

The Nazarene Circular Letter No 149

July/ August 1994

In this Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 2	10 Minutes with Hebrews 9	Brother Ray Gregory
Page 4	Exhortation - "Samson"	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 6	Further extract from "The Temple at the Time of Christ"	Dr Edersheim
Page 13	The Netherton Debate - concluding part.	Brother Ernest Brady and W.F.Barling

EDITORIAL

Dear Brethren and Sisters and Friends, Greetings in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

I wish to thank all who have written to me since the last Circular Letter; some of you expressed some concern over printing the Netherton Debate in the C.L. Brother Leo observes, "The Netherton Debate has not done any credit to either side. It degenerated into a complete jangle of words. But we shall see what each had to say in his closing speech, and what the consequent articles bring."

I feel Leo is perhaps going too far in saying that the debate degenerated into a complete jangle of words for it was the conduct of Brother Ernest which prevented this happening, though W.F.Barling seems to have made this his aim in places in the hope of derailing his opponent with bullying tactics. All through the debate Brother Ernest appears to have kept at the forefront of his mind the fact that the debate would be published for further study, therefore there was no attempt in forcing any conclusions - this could be done more effectively at a later time. If only Barling had displayed the same integrity perhaps the Christadelphians would not have been so ashamed as to prevent the publication of the debate, which, of course, had been their original agreement.

In a letter from Sister Audrey Bundy, she says, "I do not see why we had to have the Netherton Debate printed in the C.L. for all surely have a copy of it somewhere if they need to read it again. The time is short and I believe the C.L. should be a magazine to edify and comfort the Fellowship. Most of us are in isolation. Some are fortunate to have other brethren and sister's to talk to and discuss the scriptures. Those of us who are on our own need something more to help us on our walk to the Kingdom."

One of the reasons for printing the Debate in the Circular Letter is because almost no one has a copy to read or refer to should they so wish. So far as I am aware only a handful of copies were ever published, and I think that the corrected copy of the Debate sent to me by Brother Phil is one of a very few in existence. In any case the two copies I have seen are in such a dilapidated state that they are difficult to read easily. A second reason for printing the Debate is, of course, the aim of making the C.L.s a "reference library" of Nazarene Fellowship writings. However, by far the most important reason is because of all the scriptural arguments it contains used to support our understanding. Those who study it will find a wealth of information in support of our understanding of the nature of Christ, the atonement, the judgments, the resurrections, etc., as well as seeing how weak are the arguments put forward to counter such beliefs. All this will become more apparent in the next several issues of the C.L. when we hope to print a number of articles written in response to the Debate.

Regarding Sister Audrey's second point. Yes, please, we do need more exhortations and studies on Bible topics, so please, please send me some for publishing. I'm sure there must be lots of articles lying about your homes or hidden at the back of those old drawers and forgotten about. So please have a good look and see what you can find and send them to me!

In the last C.L. Brother Phil posed five questions for comment or discussion. Not one reader has mentioned them! So come on; let's have some correspondence. Brother Phil does a lot of writing for us, so please write back with your views and ideas.

Sister Ruth Woodhouse sends her love to all, as does Sister Audrey.

My Sincere love to all; your brother in the Master's service. Russell Gregory.

TEN MINUTES WITH HEBREWS CHAPTER NINE

This brief description of the old covenant in chapter nine, ends at verse 11, and it is here that the comparison with the new covenant begins; and yet, although comparison is used to expound the differences between them, it is worthwhile remembering that the details of the old covenants are an important factor in understanding the new.

The law, and its ordinances, including the tabernacle and its furnishings, are "our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." In them was the introduction of the spiritual truths to be later revealed in the life, the sacrifice, and the priesthood of God's Anointed, right up to the time when He will sit, in Glory, in His Father's Kingdom. In them were the type to be revealed in the work of God in Christ; a study in itself; and only a few of its details are we to consider here. In verse 5, the writer to the Hebrews, indicates that he, too, could go into more detail... "of things which we cannot now speak particularly."

Verse 11; "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building..." Here we are reminded of the stone cut out of the mountain without hands; taken out of the human race but not of the will of man, but by the Spirit of God; He has now become our High Priest of good things to come.

Verse 12; "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." I.e. by the giving of the life that is in the blood. He entered in once into the Holy Place; and why? Because He had obtained eternal redemption for us. By the offering of Himself, Christ has made an entrance into the presence of God as the High Priest for sinful men - the object of the priestly ministry is to secure an acceptance into the presence of God, and maintain a covenanted relationship with the Lord God as our Heavenly Father.

Now that Christ has appeared, "the good things" of verse 11 "have come." They are no longer foreshadowed or promised, for Christ has secured eternal redemption for us. He has wrought a work of deliverance which has set us free from the doom and condemnation of sin. His entrance into heaven, like His sacrifice, was once for all, and never to be repeated; "who needeth not daily as those high priests, to offer up sacrifices ... for this he did once, when he offered up himself."

Verse 14; "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

Through the shedding of His blood (which is the giving of His life, for God had said "The life is in the blood and I have given it you upon the altar), Christ is able to purge the conscience from the paralyzing power of sin and set men free to serve the living God, for the sacrifice of Christ has the power to cleanse and sanctify to a degree not possible by the ritual and ceremonies of the law, which only foreshadowed the reality to come.

The keeping of the law and ordinances was required by God to establish His righteousness. He could not be slack concerning His law, for it was a righteous law. But now, not being under the law but under grace through the sacrifice of Christ, we are motivated and stimulated by a reciprocal love; He loved us before we could love Him, and gave His greatest possession to free us, so that we may live with faith in hope.

Verse 15; “And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.”

Because of His achievement He is now the Mediator, or executor of a new covenant that is one who personally establishes all whom God calls, to the actual possession of an eternal inheritance. This result is safe because His death secured it.

Verses 16 and 17; “For where a testament is, there must also of a necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.”

This release from the penalty of transgressions under the old covenant clears the way for a new life in the grace, or favour, of God, having fully settled the outstanding issues between God and His people.

Jesus said of His death (Matthew 26:54), “Thus it must be,” but the crucifixion of the Messiah continued to be a stumbling block to the Jews. They needed help if they were to see why it was necessary, so the writer to the Hebrews gives reasons why it was needed in order to cleanse and purify the people who would wish to be covenanted with Him; he explained to them that they needed to be taken from under the law, which continually condemned them that they could enter a better covenant where a new life, free from past sin could be made; a life with a Mediator to plead their cause and to encourage them; a lively hope, or living hope, to be expressed by a loving obedience to the spirit of the law and to live by “faith in the promises” of God.

This epistle to the Hebrews would help the Jew who had a covenant with God, and it is possible that a devout and enlightened man would see in the law and ordinances, promises that he could hold to with faith and hope. Such a man would be helped in his understanding of the new covenant by these comparisons with the old; he would not only appreciate the new covenant but would now see more clearly the types forecast in the law and ordinances. This is where we, as Bible students, can find a deeper insight into the word of God.

The word of God is from the beginning and before the later covenants were made God had seen and acted in the light of men’s need, namely the saving of Adam and Eve from the result of their sin.

In this first act of mercy, God covered their sin, so that they could stand before Him and live. In this way God was the Saviour of all men (1 Timothy 4:10), for we were all in Adam’s loins when he sinned. This covering was provided by the shedding of blood, the taking of a life for their sin, typically the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. This is the sin of the world under which we all stood condemned in Adam, but now we are in Christ, purchased out of Adam unto God; under a new covenant, redeemed. For Christ having suffered on the Cross to make atonement for our sins, cleansing us from all sin so that when He died He ransomed us to His heavenly Father. This grace in which we stand as the children of God gives us access our Lord Jesus for the forgiveness of our sins day by day.

In Hebrews 10:24 we read, “Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works.” The Greek word translated “provoke” is given as “an excitement” in the word for word translation but when put into the complete sentence it reads “We should bear each other in mind, for an incitement of love and good works.” This would be the free exchange of our individual appreciation of all that the Lord God and our Lord Jesus has done for us, taking the opportunity to share our faith, our hope and expectation; in fact, “edifying one another.”

The new covenant is the outcome of all the covenants that God has made with man. Beginning with God’s first act of mercy, and the promises to Adam and Eve, forecasting the new covenant, when the seed of the woman should bruise the serpents head, the promises to the Patriarchs and the giving of the law and ordinances to the children of Israel, giving them the opportunity to approach Him and accept His love and mercy, and to give them hope in the future.

Looking back over the history of God’s dealings with men we may see so much failure that we could lose some of our confidence, but the new covenant is based, not only on God’s promises, but also on what

God has done -through His Son. These things we see are now through the work of God in Christ and in our very possession.

Hebrews 10:19-24, “Having therefore brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a High Priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering (for he is faithful that promised); and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works.”

Through the waters of baptism into this new covenant many of the promises are now with us and are now an actuality - the forgiveness of sins, the gift of righteousness, our names in the Book of Life, eternal life, if we continue faithful, the gift of hope and peace with God. The key to all this is faith and faithfulness. Jesus said to the church at Laodicea, the last message for the last days: “Buy of me gold, (i.e. faith) tried in the fire (the fire of adversity and purification, a strong faith) that thou mayest be rich (in faith); and white raiment (i.e., the righteousness of Christ), that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and I anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see.”

We know we need light to see, but even then, some things are hidden. Jesus said He spoke in parables so that some may see, but not perceive. It appears then what we need in order to perceive is eyesalve. Is it prayer as we seek, is it our desire to explore the love of God manifested in Jesus Christ our Redeemer? Down the ages, the churches have tried to explain the nature of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ and since it was hidden from the angels in former days, it is not to be wondered at that this most glorious fact of history is only found after diligent seeking. Our very life depends on it, it is above price; we must bear in mind that there could always be more to learn and appreciate, for “it is the glory of God to conceal a thing but the honour of kings to search out a matter.”

1 Peter 1:3-21; “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time. Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations: that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ: whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now we see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.... For as much as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold... but with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you, who by Him do believe in God, that raised Him up from the dead, and gave Him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God.”

Brother Ray Gregory.

EXHORTATION

Among the personalities of the Bible Samson occupies a rather unusual position. We usually think of God’s servants, in the Old Testament at any rate, as prophets, or as great leaders, such as Moses, or David. We usually think of them as having had visions of God, or some other direct communication with God on special occasions. But no such incidents are recorded about Samson. The gift that God had given him for His work was somewhat unusual; the gift of superb physical strength.

The gifts of God always varied from person to person according to need and according to the task to be carried out. In the New Testament Church, there were different gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as healing, teaching, prophesying, interpretation of tongues, etc.

Samson was endowed with this unusual strength for the purpose of delivering Israel from the Philistines. The first we learn of him is that from birth he was dedicated to the Lord. There was no razor to come upon his head. He was to be a Nazarite all his life.

A Nazarite was a person who, for a certain time, took it upon himself not to shave his head, not to drink any wine, and to devote these days especially to the service of God. At the end of this specified period he went to the priest, brought a number of sacrifices prescribed in the Law of Moses, and ceremonially shaved his head.

But Samson was to be a Nazarite all his life, and no razor was ever to touch him. The first incident of his life was when he persuaded his parents to get him a Philistine girl to wife. It was a grief of heart to his parents, but they were ignorant of the full facts of the case until later: namely, that Samson merely sought an occasion against the Philistines, and so really did God's work, though his parents could not be told of all the true facts. Had they been told of his real motive for wanting that girl, the marriage may not have taken place, and Samson's scheme frustrated. (Our faith also is often tested in that we do not know all the facts; we may only know these after our resurrection). And then comes Samson's first display of strength when a lion met him, and he rent it. Shortly afterwards a swarm of bees and honey was found in the carcase of the lion. He ate and also gave his parents of it. And this provided the occasion for the quarrel which he sought with the Philistines.

We know how he put forth a riddle that they could not solve. He told his wife eventually, who told her people. And so Samson slew thirty Philistines using the spoil he took from them to give as his pledge to the Philistines for expounding his riddle.

After this followed incident upon incident in which Samson wrought havoc among the Philistines' lives and property, from burning up their cornfields, to lifting off heavy gates of fortification which guarded the towns in those days, or slaying a thousand men with the jaw-bone of an ass.

The account of his life then tells us of his marriage to Delilah, another Philistine wife. The motive appears to have been the same as that of his first marriage, to seek a quarrel with the Philistines. Delilah tried to find the secret of his great strength. For some time, he did not tell her the truth. But by sheer persistence she eventually prevailed, and told her all. We know the sad end. Delilah caused him to sleep and got a man to shave off the seven locks of his head. And so his strength went. The Philistines bound him and blinded him, and made a great feast in honour of one of their heathen deities. But their temple was built on pillars. They brought in Samson to make them sport. Samson begged a lad to guide his hands toward these pillars, and prayed to God that his strength would come back to him once more. God heard him, and with a mighty heave, he brought down their temple with all the people in it upon himself, so that at his death he killed even more Philistines than while alive.

Unlike other great persons of the Bible, there is no record of any direct communication between God and Samson; no direct divine command to do a certain thing at a certain time and in a certain manner. Rather does it appear that God gave him that one gift of superb strength and commissioned him to use it against the Philistines as and when an opportunity arose. And it is evident that Samson certainly used his gift very well in the work God had assigned him to do.

All of us have differing gifts. We are not all speakers or gifted preachers but we all have some ability in one direction or another, and God knows our limitations and does not expect the impossible. If we can say that we always use our gifts and abilities according to the will of God and not to our selfish ends, then we need not be afraid of facing our Master on the day of resurrection.

Finally, one more thought. Things went wrong after he told his wife the secret of his strength. It is true he was under strong pressure, but the Nazarite vow and the Nazarite life were very solemn things, and like everything dedicated to Divine service at the Tabernacle, not to be trifled with. Samson's great mistake was that he betrayed such a solemn secret to a heathen people most ignorant and rebellious against God. We are told in the New Testament not to cast our pearls before swine, and although Samson lived long before this was written, the principle applied in all ages to all divine matters. And in this respect Samson failed. And

like in the cases of Adam, Solomon, King Ahab, Samson's wife was the primary cause of his fall. How well then is the exhortation to the Christian not to be unequally yoked with the unbeliever. The command applied equally to the nation of Israel to whom intermarriage with the surrounding heathen people was prohibited. The motive with which Samson married was probably sincere enough; as with his first marriage, to seek an occasion against the Philistines. But he must have known that Delilah was not loyal to him, for she was in communication with the Philistines before, to entice him to tell her his secret. In giving such a solemn matter away, he had gone too far.

We live in a world of unbelief, among people who admit disbelief in God, and who sneer at His Word. By all means we must try to convert them; but until there is some evidence of this, let us beware how we talk to them. Let us beware against talking of Divine matters in a manner that merely encourages them to scoff at it.

Brother Leo Dreifuss.

Further extract from

“THE TEMPLE AT THE TIME OF CHRIST”

The Morning and Evening Sacrifice

“And it came to pass, that while he executed the priest's office before God in the order of his course, according to the custom of the priest's office, his lot was to burn incense when he went into the temple of the Lord. And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense.” Luke 1:8-10.

Public Prayer

Before proceeding to describe the “morning sacrifice,” it is necessary to advert to a point of considerable interest and importance. There can be no doubt that, at the time of Christ, public prayer occupied a very prominent place in the ordinary daily services of the Temple. Yet the original institution in the Law of Moses contains no mention of it; and such later instances as the prayer of Hannah, or that of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple, afford neither indication nor precedent as regards the ordinary public services. The confession of the high-priest over the scape-goat (Leviticus 16:21) cannot be regarded as public prayer. Perhaps the nearest approach to it was on occasion of offering the first-fruits, especially in that concluding entreaty: “Look down from Thy holy habitation, from heaven, and bless Thy people Israel, and the land which Thou hast given us, as Thou swarest unto our fathers, a land that floweth with milk and honey.” But, after all, this was again private, not public prayer, and offered on a private occasion, far different from the morning and evening sacrifices. The wording of King Solomon's prayer (1 Kings 8) implies indeed an act of united and congregational worship, but strictly speaking, it conveys no more than that public supplication was wont to be offered in times of public necessity. Nor can anything definite be inferred from the allusions of Isaiah to the hypocrisy of his contemporaries (Isaiah 1:15) in spreading forth their hands and making many prayers.

Regulations of the Rabbis

It was otherwise after the return from Babylon. With the institution and spread of synagogues - designed for the two-fold purpose, that in every place Moses should be read every Sabbath day, and to provide a place “where prayer was wont to be made” - the practice of public worship soon became general. In Nehemiah 11:17 we find already a special appointment “to begin the thanksgiving in prayer.” Afterwards progress in this direction was rapid. The Apocrypha afford painful evidence how soon all degenerated into a mere form, and how prayer became a work of self-righteousness, by which merit might be obtained. This brings us to the Pharisees of the New Testament, with their ostentatious displays of devotion, and the hypocrisy of their endless prayers, full of needless repetitions and odious self-assertion. At the outset, we here meet, as usual, at least seeming contradictions. On the one hand, the Rabbis define every attitude and gesture in prayer, fix the most rigid formulas, trace each of them up to one of the patriarchs, and would have

us believe that the pious have their nine hours of devotion, laying down this curious principle, suited to both worlds – “Prolix prayer protracts life.” On the other hand, they also tell us that prayer may be contracted within the narrowest limits, and that a mere summary of the prescribed formulas is sufficient; while some of their number go to the length of strenuously contending for free prayer. In fact, free prayer, liturgical formulas, and special prayers taught by celebrated Rabbis, were alike in use. Free prayer would find its place in such devotions as are described in the parable of the Publican and the Pharisee. It also mingled with the prescribed liturgical formulas. It may be questioned whether, even in reference to the latter, the words were always rigidly adhered to, perhaps even accurately remembered. Hence the Talmud lays it down (in the treatise ‘Berechoth’), that in such cases it sufficed to say the substance of the prescribed prayer.

Liturgical Forms

That liturgical formulas were used not only in the Temple, but in the daily private devotions, cannot be doubted. The first trace of them appears so early as in the arrangement of the Psalter, each of its four books closing with a “eulogy,” or benediction, (Psalms 41; 72; 89; 104), and the fifth book with a psalm which may be designated as one grand doxology (Psalm 150). Although it is a task of no small difficulty to separate the ancient prayers of Temple-times from the later additions, which have gradually swelled into the present Jewish prayer-book, it has, in great measure, successfully been accomplished. Besides such liturgical formulas, some prayers taught by celebrated Rabbis have been preserved. It was in accordance with this practice that John the Baptist seems to have given forms of prayer to his followers, and that the disciples asked the Saviour to teach them to pray (Luke 11;1).

The Lord’s Prayer

The prayer spoken by the Lord far transcended any that Jewish Rabbis ever conceived, even where its wording most, nearly approaches theirs.** It is characteristic that two of its petitions find no real counterpart in the prayers of the Rabbis. These are, “Forgive us our trespasses,” and “Lead us not into temptation.” In the Temple the people never responded to the prayers by an ‘Amen,’ but always with this benediction, “Blessed be the name of the glory of His kingdom for ever.” This formula was traced up to the patriarch Jacob, on his death-bed. In regard to “the kingdom,” whatever the Rabbis understood by it, the feeling was so strong, that it was said: “Any prayer which makes not mention of the kingdom, is not a prayer at all.”

**[Thus the words in the Authorised Version, Matthew 6:13, “For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen,” which are wanting in all the most ancient manuscripts, are only the common Temple-formula of response, and as such may have found their way into the text. The word “Amen” was in reality a solemn asseveration or a mode or oath.]

Attitude in Prayer

The attitude to be observed during prayer is very accurately defined by the Rabbis. The worshipper was to stand, turning towards the Holy Placer he was to compose his body and his clothes, to draw his feet close together, to cast down his eyes, at least at the beginning of his prayer, to cross his hands over his breast, and to “stand as a servant before his master, with all reverence and fear.” Even the priests, while pronouncing the priestly blessing, were to look to the ground. In regard to the special manner of bowing before the Lord, a distinction was made between bending the knees, bending the head, and falling prostrate on the ground. The latter was not deemed “fit for every man, but only for such as knew themselves righteous men, like Joshua.

The Two Elements in Prayer

In general the Rabbis distinguished two elements in prayer, on the ground of the two terms used by Solomon (1 Kings 8:28), thanksgiving and petition. To these correspond the two kinds of early Jewish prayer: the Eulogies and the Tephillah. And thus far correctly, as the two Hebrew words for prayer indicate, the one adoration, the other supplication, or, rather, intercession. Both kinds of prayer found expression in the Temple services. But only after the manifestation of Him, who in His person united the Divine with the human nature, could adoration and supplication be fully called out. Nay, the idea of supplication would only be properly realised after the outpouring of the Spirit of adoption, whereby the people of God also became the children of God. Hence it is not correct to designate sacrifices as “prayers without words.” The sacrifices were in no sense prayers, but rather the preparation for prayer. The Tabernacle was, as its Hebrew

designation shows, the place “of meeting” between God and Israel; the sacrificial service, that which made such meeting possible? and the priest (as the root of the word implies) , he who brought Israel near to God. Hence prayer could only follow after a sacrifice; and its appropriate symbol and time was the burning of incense. This view is expressed in the words: “Let my prayer be set forth before Thee as incense” (Psalm 141:2), and authoritatively confirmed in Revelation 5:8, where we read of the “golden vials full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints.”

Burning the Incense

It is the burning of incense which in the Gospel is alluded to in connection with the birth of John the Baptist (Luke 1:9). Zacharias had come up from the hill country of Judea, from the neighbourhood of priestly Hebron, to minister in the Temple. His course - that of Abia - was on duty for the week, and the “house of his fathers” for that special day. More than this, the lot had fallen on Zacharias for the most honourable service of the daily ministry - that of burning the incense on the golden altar within the Holy Place. For the first time in his life, and for the last, would this service devolve on him. As the pious old priest ministered within the Holy Place, he saw with such distinctness that he could afterwards describe the very spot, Gabriel standing, as if he had just come out from the Most Holy Place, between the altar and the table of shewbread, “on the right side of the altar.” So far as we know, this was the first and only angelic appearance in the Temple. For we cannot attach serious importance to the tradition that, during the forty years of his pontificate, an angel always accompanied Simeon the Just, when on the Day of Atonement he entered and left the Most Holy Place, except the last year, when the angel left him in the Sanctuary, to show that this was to be the end of his ministry. What passed between Gabriel and Zacharias is beside our present purpose. Suffice it to notice several details incidentally mentioned in this narrative, such as that a special lot was cast for this ministry; that the priest was alone in the Holy Place while burning the incense; and that “the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense.

Filling the Laver

The lot for burning the incense was, as we have seen, the third by which the order of the ministry for the day was determined. The first lot, which in reality had been cast before the actual break of day, was -that to designate the various priests who were to cleanse the altar and to prepare its fires. The first of the priests on whom this lot had fallen immediately went out. His brethren reminded him where the silver chafing-dish was deposited, and not to touch any sacred vessel till he had washed his hands and feet. He took no light with him; the fire of the altar was sufficient for his office. Hands and feet were washed by laying the right hand on the right foot, and the left hand on the left. The sound of the machinery, as it filled the laver with water, admonished the others to be in readiness. This machinery had been made by Ben Catin, who also altered the laver so that twelve priests could at the same time perform their ablutions. Otherwise the laver resembled that in the Temple of Solomon. It was of brass. All the vessels in the Sanctuary were of metal, the only exception being the altar of burnt-offering, which was solid, and wholly of stones taken from virgin soil, that had not been defiled by any tool of iron. The stones were fastened together by mortar, pitch, and molten lead. The measurement of the altar is differently given by Josephus and the Rabbis. It seems to have consisted of three sections, each narrower than the former: the base being thirty-two cubits wide, the middle twenty-eight, and the top, where the fire was laid (of course, not including the horns of the altar nor the space where the priests moved), only twenty-four cubits. With the exception of some parts of the altar, in which the cubit was calculated at five hand-breadths, the sacred cubit of the Temple was always reckoned at six hand breadths. Lastly, as readers of the New Testament know, whatever touched the altar, or, indeed, any sacred vessel, was regarded as “sanctified” (Matthew 23:19), but no vessel could be dedicated to the use of the Temple which had not been originally destined for it.

Preparing the Altar

But to return. While the assistant priests were waiting, the first priest had taken the silver chafing-dish, and scraped the fire on the altar, removing the burnt coals, and depositing them at a little distance north of the altar. As he descended, the other priests quickly washed hands and feet, and took shovels and prongs, with which they moved aside what of the sacrifices had been left un-burned from the previous evening, then cleaned out the ashes, laying part on the great heap in the middle of the altar, and the rest in a place whence it was afterwards carried out of the Temple. The next duty was to lay on the altar fresh wood, which, however,

might be neither from the olive nor the vine. For the fire destined to feed the altar of incense the wood of the fig-tree was exclusively used, so as to secure good and sufficient charcoal. The hitherto unconsumed pieces of the sacrifices were now again laid upon the fire.

The Second Lot

These preliminaries finished, the priests gathered once more for the second lot. The priest on whom it fell was designated, along with the twelve who stood nearest to him, for offering the sacrifice and cleansing the candlestick and the altar of incense. Immediately after casting this second lot, the president directed one to ascend some 'pinnacle,' to see whether it was time to kill the daily sacrifice. If the priest reported, "The morning shineth already," he was again asked, "Is the sky lit up as far as Hebron?" If so, the president ordered the lamb to be brought from the chamber by the Beth-Moked, where it had been kept in readiness for four days. Others fetched the gold and silver vessels of service, of which the Rabbis enumerate ninety-three. The sacrificial lamb was now watered out of a golden bowl, and anew examined by torch-light, though its Levitical fitness had been already ascertained the evening before. Then the sacrificing priest, surrounded by his assistants, fastened the lamb to the second of the rings on the north side of the altar - in the morning in the western, in the evening in the eastern corner. The sacrifice was held together by its feet, the fore and hind feet of each side being tied together; its head was laid towards the south and fastened through a ring, and its face turned to the west, while the sacrificing priest stood on the east side. The elders who carried the keys now gave the order for the opening of the gates. As the last great gate slowly moved on its hinges, the priests, on a signal given, blew three blasts on their silver trumpets, summoning the Levites and the "representatives" of the people (the so-called "stationary men") to their duties, and announcing to the city that the morning sacrifice was about to be offered. Immediately upon this the great gates which led into the Holy Place itself were opened to admit the priests who were to cleanse the candlestick and the altar of incense.

The Slaying of the Lamb

The opening of these gates was the signal for actually slaying the sacrificial lamb. The sacrifice was offered in the following manner. One priest drew forward the windpipe and gullet of the sacrifice, and quickly thrust upwards the knife, while another caught the blood in a golden bowl. Standing at the east side of the altar, he sprinkled it, first at the north-east, and then at the south-west corner, below the red line which ran round the middle of the altar, in each case in such manner as to cover two sides of the altar, or, as it is described, in the form of the Greek letter Γ (gamma). The rest of the blood was poured out at the base of the altar. Ordinarily, the whole of this service would of course be performed by priests. But it was valid even if the sacrifice had been killed by a layman, or with an ordinary knife. Not so if the blood were caught up in any but a consecrated vessel, or sprinkled by other than the hands of a priest who at the time was Levitically fit for the service.

The Altar of Incense and the Candlestick

We proceed to describe the service of those whose duty it was to cleanse the altar of incense and to dress the golden candlestick in the Holy Place. A few particulars as to each of these will not be out of place. The triumphal Arch of Titus in Rome bears the representation of the golden mortars in which the incense was bruised, and of the golden candlestick, but not of the altar of incense. Still, we can form sufficiently accurate idea of its appearance. It was square, one cubit long and broad, and two cubits high, that is, half a cubit higher than the table of shewbread, but one cubit lower than the candlestick, and it had "horns" at each of its corners. It was probably hollow, and its top covered with a golden plate, and like an Eastern roof, surrounded by what resembled a balustrade, to prevent the coals and incense from falling off. Below this balustrade was a massive crown of gold. The incense burned upon this altar was prepared of the four ingredients mentioned in Exodus 30:34, with which, according to the Rabbis, seven others were mixed, besides a small quantity of "Ambra," and of a herb which gave out a dense smoke. To these thirteen substances salt was of course added. The mode of preparing the incense had been preserved in the family of Abtinas. The greatest care was taken to have the incense thoroughly bruised and mixed. Altogether 368 pounds were made for the year's consumption, about half a pound being used every morning and evening in the service. The censer for the Day of Atonement was different in size and appearance from that for ordinary

days. The golden candlestick was like that delineated in Exodus 25:31, etc., and is sufficiently known from its representation of the Arch of Titus.

Now, while one set of priests were busy in the Court of the Priests offering the sacrifice, the two on whom it devolved to trim the lamps of the candlesticks and to prepare the altar of incense had gone into the Holy Place. As nearly as possible while the lamb was being slain without, the first of these priests took with his hands the burnt coals and ashes from the golden altar, and put them into a golden vessel - called 'teni' - and withdrew, leaving it in the sanctuary. Similarly, as the blood of the lamb was being sprinkled on the altar of burnt-offering, the second priest ascended the three steps, hewn in stone, which led up to the candlestick. He trimmed and refilled the lamps that were still burning, removed the wick and old oil from those which had become extinguished, supplied fresh, and re-lit them from one of the other lamps. But the large central lamp, towards which all the others bent, and which was called the western, because it inclined westward towards the Most Holy Place, might only be re-lit by fire from the altar itself. Only five, however, of the lamps were then trimmed; the other two were reserved to a later period of the service.

Salting the Sacrifice

Meantime in the court of the Priests the sacrifice had been hung on one of the hooks, flayed, cut up according to rules, cleaned, and handed to the six priests who were successively to carry up the pieces to the rise of the altar, where they were salted and deposited. For "every sacrifice must be salted with salt" - nay, everything that was laid on the altar, except the drink-offering. At the same time, three other priests carried up to the rise of the altar the daily meat-offering, that of the high-priest, and the drink-offering. The skins of the sacrifices were salted, and on the eve of each Sabbath distributed among the "course" of priests that had been on ministry.

Prayer before the Third Lot

And now the most solemn part of the service was about to begin. For the third time the priests assembled in the "Hall of Polished Stones," to draw the third and the fourth lots. But before doing so the president called on them to join in the prescribed prayers. Tradition has preserved these to us. Subjecting them to the severest criticism, so as to eliminate all later details, the words used by the priests before the third and fourth lots were as follows:

"With great love hast Thou loved us, O Lord our God, and with much overflowing pity hast Thou pitied us. Our Father and our King, for the sake of our fathers who trusted in Thee, and Thou taughtest them the statutes of life, have mercy upon us, and enlighten our eyes [*in Thy law; Cause our hearts to cleave to Thy commandment; unite our hearts to love and to fear Thy name, and we shall not be put to shame, world without end. For Thou art a God who prepares! salvation, and us hast Thou chosen from among all nations and tongues, and hast, in truth, brought us near to Thy great name, Selah, in order*]** that we in love may praise Thee and Thy Unity. Blessed be the Lord, who in love chose His people Israel."

*** [The words in italics within the square brackets are regarded by some as a later addition].

After this prayer the Ten Commandments were (at one time) wont to be repeated, a practice discontinued, however, lest the Sadducees should declare them to be the only essential part of the law. Then all assembled said the so-called "Shema" (Hear, O Israel, etc., Deuteronomy 6:4 etc.), which may be designated as a sort of a 'credo' or "belief." It consisted of these three passages - Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:13-21; and Numbers 15:37-41.

The Lot for the Incense

After this, the lot was cast for burning the incense. No one might take part in it who had ministered in that office before, unless in the very rare case that all present had previously so officiated. Hence, while the other three lots held good for the evening service that for the incense required to be repeated. He on whom this lot fell chose from among his friends his two assistants. Finally, the third was succeeded by the fourth lot, which designated those who were to lay on the altar the sacrifice and the meat-offerings, and to pour out the drink-offering.

Offering the Incense

The incensing priest and his assistants now approached first the altar of burnt-offering. One filled with incense a golden censer held in a silver vessel, while another placed in a golden bowl burning coals from the altar. As they passed from the court into the Holy Place, they struck a large instrument (called the 'Magrephah'), at sound of which the priests hastened from all parts to worship, and the Levites to occupy their places in the service of song; while the chief of the 'stationary men' ranged at the Gate of Nicanor such of the people as were to be purified that day. Slowly the incensing priest and his assistants ascended the steps to the Holy Place, preceded by the two priests who had formerly dressed the altar and the candlestick, and who now removed the vessels they had left behind, and, worshipping, withdrew. Next, one of the assistants reverently spread the coals on the golden altar; the other arranged the incense; and then the chief officiating priest was left alone within the Holy Place, to await the signal of the president before burning the incense. It was probably while thus expectant that the angel Gabriel appeared to Zacharias. As the president gave the word of command, which marked that "the time of incense had come," "the whole of the people without" withdrew from the inner court, and fell down before the Lord, spreading their hands in silent prayer.

Imagery in the Apocalypse

It is this most solemn period, when throughout the vast Temple buildings deep silence rested on the worshipping multitude, while within the sanctuary itself the priest laid the incense on the golden altar, and the cloud of 'odours' rose up before the Lord, which serves as the image of heavenly things in this description: "And when he had opened the seventh seal, there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour... And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand."

Prayers with the Incense

The prayers offered by the priests and people at this part of the service are recorded by tradition as follows: "True it is that Thou art Jehovah our God, and the God of our fathers; our King and the King of our fathers; our Saviour and the Saviour of our fathers; our Maker and the Rock of our salvation; our Help and our Deliverer. Thy name is from everlasting, and there is no God beside Thee. A new song did they that were delivered sing to Thy name by the sea-shore; together did all praise and own Thee as King, and say, Jehovah shall reign who saveth Israel.

"Be graciously pleased, Jehovah our God, with Thy people Israel, and with their prayer. Restore the service to the oracle of Thy house; and the burnt-offerings of Israel and their prayer accept graciously and in love; and let the services of Thy people Israel be ever well-pleasing unto Thee.

"We praise Thee, who art Jehovah our God, and the God of our fathers, the God of all flesh, our Creator, and the Creator from the beginning! Blessing and praise be to Thy great and holy name, that Thou hast preserved us in life and kept us. So preserve us and keep us, and gather the scattered ones into Thy holy courts, to keep Thy statutes, and to do Thy good pleasure, and to serve Thee with our whole heart, as this day we confess unto Thee. Blessed be the Lord, unto whom belongeth praise.

"Appoint peace, goodness, and blessing; grace, mercy, and compassion for us, and for all Israel Thy people. Bless us, O our Father, all of us as one, with the light of Thy countenance. For in the light of Thy countenance hast Thou, Jehovah, our God, given us the law of life, and loving mercy, and righteousness, and blessing, and compassion, and life and peace. And may it please Thee to bless Thy people Israel at all times, and at every hour with peace. (May we and all Thy people Israel be remembered and written before Thee in the book of life, with blessing and peace and support.) Blessed be Thou, Jehovah, who blessest Thy people Israel with peace."

These prayers ended, he who had formerly trimmed the candlestick once more entered the Holy Place, to kindle the two lamps that had been left unlit; and then in company with the incensing priest, took his stand on the top of the steps which led down to the Court of the Priests. The other three who had also ministered within the Holy Place gathered beside him, still carrying the vessels of their ministry; while the rest of the priests grouped themselves on the steps beneath. Meanwhile he on whom the fourth lot had fallen had ascended to the altar. They whose duty it was handed to him, one by one, the pieces of the sacrifice. Upon each he pressed his hands, and next flung them confusedly upon the fire, that so the flesh of the sacrifice might be scattered as well as its blood sprinkled. After that he ranged them in order, to imitate as nearly as possible the natural shape of the animal. This part of the service was not unfrequently performed by the high-priest himself.

The Blessing

The priests, who were ranged on the steps to the Holy Place, now lifted their hands above their heads, spreading and joining their fingers in a peculiar mystical manner. One of their number, probably the incensing priest, repeated in audible voice, followed by the others, the blessing in Numbers 6:24-26: "Jehovah bless thee, and keep thee: Jehovah make His face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: Jehovah lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." To this the people responded, "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting." In the modern synagogues the priestly blessing is divided into three parts; it is pronounced with a disguised voice and veiled faces, while the word "Lord" is substituted for the name of "Jehovah." Of course all this was not the case in the Temple. But if it had been the duty of Zacharias, as incensing priest for the day, to lead in the priestly blessing, we can all the better understand the wonder of the people as "he beckoned unto them, and remained speechless" (Luke 1:22), while they waited for his benediction.

After the priestly blessing the meat-offering was brought, and, as prescribed in the law, oil added to it. Having been salted, it was laid on the fire. Next the high-priest's daily meat-offering was presented, consisting of twelve cakes broken in halves - twelve half-cakes being presented in the morning, and the other twelve in the evening. Finally, the appropriate drink-offering was poured out upon the foundation of the altar.

The Temple Music

Upon this the Temple music began. It was the duty of the priests, who stood on I the right and the left of the marble table on which the fat of the sacrifices was laid, at the proper time to blow the blasts on their silver trumpets. There might not be less than two nor more than 120 in this service; the former in accordance with the original institution (Numbers 10:2), the latter not to exceed the number at the dedication of the first Temple (2 Chronicles 5:12). The priests faced the people, looking eastwards, while the Levites, who crowded the fifteen steps which led from the Court of Israel to that of the Priests, turned westwards to the sanctuary. On a signal given by the president, the priests moved forward to each side of him who struck the cymbals. Immediately the choir of the Levites, accompanied by instrumental music, began the Psalm of the day. It was sustained by not less than twelve voices, with which mingled the delicious treble from selected voices of young sons of the Levites, who, standing by their fathers, might take part in this service alone. The number of instrumental performers was not limited, nor yet confined to the Levites, some of the distinguished families which had intermarried with the priests being admitted to the service. The Psalm of the day was always sung in three sections. At the close of each the priests drew three blasts from their silver trumpets, and the people bowed down and worshipped. This closed the morning service. It was immediately followed by the sacrifices and offerings which private Israelites might have to bring, and which would occasionally continued till near the time for the evening service. The latter resembled in all respects that of the morning, except that the lot was only cast for the incense; that the incense was burned, not, as in the morning, before, but after the pieces of the sacrifice had been laid on the fire of the altar, and that the priestly blessing was generally omitted.

The Order of the Psalms

The following was the order of the Psalms in the daily service of the Temple. On the first day of the week, they sang Psalm 24, "The earth is the Lord's," etc., in commemoration of the first day of creation,

when “God possessed the world, and ruled in it.” On the second day they sang Psalm 48, “Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised,” etc., because on the second day of creation “the Lord divided His works, and reigned over them.” On the third day they sang Psalm 82, “God standeth in the congregation of the mighty,” etc., “Because on that day the earth appeared, on which are the Judge and the judged.” On the fourth day Psalm 94 was sung, “O Lord God, to whom vengeance belongeth,” etc., “because on the fourth day God made the sun, moon, and stars, and will be avenged on those that worship them.” On the fifth day they sung Psalm 81, “Sing aloud unto God our strength,” etc., “because of the variety of creatures made that day to praise His name.” On the sixth day Psalm 93 was sung, “The Lord reigneth,” etc., “because on that day God finished His works and made man, and the Lord ruled over all His works.” Lastly, on the Sabbath day they sang Psalm 92, “It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord,” etc., ‘because the Sabbath was symbolical of the millennial kingdom at the end of the six thousand years’ dispensation, when the Lord would reign over all, and His glory and service fill the earth with thanksgiving.’

Dr Edersheim

Final part

The Netherton Debate

Evening Session

Brother Brady questions W. F. Barling:

- 294.** Will you give me your strongest scriptural proof for Christ having to die for Himself?
A. Hebrews 13, verse 20. “Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant...”
- 295.** That verse is construed (I don’t know whether you know) to read “Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, make you perfect through the blood of the everlasting covenant.”
A. You cannot give me a version that supports you in that.
- 296.** Off-hand I can’t, but I can give you the key, though. Hebrew is a disjointed language, and it is necessary to construe in harmony with the rest of the Scriptures.
A. I have here the versions which occur in the American Revised Standard Version, Moffatt, the Revised Version, Weymouth, Rotherham, Conybeare & Howson, and Young’s Literal Translation; and they are all against you.
- 297.** All right. Will you turn to John 8:34? I want to draw the contrast between Jesus and ourselves, and show you how the Scripture nowhere supports your view that Jesus was in condemnation. “Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.” Was Jesus the servant of sin?
A. No.
- 298.** Is there a distinction between a son and a servant? “And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever.”
A. It depends on the particular context in which the contrast is set, of course. You say that the distinction between a son and a servant is based on the first century practice of slavery. Quite obviously there is a difference.
- 299.** Verse 36: “If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.” Was there any sense in which Jesus was free?
A. Yes.
- 300.** Was it as a result of His birth?
A. His perfect life of obedience.

- 301.** But still under condemnation as the penalty of this physical sin?
A. Physically, yes.
- 302.** And He had to pay the penalty?
A. I must object to the language, which doesn't account for our belief, as I have shown already.
- 303.** Verse 38: "I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father," Do you recognise the distinction between Jesus' Father and our father?
A. Jesus Father and the sinner's father?
- 304.** Who is the father of sinners?
A. The principle of evil in the flesh.
- 305.** Verse 44: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father will ye do." Who was the devil?
A. Jesus clearly indicates that it's that which possesses 'lusts,' which is one thing only in the case of man - the nature which he bears.
- 306.** Does the Apostle James say: "Resist the devil and he will flee from you"?
A. No, but sinful and evil impulses can be subjected and brought into harmony with the will of God. I've given an analogy of the tree and...
- 307.** Verse 46: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" Do you convict Jesus of sin?
A. No, He was the only person ever to live who has not offended morally.
- 308.** John says, "in Him is no sin."
A. John is not referring to the physical body of Christ, but to the fellowship with the Father that we have in Him and "with the Father."
- 309.** Will you give me your strongest proof of sin in Christ?
A. Romans 6, which is based on your own insistence that if their reality lies in Christ, there is the symbol to our case. Do you insist – do you urgently commit yourself to the view, that in symbol (in baptism) "the body of sin" is put to death. Then in reality it was with Christ.
- 310.** Do you admit Jesus rose with the same body as the body that had to be put to death?
A. I said, I do not know.
- 311.** Verse 49: "Jesus answered, I have not a devil." Do you agree with that? Do you believe He had a devil in His flesh?
A. You appreciate the different wording? He is referring to something quite different; the 'diabolos,' not 'daemon.'
- 312.** I am quoting from your book "Redemption in Christ Jesus." Page 28 paragraph 4; "The Scriptures leave us in no doubt where the true Diabolos resides and operates. In order that by his death he might destroy Diabolos Jesus partook of flesh and blood... It is abundantly clear that Diabolos must be located in man's physical constitution." Was the devil in Jesus?
A. Hebrews 2:14 says it was.
- 313.** Now we turn to John 10: 9, "I am the door..." Can a door go through itself, or can a door be confused with those who go through it?
A. The question is so facetious that I can't answer.
- 314.** Verse 10: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." Did we receive our natural life because Jesus came and paid the price of Adam's sin, thus redeeming us?

A. We are in the position (as a result of this operation) that, whereas the inheritance from Adam takes us to the grave, Christ brings us back. And God does not merely raise the dead but quickens them; and there will be, in the case of those who on that occasion, transformation of nature when we are “in Christ.”

315. Have we life now, in the sense other than natural life?

A. Yes.

316. And do we hope to get that life more abundantly in the future?

A. Yes, certainly.

317. Verse 11: “I am the Good Shepherd. The Good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.” I ask the question, Can the Shepherd be one of the sheep?

A. You must not base on one figure the whole teaching of the Scriptures.

318. No, and you mustn’t base on one verse, in dealing with the resurrection the whole teaching of Scripture concerning that from which man needs redemption.

A. So far I’ve used three verses.

319. Verses 17-19 “Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again.” Now if Jesus had no choice about laying down His life, or was required to submit to ceremonial condemnation of His nature, could it be said “I lay it down of myself”? And could there be any sense or reason why His Father should thus love Him? “No man taketh it from me... I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. Your affirmation was that, in effect, ‘He had no choice because He was under condemnation.

A. When God asks me to observe His law, I have a choice, although God tells me that I must obey. That was the way in which Christ was “obedient” unto death, even the death of the Cross.

320. If Jesus’ death was required of Him, was His act of obedience a part of duty? Was He not in the same position as those He spoke to in Luke 17:10, “So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do”?

A. You see, here again, you are confusing the matter. As I have explained, Christ would not have been born apart from sin. Christ came with a unique mission, and therefore it is mere confusion to try and square Him by a statement which governs the status of His servants.

321. But unless you can contemplate the opposite view... Jesus said His Father loved Him because He did it out of love. It was that which He was neither called upon to do nor obliged to do for the ungodly, and to be a propitiation for our sins.

A. God sent Him to be a propitiation for our sins.

322. I want to ask you a question on Romans 5:18, “Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation.” Is that the same condemnation as in Romans 8:1, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.”?

A. I should say it is more comprehensive than the other.

323. One is more comprehensive than the other?

A. The first is a general legacy from Adam, whereas in Romans 8:1....

324. Condemnation came by one, and ‘condemnation’ is a legal term, you will agree. Now it says that “there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus.”

A. Those who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

325. But if we walk after the flesh we prove that we are sinners. But you say it is impossible to walk after anything else, it is impossible for men to live in obedience.

A. I have said nothing of the sort! I have said that if a man strives to the best of his ability to be obedient he can say ‘I have done it; yet not I, but the grace of God which is with me’ with the help of God’s grace, even to this.,.

- 326.** So it is possible?
A. With external help from God
- 327.** Romans 5:1, “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Was there ever a moment when Jesus wasn’t at peace with God?
A. No
- 328.** This is proving, you see, that His death was not on His own account. It was not for Himself, it was for us. In verse 2; “By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand.” Was Jesus ever in a state of disgrace?
A. Disgrace isn’t the opposite of grace.
- 329.** Was He ever in a state when He needed to be restored to grace?
A. Again, the language is incongruous. The language is not scriptural.
- 330.** Did Jesus need access by grace?
A. Access was by His own blood.
- 331.** Verse 6; “For when we were yet without strength...” Was Jesus without strength?
A. In the sense of the term used here (namely, that we were sinners), no.
- 332.** But He was without that strength in some sense?
A. He acknowledged that the works He did were not His, but His Father’s Psalm 80 said He was the branch made strong for us.
- 333.** Verse 6; “Christ died for the ungodly.” Was Jesus one of the ungodly?
A. The position here is that the ungodly are those who are ‘sinners’ in literal sense that they are ‘transgressors’, and in that sense He was not among them.
- 334.** He was not among those for whom He died?
A. Don’t put words which I have not said.
- 335.** “For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Is that substitution?
A. That is the death of Christ for sinners, not to redeem them from some legal bondage, but from the literal spiritual bondage to which we, being sinful persons, are condemned. Christ died “for us,” to liberate us from it; and we have that liberation and justification of life in that if ‘we are crucified with him we live with him.’
- 335a.** Verse 9, “Much more, then, being now justified by his blood..” Did Jesus need justification? Was the wrath of God ever against Jesus?
A. Would you define ‘justification’ for me?
- 336.** No. I’ll go on. Verse 10, “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God.” Was Jesus ever an enemy?
A. Not in the sense we are, because we are sinners.
- 337.** Did Jesus ever need reconciliation?
A. Not in the sense we do.
- 338.** “Reconciled by his death” and “saved by his life.” Is that a parallel to Romans 4:25, “Who was delivered for our offences and was raised again for our justification”? Now this answers your point, in Corinthians, about the resurrection. Jesus was “delivered for our offences,’ which would have bound us in eternal death, and “raised again for our justification,” in order that we might rise from the state of death - which would have the end of all mankind, if Christ had not given Himself the Just for the unjust.
A. You have asked a question; I would like to answer it.

339. No. I don't want that question answered. "And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ by whom we have now received the atonement." Where and when did Jesus need atonement, making Him at one with God?

W. F. Barling now questions E. Brady:

175. Well, we will return now to Hosea 13, and I will recapitulate the position partly. In 1 Corinthians 15, Paul is refuting a false idea that there is no such thing as resurrection. Therefore the whole terms of reference of the chapter are man's nature, which takes him to the grave, and salvation, which has come by Christ. That is the beginning of the argument, and, in the course of developing it, he shows that "now is Christ risen from the dead" (in accordance with God's purpose) "and become the first fruits of them that slept." He is the first stage in the harvest of redemption from death. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." You have admitted that we are disputing the interpretation of those four verses. Now I ask you frankly, do you still adhere to the view that when Paul says, "by man came death" he is not referring to natural death?

A. Yes, I do, certainly.

176. When in the latter part of the chapter, he explains that the transformation of nature is the fulfilment of Hosea 13.14, is he indicating 'natural' death or this 'legal' death of which you spoke?

A. If you will allow me to say so, the Old Testament is often quoted in the New, without a precise fulfilment of the prophecy.

177. Paul says, "Then..." with absolute precision, "then will be brought to pass the saying that is written."

A. I haven't disputed that.

178. Very well. What is the death that is swallowed up in victory?

A. It is death, in the whole sense of death.

179. Does it include natural death?

A. Yes. All death will be swallowed up in victory

180. So that natural death will be swallowed up in victory?

A. Yes.

181. When, in the prophecy which we have here, God says, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death," does that include natural death?

A. Yes.

182. And does that, to some extent, concern natural death?

A. No. I should say...

183. But you are contradicting yourself. You have said that in 1 Corinthians 15 'death' involved natural death?

A. Yes.

184. When I ask you the question whether the ransom covered that.

A. I say it covered it, in the sense that a ransom was necessary in order to get salvation for life of any kind.

185. That isn't Paul's argument. Paul says that when this physical transformation takes place the prophecy will be fulfilled.

A. That will be at the time when the consummation of God's purpose will come, when mankind will have been redeemed and saved as a whole.

186. But it isn't mankind as a whole; it is "those who are alive" in Christ at His coming.

A. There will be those alive, and there will be those in the grave.

187. That is all you need, as even in the case of the living this change to immortality will be brought to pass. “O death, where is thy victory?” What death has victory over me when I am in Christ? Well, why does death have victory when the transformation takes place in me? Paul says that death concerns a living person: “And the scripture will be fulfilled...”

A. It hasn't any victory, because Christ has paid for the sin; He has paid the price.

188. Well, why does Paul say explicitly that “when” the transformation takes place “the scripture will be fulfilled”?

A. Because I have explained to you, at that time, the time of the resurrection, is the consummation of God's purpose. When all these things...

189. But this concerns living people, as well as dead people: “and when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption.” And what is so damaging to your case is that the actual context is the context of ‘ransom’ and ‘redemption.’ You perceive that and quickly retreat and withdraw from what previously you have conceded - that this comprehends natural death. Now please turn to Psalm 49. This is quoted extensively in your literature, is it not? You frequently quote “None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him.” Am I correct in taking it that you use this to prove that unless Jesus had had a free life He could not have redeemed us? But that is by the way. Let us read verses 6, 7, and 9 straight through: “They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches; none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him:.. that he should still live for ever and not see corruption.” Can you tell me why the ransom is paid to God?

A. It says that none can give to God a ransom: there is no ransom.

190. This is the verse in which you said Jesus could, and did, do it, but nobody else could? Did He pay the ransom to God?

A. No.

191. Why does the Psalm use that language, then?

A. Why, of course, because God is the supreme power. God has established the constitution of things under which we live. And God has inaugurated the law which requires the recognition of the purpose of redemption.

192. In other words, when you are insistent that God redeems man, you are only saying that God insists that His own law is upheld. You can't have both these things: one must be metaphorical. The metaphor, in this case applies to the ransom; but the literal truth is that God was “a just God and a Saviour.” When you appreciate that you are building your theory on a misapplied metaphor you will see the light. If you insist that it is literal why, then, is the ransom paid to God?

A. This ransom here is not paid to God. The ransom that Jesus paid was paid to the ‘Sin power,’ the personification of sin; which is not what you say.

193. This scripture says that no man can redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him. Now why, in this verse (this is scripture, now), why is the ransom paid to God?

A. This ransom is not paid at all. It says that no man can give to God a ransom.

194. But why do you quote this verse to prove that Jesus did?

A. Because no man can pay a ransom, to God or anybody else.

195. You use it in an attempt to prove that if Christ was involved in the scheme of salvation He couldn't have saved us. When it suits your purpose you use the verse, but when the difficulties implicit in that verse are pointed out to you, you hastily drop it.

A. We stand by it, and we stay by it.

196. If you stand by it; whether a man could or couldn't, is the ransom paid to God?

A. I would say the ransom is not paid to God; in this case it is spoken of as “none of them can by any means redeem his brother.”

- 197.** Why should the very idea of the ransom being paid to God be mentioned?
- A.** Because God is the supreme power in the organisation of things; but God didn't receive the ransom that Christ paid.
- 198.** You are trying to get out of obvious difficulties. You have no explanation to offer. Now, can you tell me why he is unable to redeem his brother; or to give God a ransom for him; that he should still live for ever and not see corruption? The ransom is paid for a living person, and that ransom is paid, if it is paid, that a man should still live and not see corruption. Once more, 'ransom' is used of liability to 'natural' death, as you call it, which in your theory is impossible. Why is the language used, then?
- A.** Corruption comes as a result of death, of whatever type. If a man suffers death by execution for sin, he enters into corruption. If a man reaches the end of his natural life, he similarly enters into corruption. Death which is the wages of sin would make life impossible, because he has paid the just penalty of his deeds, but natural death...
- 199.** But that isn't what the Psalm is concerned with. No man is able to prevent another man going to the grave.
- A.** We are not arguing about that.
- 200.** Why, then, is the term ransom used? What relevance, according to you, has the term ransom to the idea of going into the grave?
- A.** It proves this: that ransom is a scriptural principle which had to be paid for every creature to God.
- 201.** You are insistent that ransom is legal, but in Hosea, and in Psalm 49, it is not concerned with a legal situation, but with a very literal physical condition.
- A.** It may not be concerned here with the legal situation
- 202.** Yes, that suffices; it may not be concerned with a legal condition. Is it concerned with the physical condition?
- A.** No. Not necessarily.
- 203.** Why, then, does the Psalmist say, "nor give to God a ransom for him, that he should still live for ever and not see corruption"? We will leave that. I think you have proved your inability to deal with that difficulty. Now turn to Job 33:23, which you quoted in your opening address. Job 33:22, "Yea, his soul draweth near unto the grave, and his life to the destroyers. If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter, one among a thousand, to show unto man his uprightness: then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom." What pit has Elihu in mind?
- A.** The grave.
- 204.** "Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom." Is that natural death from which man is bought by ransom?
- A.** I couldn't say it is the death. Going down into the pit is the result of death.
- 205.** Yes. And man, according to this communication, is, by the graciousness of God, saved from that by a ransom found by God?
- A.** Yes.
- 206.** So once more we have ransom and redemption related, not to a legal condition, which you favour, but to a physical state of man; a bondage to death of a very literal, material kind. Now, you can't have it both ways. It is... You can't insist that it is legal, and then insist that it is physical. It over-rides... If it over-rides, comprehends, and concentrates, the other is included?
- A.** Yes, I have admitted that.
- 207.** Does ransom save us from this natural condition of corruptibility and mortality?
- A.** Of course. Because the victory over death is the victory, whether it is over the death which is the wages of sin...

208. But it does include natural death, so that the ransom by Christ impinged on that great problem we all face? It concerns this problem of being subject to death in the physical sense?

A. Yes, obviously.

209. That is a big admission on your part?

A. It is no admission. The death that would exclude us from eternal life is not natural death.

210. Yet you just admitted natural death is not...

A. Unless ransom is paid.

211. The very verse quoted to support your legal theory is concerned with a physical condition, pointing out the perfection of God's purpose. When this ransom has its effect, as Paul points out, his nature is changed; "His flesh shall be fresher than a child's: he shall return to the days of his youth. He shall pray unto God, and he will be favourable unto him and he shall see his face with joy: for he will render unto him His righteousness" (Job 33:25-26). Going into the pit of corruption... "shall all be made alive..." God gives a ransom, and says, "Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom." Therefore we are redeemed from the bondage of corruption, and that redemption is what Paul calls "the redemption of the body."

End of questioning.

ERNEST BRADY'S CLOSING ADDRESS

We affirm that the penalty that Adam incurred was a judicial death, and we are told that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. "The life is in the blood," and when the blood is shed the life is taken. Natural death is not a punishment, neither can it be a sacrifice. It was a specific principle that that which dies of itself was neither to be eaten nor offered. Why? Because the whole purpose of the sacrifice, under the Law, was to impress the lesson that the wages of sin is death, an inflicted death and not natural corruption - the violent cutting off, in any form of execution. If an Israelite broke the law, he was required to bring a lamb to the tabernacle, lay his hand upon its head, and confess his sin. The lamb was then killed,

Now no one denies that the Mosaic sacrifices were substitutionary; no one would be so foolish, for it is self-evident. And no one denies that Jesus is the anti-type of those sacrifices, and shows the substance of which they were a shadow. How, then, can anyone be so perverse as to deny that His sacrifice was, in the same way, substitutionary, or to present the argument that His death was for Himself?

We affirm that the sacrifice of Christ took away sins upon precisely the same principle as was foreshadowed in the Mosaic Law, by transfer of the penalty from the guilty transgressor to the innocent victim? who bore it in his stead. Sin cannot be transferred, because it is an act which is past; neither can guilt be transferred. But the penalty can be transferred, and was transferred, and for the act of obedience and the expression of repentance and confession, in offering the typical sacrifice, permitted an escape from the penalty, which was transferred to the innocent victim. Where the typical sacrifices fell short was in that they were involuntary; the animals offered were unreasoning creatures. The sacrifices under the law could not take away sin, because they were not of the race that sinned; they could only serve as a type to provide a covering for the time then present. The law was weak through the flesh, not because flesh could not keep it, but because the whole race born of the will of the flesh was under condemnation because of sin. So the ceremonial of the law could not finally take away the power of sin; but Jesus could, because He could voluntarily meet the claims of the law, and pay its claim with His own blood.

The prophet says: "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, and the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all." Why is there such a horror of the idea of Christ dying in our stead? I will tell you: it is because it is wrongly believed that the Cross was an act of revenge; that God was punishing Jesus with death because Adam sinned. Now, if Jesus were wholly righteous that obviously would have been unjust, and no right thinking person could accept it. Therefore, the theory is advanced that though His character was perfect, His nature was defiled and sinful and had to be destroyed. Not only is this teaching utterly unscriptural, but, when examined, it does not even remove the difficulty. For if it would be unjust to punish a man for someone else's sin, it would be equally unjust to punish him for his nature, because he could no

more help that. The answer is, of course, that God was not punishing; He did not even instigate the death of His own Son; He was giving, saving, redeeming, by the surrender of His own beloved Son to the power of sin, to bear voluntarily the penalty of sin for us, to receive the wages of sin, which He did not earn, so that they might not be paid to us, who did.

The idea that Jesus was under condemnation not only makes His death unjust, but it would also make it impossible for His sacrifice to accomplish its purpose. The most vital principle in the law of sacrifice was that the victim had to be legally clean and physically unblemished. An imperfect offering would have been unacceptable, and was, in fact, legally unfit to be offered.

Now we go to the great anti-type, the “Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world,” and ask: If Jesus was legally unclean, condemned, or in any way defiled, how could He have borne away the sins of the world? No wonder Mr Barling was so reluctant to meet the questions I asked him on that point! Not only were the plain and precise injunctions on the law being reversed, an anti-type made inferior to a type, but - the whole purpose and intention of the type would be destroyed. If, to take away the sins of the world, Jesus had to be unclean, then the true type of Him would have been an unclean beast - like the swine --not a lamb without spot or blemish. Morally, the swine is on the level with the lamb; neither has any morality, good nor bad. If, in order to redeem us, Jesus had Himself to be under condemnation, then He would have been more fittingly typified by a dead carcass. What would have been the result, if an Israelite had made such an offering? “Cursed be that deceiver who sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing.”

Now you will have noted that, in this debate, I have been tactically at a disadvantage. I had the first speech without knowing the line my opponent would take; and when I have finished he will have the last word; but I am quite happy for him to have the tactical advantage, knowing that truth and weight of evidence is on my side. I am convinced that one who has the truth can put to flight ten thousand. Mr Barling is a clever advocate and he reasons well on the scriptures advanced in order to try and justify his case but you cannot justify a case for Jesus' being under condemnation, or needing to be sacrificed for Himself. It destroys the weight and purpose of God's plan. The more closely one examines the theory that Jesus' death was for Himself, the more unthinkable it becomes.

Now if Adam was changed from the very good original of his creation to a compound of physical sin, so that we have all to be born sinful (for -that is the implication of the Christadelphian theory), what sense or reason is there in God's setting before us the choice of good and evil? Who else but God could have made the change? And, having made it, how could He justly condemn and punish those who are sinners as a result? To propose that God expects us to see justice in creating men incapable of righteousness and then punishing them for being sinners is to charge Him with foolishness. The matter, in relation to Jesus, is nothing short of an “abomination that maketh desolate,” for the contention that God engineered the slaughter of His innocent, sinless, obedient Son, to stage a ritual exhibition of that supposed sinful flesh ceremonially destroyed, is an abomination, and the position in which it places those who believe it is, truly, one of desolation, for they, in effect, reject the Holy One and the Just and desire one under the condemnation of a murderer to be given unto them.

I say to Mr Barling: I have no ill-will or unkind feeling for him or his community, but I truly hate the teaching that Christ was under condemnation and believe it is a doctrine of devils. He has done the best he could, with the tools and the material that were to his hand, and he has raised a structure which, no doubt, he sincerely believes is a fit dwelling for the Holy One of God; the One born to be a Prince; the future King of the whole world; “the chiefest among ten thousand;” the “altogether lovely” One. But he that hath eyes to see can penetrate the whitewash. I say that palace is a tomb; a white sepulchre, and inwardly full of uncleanness and deceit and rottenness, and dead men's bones. If he had succeeded in concealing the true ugliness of his case, he might have made it appear plausible that God's Son could have been born under condemnation; but he would still have to explain how it pleased God or benefited man to put Him to shame, torture, and ignominy of a criminal's death. And even if he could have done that, he would still be left with the impossible task of altering not only the whole weight of the scriptures' testimony, but also the inference from it which proves to a demonstration that Jesus paid for Adam's sin; that He died for the ungodly; that He gave Himself for us; He died in the stead of sinners - why do you tie yourselves up in knots to explain that it doesn't mean what it says? The plain scriptural testimonies are there; what are you afraid of? I say, cast aside the remnants of priest-craft, and apostasy, with the idea of original sin defiling human nature; accept it,

and believe it. We confess to the glory of God, that the life we now live in the flesh we live by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who loved us and gave Himself for us, and it is our constant joy and rejoicing, and our “song in the night.” And I say to Mr Barling: Although you may succeed in drugging yourself with your medicine, we know that the majority of the ordinary members of the community have the same views in regard to the sacrifice of Christ as we have. Time and again, when we have explained our views, they said “but I have never believed anything else.” They have a superstitious dread of the word “substitution,” but they either believe that Christ died for them and in their stead, or they believe nothing at all. And that is the position to which you come when you teach that Christ’s death was for Himself? It utterly destroys its purpose and meaning, and you come to the point where a book like this Mr James has written (Why Christ Died) sets out to prove that it was no more than a bloody crime. It was that, certainly; and here, I think, he is in advance of Mr Barling, who says it was just and right for Jesus to die, but it is the keystone of God’s revelation and purpose with man that Jesus gave Himself, the Just for the unjust.

And now a final word to those of you who have listened. If anything I have said has seemed offensive or unkind, I ask your pardon; put it down, if you will, to mistaken zeal or anything else. But no-one realises better than I how much the Christadelphian name and association mean. I believe there was a time when Christadelphians had all the light that was then available, and in their day and generation they were faithful people who will, in due time, receive their reward. But I believe that that time has gone. In the last seventy years truth has unfolded a little further, and I think that we are probably on the last stage. The issue which faces us is a test of faith. If you are satisfied with the Christadelphian Statement, that “it is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,” well, I say let us part friends, but let the strife continue. We shall continue to spend ourselves and be spent to defend what we believe to the honour of our God and Saviour. And we await in confidence -the day when He will be here to defend His own. And if you have a suspicion (and I know there are many) that things are not as they should be, then you have to choose either the community or the truth; you cannot retain both. I say: Dare to be a Daniel. Dare to stand alone. Put your faith beside Abraham’s. Go forth - if necessary alone. It is doubtful if you think more of your community than the Apostle Paul did of his, yet it turned out that he, a persecutor, was yet a true follower of Christ.

There has not, perhaps, to-day been a blinding light from heaven nor a voice of thunder. But I confess that I hope that some of you have seen a glimmer, maybe, and heard, perhaps, a still small voice: “It is Jesus whom thou condemnest and it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.”

MR BARLING’S CLOSING ADDRESS

Those who heard my opening remarks will know that the extreme and extravagant statements attributed to me, in the words which you have just heard, have not been expressed; that I have been said to say things which I did not say, and to hold views which I do not hold. And I leave it to the record of this debate (when it is perused carefully by the independent reader) for what I did say at the outset and what I have said in answer to the questions. I know the impartial reader will reach the verdict which must be reached by everyone.

Rather than concern myself at this stage with answering fresh points in the speech you have just heard, I would like to recapitulate the debate.

As far as I see it, one has come to present a theological system in which the term “cursed Christ” is used disparagingly. The basic doctrines of that system have not received the support of the scriptures. It has been a characteristic of that which we have heard from my opponent that much assertion has been made and very little proof has been put forward. When verses have been examined in detail it has been frankly admitted what they seem to say, but it has been insisted that although they seem to say they do not say it, and that what they don’t appear to say they do, in fact, say. There has been an evasion once it has become obvious that the course adopted up to that point has become impossible. Airy assumption has taken the place of reasoned scriptural proof. I think that is a fair summary of the attitude that has been shown by my opponent and I say it in all modesty and sincerity. What, then, is the position? There is no scriptural proof.

I think, myself, that the error lies in the assumption that what is a metaphor is literal fact. When Paul wrote to the Corinthians, he said, “Ye are washed,” they knew what he meant. When he said, “Ye are

clean,” and “Your bodies are the members of Christ,” they knew what he meant. When he said, “Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit,” they knew what he meant. In that sixth chapter of the first Epistle he uses impressive metaphors. They had washed away sin, not literally, but symbolically; they had become part of Christ’s body - not literal members and limbs, but nevertheless in a very real sense, which the symbol indicates, part of Christ. Also the grace of God had come to them, and they were, in that sense the “temple of the Spirit.” Paul goes on to say, “Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price,” but not as slaves were in the first century, as those familiar with their redemption would very well know. That is, he was using a metaphor there also.

When Paul spoke to the Ephesian elders and told them to take heed unto themselves and to the flock of God they knew what “the flock” meant; they knew it was not a flock of literal sheep but those in their spiritual care, over whom they were “overseers.” When he said “After my departing shall grievous wolves enter among you, not sparing the flock,” they knew what those “wolves” were. They were not literal wolves. Therefore, when he said that this was the Church of God which he had “purchased with his own blood,” they knew what that “purchase” was.

The truth is that there are many metaphors in scripture to describe our new state, and “ransom” is one of them. This has been perverted and misapplied in the system which is advocated by the Nazarene Fellowship, and if they can only see that the “true ransom” is “the forgiveness of sins,” then they are nearing the light. And hasn’t it struck us all that the emphasis, in this theory, is not on personal transgression, but on a legal condition for which we are not responsible? When we rapidly review the quotations in the scriptures, what do we find?

“Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins;” “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;” “Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;” “He was manifested to take away our sins.” In the verse that has been quoted; “He was delivered for our offences;” “Repent and be baptised, every one of you,” said Peter, “for the remission of your sins;” “We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins.”

And so we could continue, and the list could be made longer. What is indicated in the scripture is not the condition in which we are born, but the sin that results from that condition, and our failure to observe the law of God. These terms of “punishment” and “penalty” which have been bandied about have been grossly misapplied. The “punishment,” if the term could be used, is on account of personal transgressions. “So death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” One only did not sin, and so the way was opened up for those who had sinned to escape from the consequences of their transgressions. “Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures.” Therefore this postulate, this hypothesis, of legal alienation, just does not square with the scriptures, it is foreign to the Word of God. It is the device of man which has resulted from an extreme application of that beautiful metaphor, “redemption for a ransom.”

There was much slavery in New Testament times, and many of those who came into the truth were slaves. Paul was indicating their condition when he said that they were “dead in trespasses and sins.” They were, under this other figure, slaves to sin; but slaves could be redeemed in the first century days by a purchase. Deissman, in his “Light from the Ancient East,” points out that the money deposited in the temple of the god by the slave himself was from his own savings. If this figure of redemption is to be taken literally, then it should be used against a background where the slave himself paid the money. Paul was not concerned with the fact that the slave paid the money; he was concerned with the fundamental transformation in the slave’s relationship to his God. Before, he was the slave of sin; he observed sin; and sin, for his service, paid him wages - death. But God, in His grace, gave him eternal life, “By man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.” The whole wonderful scheme of redemption was wrought out in the experiences of one man.

Instead of that, we have, on the other hand, the altogether capricious application of a metaphor; and confusion results. We have seen it on the physical plane: “redemption,” in the scriptures applies to natural death, as it is called, just as much as to a literal “free ransom” from the grave. God will be “the plagues” of death. “Thanks be to God,” says Paul, “who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.” What is that victory that he has in mind? Namely, the victory that will result when death itself “is swallowed up in

victory;” when, in the expressive words of the eighth chapter of Romans, as he says, “the redemption of the body.”

Much time is needed to expound fully all the aspects; but I would suggest in all modesty, that, in the opening address there was a sound scriptural argument presented which contrasts strongly with what we heard before it, wherein was very little scripture and much explanation. We have heard it said by my adversary, when we examined his fundamental doctrines, that he reaches his conclusions as a result of reasoning from the scriptures. I think it is a sorry state of affairs for anyone that he has to make a statement of that kind and to admit that he has not precise and explicit and unambiguous texts in the scriptures to support him and his beliefs. And so the impartial reader, or those of you here to-day, can examine both sides; can examine them with the Bible near at hand, to check the references to see if the interpretations suggested by Mr Brady or by myself accord with the Word of God. “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” That must be the test. Our faith must be built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone.

What, then, is the sum of the matter? All of us are sinners. There is none righteous; no, not one. “The scripture hath concluded all under sin;” but in the mercy of God there is “redemption in Christ Jesus.” God, in His forbearance, extends to men the remission of their sins. He was “in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto thorns So we have the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works. Paul takes up the significance of David’s story, so beautifully described in the language of the Psalms: “Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile.”

We have iniquity, every one of us; we are morally guilty. It is no question of a legal state. We are all sinners, and God commended His love towards us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; so in Him and in His blood we have redemption, even the forgiveness of our sins. That is the simple Bible story. “Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses,” it says. He was the beautiful sheaf waved before God at the beginning of the harvest. There was only one sheaf; there was only one Christ who rose from the dead; but in that sheaf there were many blades of corn, and in each ear many seeds. There was only one sheaf waved before God, yet all the believers were involved. That is the beauty of the figure: He was part of the harvest: we are in Him, in His death and in His resurrection. He is “the first fruits of them that slept,” and since He was born and lived, and died, and rose again from the dead, and ascended, all for us, it is right that every man should receive redemption in his own order. “Christ is the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming.” “Christ... the first fruits.” Because, when that sheaf was waved a burnt offering was offered. His own death had efficacy for Him, it has efficacy for us, too. “Every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ’s at His coming.” And also that great end of the harvest will have its counterpart in the Kingdom, which will have come to its end when the final resurrection takes place. The world will be populated with those who are not subject to death: “the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.”

And so the wonderful story of the harvest of redemption will be complete. Beginning in Christ, with us involved; then ourselves at the coming of Christ, if it be God’s will; and eventually the time will come when God will be all in all.

The faith which is dear to me is not one which debases man, it is one that offers to him, in his strivings, the offer of forgiveness. It is one that inspires him to succeed where he has failed before, to be grateful to God that He has sent Jesus to be “a propitiation for our sins.” The resolve can be made, and it must be made continually, as it was made by Paul: “I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me, and gave Himself for me.”

Yes, “I am crucified with Christ...” and yet, despite that “He loved me and gave Himself for me.” There is room for both aspects, and let us not forget it. It is because there are those two aspects that there is hope for us.

And so I end with an appeal. Many years ago David Handley of Maiden, began the sad story that has continued this evening. He propagated these views, but before he died he renounced them. He went back to the towns and villages where he had preached them. He went back to refute them. I call upon my adversary to-night, in all sincerity, to do the same as David Handley - to find his way out of the fog. I make an earnest appeal to Mr Brady to do the same.

CHAIRMAN: Sisters and Brethren, I would likes to thank the two speakers in your name, who have come here this evening, for the way they have conducted themselves, for the restraint they have used, and the way they both endeavoured to put before us the views in which they both sincerely believe. I would like to thank you all for the help you have given the Chairman in carrying out an exceedingly difficult task. I would like you/ please, to thank God.

* * * * *

Jesus' priceless treasure, source of purest pleasure,
Truest friend to me;
Long my heart hath panted, till it well-nigh fainted,
Thirsting after Thee.
Thine I am, O spotless Lamb,
I will suffer nought to hide Thee,
Ask for nought beside Thee.
Hence, all fears and sadness I For the Lord of gladness,
Jesus, enters in:
Those who love the Father, though the storms may gather,
Still have peace within;
Yea, whate'er we here must bear,
Still in Thee lies purest pleasure,
Jesus, priceless treasure!