

THE OFFERINGS (25)

—H. L. Heijkoop

Leviticus 6:24-30; 7:1-7

The end of chapter 4 and the beginning of chapter 5 dealt with the sin-offering; we saw that this offering was for the sins which had injured God's holy nature. The second part of chapter 5 spoke of the trespass-offering, in connection with the sins which injured the rights of God and of men. That offering was, therefore, connected with the government of God. The portion now before us deals with the laws of the sin- and trespass-offerings.

As I mentioned already, the sin-offering relates to sin, and thus it is beautiful that it is here said: "At the place where the burnt-offering is slaughtered shall the sin-offering be slaughtered before Jehovah." We should not forget that the laws were given to the priests; verse 25 expressly says, "Speak to Aaron and to his sons" — and the law of the trespass-offering is connected with this. Verse 4 of this chapter emphasized the person who had sinned, but this verse stresses the role of the priests. We know that Aaron is a type of the Lord Jesus and that the sons of Aaron are a type of us in our priestly character. This verse, therefore, speaks of persons who are occupied with the matter. First it speaks of the Lord Jesus, but secondly of us, at least in as much as we are priests. The Lord indeed knows that the sin-offering is connected with the burnt-offering, and we ought to know this too; it was to be slaughtered at the place where the burnt-offering was slain.

Then follows this: "it is most holy." This is not easily grasped by human understanding. The true significance of the sin-offering is that the Lord Jesus has died for us and taken all our sins upon Himself. Never was the true character of sin so clearly revealed as in Him upon the cross. He took upon Himself the sins of all who would believe in Him and, moreover, He was made sin. We could say that He, at the moment that He bore our sins, was Himself the type of sin. In type we saw this in Leviticus sixteen the body of the sin-offering was burnt outside the camp, and the man who had to bring away the goat on which the sins were laid became unclean. Nevertheless, it is here said: "It is most holy." Certainly the Lord Jesus was made sin; He bore our sins in His own body. Yet, in Himself, He was the Holy One; even when He bore our sins, He was the Holy One. God accentuates this, desiring that we are thoroughly aware of it. When we contemplate the sin-offering (which speaks of a believer who has sinned, not of the work of the Lord Jesus on the cross, nor of the gospel), we look back to the cross, to learn there how terrible sin is, how wonderful the work of the Lord Jesus is, and how God has been completely satisfied by it. Meanwhile, however, we should not forget what it meant to the Lord Himself, and that He, in spite of the cost, has perfectly finished the work.

After this, we see that the sacrifice had to be slain. This speaks of truly entering into the awful reality that the Lord Jesus had to die for sin. The priest who offered it had to eat it in a holy place, later we notice that the sons of Aaron had to do the same. This causes me to believe that verse 26 refers to the Lord Jesus (not as the sacrifice but) as the Priest who occupies Himself with the sin of the person concerned. 1 John 2:1 speaks of this: "And if anyone sin, we have a patron with the Father." And who is He? "Jesus Christ [the] righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins." That is what we find here. On the cross He bore all our sins; that is true: He truly made them His own. In Psalm 40:12, He says: "Mine iniquities have taken hold upon Me." That was not a mere outward thing for the Lord, and neither is it so for Him when a believer sins; this we can see here in Leviticus. The priest had to eat the sin-offering: he had to penetrate into the work of the Lord Jesus on the cross, thereby tasting how terrible sin is. He saw that God had to judge sin in this way, and tasted what this meant for the Lord Jesus. Yet he also had to realize that this judgment had been completely executed. When a believer sins today, we know that the Lord Jesus is the Advocate. This is not something that does not deeply affect Him: He truly feels in His heart the sin committed by a believer, for He knows how terrible sin is. However, He also knows that the work needed for it has been finished. Consequently, He can truly be our Advocate. Fully conscious that the judgment over that sin has been borne, Christ yet occupies Himself with it, sees its horror, and knows that it has to be put away from before the face of the Father. That is a wondrously glorious thought! The Lord not only bore our sins upon the cross (where He was made one with us lost sinners), but He also makes Himself one with us as believers when we have sinned. Hence, the sin-offering had to be eaten in the holy place: where God meets His own.

In verse 27, we further read: "Everything that toucheth the flesh thereof shall be holy." The sin-offering speaks of God's judgment over sin; it shows us that, to God, sin is something so terrible that He must judge it. Therefore, what comes into contact with this sacrifice is holy. How could anyone be connected with this sacrifice and yet, at the same time, be connected with that which has no relationship with God? It is impossible. The seriousness of this should speak to us when we meet on Sunday morning. We come together to announce the Lord's death, to express that He had to die for us, and to remember that sin is something so terrible to God that the Lord had to go into death for it. How could we be together to remember this great fact when we are defiled by sin? Once again, it is impossible! I do not say that it does not occur, but God cannot tolerate it. This we see in 1 Corinthians 11; God, in His government, had to interfere; thus several had become sick and others had died — because they had forgotten how holy that place was.

"And if there be splashed of the blood thereof on a garment — that whereon it is sprinkled shalt thou wash in a holy place" (v. 27). Our clothes are that which people see of us. In the typical language of the Word, they speak of the manner in which we manifest ourselves in our lives, that which others may notice of us. How could we be connected with this sacrifice without having our clothing washed? How dare we announce the Lord's death and live as children of this world during the week?! In Chapter 2 we saw that he who brought a meal-offering — which speaks of the holy walk of our Lord upon the earth — was not allowed to have the salt of the covenant lacking. This means that, whenever he brought a meal-offering to God, it had to be the longing of his heart to be practically holy himself, as was the Lord Jesus. This is the thought here. How could we be truly occupied with Him as the sin-offering without sincerely desiring that our practical lives be in agreement with His holiness?

The significance of the statement made in verse 28 now becomes rather obvious: "And the earthen vessel wherein it hath been sodden shall be broken." 2 Corinthians 4:10 tells us what the earthen vessel represents. In that portion, Paul says that, as man, he is an "earthen vessel"; then he does what we read of here: he brings into practice that he has died with Christ. The cross is the end of the natural man: man was so corrupt that God could not do anything further with him; therefore, we have died with Christ. Man, that which we are by nature, has been put to death upon the cross, and the breaking of the vessel, found here, is the practical realization of this. When we truly contemplate the work of the Lord Jesus more deeply, and thereby understand the significance of the sin-offering (that God could only judge the natural man), we will no longer trust in the natural man, even when he presents himself in an agreeable form. We are dust, here seen as dust which has received a form; obviously, it speaks of something useful. Our personal characteristics may be useful; God uses them in the service that He charges us with. When He gives a spiritual gift, He has beforehand given the capability to exercise that gift. But woe to the servant who rests on his natural capability! Suppose there is one brother with the gift of an evangelist, and another with that of a teacher. They must be able to speak well, and God has given them the natural capability for it. But if they have been truly occupied with the sin-offering, they will be conscious of the fact that they are not allowed to trust in their natural capabilities; they will remain entirely dependent upon the Lord, realizing that the power of the Holy Spirit alone gives blessing. That is the significance of the broken vessel: practically realizing that natural capabilities can only be properly used by God — they can be no more than an assist.

"And if it have been sodden in a copper pot, it shall be both scoured and rinsed with water" (v. 28). We know that copper speaks of a righteousness which can exist in God's presence — and this is ours, if we have been born again. The new life that we have received neither can, nor need, be broken, for it is eternal life. But in its practical manifestation, it can come in contact with something of the old nature. When we are occupied with the sin-offering, we see what sin is in God's eyes, and that all that stems from the old nature must be judged. "Scoured" signifies the self-judgment we find in Colossians 3:5: "Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth." Now, as far as the second clause is concerned ("rinsed with water"), we know that water is a picture of the Word of God in its cleansing power. It speaks of the Word applied to our practical lives, thoughts, and entire being: for judgment of everything that is not in agreement with our new life.

"All the males among the priests shall eat thereof: it is most holy" (v. 29). Here it is no longer the Lord Jesus, but us. When a brother or sister has sinned, we are all involved. Therefore, we see here that every male among the priests had to eat the sin-offering. The male represents, as we know, the practical realization of our new position in Christ. Every son of Aaron had to eat of it: just as the Lord Jesus, they had to make themselves one with him who had sinned, realizing what sin is, and being aware that God had to judge that sin. They must also recognize that the work of the Lord Jesus was perfect. This contains a most important instruction for us, for we are inclined to quickly set ourselves up as judges. In chapter 10, we see that the two sons of Aaron acted in this wrong manner: Moses sought the buck of the goats of the sin-offering, but they had burned it, executing judgment over it, without making themselves one with him who had sinned. That is a very real danger for us as well. When we hear that someone has sinned and judge him severely, we set ourselves up as judges without making ourselves one with the guilty party: we fail to eat the sin-offering. We ought to act as we have seen in the example of the Lord Jesus towards Peter. The Lord certainly did not approve of his sin; He had forewarned Peter of the sin that he was about to commit. But the

Lord went to the cross, took the sin of Peter upon Himself, and bore its judgment. After His resurrection, the Lord visited Peter and did everything that was needed for his restoration. In 1 John 2, we also see the Lord Jesus occupied for *our* restoration, and we may learn from it how we should act (see also John 13:12-17).

We will now continue with the law of the trespass-offering. It is again said: "In the place where they slaughter the burnt-offering shall they slaughter the trespass-offering" (7:2). The work of the Lord Jesus is as sufficient for sins committed towards God as for those committed towards a brother or sister: both must be made right. We ought to realize how serious such a matter is (be it sinning in the holy things of the Lord, or wronging a brother or sister), but we must also see that the work of the Lord Jesus is entirely sufficient for it. The trespass-offering was to be slaughtered in the place where the burnt-offering was slaughtered, "And the blood thereof shall he sprinkle on the altar round about" (v. 2). This tells us that after a trespass-offering has been truly brought, after one has truly judged himself and seen in the cross how terrible his misdeed was, and after one has made right that wherein he has failed, the fellowship with the Lord is restored. The altar referred to here is the brazen altar, the meeting place of the people with God.

Although the fat was mentioned in connection with the sin-offering in chapter 4, we did not find it in chapter 6. Here, in verses 3-5, the priest had to see the fat, which speaks of the energy of the will. In connection with the Lord Jesus, it speaks of the willpower with which He has performed the work upon the cross. The fat shows us how He has done the work with great determination, because He wanted to put away sin. All the fat was, as a sweet-smelling savour to God, offered upon the altar, for the manner in which the Lord Jesus has accomplished the work is precious to God. We may well say that it linked the trespass-offering to the burnt-offering, and even to the peace-offering. It directs our thoughts toward God. The priest sees how completely the fellowship with God is restored, and that the person concerned has been made acceptable in the beloved. That is an important thought for us. Some years ago, I had to be occupied with the case of a brother who had to be excommunicated on account of a particular sin. A few years later, the brethren were convinced that the brother had humbled himself, and could once more take his place at the Lord's table. But a few sisters said, "No, one who has committed such a sin can never take his place again." They did not understand what we find here; they had not seen how sufficient the work of the Lord Jesus is: there is always the possibility of full restoration. In this regard, let us think of Peter. He had grievously sinned: with an oath had he sworn that he did not know "the man," — at the very moment the Lord was in the hands of his enemies! But let us observe how he, two months later, said to the chiefs amongst the Jews: "But ye denied the holy and righteous One" (Acts 3:14). Naturally we would react, "How can *he* say that?! A short while ago he did just that, and in a much severer way." But he was completely restored; the Lord had restored him, enabling him to say this to the Jews.

"And the priest shall burn them on the altar, an offering by fire to Jehovah" (v. 5). Even looking at the Lord in the trespass-offering aspect of His work, which considers how God had to judge Him in connection with our debt, He was yet perfectly acceptable to God. He was simultaneously the trespass-offering and the burnt-offering.

In verse 6 we read anew that all males among the priests had to eat of it in a holy place. That means that they had to identify themselves with the one who had sinned. But they had to do so in the holy place. It is, of course, possible to do so outside the holy place, but then it is not a priestly activity. I am afraid that, in this respect also, we have to judge ourselves. When we hear someone talk about a brother or a sister who has done something wrong, how do we speak or think about it? We frequently notice how curious some brothers and sisters are to know all the details. Theirs is a sinful curiosity that wishes to be occupied with the sin, identifying oneself with it. Here, however, it is done in a holy place: where God meets His own. Today that place is the assembly, in the midst of which is God. There we are together, on the basis of the work of the Lord Jesus, as those who have died and are raised with Him, and, therefore, as new men. Then we can make ourselves one with him who has sinned; that is, associate ourselves in a holy manner, according to the priestly holiness of the new man, and in fellowship with the Lord Jesus, our High Priest.

The End

VERILY, VERILY (2)

—*J. van Dijk*

In the chapter now before us, the Lord speaks these attention-catching words three times in close succession. This causes one to wonder whether the Lord wants to accentuate the whole discourse or especially distinguish the words immediately following each "Verily, verily"? It seems correct to settle for the latter option, for it is hard to see what need there would have been to repeat these words in verses 5 and 11 if those in verse 3 had accentuated the whole discourse.

John 1 directed our attention to the first Man with whom God could have the fellowship He longed for. In chapter three we find Nicodemus' attention caught by that Person. Just as we are so apt to do, Nicodemus starts to tell the Lord what *he*, and for that matter, all his colleagues (he says, "we know"), have come to know about Him. Was Nicodemus sent by the others? Did the Pharisees use Nicodemus as a "probe" in an effort to win this obviously worthwhile teacher (as they believed the Lord to be) to their circle? True, this is speculation; but at least we know that this is how men of the world operate: they like to enlist useful individuals to their cause. Whatever may have been the case, Nicodemus (who apparently did not know that light cannot have fellowship with darkness — there is a wide gulf between those who truly believe and those who merely "know") speaks these words: "We know." He fails to separate those who believe from those who have no life from God. The Lord is going to deal with Nicodemus' failure by the words we want to consider.

It is sad to see that many of today's Christians share Nicodemus' problem. Often articles are written by authors who, in spite of their place in Christian circles, express themselves most questionably about Christ and the value of His work. Whether or not they know that their sins are forgiven on the basis of that work remains, at best, obscure to us; only God knows. If we apply the rule that Christ gave us ("By their fruits ye shall know them" — Mt. 7:16), we have little reason to conclude (from their fruits — their articles) that they know Him as their personal Saviour. Yet, their opinions seem to be highly valued by many editors of Christian magazines who, by accepting them on their pages, say, "We know." The Lord's response to Nicodemus is what is needed here: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except any one be born anew he cannot see the kingdom of God."

The Lord's words dealt effectively with this notion: "Nicodemus, whatever you think of the 'knowledge' of your colleagues, you had better realize that if there is not new life in them they cannot even see the kingdom." (This is especially amazing when we consider that the Lord, referring to Himself, once said, "The kingdom of God is in the midst of you" Lk. 17:21). What a blessing it would be if all Christian editors knew that it is perfectly impossible to say, "We know," referring to the Person of Christ, unless all who constitute the "we" have been born again. No sensible word about Him will ever come from the lips of one outside of Christ (apart from such rare occasions as we read of in John 11:50-53, where Caiaphas was used, in spite of himself, to speak prophetically about Christ — it is obvious that he was not aware of the import of his words).

What an impact it would have if Christian readers realized that there is no benefit in occupying ourselves with the thoughts of so-called "great thinkers" (scholars as they may be in their particular field) who are not born again, who have not the new life that is only received through true faith in Christ. Anything we learn from them will only prove to be detrimental to our Christian lives. The value of their articles resembles the value of a blind man's description of a cloudy sky, for they are blind and know nothing in the spiritual realm, that is. The saddest part of all is that especially educated Christians seem to have difficulty in this area.

Then the Lord speaks again: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except anyone be born of water and of Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Now the Lord speaks of the manner in which the new birth is brought about. Today we hear a lot about so-called "new birth"; however, frequently the term is used differently from the way the Lord used it here. When someone improves his behaviour, many speak of his being "born again," although nothing has happened but that which the Lord refers to in His address of woes to the Pharisees: the outside of the cup is cleansed, but the inside has remained as it was (Mt. 23:25). In short, there is no living faith in Christ. It is important that believers realize this, for many become confused by this improper usage of the term the Lord uses. As a result, Christendom is a strange mixture of some who are the Lord's and some who are not.

The Lord tells us that there are two agents involved in new birth. He first mentions water. This has been wrongly interpreted by many; they claim that it refers to baptism, but it speaks of the Word of God. To confirm this, we need to see if elsewhere in God's Word either baptism or the Word of God is connected with new birth. We also need to see whether or not God's Word is elsewhere spoken of as water. It also is helpful to check whether or not John uses water elsewhere in a typical way, and when he does so, whether he refers at all to baptism.

There are at least two other scriptures referring to the Word of God as one of the agents in the new birth. Peter says that we are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by [the] living and abiding Word of God" (1 Pet. 1:23). James

says that "according to His (God's) will begat He us by the Word of truth" (Jas. 1:18). These clearly establish the possibility that the Lord used water as a symbol for the Word of God. Paul's remark in Ephesians 5:26 ought to settle it, for he speaks of Christ and His Church saying, "In order that He might sanctify it, purifying [it], by the washing of water by [the] Word." The Lord Himself, after having washed the disciples' feet, tells them *how* they have become clean (He had already told them that they were in John 13:10-11): "Ye are already clean by reason of the word which I have spoken to you" (John 15:3). It is perfectly clear that in these cases the water stands for the Word of God.

Let us now look how John uses water in his gospel. There are, of course, the direct references to physical water, many of which are connected with the baptism of John. Then there is the water that became wine in John 2. In its literal sense, its employment there is straightforward enough. If, however, there is a spiritual message to be found in this event, we can see this water as the Word of God, but not as the water of baptism. In John 4 we find physical water used by the Lord to introduce "living" water. Again the thought of baptism cannot be introduced here; here water either speaks of the Word of God or of the Holy Spirit. There seems little need to dwell on the water in the pool of Bethesda; the Lord showed that healing by means of that water was not to be looked for, but healing through power found in Him. The water at Bethesda was set aside, whereas the water in John 3:5 was declared essential for new birth. There is obviously more contrast than similarity here. We are then left with only one further reference to water, in John 7. The Lord there speaks of the water which someone drinks and becomes in him rivers of living water. The latter, John explains, refers to the Spirit. As to the drinking, we can perhaps see it as taking in the Word of God, but there is no possible way it could be interpreted as referring to baptism. With this we have come to the end of our consideration of this matter. While water can legitimately be a type of the Word of God, John never uses it as speaking of baptism.

But let us also look at the context. In verse 8 the Lord speaks of the mysterious manner in which one is born of the Spirit. We do not really understand where the new life comes from, nor its beginning. At a certain moment we realize that it is there, but precisely how or when it came about remains a mystery to us. If the Lord had referred to the water of baptism, we would still not know how, but we would certainly know where and when one was born again. This does not fit very well with the Lord's words in verse 8. Besides this, new birth, as we know from John 1:13, is brought about by the will of God, not the will of man. This could not be said if baptism was the means. The meaning of the Lord's words is that man has no hand in it; it is God's doing through the Spirit with God's Word as the means. This work of God in the soul is an absolute essential for entering into *His* kingdom. No work of man, only God's work in the heart, both of the "simple" labourer and of the "sophisticated" scientist or philosopher, will bring about this new birth. Man may hand out diplomas or call some "Reverend"; nothing counts but the new birth God has worked in the soul. Sad will be the lineup (figuratively speaking) at heaven's gate, when many who are today so prominent and looked up to for their "Christian" thought, and, therefore, many who are baptized will hear the words, "I do not know you," from the Lord's lips.

Then the Lord used these words for the third time, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that which We know, and We bear witness of that which We have seen, and ye receive not Our witness." The Lord speaks in the plural. If we consider the context, it is not hard to see that He speaks of the Spirit and Himself. In John 14-16 we read that the Holy Spirit will teach and testify of the Lord Jesus: these are His tasks. The Lord, as it were, now takes up the first words of Nicodemus; He says, "We know." This is a more worthwhile remark than the one Nicodemus made. The "we" of the confused Pharisee encompassed completely incompatible persons. But here is a beautiful and harmonious "we": the Lord and the Spirit give an absolutely harmonious testimony. When we hear the Spirit speak anywhere in the Word of God (and we hear only Him in the Word of God — not a bit of Paul, a bit of Peter, a bit of James, and a bit of the Spirit), His thoughts are identical to the thoughts of the Lord Himself. Their testimony is entirely one. They speak that which they know. It would be well if all Christians realized this when they read, for instance, in 1 Corinthians 14:34, that women ought to be silent in the churches the topic of today. That is not just Paul speaking, but rather the Holy Spirit, who moved Paul to say exactly that; the words are entirely those which the Lord Himself would speak; yes, it is the Word of God. It is not that on one occasion the Spirit speaks and on another the Lord; no, the "We speak" here reaches much further. Whenever the Spirit speaks, the Lord speaks; whenever the Lord speaks, the Spirit speaks: they always speak harmoniously and simultaneously. Their testimony is one, it is of the things "They know."

And then the Lord once more takes up Nicodemus' manner of speaking. He links Nicodemus with the others: the "we" of whom His visitor had spoken earlier. That must have hurt Nicodemus. I reckon that he believed the Lord, that he had life from God, and that he, therefore, was essentially different from the "we" with whom he had leagued himself. Now the Lord shows him the result of this kind of association: He speaks of "ye." He says, as it were, "That entire group you were speaking about, Nicodemus, your whole "we," does not receive the witness that We give." That is the consequence of erroneous affiliation. As a whole, they did not accept what the Lord had to say; as long as Nicodemus insisted on speaking of "we," the Lord could respond with "ye." And we well know, and I suppose Nicodemus must have realized it also, what the outcome is of not

receiving what the Lord and the Spirit say. It means ultimate rejection. Surely the Lord knows how to save those who are truly His, but who wants to be saved as Lot (2 Pet. 2:7-10)?

Nicodemus seemed slow to see what folly it is to associate oneself with the "we" (religious as they may have been — actually that was the biggest problem!). But what about us? Have we seen that it is folly to remain in that which mixes the people of God with those who are not His? That is more important. The Lord says that to be vessels serviceable to our Master (meet for His use), we must separate ourselves from the vessels to dishonour (2 Tim. 2:21). In Revelation 18:4 He calls, "Come out of her, My people, that ye have not fellowship in her sins and that ye do not receive of her plagues." This is the principle of God that caused Moses — who understood it — to pitch the tent of meeting outside the camp (Ex. 33:7). And when, in our effort to apply these things to ourselves, we read Hebrews 13:13, we should not overlook the fact that the camp in Moses' case was the (defiled) camp of the people of God: separation may have to go further than from unbelievers only!

As Nicodemus, we are slow to learn; it took him about three years to realize the need for separation. Meanwhile, his testimony was ineffective (Jn. 7:50-53). If the bearing of these words of our Lord would sink into the hearts of those who are His, there would be a separation between the true children of God and mere Christian professors. And the effect of it would be nothing short of revival!

To be cont'd

OUTLINES FOR BIBLE TEACHING (2)

3. MAN'S FALL — Genesis 3

Outline

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. The conversation between the serpent and the woman | Gen. 3:1-5 |
| 2. The eating of the forbidden fruit and its consequences | Gen. 3:6-8 |
| 3. The Lord's conversation with Adam | Gen. 3:9-13 |
| 4. The curse and the promises | Gen. 3:14-19 |
| 5. Eve named and the people clothed | Gen. 3:20-21 |
| 6. Man driven out of the garden | Gen. 3:22-24 |

Explanation

1. Satan raised doubt in man as to the truth of God's Word (v. 5). Man believed these lies; his desires were aroused, and he became disobedient, wanting to have more, and be more (Jas. 1:15).
2. The consequences of sin: man acquired knowledge of good and evil (conscience), but with this, he also gained the consciousness that he was a sinner. He had been disobedient: he had fallen away from God - helping himself.
3. When God came to talk with him, Adam fled, for he was afraid of God, being conscious of his nakedness. Answering God, he blamed others, and eventually, even God Himself.
4. (a) God cursed the serpent (Satan: Rev. 12:9). He also put enmity between the serpent and the seed of the woman. (b) God increased the woman's pain and conception (childbirth would be painful), and said her husband would rule over her. (c) Adam would experience the effects of the curse with which God cursed the ground: weeds would grow, and food would be produced only through hard work. After a hard life, man would return to dust: he would die. (d) But God also revealed that the Redeemer, who would be man, would come; although He would suffer, He would conquer Satan.
5. Then Adam called his wife "Eve," which means "Life." God provided clothing by means of a bloody sacrifice.

6. After they had gained knowledge of good and evil, they were put out of the garden to prevent them from partaking of the tree of life. The Cherubim, with their flaming sword, guarded the way to the tree.

Lesson

The first Adam exalted himself and fell; the "Last Adam" (the Lord) abased Himself and has been exalted (Phil. 2:5-11). The first Adam fell when tempted in the garden because he did not cling to the Word of God; the "Last Adam" withstood the temptation in the wilderness because He did cling to the Word of God (Mt. 4:4, 7, 10). Since the fall, all men are sinners and subject to death (Rom. 5:12). Death is threefold: physical, spiritual (without the knowledge of God), and eternal (there will be an eternal separation between the soul and God — Rev. 20:14, 15). The clothes, made from animal skins, speak of redemption, which is only made possible by the death of the Lord Jesus. True salvation is in Christ, of whom the first slain animal was a type.

4. CAIN AND ABEL, ENOCH — Genesis 4 and 5

Outline

- | | | |
|---|--|----------------|
| 1 | Birth of Cain and Abel; their work and sacrifice | Gen. 4:1-5 |
| 2 | Cain exhorted | Gen. 4:6-7 |
| 3 | Abel killed and Cain cursed | Gen. 4:8-16 |
| 4 | Cainite civilization | Gen. 4:17-24 |
| 5 | Birth of Seth and his descendants | Gen. 4:25-5:32 |
| 6 | Enoch | Gen. 5:21-24 |

Explanation

1. An altar is a table of stones upon which sacrifices were burned (burnt-offerings). Cain brought the fruits of a cursed ground, while Abel brought bloody sacrifices — lambs, the firstlings of his flock. Cain sacrificed without consciousness of guilt, whereas Abel understood that death is the wages of sin. The lamb was, therefore, his substitute, his "saviour." Cain was jealous and angry.

2. God exhorted Cain and gave him promises, but to no avail.

3. Cain's hatred led to murder, lying, and defiance. God judged Cain, cursing him; he was banished (or fled) to Nod.

4. Cain built a city. His descendants were inventors of all kinds of instruments and crafts.

5. Seth is "appointed" as replacement for Abel. His descendants were God-fearing.

6. Enoch walked with God amidst an ungodly generation; he testified and proclaimed that judgment was coming (Jude 14, 15). God took him.

People were long-lived before the flood, so that there were only ten generations from Adam to Noah. Noah's father (Lamech) and Adam were contemporaries for more than fifty years; Noah and Abraham for about 60 to 70 years. Thus, God's Word could be handed down faithfully and purely from most ancient times.

Lesson

There is progression in sin, down to murder of one's own brother (1 Jn. 3:15). A lack of rest and peace results (Isa. 57:20, 21). Although there is perhaps an outward similarity between them, sorrow is not repentance (2 Cor. 7:10). Abel's sacrifice was a type of Christ (Jn. 1:29). God testified that Abel was righteous (Heb. 11:4; Rom. 5:1).

Cain and Abel represent two contrasting heads of, or directions in, mankind: Abel — belief, surrender to God — typifies God's people; Cain — estrangement from God — typifies the world. Enoch's translation to heaven before the great flood is a type of the rapture of the Church (Heb. 11:5; Rev. 3:10).

To be cont'd