within the community of the White or ruddy race and its descendants nor why the LORD God (Yahveh Elohiym) formed (Heb. *yatsar*) THE Adam (the article is present in all Hebrew texts here) out of the dust of the ground and placed him in the specially fenced area and committed him to dressing and keeping the “garden”. There is no mention of THIS Adam having dominion over the fish, fowl, cattle and everything that creeps on the earth, nor is there any command to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth with his kind — an impossibility as Eve had not yet been formed.

Before dealing with the “sin” of THE Adam which could not be imputed to the first White or ruddy people nor the “living of the earth”, it would serve to note the other Hebrew words which the translators simply made “man” in the scriptures. The Hebrew word for consideration is *Ish* or *Ishah*, the former being used to describe a male or a husband in contrast to a woman or a wife where the latter word is used. Enosh or the variant of the name Enoch is used as a proper name in Genesis 4:17 as the son of Cain and in Genesis 5:6 as the son of Seth the replacement for Abel whom Cain slew. Although not part of the theme in this article, it is most interesting to note the story of Cain as it appears in the Bible and which shows something of scribal manipulation in those early Genesis chapters.

As all will know, Genesis 4 relates that because Abel’s “Blood offering” was more acceptable to the LORD Who throughout the Bible story relates that He never wanted nor wished for propitiatory sacrifice, Cain therefore slew his brother. Now, if Law was in operation at that time, Cain should have paid for his crime with his own life but, as all will know, this did not happen. Cain was condemned to expulsion from the Adamic earth to be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth with every man’s hand against him. However, as one passes to the sixteenth verse of Genesis 4, one finds that Cain did not become the wandering criminal prescribed in verse fourteen nor is he depicted as being treated as an outcast by the people from outside the Adamic earth. Instead, one finds that Cain became the founder of a city and his descendants, whom one would expect to share his curse as wanderers in a sterile earth, were projected in the honourable role as the inventors of the civilised arts of music, metal-working and agriculture generally. Something is therefore very much awry with the Genesis account which certainly calls for further examination and elucidation.

However, to return to the usage of the name of Enos or Enoch when translated simply as “man”, one finds this so used for the first time in Genesis 6:4 — a feature which is only ascertained if one uses a reliable concordance to evaluate word meanings. The following are the first two verses of Genesis six with the relevant Hebrew words included next to those which in English, are translated as “men”. “And it came to pass, when men

(Adam) began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, That the sons of God (Elohiym) saw the daughters of men (Adam) that they were fair; and they took them wives (Ishshâh) of all which they chose." It is only in the latter portion of verse four that a change is to be noted in that instead of "men" being translated from Adam, it is recorded as Enos. "... and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men (Adam), and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men (Adam), which were of old, men (Enos) of renown." As the result of the crossing of the "sons of Elohiym" (those created in Genesis 1?) with the "daughters of Adam", the children were described as "men (Enos) of a name" – the name literally describing what they were. Dr. Bullinger states that *enos* means "one who is morally depraved, physically frail and weak and characterised by inability in all departments of life."

The fourth Hebrew word which is rendered as "man" on sixty-seven occasions is "Geber" which on one occasion only is rendered as "mighty" in Genesis 6:4. Its meaning is somewhat obscure and one is left to wonder why it was ever used. The following are passages where the word "Geber" appears and as will be seen, does nothing to provide light on its meaning; Exodus 10:11; 12:37; 1st Sam. 16:18; 2nd Sam. 23:1; Numbers 24:3,15 etc.

The "Seed of Beast"

From the brief consideration of the word "man", attention is now directed to the term "seed of beast" as used by Jeremiah. In the English translation of Genesis 1:24, one is confronted with the word "beast" as in the phrase "beast of the earth" but the context shows, if one is honest, that the English translation is a very poor one and has led to more than a little confusion. "And God (Elohiym) said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature (Heb. *nephesh*, that which has self; conscious life as opposed to unconscious life as manifest in plant life) after its kind, cattle (Heb. *behêmâh*, the dumb beast, any and all quadrupeds in other words the animal kingdom), and the creeping thing (Heb. *ramas*, the reptilian family), and the beast (Heb. *chay*, a living person) of the earth after its kind: and it was so." Thus, in reading through the Old Testament and noting the English word "beast" appearing in a text, one should take the trouble to check the Hebrew word and note whether it is a "living person" or a quadruped, one of the animal kingdom. The phrase used by Jeremiah is "*zerah behêmâh*" which literally translated should be "the seed of the brute animal".

Now, to apply Jeremiah's analogy of Israel being sown with the "seed of man" (Adam) and the "seed of beast" (*behêmâh*) one cannot help but equate this with the condition which currently

obtains within the company of nations which this Federation identifies as the true modern development of the Covenant people – Israel. The fact of being sown with the seed or "fruit" of Adam can only refer to the disobedience which highlights the Adamic story in the Bible and is this not a characteristic of the Israel company of nations which today profess to be Christian insofar as their religion is concerned? Obedience to the whole body of Constitutional Law as given to Israel has not been taught among God's Covenant People since the antinomian (lawless) doctrine of "grace" was introduced and was said to have replaced that Law. Heedless of the fact that the Christ of God stated with all emphasis that the Law enjoyed continuing validity – and this notwithstanding those who held and taught partiality in the Law (Matt. 5:19) – until heaven and earth passed, today's Covenant People prefer to believe that "A man is justified by faith *without* the deeds of the law" (Rom. 3:28). Thus the Law of the LORD which gave content and meaning to the existence of Israel is now abandoned in favour of Lawlessness which, dominated by a nebulous faith, continues to engender disobedience – the disobedience of Adam – in the Covenant People today.

Insofar as the "seed of beast" is concerned, this, as with the "seed of man", is plainly demonstrated in the Anglo-Celto-Saxon and kindred North-Western European nations who have been coerced, by their religious leaders, into discarding *reason where their religion is concerned*. As was noted earlier, Tertullian, the 2nd Century church father, is on record as having taught that religion, by its very nature, "... *required the active subversion of reason*", and if one is obedient to this injunction, the person who discards this principal faculty which distinguishes him from the brute beasts, becomes no better than the beasts. The incredible paradox in true Israel today is that this company of nations, which have provided the genius which has created all the benefits enjoyed by the earth's many millions in this twentieth century, this company of nations which have shown that it has been dominated by the spirit of research and enquiry, has been rendered spiritually inert because the reason and logic which has characterised their pioneers in political life, has been deliberately suppressed as contrary to spiritual growth. Thus, this discrediting of reason and logic in religion, reduces God's Covenant People to the level of beasts and makes them spiritual slaves to those who formulate and implement the orthodoxy of the day.

Logic and Reason Concerning Original Sin

The Biblical story of Adam and Eve has been available in the English language since the middle of the sixteenth century and although there have been individuals who have rejected it on the basis



The generally accepted picture of the expulsion from 'the Garden'

of being contrary to logic and reason, orthodoxy has simply dismissed their protestations and consigned their arguments to the garbage heap of heresy. However, with the passage of time, more and more people are beginning to look for reasons which would account for the incredible guilt complex which afflicts the Western world and are finding this in religion and the doctrine of "original sin". If all men everywhere are under the condemnation of original sin as is stated by Paul (1st Cor. 15:22) and if all men are held accountable for the sin of Adam and dependant on a selective redemption from above (Rom. 11:5), it is small wonder that people simply give up in despair and become totally disinterested in trying to achieve the genetic potential with which they were endowed by their parents. However, "original sin" is a church fallacy and does not exist as even a superficial look into the subject will reveal and is one of veils of blindness which, at the end of the age, will be removed from Israel - Jeremiah 31:29, the scripture which prefaces this article, assures this.

Exploding the Fallacy

Paul's statement in Romans 5:12 and that in 1st Corinthians 15:22 need to be examined here as do Biblical definitions concerning the subject of "sin". In both the pertinent passages, it is stated that ALL sin and ALL die because of one man - Adam. This being so and as "sin" is primary to death, attention is focussed on this subject which according to 1st John 3:4 is explained as a transgression of the Law. Paul however, had a different definition which is most difficult to apply to Adam for he contended that "... whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23). While Abel, Adam's son's name appears at the head of the list in the so-called "Hall of Faith" (Heb. 11:4), that of Adam is entirely missing which makes it doubtful that Paul's definition of "sin" could apply to him. According then to Paul - if "faith" is the yardstick against which violation is measured -

Adam could *not* sin and Paul's whole argument falls to the ground.

The universality of "sin" and its consequent "death" too misses the mark when one considers the Biblical narrative. The "living of the earth" (Gen. 1:24) and the "man" - male and female of Genesis 1:26,27 - received no command nor any Law from the Elohiym other than to "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it" (Gen. 1:28). This was long before the "formation" of THE Adam from the dust of the ground (Gen. 2:7) which makes it utterly ridiculous for them to be held responsible for the behaviour of THE Adam in the "garden". The existence of these other people is admitted in Cain's contention that after his expulsion from the Adamic earth, "... every one that findeth me shall slay me" (Gen. 4:14). This being so, how could ALL sin (Rom. 3:23) and how could the sentence of death be passed on those races who had had nothing to do with THE Adam? Those who lived before THE Adam's time had died *without* any sentence being passed on them - thus indicating that death was part and parcel of the law of nature which, in the fulness of time, takes its toll.

Passing on to THE Adam whom the theologians teach was the first human being to be created and who, being the so-called "head of the human family" introduced the original sin, one finds the Genesis story, which undoubtedly originated in Babylon, full of derogatory implications concerning the Character of the Creator which logic and reason simply cannot accept. The Genesis account of Creation claims that everything that was created was "good" and one has no reason to doubt that the formation of THE Adam was nothing less than perfect too. He was then placed in the "garden" - an environment of perfection - and, in place of the command given to the earlier creation in which they were told to "be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it," Adam's responsibility was limited to "dressing the garden and keeping it." It was at this point that Adam was endowed with "free will" i.e. he was given the freedom to choose and make decisions for himself - which, as must be obvious, introduces the subject of accountability into the Genesis story. Being a "free agent", Adam had to take on the responsibility and the accountability of that status and, if found guilty of any crime as it were, he could justifiably be sentenced to whatever penalty was prescribed for the crime.

These facts introduce a note which places all the responsibility of what Adam was supposed to have done on his shoulders whereas, if one looks at the whole situation, the responsibility for what Adam did, or did not do, must lie in some other direction. An illustration to support this contention is to be found in the case of a watchmaker who makes a chronometer with all the parts necessary for that watch to operate perfectly and he alone is responsible for the way in which it works.

All will surely agree that it would be the height of stupidity to blame the *watch* if it did not operate correctly – the responsibility for the malfunction must surely lie with the watchmaker! Now, Adam did not ask to be formed and there is certainly no evidence to suggest that he had anything to do with the faculties, inclinations and desires with which he had been endowed. Everything that was in Adam, was put there by He Who formed him – how then could he be held accountable for doing what he did, particularly as the means for his malfunction had, according to the Genesis account, been deliberately put there by the Creator.

Genesis – the Babylonian version!



In looking at the overall situation arising from the Genesis account with its many contradictions and its implication wherein the LORD God may be seen in an uncomplimentary light, one cannot help but feel that this record is an *interpretation and not a true history*. It will be recalled that Israel did not boast of a written history and that the Covenants and Promises were handed down from one generation to the other in what is referred to as “the songs of Zion” (Psalm 137:3) i.e. orally. Had there been any written account, as in the case of the Law found in the temple during the reign of Josiah (2nd Kings 22:8), this would have been destroyed when Nebuzar-adan “... burnt the house of the LORD, and the king’s house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man’s house burnt he with fire” (2nd Kings 25:9). This being so, the question naturally arises as to where the history of Israel indeed, where the history of THE Adamic race came from as well as the renewed version of the Law?

According to the Book of Ezra, he, Ezra, “... had prepared his heart to seek the law of the LORD, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments” (Ezra 7:10). However, if one takes the trouble to “prove all things”, one finds that Ezra’s credentials are somewhat spurious for in verse one of that seventh chapter, it is stated that Ezra was “the son of Seraiah, the son of Azariah, the son of Hilkiah.” In 1st Chronicles 6:13 (Ezra’s own account according to most modern theologians), Ezra’s name does not appear in the genealogy of Serajah and even if the omission of Ezra’s name was an error, from the accounts in 2nd Kings 25:18 and Jeremiah 52:24 it would appear that Seraiah died or was killed some 133 years before Ezra was born!

The *Babylonian* scribes, basing their account on “the songs of Zion” – to give some form of

credibility to the masquerade now in operation – intermingled the Truth with the then current Babylonian interpretation of that Truth and so produced considerable controversy with which students have to grapple. This is why the Genesis account is so unacceptable – not the fact of THE Adam but rather the Babylonian priestly slant which was designed to create the need for a priesthood at all times.

Jeremiah Tells of the End of the “Original Sin” Fiction

In returning to Jeremiah 31 and the sowing of the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man and the seed of beast, this, it will be noted is followed by: “And it shall come to pass, that like as I have watched over them, to pluck up, and to break down, and to throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict: so will I watch over them, to build, and to plant, saith the LORD. In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children’s teeth shall be set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge.” This statement was used by Ezekiel while in captivity and once again one finds that the responsibility for the act of sin is not laid on another – “... the soul that sinneth, it shall die” (Ezek 18:4).

It will be noted that Jeremiah records the positive statement that “they”, i.e. the whole family of Jacob/Israel, *shall no more say*, “The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children’s teeth shall be set on edge.” This tells in no uncertain terms that the doctrine of the inheritance of the mythical “original sin” is exploded and that the house of Israel will no more suffer under the guilt which belief in that doctrine inculcates. It means of course, that the people will once again have the chains of orthodoxy broken and as promised by the Lord Jesus Christ, “... ye shall know the truth and the truth will make you free.” Jeremiah’s assurance of the end of the doctrine which has controlled God’s People for so long, is followed by the promise of the writing of the Law in Israel’s “inward parts” and “in their hearts” thus indicating that the National Constitution will be the WILL of the LORD by which His Covenant People will live – in contrast to the theological interpretation which certainly perpetuates mythical doctrines which make *their* services indispensable to the people.

However, in heeding the words of the prophets, one may know that the Israel company of nations will, in the near future, discard the superstitions and errors foisted on them and face the future with a reborn dignity and pride knowing in Whose service all their national actions are dedicated.

*** **

'THE ASSYRIAN CAME DOWN'

It was the Assyrian army that won the empire for Assyria. Hundreds of years before the Roman legions conquered the ancient world, the Assyrian army triumphed over its enemies through a combination of highly skilled troops, superior weapons and strict discipline.

The original Assyrian soldiers were tough peasant farmers recruited from the rugged highlands of northern Iraq. An army of conscripts, they served Assyrian objectives well for over 300 years, but as the empire grew and its enemies became stronger, a permanent army was needed. King Tiglathpiaser III (745-727 BC) enlisted fighters from the outlying provinces of the empire-horsemen from Iran, camel drivers from Arabia and infantrymen from Anatolia and Syria - to form a full-time standing army. Citizens of Assyria were still liable to be conscripted, but they could send slaves to fight in their place. Later the army relied on mercenaries from hostile tribes who were attracted by the promise of rich booty. These elements weakened the army and contributed to its eventual defeat.

We have few exact figures for the number of soldiers engaged in battle - King Ashurnasirpal mentioned 50 000 at one battle, and Shalmaneser III claimed to have 120 000 men in the

field in the battle of Qarqar in 853 BC. What is obvious from the carved reliefs in the royal palaces depicting the army is the importance of the engineer corps, invaluable for besieging hostile fortified towns. These men filled in moats, constructed earthworks, dug tunnels, and used enormous battering rams to breach gates or walls. The vital infantry section consisted of archers and slingers, who had no defensive weapons, and lancers who were protected by a coat of mail and a tall shield. Cavalrymen, armed with a long spear initially rode bareback, but later their horses were protected by armour. Fast, light, two-wheeled chariots were used, enabling the Assyrians to outmanoeuvre their opponents. The army was followed on its long treks by male and female servants and many supply wagons.

Such records as we have are vague as to the organisation of the army, although we do know the names and ranks of the officers. Assyrian war records are more concerned with recording victories than with detailing the mundane life of the common soldier.

JUDEO-CHRISTIANITY!

-Desmond Burgess,

According to Josephus, the Jewish historian, and to Eusebius, the Greek version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint (the LXX) was translated from the Hebrew at Alexandria by 72 elders, 6 from each of the 12 tribes of Israel, sent from Jerusalem by the high priest, Eleazer. However, as the 12 tribes had been taken into captivity some hundreds of years earlier, it is highly unlikely that 6 elders from each tribe would have been available in Jerusalem. It is more likely that the 72 were all men from the province called "Judaea", in other words, were Jews. But "the Christians from the beginning adopted the

Septuagint; in the Greek church it is still used; but in the Latin church it was replaced in the 5th century by St. Jerome's Latin translation, the Vulgate... *After the Christians adopted the Septuagint as their own, the Jews discarded it.*" Is there not food for thought here?

The churches of Christianity say that Christ was a Jew, indeed, the King of the Jews, which is rather strange when it is considered that Christ vehemently denounced the Jews in no uncertain terms, calling them the children of the devil, who know not God. If Christ had Himself been a Jew, He would by these

sidered that the writings of the great medieval Franco-Jewish biblical commentators Solomon ben Isaac of Troyes (known as 'Rashi') and David Kimchi of Narbonne were of the highest importance... and Kimchi's commentary was used in a large degree by successive generations of Christian exegetes, particularly in the preparation of the English 'Authorised Version of the Holy Bible' of 1611." Rabbi David Kimchi, whose sacred book was the Talmud and not the Bible, wrote in "Obadiah" that "what the prophets foretold about the destruction of Edom in the last days was intended for Rome, as Isaiah explains (34:1) 'Come near, ye nations, to hear...' For 'when Rome is destroyed, Israel shall be redeemed.'" Thus, a Jew who believed that "there is nothing superior to the Holy Talmud" not only had considerable influence on the English translation of the Holy Bible, but persuaded men to believe that Rome and not Edom was the real enemy.

The "Christian" Church pays lip-service to the Bible as the inerrant Word of God (based on Paul's statement that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God"), whilst knowing full well that the record has been doctored. To take another instance, the whole of the missionary activity of the West has been based on the last eleven verses of Mark's gospel, which reputable scholars say are not to be found in the most ancient gospels. These verses include the famous (or, infamous) words, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," notwithstanding the absurdity of preaching to any creature other than man and notwithstanding Christ's explicit instructions to His Chosen Apostles not to do so. Matthew's gospel which contains much material derived from Mark who wrote first, also contains a similar instruction at variance with Christ's to His Chosen Apostles to go only as He Himself had been sent - to the "lost" sheep of the House of Israel and to them only.

Missionary activity was a marked characteristic of the Jews, for which Christ roundly castigated them, saying that a proselyte (that is to say, a "convert") was twofold more the child of hell than were the

emotion and to "liberty, equality and fraternity", the unholy trinity. Compassion is the name of the game today - compassion especially for the lawless, the criminal, the murderer, the rapist, the child abuser, the pornographer, the abuser of the aged, et al. It will not do in this modern, humanistic, brain-washed world to uphold the Lord's authority for the restoration and maintenance of discipline (Oh horrid word!) in an ordered society. No living God we are emotionally told would sanction the death penalty for murder, however foul, or severe punishments for other criminals. Tough on the victims; but reform is the key, not retribution - and if God doesn't like it, too bad! What He says must be adapted to modern ways of thinking.

As for equality, we are bombarded with lying statements which commonsense refuses to accept. "The Bible says all men are equal" cry enthusiastic ecclesiastics in support of the impossible dream. But when challenged to point out where, they are unable, for the simple reason that the Bible says nothing about all men being equal in the eyes of God. On the subject of fraternity, which today seems to be equated with cross-breeding, the Bible specifically forbids the children of Israel to mix their seed with others. They are commanded to keep themselves separate from other people; and to any rational thinker, it is inconceivable that the Creator God Who made the disparate races should wish them to become a mish mash. In the animal world there is no natural cross-breeding; there should be none amongst the different races of mankind.

"Liberty" of course is now transliterated as "licence". Do what you want to, so long as you can get away with it, seems to be the message. The churches are strong on liberty. But what has happened to the gospel of the Kingdom of God?

Only that most subtle of creatures, the original "old serpent" of Scripture, Satan himself, could conceive to bring about a situation whereby Christ's gospel of the Kingdom is relegated to "pie in the sky, by and by" and "another gospel" is promoted,

He accused the Jews of making the commandments of God of none effect by their tradition, and said

from their wicked ways, then will I lean from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

OF MORE THAN PASSING INTEREST

The English translation of the Greek text of Luke 23:34 reads: "Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do". However, as one searches the archives and considers the evidence presented by early manuscripts, we take another look at what is generally taught.

The copy of the text opposite is taken from the pages of the *Emphatic Diaglot* and as will be obvious, the relevant text is translated somewhat differently. It reads: "Father, forgive them not, for they know what they do".

If this text is correct, there is a desperate need to revise some ideas about the translations.

Chap. 23:29.]

LUKE.

τέκνα υμῶν. ὅτι ἰδοὺ, ἔρχονται ἡμέραι, children of you. For lo, come days. ἐν αἷς ἐροῦσιν· Μακάριαι αἱ στείραι, in which they will say: Blessed the barren ones, καὶ κοιλῖαι αἱ οὐκ ἐγέννησαν, καὶ μαστοὶ and wombs which not bore, and breasts of οὐκ ἐθήλασαν. ὅτε ἄρξονται λέ- which not suckled. Then they will begin to γινῆναι τοῖς ὄρεσι· Πέστετε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς· say to the mountains: Fall you on us; καὶ τοῖς ὄρεσιν· Καλύψατε ἡμᾶς. ὅτι εἰ and to the hills; Cover you us. For if ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ in the green tree these they do, in the dry τι γένηται; what will be done!

ἦγοντο δὲ καὶ ἑτεροὶ δύο κακοῦργοι σὺν were led and also two malefactors with αὐτῷ ἀναίρεθῆναι. Καὶ ὅτε ἀπῆλθον him to be put to death. And when they came ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, τὸν καλούμενον Κρανίον ἐκεῖ to the place, that being called Skull, there ἵστασάν αὐτόν, καὶ τοὺς κακοῦρους· ὅν they crucified him, and the malefactors; ὁ μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν, ὁ δὲ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν. ὁ δὲ Jesus εἶπε· Πάτερ, ἄφεσ ἀγαθή· and Jesus said; O Father, forgive them ὅτι οὐκ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν. Διαμερι- not for they know what they do. Having ζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἔβαλον κλήρον. divided and the garments of him, they cast a lot. Καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν· ἐξεμυκτήριζον And stood the people gazing; scoffed at δὲ καὶ οἱ ἀρχόντες· [σὺν αὐτοῖς,] λέγοντες· and also the rulers [with them,] saying:

For Donation/ Subscription rates to *The Covenant Message*, write to:-

The Federation of the Covenant People, P.O.Box 830,
Honeydew, 2040, Republic of South Africa.