

# Nazarene Fellowship circular Letter No. 159

March/April 1996

## In This Issue:

Page 1	Editorial Sister	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2	Exhortation "Passing the Buck"	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 3	From your letters and other correspondence	
Page 12	Correspondence concerning The Netherton Debate	
Page 15	Chronology of The Deluge	Brother John Stevenson
Page 16	Wrested Scripture Straightened Out	Brother A.H.Broughton
Page 17	Exhortation	Brother Harold Dawson
Page 18	Ezekiel's Temple - Part Seven	Brethren Bert Gates and Edgar Wille
Page 27	Comment	Brother Russell Gregory

---

## Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Friends,

Loving greetings. We hope that all our readers on the wintry side of the globe have come through the bitter weather of recent weeks as comfortably as possible. Those of us in the world who have a roof over our heads, sufficient food and a warm bed are blessed indeed at such times. We can be sure that the spring will eventually come as it always has done, for every year we see the earth renewed and it is a miracle which gives a foretaste of the renewal which one day we shall enjoy under Messiah's mighty hand when he returns to us from His Father.

Recently a book has been published which predicts that European Jewry will not survive the next century, The possibility is raised by Bernard Wasserstein, whose book "Vanishing Diaspora: The Jews in Europe since 1945" includes some sombre figures.

In 1937 there were 9,648,100 Jews in Europe. Hitler and others murdered nearly 6 million of them including the parents of our beloved brother Leo Dreifuss. In 1946 their number was calculated at 3,898,350. By 1967 the figure had fallen to 3,119,650 and in 1994 the latest year for which comprehensive data is available it had dropped to 1,980,900.

An increasing number of Jews marry Gentiles and their children cease to count themselves as Jewish also Jewish birth-rates are abysmally low. This is a comparatively new phenomenon. When Paul Johnson wrote his History of the Jews in the 1980's he calculated that during the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the Ashkenazi Jews of Eastern Europe had the highest birth-rates in history. Among those who emigrated to America families of 10 children were common and 15 not unusual and since Jews looked after infant children more successfully than others in the same income groups, many more survived. All that has been reversed.

In Germany and Italy the general birth-rate is now lower than required to maintain the existing population and the Jewish birth-rate is well below average. French and British birth-rates are higher but Jewish rates in both countries are exceptionally low. In Whitechapel, London, the Jewish east end there were 44 synagogues in 1955. There were only 8 left by 1982 and most of those disappeared during the eighties.

Paul Johnson says that there are more than 2 million American Jews who feel they are Jews because they believe in and practise Judaism. Most of them – 86 per cent – marry Jews and bring up their children as Jews so for these reasons unlike Europe the committed religious core of American Jewry has not declined.

In the United States the National Jewish Population Study divided those with some claims to be Jewish into 4 categories; “actively engaged” “moderately engaged” “loosely engaged” and “disengaged.”

To be an “actively engaged” Jew you have to take part in three types of activity: regular attendance at synagogue, support of Jewish institutions and observance of religious rituals at home.

The first of these means an individual Jew must attend services at least twice a month. For the second, he or she must participate in four or five activities, such as formal synagogue membership, joining a Jewish organization, contributing at least £300 to a Jewish charity or subscribing to at least one Jewish periodical and visiting Israel at least twice. In the third category – home rituals – it is necessary to perform three out of four acts; Lighting Sabbath Candles, buying kosher meat, using separate dishes for meat and dairy foods, and celebrating four Jewish holidays. Perhaps European Jewry is not doomed provided it retains its belief in God, but Paul Johnson thinks that secularised Diaspora Jewishness unsupported by religious belief has no future. He also remarks that it is amazing that belief in God has survived the 20<sup>th</sup> century at all, but it has and in some respects it is as strong as ever. His view is, unlike Mr Wasserstein that the Jewish Diaspora will survive the 21<sup>st</sup> century, but whether it does so or nor rests entirely in the hands of God. How right he is.

Love to you all, Helen Brady,

---

## Passing The Buck

I am sure we have all experienced the practice of people “passing the buck” when we needed some services, or some information. You send for a workman to do a repair job. He looks at it, says, “not my job” and goes away. You call at an office for some advice. After you told them your problem, back comes the answer, “You are at the wrong place, go to such and such an office.” But has anyone noticed that buck-passing is as old as man, since he was created? It goes back to the sin in Eden, and we have a first rate example of it as early as Genesis 3:12,13.

When God took Adam to task over his eating of the forbidden fruit, he put the blame on Eve, who promptly passed it on to the serpent. But let us have a closer look at Adam’s excuse (Genesis 3:12) “The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.” Note the phrase! The woman whom Thou gavest to be with me...” This nearly puts the blame on God. It seems to imply, “Well, You gave me the woman, so why blame me if she put temptation in my way?”

Eve’s excuse is similar, though a little more honourable in that she did not seem to blame God.

We now pass on to about 1½ millennia later, the time of the Exodus when Aaron made the golden calf. This was an exceptionally bad case of evading responsibility (Exodus 32:21- 24), Aaron was the deputy leader during Moses’ absence; and there he blamed the people he should have led and prevented from sinning. He allowed the people to lead him instead! Look especially at the last statement, “...then I cast it (the gold) into the fire, and there came out this calf.” Well, what a stupid excuse is this? Does not every engineer and foundryman know that what comes out of a mould is exactly to the design and construction of the pattern-maker? He nearly sounded as though he had no control over the shape of the ensuing idol.

Enough said about making excuses. Let us consider one or two examples of men who had the honesty to admit their sin - David and Daniel. The former “The man after God’s own heart;” the latter, “The man greatly beloved.” Not much is recorded about Daniel except where we read that he had a sin to confess (Daniel 9:20). What it was we don’t know, but this example, together with David’s case, shows that even beloved people who walk with God can and do sin. And it serves as a great lesson and comfort to us all that if we sincerely repent, we have the sure divine promise of forgiveness. Let us then turn to David. Three sins are recorded about him: 1) Adultery, 2) Murder, 3) Numbering the people, which was strictly prohibited under the Law of Moses. But how different David’s attitude from that of Adam and Aaron. Let us just take one verse - Psalm 51:4, “Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight:

that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest.” This verse serves as a supremely good example of honesty towards God, and accepting the responsibility for our misdeeds.

And now what about our position? We have all, in God’s favour and mercy towards us, learned that there is no divine command that cannot be kept. We have all learned that the concept of “original sin” with its many variants, such as “sin-in-the-flesh,” or “the devil in me” is of human, probably heathen origin, and not taught in the Word of God. But privilege brings its responsibilities with it. It means that now we have been enlightened we are responsible for our own actions, and have to take the consequences of our misdeeds. No longer can we blame “the old man in us,” for our wrong doings. It is we every time. As our late brother Fred Lea used to put it so aptly, it is not sinful but sinning flesh that does wrong. But like so many faithful witnesses before us, we have our High Priest in heaven who intercedes for us. But our repentance must be sincere. Sorry for what we have done and having offended God, like David in Psalm 51, and not merely sorry for ourselves at having been caught. David and Daniel have both had the assurance of their resurrection, and so has the apostle Paul; as he says of himself, 2 Timothy 4:8, “Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.”

Let us all endeavour, with God’s help, to be among them.

Brother Leo.

---

## From Your Letters:

### Sister Joan Warre writes:

“The booklet The Questions Christadelphians Cannot Answer states, on page 5, “Will you accept... here and now... that I and those associated with me both believe and teach that Jesus was the same as other men... same sort of man as other men.” This causes me concern - I trust it is not true of you, for I have never come across such an idea, let alone any verse saying that Jesus was the same as other men - same sort. Plenty to prove He was not - in the Old Testament types and prophecies, and in all the New Testament.

God told Joseph that Mary’s conception was very special, certainly very different; Jesus - Saviour - Emmanuel - God with us. “The manifestation of God in the flesh” throughout the whole of Jesus’ life here on earth, in thought word and works was for those with eyes to see and ears to hear.

The shepherds certainly did not consider Jesus was just the same as other babes - they broadcast what they saw and heard “Unto you is born this day...”

Mary and Joseph at the Temple with Jesus when only eight days old, He was proclaimed different. And at 12 the doctors and all who heard Him were astonished (which no doubt stirred their hate) but it showed Jesus was different to 12 year olds.

Again, in the wilderness, Jesus knew God’s protection and help.

A) Make these stones bread and His answer - man shall not live by bread alone but by every word of God  
B) Cast thyself down, he shall give his angels charge over thee - answer - Thou shall not tempt God.  
C) Bow down and worship me and I will give thee all the kingdoms of the world - answer Worship God. All met with “It is written.” Jesus knew the stones could be bread to feed His hunger; and that He was born King of the Jews.

The Pharisees questions to trick Him, “Art thou the Christ, tell us” - “I have told you yet you will not believe.” Condemned by their own words they did not believe. Jesus said, “If I had not done among them the works which no other man did they had not had sin - but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father,” - John 15:24.

Jesus remarks to Peter after that confession “Thou art the Christ” the Son of the living God” “Blessed art thou - but my Father revealed it to you.” Upon this rock, the confession, I will build my church and He charged them not to tell any man. Again Jesus charged Peter, James and John at the transfiguration “not to tell any man, any of the things which they had seen and heard, until the Son of man were risen from the dead.”

To Peter He said, “Thinkest thou not that I can ask my Father for twelve legions of angels - but how then can the scriptures be fulfilled.”

Jesus knew “A body hast thou prepared me;” His conception was direct from God’s Spirit. He was “in the form of God” yet “made in the likeness of men” (Philippians 2:6,7; Romans 8:3) to redeem mankind, all those who will believe in Him.

Yes, to the Pharisees Jesus was “the same as other men” here is his ordinary family; this was their main sin which is surely blasphemy against God’s Spirit (which is certainly Holy), which is unforgivable. They were hypocrites, they knew the Scripture promises of God for they had told Herod where the King of the Jews was to be born. They were false shepherds of the flock; they rejected Him, plotting His death with the two-year olds and many times after until Judas betrayed Him.

Yes, Jesus was born human, “for the suffering of death.” He became tired, hungry, thirsty; and He was tempted, tried - actually far deeper than any other man; e.g., the temptation to use the fact that His Father was the Almighty God, conceived by God’s Power.

His Agony at Gethsemane - “If it be possible let this cup pass from me;” three times He asked in His deep agony - “nevertheless, not my will but Thine be done.” What amazing love.

If the true identity had not been hidden for a while “they would not have killed the Prince of Life.” It was there all the time; His words and works showed it, but Jesus Himself hid it by how He taught - in parables. His disciples asked why parables (Matthew 13:10-16, Acts 28:26,27). Fulfilment of Isaiah 6:9,10: “We speak the wisdom of God,” hidden wisdom, ordained before the world unto our glory; none of the princes of this world know for had they known they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. I Corinthians 2:7,8.

All this was fact before His crucifixion, death and resurrection and acknowledged by Him.

Joan Warre.

\* \* \*

**In reply:**

Dear Joan,

Thank you for your letter and I note your concern regarding Ernest Brady’s statement that “Jesus was the same as other men.” You have shown many differences, all of which can apply only to Jesus Christ and we know there are many more as you stated elsewhere in your letter.

Of course all these qualities were true of Jesus Christ for He was the Good Shepherd and by the grace, mercy and love of God we are the sheep; and a sheep is quite different from a Shepherd.

However, Ernest Brady was quite right when he wrote in the preceding paragraph on page 5 of his booklet:- “Since Jesus was of exactly the same human nature and yet lived a perfect life, does it not follow that there cannot be anything in men which makes it impossible for them to be sinless?”

This statement is sound, and the writer was contending against the false teaching of R.Roberts who wrote “He (Jesus Christ) was not a mere man... not mere flesh... He was flesh...in a special form.”

What arrant nonsense this is from Robert Roberts, who was trying to uphold his view that Jesus Christ received His life direct from God in order to give Him the strength required to overcome all temptation.

The truth is that Jesus Christ “was in all point tempted like as we are, yet without sin”, and if He were not of exactly the same human nature as we are then that statement would have no meaning for us; no relevance to our own temptations, but I know you accept that quotation from Hebrews 4:15 and it proves that Jesus Christ was of the same nature as ourselves. Your own father saw this and I have before me a copy of one of his letters, dated 15th January 1911, written to a Brother Beesly, and I quote from it as follows:-

“It has been interesting in this discussion to note that every writer without exception has made the same error in misunderstanding my position. It is not that the position is so very complex or involved but simply that the brethren have quite false ideas of what is termed the Renunciationist position. All start with the assumption that the Christ I believe in is a being of a different nature. This is not the case. The Scriptures are perfectly clear and definite on this head. Hebrews 2:14 is quite sufficient to prove to me that the Lord Jesus Christ partook of the flesh and blood of the children.

Your father was contending for the truth in 1911 on exactly the same point of doctrine as Ernest Brady was so many years later in his booklet “The Question Christadelphians Cannot Answer”

You make reference to Philippians 2:6, “Who, being in the form of God...” and verse 7 ...”was made in the likeness of men,” also Romans 8:3. “Made in the likeness of sinful flesh.”

By using these references here you seem to be inferring that Jesus was more than human, perhaps even ‘super-human.’ But we must balance these references with Genesis 1:26, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” Adam was indeed a remarkable creation and had he not sinned who knows what great qualities he would have had and what noble character he would have developed. May it not have been as great and noble as the Lord Jesus Christ? However, Adam did sin and Jesus Christ was sent into the world with the special mission of redemption, but to say He was of a different nature to Adam would rob Him of the honour and glory due to Him for His wonderful achievement on our behalf. Throughout the past six thousand years we have seen extremes of character within the human race, from the basest to the noblest, but their nature has never changed.

Indeed, I think the comparison we should make here is between Jesus Christ and Adam and for this I refer you to the last Circular Letter, where on page 8 Edward Turney shows the foolishness of Robert Roberts assertions, but he also shows the differences between Jesus Christ and Adam and please note that none of these differences make His human nature any different to ours, and that is what Ernest Brady was contending for and that is what we of the Nazarene Fellowship contend for as did your own father.

I do hope this helps you and thank you once again for writing. The following correspondence also has a bearing on this matter and you may find useful.

With Sincere Regards, Russell.

---

**Brother Phil Parry has recently been in correspondence with Miss S. Powell, a Christadelphian from Gloucester:**

**First, Miss Powell’s Letter to Brother Phil;**

Dear Brother Parry, I’m addressing you as “Brother,” seeing that you opened your letter of the 17th December with “Sincere Greetings in the exalted Name of Jesus.” God has indeed “highly exalted him” - after he “learned obedience by the things that he suffered,” which he could not have done if he was different from us. We dishonour the Lord Jesus Christ if we do not attribute to him the victory in overcoming the impulses of the flesh - which wasn’t easy for him.

His character was holy, harmless and undefiled. Jesus himself said that “the flesh profiteth nothing” (John 6:63); and the Apostle Paul said that “in the flesh dwelleth no good thing” (Romans 7:18).

Here are my comments on the booklet “Blasphemy Against the Holy Ghost...” - Page 2, first paragraph – Mary, a godly person though she was, was not exempt from the laws dealing with the uncleanness of the flesh, as set out in several chapters in Leviticus. Even Mary had to be purified and offer a sacrifice after Jesus’ birth (Luke 2:22-24 – marginal reference to Leviticus 12). Second paragraph - When Adam sinned, God did condemn the sin, and therefore he was driven out from the Garden of Eden wherein was the tree of life, lest he ate of it and lived for ever. “God saw everything He had made (including man - Genesis 1:27) and behold it was very good” (verse 31). After Adam sinned, it is nowhere described as “very good.” Therefore there was a change in his physical nature.

Page 3, second paragraph - Two genealogies (Matthew 1 and Luke 3). David is in both. It is recorded that Jesus was the son of Adam (Luke 3:23 and verse 38).

Third paragraph - Jesus saw no corruption, for he was raised on the third day. (A body begins to corrupt after the third day).

Page 4, second paragraph - The babe, when grown, would eventually bring Simeon from the grave. Jesus was special and therefore called “holy.” His blood is described as “precious” because of its source, rather than its composition.

Jesus needed to be saved from death (Hebrews 5:7), and this did not come about until he died. He needed to obtain redemption (9:11,12 - the words “for us” are not in the original), but not until his own blood was shed. It was after he had been made perfect through suffering that he was able to save others (5:9). Luke 13:32.

Last paragraph - “Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit” (Matthew 12:31) - the only occurrence of the expression in the Bible. The context relates to the Pharisees’ blasphemy in attributing to the god Beelzebub the power of Christ to heal. We don’t do that.

The Christadelphians do not believe as they do simply because of what Brethren Thomas and Roberts wrote, but because of the Scriptures to which they directed attention. In a Nazarene booklet I used to have it is said that the Nazarenes owe much to the Christadelphians.

I have been a long time writing to you because of having correspondence with those wanting to understand the Gospel message, which pretty well keeps me occupied. That being so, you will not be surprised if I don’t respond to any further literature which you or anyone might send.

I hope that you and your sister wife are well.

Sincerely your sister in the Lord Jesus Christ,

S.Powell.

P.S. The attached extract might help - written as a result of studying Hebrews as well as the Law of Moses. I don’t feel confused:

“...The operation of the Spirit, though resulting in a son of David according to the laws of maternity, produced such a Son of David as the world had never seen before, viz., a sinless man: human nature morally cleansed “He did always those things that pleased the Father.” He could ask, without fear of successful answer, “Which of you convinceth me of sin?” He was in this sense “without spot,” which could not be affirmed of any other son of Abraham.

Some experience a difficulty here. They say that if the begetting of Jesus by the Spirit had such an effect as this, he was not of the same nature as ourselves. The simple answer may suggest itself in the question: Are there not different sorts of the same nature in everything? Contrast a crab-apple with a delicious Blenheim: a worn-out cart-horse with a high-blooded charger; a mumbling Maori savage with a British peer - different sorts, but the same nature. Jesus was a man, but not as other men in his powerful affinity for God and his abhorrence for everything in opposition to His will. He was human nature mentally washed in this sense by the Spirit. If it were not so, to what can we attribute his

spotless divinity of character? It is there: was it an effect without a cause? Education cannot account for it - for other Jewish children had as good an education as he. Education had something to do with it, doubtless, but it was only as the culture of good seed in good soil. The parable of the Sower touches the subject: the same seed produced different results, according to the nature of the soil. The "soil" differs in different men, and yet they are all men. Christ was a man, yet his mental soil differed from all men's. He had the impulses common to all men, but conjoined with these a power of control possessed by no man.

God's forbearance, His kindness, His readiness to pardon when His claims are conceded excludes the idea of vicarious suffering. If Christ paid our debts, there would be no forgiveness, but exaction, and thus would be blotted out the crowning glory of the apostolic proclamation

Paul says that Christ was made under the law to redeem them that were under the law (Galatians 4:4). He was himself born under the law that he might work the work that was to be done for others in that position. Not only so, but in bearing the curse of the law away, it had to act on himself. He did this by himself coming under it and bearing it.

When he died, he was no longer under the law, which was made for mortal men, and had dominion over a man only as long as he lived (Romans 7:1). When he rose he was free from the curse of the law - redeemed by his death. It is by union with him as a resurrected free man that we obtain this redemption wrought in him. When we say, as some in their reverence for Christ prefer to say that his death was not for himself but only for us, they destroy all the typical analogies in the law, and in truth, if their view could prevail, they would make it impossible that it could be for us at all; for it only operates "for us" when we unite ourselves with him in whom, as the first born, it had its first effect."

\* \* \*

#### **Brother Phil's reply: -**

Dear Miss Powell, Forgive me for not addressing you as Sister, but this is only due to the inconsistencies in Christadelphian teaching which you support not only in literature and the B.A.S.F., but your own letter to me of 13.2.1996.

However, I thank you for your courtesy in making an effort to reply. Therefore I want to draw your attention to the seriousness of your own individual position. In your reference to Mary you have demonstrated your belief that the physical flesh of Mary was unclean. The fact is that her flesh was never unclean in the physical sense - it all had to do with the law as was the case also with animals - there were clean and unclean as God stipulated to Noah - but their flesh was identical.

Was there a change in the quality of Mary's flesh after she had offered the requirements of the law after the birth of Jesus? And the fact that a maid child caused a woman to be unclean by law double the number of days to that of a male, does that maid-child have a greater adverse effect on the woman's physical flesh? I think not. It is a matter of conscience and respect for the law; it is a legal cleansing. There is nothing unclean of itself, but as Jesus said, "The unlawful things that proceed from an evil man, these are the things that defile him." Nowhere does it say that the law condemned Mary before or after the birth of Jesus, for she met its requirements. The Gentiles were considered by the Jews of Old Testament times to be unclean. God told Peter "What God hath cleansed that call not thou common or unclean." Did God change the flesh of Cornelius and other Gentiles when He brought them under the New Covenant in Christ?

This brings me to a consideration of the seriousness of your position and that of all who subscribe to the unscriptural clauses of the Christadelphian Statement of Faith under which I also was a slave in my ignorance and until God enlightened me to the Truth. My Brother in law, the late Arthur Latham whom you probably knew, continually contended in the Bible Class that Jesus was unclean from birth. He must have meant in a physical sense, for Jesus had no character at birth to cause legal defilement - also he

contended that Jesus had to die for Himself in order to cleanse His physical flesh. I continually opposed him on the basis of what the Scriptures stated, but he was more concerned in defending R.Roberts lecture "The Slain Lamb," which degrades the Lord Jesus and makes Him a Son of Adam and of the condemned line of David and Abraham and wearing their condemned nature. Clause VIII B.A.S.F. a reference to a person dwelling inside a condemned body of flesh yet in some way independent and unexplainable. How does your misquoting of Paul sound here? "In the flesh there dwelleth no good thing"? Was Jesus in the flesh? Was He no good thing? Was God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself? Was God a no good thing dwelling in the body and flesh of Christ? Paul did not say "In the flesh dwelleth no good thing," he did not even say of himself as a Christian, "For I know that in me dwelleth no good thing," No, he added a governing clause, namely, "that is, in my flesh." And what does he say in Romans 8:8,9? - "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; (dead indeed unto sin - Romans 6:11) but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." But those Romans were still flesh and blood nature.

Your mistaken view is that we dishonour Jesus if we do not attribute to Him the victory in overcoming the impulses of the flesh. If you had said, unlawful impulses of the mind, I could agree with you, for when Adam was created, impulses were common to his nature, and until he came under law to God he could not be convicted of sin, for we are told in Scripture that sin is the transgression of Divine Law, therefore impulses were not, and are not necessarily wrong, they can direct a man in the right way and also the wrong way according to the development of his mind by the operation of the Word of God furthering his enlightenment.

I was ridiculed for putting Jesus Christ on a pedestal for His being tempted and tried in all points as we are and in the likeness of our nature yet without sin (that it was God who did it; another invention as taught by R.Roberts in "The Slain Lamb").

You may not agree with this error, for you admit that Jesus learned obedience by the things which he suffered and this could not be so if He was different from us. Neither Edward Turney or any member of the Nazarenes has ever taught or believed that Jesus was of a different nature to us, but we do say that Adam was not his father so that alienation from God was no part of His position - He was a direct begotten Son of God, not an adopted Son, which we have to become through His sacrificial death.

You say "It is recorded that Jesus was the Son of Adam" (Luke 3:23-38). In effect you ignore what people at the time supposed, in their ignorance of the facts of His birth, but Luke knew the facts having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first (Luke 1:1-4), hence his statement in chapter 3, verse 23, "Being as was supposed, the son of Joseph." Then follows the book of the generation of Joseph back to Adam which was the son of God by creation. There is also the genealogy of Matthew 1 which only goes back to Abraham. Nowhere does it give the male line of Jesus (except in regard to Mary it does give her male line of descent as the seed of David according to flesh) but Matthew 1:18 states that before Joseph and Mary came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Therefore, Son of God.

You say in one quote "The flesh profiteth nothing" yet you and Christadelphians in general have tried to move Heaven and Earth to prove that it does, in fact your whole structure has been based and built on that false view, namely that when Adam sinned his physical nature was changed by God to a defiled, condemned, and dying nature with an increased tendency or bias to sin, transmitted also to his posterity. Neither Dr. Thomas or Robert Roberts believed this in 1869 adding that there was no evidence in the Scriptures for such imagination. They were correct then but changed to the false view with no Scripture evidence of support, hence Clause V not found in Genesis.

You say "When Adam sinned, God did condemn the sin, and therefore he was driven out from the Garden of Eden lest he ate of the Tree of Life." But are you not a little too previous? What of the penalty for sin? Did God say to Adam "You will be turned out of the garden if you eat of the forbidden tree"? No. God said, "In the day you eat of it you shall surely die." The important thing to consider is why God spared Adam's inflicted death and in what way, for it is obvious Adam was of a dying nature at creation and in the natural course of events without a change to spirit nature, he would have died and returned to dust irrespective of the fact of remaining obedient. I agree with you that as a living soul Adam's nature was very good, but you say that after Adam sinned it is nowhere described as "very good." If we accept your



false doctrine of “changed nature” you would be correct but the fact is found in Dr. Thomas’s and R. Roberts’s statements in 1869, “There was a change in Adam’s relationship to his Maker but not in the nature of his organisation.” The change therefore was not physical but a legal one. Now, what God hath joined together in Eden is still the same nature of flesh and blood today and was so in Christ’s day, for Jesus says so. But your false views of changed nature puts God’s creative work asunder. Read Matthew 19:4-6:

“And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”

Having read the words of Jesus, do you prefer Roberts’ Clause V to the words of Jesus?

You say in your letter; “Jesus needed to be saved from death (Hebrews 5:7).”

This is another example of Christadelphian misinterpretation and manipulation of the teaching of Paul, for you add,

“And this did not come about until he died, he needed to obtain redemption (Hebrews 9:11,12 - the words “for us” are not in the original), but not until his own blood was shed. It was after he had been made perfect through suffering that he was able to save others.”

Certainly Jesus was made perfect through suffering, but you ignore verse 14 and the rest of chapter 9. The fact is, Jesus prayed to be saved not out of the grave, but from inflicted death and it was in Gethsemane that He pleaded with strong crying and tears to Him that was able to save Him from that agony, nevertheless not my will but thine be done. And what was that will of God? It is stated in Jesus’ own words, Matthew 20:28, “For the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many.”

How could He give His life a ransom for many and for all (1 Timothy 2:6), if His own life was in pledge and not free to give? Who else would be able to redeem Him? No one - Psalm 49.

Have you witnessed any of your community sweating as it were great drops of blood and offering up prayers to God with strong crying and tears to be saved from the experience of natural death and the grave?

The prayer of Jesus was heard and Angels comforted Him but He was not saved from death, He suffered it for Adam, for me and for you if you are prepared to acknowledge it in the prescribed way, that is, by dying the death due to the enlightened sinner by symbolic death in the water of Baptism, thus being spared the inflicted judicial death which Jesus suffered willingly for all, by the shedding of His blood.

Of course seeing that Christadelphians believe the condemnation to be in the flesh and natural death by decay the penalty, their immersion in water would have no significance nor relationship to the death of Christ; He did not die a natural death but a death by blood- shedding due to Adam’s violation of the Edenic Law.

This has been explained continually by Nazarenes in literature, lectures and debate, yet only the few Christadelphians God has shown interest in have been enabled to understand and accept the Gospel of salvation centred in the sacrificial and voluntary death of Christ. Others also apart from Christadelphians have come to the same understanding. We give credit to Christadelphians in being a starting point for further contending for the Truth, this is why we are qualified to show them where they have followed doubtful leaders. I would have preferred a friendly discussion with you or any of your members, but you have indicated you have no desire in this direction, being busy preaching what you think to be the Gospel in all sincerity. I have had similar replies from others who have pre-judged in their ignorance.

I hope you will be led to see light and reason in due course before it is too late. You end with the words, “I don’t feel confused.” But you are very much confused and very much astray in your theory of the way Jesus bore away the curse of the Law. Jesus was not cursed by the Law but in bearing the curse due to

those who were under it, He was made a curse for their benefit in fulfilling it and thus bringing it to an end. Paul puts it in another way in 2 Corinthians 5, "God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Paul simply means that the Sin of the world was laid on Jesus, thus He was made a sin-offering on Calvary at the age of 33 years (not at birth) who knew no sin. So whatever Jesus was made, we are made the opposite, that is, the righteousness of God in Him if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death which was not a natural death by decay.

If you are as sincere as you should be then I will trust you to read the enclosed booklet giving credit to a member of the Christadelphian community in Australia. It is entitled "A Christadelphian Lifts the Curse."

I think I have written enough though I have not covered the whole of your letter.

So I close with Respect and Kind Regards for your sincerity hoping you will adopt a serious view of things before Jesus comes, and accept that before He died on the Tree He was "The Prince of Life" whom Peter said they had killed. Work that out.

Yours Sincerely in the Service of God and His Son, P.Parry.

- - - - -

**Sister Evelyn Linggood writes:**

**Regarding Ezekiel's Temple.** I am not sure about the size of it but if representative people were sent from the nations of the earth (and this is most reasonable) a Temple the size of Solomon's would be able to cope. Henry Sulley's measurements would take up most of Jerusalem and incidentally if all families of the earth went the whole of Palestine let alone Jerusalem wouldn't hold them.

I think we have established the fact that the vision Ezekiel saw was not of the second Temple, it must therefore be future. I think as I have said before that he was transported in Spirit into the Kingdom age - like the Apostle John was on the Isle of Patmos - and saw in vision all that is recorded; the re-introduction of animal sacrifices God must think necessary for the mortal nation of Israel and all other nations; it must be remembered that only Christians are in the New Covenant in Christ Jesus, not Jews who are still blind and will be until the saints have been made immortal, for they will be with Christ when He comes to fight against the Kings of the earth (Revelation 19). How are you going to harmonize the references you gave, namely Isaiah 56:7, Jeremiah 33:18 and Zechariah 14:21, if you reject animal sacrifices for the future? Whereas they harmonize perfectly with Ezekiel's account and remember all Scripture is given by inspiration of God. I think you were describing the perfect state when all will be immortal when you said there will be no sin in the Kingdom. It is evident there will be otherwise there would be no need for the fountain to be set up for sin and for uncleanness in Jerusalem (Zechariah 13:1, Isaiah 65:20). People will have to learn righteousness even as we do now and we cannot say that we are without sin even now - Ecclesiastes 7:20, 1 John 1:8-10, though of course it is possible for human beings to be sinless, otherwise Jesus would not have remained so..

"Presenting our bodies a living sacrifice" applies to the saints as also does the Lords prayer; they are in a different category to Israel and the nations, as I have spent my strength pointing out to brother Phil, but to no avail. He says also that he sees Micah 4:1-4 on the basis of Paul's declaration that "God dwelleth not in Temples made with hands" but this does not apply here as it won't be God that dwells there but Christ. Ezekiel 43:7.

On page 14 of C.L.158, 3rd paragraph, Brother Phil intimates that where there are animal sacrifices there is no faith, whereas the truth is that If they were not offered in faith they were displeasing to God, especially the Sin Offering which was most holy (Leviticus 6:25) because it represented Christ. Abraham was the father of the faithful and he offered animal sacrifices so also all the worthies of old. Moreover they were appointed by God from Adam onwards as a covering for sin. Christ took that Sin away in His sacrificial death and so animal sacrifices became obsolete for us. In this age we live by faith alone, but if God thinks them necessary for mortals in the age to come, and Scripture teaches this is so, who are we to argue against God?

Brother Phil insists on mixing up the remnant who are the saints with the remnant who are natural Israel - Zechariah 13:8,9. It is these that God will make a new Covenant with and this is still future, not in the past as he implies on page 20 of C.L.158 commencing line 10 from the bottom. So also Isaiah 59:20 & 21, still future. Also I fail to see what being born of water and of the spirit have to do with animal sacrifices? It is the saints who are begotten of God (which is to be born of water) and birth of the spirit is a separate operation answering to a change of nature as flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. 1 Corinthians 15:50. That is to be the rulers thereof, natural Israel will enter into their inheritance of the land. The New Testament has mostly to do with the calling out of the nations of a people for Christ's Name, so naturally natural Israel is secondary to that, and God had "given them up" until the time when her that travaileth hath brought forth her children." Micah 5:3), and that is still future. Brother Phil seems to string together unrelated texts; i.e. Romans 8:29 and Romans 11:2. The former relates to saints, the latter to natural Israel who are now blind as to Christ but will see when Christ is revealed to them and will be grafted in again to their own Olive Tree, Romans 11:24.

We think the latest instalment of "The Temple" is quite good and explains why the "Prince" cannot be Christ. I had often thought that Christadelphians were wrong there. On page 14, line 20 from the bottom, Brother Phil says, "From chapter 40 of Ezekiel his walk commenced and came back to where it had started with no mention of seeing any water issuing from under the threshold of the house." I ask what is chapter 47 all about then? It is plain enough and Jerusalem will still be a material City in the Kingdom. Revelation 21 describes the Jerusalem when God will dwell with men and be all in all. Revelation 21:3.

With Love and Best Wishes,

Harvey and Evelyn.

### **Brother Phil Parry writes**

Now regarding what Bert Gates and Edgar Wille have said of the Bread and Wine which Jesus instituted with His disciples - see C.L.158 Jan/Feb 1996, bottom page 31 and half of page 32, I cannot accept entirely their views and interpretation of what took place, for it seems plain to me from Luke 22:7-18 that Jesus did eat of the Mosaic Passover Lamb, verse 8. From verse 8 to 18 is a record of the eating of the Mosaic Passover Lamb and from verse 19 is a record of Jesus instituting a New Passover and a New Covenant involving Himself as the anti-typical Lamb slain from the foundation of the world for us.

This was symbolized in Bread and Wine - the Body and Life of Jesus given in exchange for the life of the world, as He said, "I am come that ye might have life and have it more abundantly." See also John 6:51-57.

It appears that Jesus respected the Mosaic Passover, being a Jew and born under the Law, yet free of any claim upon Himself through deriving His life direct from God and not from the Adamic life which was in pledge until the debt to the Edenic Law was paid by one who was free-born. Thus Jesus could say "This is my body given for you, this is my blood of the New Covenant which is shed for you." He did not partake of the Bread or the Wine Himself, having said "This is my body and my blood shed for and given for you." How could it mean anything else but for them and others if it was the purchasing price? He could not give His life as a ransom for Himself being a free-born Son of God. Was Adam (the Son of God by creation), in need of ransom or redemption at the moment of creation? Of course not. Now Luke 22:7 & 8 refers to a killing of the Passover which was a living animal - you don't kill Bread and Wine.

Jesus said of the Mosaic Passover, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer, for I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God;" you will notice He did not partake of the wine but instructed His disciples to divide the contents of the cup among themselves, adding. "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come."

Nowhere since is it recorded that He did so, but He did eat bread and fish on some occasions after His spirit resurrection, but not because He needed to but to show that His life blood having been shed for the world He could not take back that which had been given freely as the Adamic debt due to Sin.

Mark 14:12 and onwards gives the same definition as that of Luke 22. Verse 12 of Mark 14, addresses Jesus in person, "That thou mayest eat the Passover"

In conclusion, Jesus said, "I came not to destroy the Law or the Prophets, but to fulfil." Thus will be fulfilled the whole consummation of Eden, the Law and the Prophets when Christ our Passover will eat with His disciples and drink new of the fruit of the vine, having involved Himself willingly in the whole purpose of God as the central point of His Creation and Purpose.

Thy Kingdom Come. May we be accounted worthy of it. Amen.

P.S. I cannot myself think of any sacrifices to be offered in the future that have not been offered before on the earth as quoted from Dr. Thomas. I am inclined to agree with Brother Russell's comments therefore on this matter, but as I have said before, Dr. Thomas was inclined to allow his pen to run riot at times and to even tell people what God had not even stated as His intentions.

Even as the absurd statement of Robert Roberts "God will keep no man in the grave if he remains sinless." If sinless, why is he in the grave in the first place if that, in his view, is the penalty Adam incurred by Sin?

Brother Phil Parry.

**Brother Leo Dreifuss writes:**

"...as for the signs of the times, how true Isaiah 59:8, "The way of peace they know not; and there is no judgment in their goings: they have made them crooked paths: whosoever goeth therein shall not know peace." All attempted peace treaties don't last; wherever you look - Ireland, Yugoslavia, now trouble in Israel has just flared up again. And how blessed are we in that God has enabled us to understand the reason for these upheavals.

Concerning Ezekiel's Temple - I think the argument has gone on long enough; I think we shall have to wait and see. But to judge from the signs of the times, we may not have much longer to wait to find out."

Brother Leo, in hope of the Resurrection.

---

## Regarding "The Netherton Debate"

We hope shortly to publish a second edition of The Netherton Debate in book form and with this in mind we approached The Christadelphian Office in Birmingham to see if they could help us find a copy of W.F.Barling's Opening Address. Here is the correspondence:-

"Dear Christadelphians,

19th January 1996.

In May 1949 a debate took place in Netherton between my father Ernest Brady of the Nazarene Fellowship and W.F.Barling of the Christadelphians on "Why The Cross?"

About 12 months later The Nazarene Fellowship produced and circulated the only account of the debate, but it went out without the opening address given by Mr Barling because it was withheld from us.

We are about to reprint the Netherton Debate and we shall include various other interesting items pertaining to it. This time it would be good to be able to include the missing opening address by W.F.Barling if possible.

Do you have this address in your archive? If so would you be prepared to release it so that it can be included in the reprint? If you don't have a record of it do you know where I could obtain it?

No doubt you know that both the main participants in the debate are dead. I dare say most of the people present on that day are dead also. I was present as a small child.

If you wish to see the Debate in as complete a form as we now have it and also the items we intend to reprint with it, please let me know and I will arrange for you to receive a copy

I hope very much to hear from you soon with a favourable reply.

I am yours sincerely,

Helen Brady (Miss).

**In reply we received the following:-**

Dear Miss Brady,

23rd January 1996.

Thank you for your letter about the proposal to reprint the debate between your late father and W.F.Barling on "Why The Cross?"

The only archival information I have about the debate is the mimeograph report compiled, I believe, by F.J.Pearce of Newbridge, Monmouthshire. I have also tried without success, to trace a copy through W.F.Barling's family and the Netherton Ecclesia and I am sorry I am not able to be of any help in your search for his opening address.

If you decide to go ahead and republish, I would be grateful to receive a copy as it will undoubtedly be easier to read than the copy I presently have.

Can I be allowed a brief comment about your proposal? I believe the best purposes of both participants will be served by restricting your publication to material presented at the debate. It is the most even-handed approach. I am sure you do not believe the Nazarene case requires additional material, just as I believe Christadelphians will be content with what was presented by W.F.Barling in 1949. If you are able to track down a copy of his opening address, you can be sure there will be no objection to its inclusion from this quarter.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Ashton (Editor).

**On the 22nd February I sent Michael Ashton a rough copy of the debate with the following letter:-**

Dear Michael Ashton,

Miss Brady has passed your letter to me for reply and to send you a copy of the Netherton Debate.

We are most grateful to you for your efforts in trying to obtain a copy of W.F.Barling's opening address but sadly it appears we shall have to publish without it.

We have pleasure in sending you the enclosed rough copy of what we are about to issue though some alterations may yet be made. A copy of the final reprint will be sent to you when available.

I would like to make a few points especially in response to your effrontery suggesting that the best purposes of both participants will be served by restricting our publication to material presented at the debate, as in your opinion it is the most even-handed approach.

We can well understand your concern that our views should be suppressed but it is futile to suppress freedom of speech not only because it is politically inexpedient in a country of free speech but principally because we all have a duty to contend for the faith. The best purposes of either the Christadelphians or the Nazarene Fellowship is to honour and glorify our heavenly Father and His beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, also to seek the Truth to be found in His Word and express our grateful, heartfelt thanks to both the

Father and the Son for their great and merciful love towards us, so no good purpose can be served by restricting our publication to material presented at the Debate as we feel it is necessary to explain the errors in Christadelphian doctrine to the wise that they may be wiser still.

The majority of our Fellowship have come out from the Christadelphian community and we are indeed grateful for what we learnt during the time we were among them, but it was not good enough; we see now that it was a stepping stone for each of us to a better understanding of the work of God in Jesus Christ and it is our duty to extend to others the opportunity and help of seeing this better understanding for themselves.

When you have studied the enclosed record of “The Netherton Debate” and our attendant articles you will perhaps realize just how the Christadelphians of 1949 were hardly ‘even-handed’ in not only going back on their word and not publishing the Debate but also in circulating a tendentious report of it to the readers of The Christadelphian magazine. We look to more honourable behaviour amongst the Christadelphians of today.

You will see we have had no need to add anything to our case although we have taken the opportunity of enlarging it in a few places in order to explain more fully some aspect or other, as in the article “The Responsibility and Enlightenment Question,” but however can you believe Christadelphians will be content with what was presented by W.F.Barling in 1949 once they have considered but a small portion of what he had to say? Is it not rather the case that you wish to keep the status quo, the peace and unity, within the community lest we should rock the boat? The Christadelphian boat needs rocking to free it from the reef on which it has foundered and we feel sure the angels would rejoice to see us working together to free it, and in this we ask your co-operation for the sake of the glorious truth and the great Hope set before us. Let our joint aim be to prove all things and hold fast that which is good.

With sincere regards,

Russell Gregory.

---

## **The Chronology Of The Deluge**

Genesis chapter 6: Noah built an ark and stocked it, and took on board his wife, three sons, and their wives, and every sort of animal and bird, Chapter seven: A week later the flood started, with water from the depths (verses 4 and 10) and forty days of rain (v.12). Is forty days and forty nights literal, or is it a stylized way of saying “it rained for weeks”? Noah was six hundred years old when the flood was upon the earth (v.4). I understand this to mean that he turned six hundred while in the ark. Verse 11 says, “In the six hundredth years of Noah’s life (i.e. at age 599), on the seventeenth day of the second month (presumably according to the civil calendar), the fountains of the deep broke forth and the windows of heaven opened.

The forty days of rain made the flood lift the ark and destroyed all other life (v.17). Then the flood persisted for one hundred and fifty days (v.24).

Chapter eight: Then after 150 days (the wording and the context indicate that it was the same 150 days as just mentioned) God brought a wind to dry up the flood, and the waters abated (verse 1 to 3), and the ark settled on the mountains of Ararat (v.4) on the seventeenth day of the month (again, presumably, according to the civil calendar). The waters continued to decrease (v.5) until the first day of the tenth month, that is, another 72 days after grounding. Why is this date mentioned? Nothing significant happened then. After forty days (vs.6,7) Noah sent forth a raven and a dove. The dove returned (v.9). After another seven days he sent the dove out again (v.10) and it returned with an olive leaf (v.11). After another seven days he sent the dove out again and it did not return (v.12).

In the six hundred and first year (indicating that Noah had now passed his birthday) on the first day of the month, Noah looked out of the ark and saw the ground dry (v.13). On the 27th day of the second month the earth was dry (v.14). Does this imply a difference in degree from the ground being dry? God then directed Noah to leave the ark with his family and every living thing (vs. 15 to 19).

If the flood commenced on the seventeenth day of the second month, and the ark settled on the seventeenth day of the seventh month, that is exactly five months, which is about twenty-one weeks. That period is made up of forty days of rain and fountains, plus one hundred and fifty days floating, plus an unstated interval of wind causing abatement; a much longer time. If those three periods were concurrent, totalling 150 days inclusive, that would reconcile the texts.

Next follows a period of more abatement, to the first day of the month, that is, roughly ten weeks later. Presumably the very wet ground was then visible. After another forty days Noah sent out the dove; again a week later; then for the last time another week later; this eight-week interval would bring us to near the end of the eleventh month. Then on New Years Day the ground appeared dry, and eight weeks later they all exited the ark because the (whole?) ground was dry. The total time in the ark was slightly more than one year, except that the use of the lunar calendar might make it barely any more than an exact sidereal year.

What is not clear to me is whether a civil calendar is being used, or whether the dates refer to Noah's birth-dates; for example, are we to assume that the flood began when Noah was aged 599 years, one month, and seventeen days? If the dates quoted with reference to his age were related to his birthday but the other dates were from a civil calendar, the chronology would be impossible to unravel.

An acquaintance showed me a book by Spong "Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism." A Wellhausen disciple, this acquaintance asserted that the muddled chronology of the deluge was one of many proofs that Genesis consisted only of fictitious fables, never committed to writing until the time of the Babylonian Captivity. I am not particularly worried, because better minds than mine have solved many similar problems in the Bible, but I would be grateful if anyone could help find the answers or refer me to any good analysis of the chronology.

Brother John Stevenson.

---

## Wrested Scripture Straightened Out

"What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" Job 15:14.

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

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

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

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

By following the ideas which run through the book of Job, we shall find that in understanding the word "clean" as meaning "righteous" we shall not err; but if, on the other hand, we understand by the word "clean" a freedom from that "sin-in-the-flesh" (which according to Christadelphian literature exists in the physical flesh, and therefore existed in the flesh of Christ) we shall be putting into the mouths of the speakers an altogether foreign idea merely in order that we might take it out again. Such a method of "understanding" Scripture is capable of inventing the wildest notions, and is altogether without excuse.

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

First, then, the commencement of the story of Job 1:1, “Job...was perfect and upright...” God witnesses to this fact in 1:8; and after the first tribulation God again declares of Job that he “still holdeth fast his integrity” (2:3). After the second tribulation had come upon him, God again testifies that “in all this did not Job sin with his lips.”

Job is perplexed, and asks “Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery” (3:20). Eliphaz, the first speaker, answers him; “Who ever perished being innocent? or where were the righteous cut off?” (4:7,8) and he then proceeds to tell of a “spirit” that passed before his face in the visions of the night, and which said “Shall mortal man be more just than God. Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?” (4:17). But still Job asserts his integrity: “Cause me to understand wherein I have erred” (6:24), and again: “my righteousness is in this matter” (6:29 margin).

Then Bildad speaks and says: “Doth God pervert judgment?... if thou wert pure and upright... He would awake for thee... God will not cast away a perfect man” (8:3,6,20). And Job returns answer: “I know... but how should man be Just with God? (9:2), and “thou knowest that I am not wicked” (10:7).

Then Zophar refers Job to that statement of his (“Thou knowest that I am not wicked”) and puts it in these words: “Thou hast said...I am clean in Thine eyes” (11:4).

Here we meet with that word “clean” and we can easily understand what Zophar means by it, because of the prior statement of Job to which he refers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the mercy of God we have been freed from grave error, an error that we held tenaciously for years, amazed now that we should have so firmly held to a doctrine which is NOWHERE to be found in the Book of God. Therefore we now appeal to you to search the Scriptures for yourself.

A.H.Broughton.



# EXHORTATION

Moses was the leader of the children of Israel in the wilderness, although not right up to the time when they finally reached the land described as a land flowing with milk and honey, and during his time of leadership Moses on numerous occasions became extremely exasperated with the rebellious attitudes with which he had to contend and deal; and at the same time one might understand the plight in many ways that some 5 million people found themselves, after the comparative comforts and plenty they enjoyed as servants to their Egyptian masters. Nevertheless God may well have 'let' them all go round in circles in the wilderness for 40 years over a journey which would be done, certainly nowadays in a matter of hours. God saw their deeds, although but few of the original multitude actually entered the promised land. But round in circles the Israelites certainly did go - until the "Pillar of Fire" led them and manna came daily and finally the waters parted miraculously, and the murderous following Egyptian cavalry met their end in the returning waters which engulfed them. Moses in the meanwhile had long before collected the Law - that the Israelites badly needed - on the Tablets of stone and before this had struck the rock in anger - in exasperation at the rebellious attitudes he was faced with. This Law, via Moses, was the only Law God ever gave to humanity in general - the 10 Commandments, and they apply as much today as they ever did. What followed of course was the detailed legislation which the Israelites were required to learn and know and obey, including animal sacrifices and which continued until A.D. 70, when the Temple in Jerusalem was destroyed, as Jesus said it would be, the time when Israel revolted against Roman occupation and tyranny - but failed in the face of Roman superiority in the military sense.

Coming up to the time of the three years ministry of Jesus, which three years of course, ran concurrently with the phase of the Levitical Priesthood and of course also the extant 10 commandments. Jesus found Himself at variance with the High Priest of the Sanhedrin and Temple. These Priests saw Jesus as a threat to their position and were constantly endeavouring to trip Him up. Jesus of course realised this and saw without difficulty just what a hypocritical group they really were, but in the process of Jesus' dealings with them He in effect signed His own death warrant. "Which of you," He asked, "convinceth me of sin?" Jesus of course was speaking of the Levitical Law which He knew better than they did, and they knew it. Jesus always interpreted the Law in terms of "common sense," they were accusing Jesus of Sabbath breaking and Jesus refuted their pompous protests "Which of you, having a farm animal in the ditch does not get it out, Sabbath day or not?" The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath! He confronted the 'hate filled priests' with their own stupidity.

If we come up to date - 1996 - in many ways nothing has really changed in the matter of world wide hypocrisy. The 10 commandments still are there to be kept in everyday life, for everyone, and if this were done, what a better place in the general sense the world would be. But for the rest of us, the Spirit is willing and the flesh is (maybe) weak and so we can look to Jesus the author and the finisher of our faith, for the fact is that only Jesus succeeded in keeping the law in its entirety and by Grace are we saved - not by works, lest any should boast. But we can, if we have the character at all, remember, A) the price paid for our redemption and, B) not blame our natures for the shortcomings of our characters, for again this is where common sense comes in.

When the ministry of Jesus was completed and on the Cross, speaking to God, His Father, Jesus said;- "It is finished." The bridge for us to cross back to God - He had created in His sinless substitutionary death on the Cross for us, and Adam in his disobedience in Eden created the need for that bridge. Adam, and we all, never paid the price of that disobedience - Jesus did and so as Jesus died physically, the veil of the Temple was ripped from top to bottom. No need for a human priest to enter the Holy of Holies once a year; we all can enter through faith now and baptism for Jesus has redeemed us and paid our debt for us having no debt of His own. No need now and ever for animal sacrifices - Jesus was the Lamb of God - who gave Himself for the sheep. Jesus kept and fulfilled the Law.

But, and this is important, on leaving His disciples and this world, Jesus said, "A New commandment I leave with you - that ye love one another." No doctrine in this. Nothing sloppy or sentimental, but kindness, gentleness and respect and generosity in spirit towards each other, or if you prefer it, common sense.

Brother Harold Dawson.

# EZEKIEL'S TEMPLE

## Part Seven

### Introduction

It has been the message of these notes that the faith we share offers us a future. We are called to be the princes of the future age, the aristocracy of the Kingdom of God. This needs to be affirmed constantly, as a number of our correspondents have suggested that the trend in the brotherhood is away from these tangible, practical hopes, back towards an abstract morality. If this be so, the situation is serious and we need to refurbish ourselves in the love of the Hope of Israel. It is our hope that in a few years time we shall have become immortal shepherds, guiding the mortal survivors of the great war of God Almighty into the paths of Righteousness. This, rather than a general aspiration after immortality, should be the very centre of our anticipations. Our thoughts will be centred on the land of God's choice, for it is our land (Galatians 3); on the city of God's choice, for we were born there (Psalm 87); on the nation of God's choice, for we belong to it (Romans 11); and on the King of God's choice, for He bought us to be kings and priests and reign with Him (Revelation 5). Wise presiding brethren will see to it that no meeting goes by without a contribution from the sweet Psalmist of Israel and a hymn which rejoices in the things of Zion.

One way by which our community can get back to a more positive appreciation of the Kingdom to which we are called, is by studying in detail what God, through the prophets, has revealed concerning it. With such detail these notes are concerned in the prayerful hope that they may make a small contribution to the enhancing of that vision without which a people perish. We now continue with our detailed study. The reader should have Nos. 5 and 6 before him for back reference.

### **The Levitical Priesthood Restored**

We have shown previously that the future Temple services and the priesthood are essentially based on the ancient Levitical and Aaronic system. It is necessary here only to remind the reader of the basic principles involved.

The details given by Ezekiel clearly show us that Israel will have two orders of mortal priests, the one called the "Levites" and the other the "sons of Zadoc." The work and charge allotted to these two groups is defined, for the former as "keepers of the charge of the house," and the latter as "keepers of the charge of the altar" (Ezekiel 40:45,46). On referring to Numbers 18 we find a precisely similar arrangement. The tribe of Levi generally were to be keepers of the charge of the tabernacle and the sons of Aaron were allotted the charge of the altar. It is, therefore, quite clear that the arrangements for the future are a repetition of those under the Law of Moses. The two orders will be composed of mortal men as before and they will minister to mortal people. This is all in accordance with the promise of God concerning His covenant with Levi. Jeremiah states:-

"If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant with the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers." - Jeremiah 33:20,21.

### **The Princes of Israel.**

We have shown previously that the prince of Ezekiel is not Jesus. He is obviously a mortal man who has the job of collecting from the tribes of Israel the animals, fine flour, and other commodities which are necessary for the Temple service.

But who among the restored tribes of Israel could occupy such a position? There are many references in the last eight chapters of Ezekiel to the prince and to his office, and in most of these cases the reference is to a "prince" (singular). But there is also a hint of a plurality of princes. It could be that there are a number of such men and that one of them is the chief and takes the lead; or it could be that "prince" (singular) is a

generic term and applies to the whole company of princes. In the past there were several princes. We read of them in Numbers: -

“And with you there shall be a man of every tribe; every one head of the house of his fathers... These are those that were numbered, which Moses and Aaron numbered, and the princes of Israel, being twelve men: each one was for the house of his fathers.”  
Numbers 1:4,44.

We suggest the future arrangements will be similar. There will be twelve princes; one for each tribe. This would follow the pattern as it was before under the Law of Moses and is in keeping with the general idea of a restoration of all things “as at the first.” They would be chief mortal men, subordinate, of course, to the Apostles sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

A plurality of princes is indicated in Ezekiel 45, where, after speaking of the prince’s portion in the land (v.7) the prophet continues, “In the land shall be his possession in Israel: and my princes (plural) shall no more oppress my people.” It is customary to look upon this verse as referring to the many princes of the past who did oppress the people, but by contrast there will in the future be only one prince, who, being immortal will no more oppress.

But this view overlooks the fact that the verse and subsequent verses contemplate many princes in the future - my princes shall no more oppress my people. Ezekiel continues with instructions for these princes in the restored Kingdom; laws governing their exactions so that they shall no more take from the people more than is their due.

“Ye shall have just balances, and a just ephah, and a just bath. The ephah and the bath shall be of one measure...” Ezekiel 45:10,11.

These are the instructions’ let it be noted, for the princes in the restored Kingdom of Israel. Money and measures will be controlled and the princes will act justly and fairly in their exactions from the people. If a plurality of mortal princes is not contemplated in these verses then the instructions have no significance.

The work of these princes includes the provision of the necessary animals, fine flour, etc., for the temple offerings on behalf of the tribes of Israel. It is evident that they collect what is necessary from the people for these sacrifices and see that these are presented at the Temple at the appropriate times.

Against this idea of a plurality of princes it can be argued that in most of the passages the reference is to a “prince” (singular). In particular, in relation to the territory allotted to the prince, called “the prince’s portion,” it would seem more fitting that Jesus should have this for His possession. But if this territory is to be shared by 12 mortal men and their families and servants (which seems clear from Ezekiel 46:16-18) who must have ample space to receive the animals and other materials for the offerings before taking them up to the Temple, this “portion” or “residue” does not seem too large.

It would be proper then, to look upon the word “prince” (singular) as a generic term involving the whole company of 12 men, even as the word “priest” is used when there are in fact a whole company of priests. (See Ezekiel 45:19 “The Priest shall take the blood.” It would not always be the same priest.). This is more understandable when it is realised that the twelve men would not be leading the Temple worship at the same time but would probably do it on a rota system as would the priests. Each one will take his turn when his own particular tribe go up to the Temple. He will go in with his people as Ezekiel indicates:-

“And the prince in the midst of them, when they go in, shall go in; and when they go forth, shall go forth.” Ezekiel 46:10.

There is even a suggestion of plurality in this passage, for the Revised Version renders the last part “and when they (the people) go forth, they (the princes) shall go forth.” But it is only fair to remark that in a footnote the Revised Version says that this rendering occurs in only some manuscripts.

## **The Temple only for the Circumcised**

In the details given by Ezekiel it has to be noted that frequent reference is made to “the people of the land.” It is they, Ezekiel declares, who come up to the Temple to worship, he states;-

“Likewise the people of the land shall worship at the door of this gate before the Lord in the Sabbaths and in the new moons. But when the people of the land shall come before the Lord in the solemn feasts, he that entereth in by the way of the north gate to worship shall go out by the way of the south gate...” Ezekiel 46:3,9.

It seems clear from such passages that the Temple is primarily for the nation of Israel, and it is further evident that circumcision will be insisted upon. Israel must be a circumcised nation and only the circumcised will be allowed in the Temple. For Ezekiel states;-

“Thus saith the Lord God; No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into, my sanctuary, or any stranger that is among the children of Israel.” Ezekiel 44:9.

Lest any should think that this verse means spiritual circumcision we would point out that it distinctly states “uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh.” There is only one conclusion to be drawn from this passage, namely, that all Israel are to be circumcised and that no uncircumcised men are allowed in the Temple. This excludes other nations unless individuals choose to be circumcised.

Let us face up to this matter. The Temple is not for all and sundry. Uncircumcised people would defile it, they are excluded. As Isaiah says:-

“Awake, awake; put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city: for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean.” Isaiah 52:1.

Does this mean that all nations are to practise the rite of circumcision in the future, or does it mean that the nations are, until circumcised, excluded from the Temple? The latter is the more probable because of the emphasis which the Scriptures place on the holiness and separateness of the Israelitish nation. Circumcision was instituted in the first place as a token of God’s covenant with Abraham and it was commanded to be done by all his descendants.

“And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.” Genesis 17:14.

This law is insisted upon in the Kingdom; Israel is still to be a circumcised nation and this is made a condition of admittance to the Temple. But strangers living amongst them can avail themselves (as they could in the past) of the privilege of access to the Temple if they submit to the act of circumcision. In respect of the Passover of old we read:-

“And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Passover to the Lord let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land; for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof.” Exodus 12:48.

This law will undoubtedly be enforced when the Passover is resumed in the Kingdom (Ezekiel 45:21). This feast is not for the nations generally but only for Israel. Any Gentiles living in the land of Israel (uncircumcised) will be excluded; they cannot partake with Israel of this nor be admitted to the Temple.

## **Israel - the First Dominion**

The Temple described by Ezekiel is therefore essentially for Israel, as befits their special position in the Kingdom. We shall see later how Gentiles may come to share its ministrations and how all pilgrims who come up to Zion will be tremendously impressed even if they are not allowed to enter it. But for the

present the essential thing is to grasp the special function of Israel in the Kingdom, which when understood makes clear why the Temple and worship in Jerusalem is less specifically for all mankind than we at one time thought. Throughout the millennium, Israel will be nearer to God than the rest of mankind, who will be making their slow Journey to the position where at last they will be fully joined unto Yahweh.

Far though Israel are from God at present, the Gentiles are even farther away. Israel have rooted in their history a national Messianic consciousness and will, after terrible punishments for their present godlessness “look upon me whom they pierced and mourn for him as for an only son” (Zechariah 12:10). At present they are far from this and it is not scriptural to describe the present condition in the land as the restoration of Israel. We still mourn for Zion, we still cry “How is Zion’s glory gone...” and bemoan that the “once bright diadem is crushed before the wrath of God.” Nevertheless the Lord is near and the tide is about to turn, though two thirds of Israel’s present population will die first (Zechariah 13:9), The Jews all over the world will similarly be brought through the fire into the bonds of the covenant (Ezekiel 20:33-38).

Then will be brought to pass the saying of Paul, “God is able to graft them in again” (Romans 11:23). Israel, restored and purified, become the first dominion of Christ’s empire (Micah 4:8), the little stone which becomes a great mountain (Daniel 2). From this nucleus the whole arrangement of the future develops (and we ought to stress it more in our lectures). “If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead: if the fall of them be the riches of the world and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fullness” (Romans 11).

So will the mortal Israelitish race become the head and not the tail. The blessing of mankind will be to the Jew first and also to the Gentiles. Nationally, as well as individually, salvation is of the Jews. All the blessings first established in the land of Promise (described for example in Isaiah 65, Isaiah 35 and Jeremiah 31 etc.) will extend like a river from Zion to all mankind. Jerusalem is set in the midst of the nations (Ezekiel 5:5) as a practical centre for the work God has planned whereby “He shall cause them that come of Jacob to take root; Israel shall blossom and bud and fill the face of the world with fruit.” (Isaiah 27:6).

### **Incense and Offering in Every Place**

Israel, then the first dominion - but what of the rest of the world? The Temple in Jerusalem, the place of Yahweh’s throne, the place of the soles of His feet, is essentially the place where He dwells in the midst of the children of Israel (Ezekiel 43:7). The Gentiles will not be swarming within it in their millions.

Two questions then:-

- 1) What arrangements then has God planned for their worship and spiritual education?
- 2) What part have mortal Israel - the priestly nation - to play in the conversion of the Gentiles during the millennium?

A key passage in answering the first question is to be found in Malachi 1. In verse 10, Yahweh is rebuking Israel for the unwilling spirit of their service in the prophet’s day- Because of this He says, “I have no pleasure in you, neither will I accept an offering at your hand.” In the words of Paul this is the fall or casting away of Israel (Romans 11). Then Malachi 1:11 -

“For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts.”

God is saying, “You - Israel - must not think that you alone are my concern, for the day is coming, when all the world will worship me with sacrifice and offering.”

The R.V- and R.S.V. put the verse in the present tense - but this cannot be, for neither in Malachi’s day or ever since has God’s name been great among the Gentiles; and universal incense and offering, spiritual or literal, has never ascended to God.

So future it must be! But, say some, surely it refers to the offering or prayer and service and it is already fulfilled by the preaching of the Gospel to Gentiles.

True, the Apostles often use passages like this to prove that God always intended to call Gentiles into the New Covenant. Amos 9:12 is quoted in Acts 15:17,18 - James is saying that the fact that God is going to save Gentiles in the Kingdom is evidence that He is willing to do so now. Paul similarly expounds Isaiah 11:10 in Romans 15:12; if Gentiles are going to be fully involved in the Kingdom, which is to extend to all the earth; then, he concludes, individual Gentiles are fully involved in the individual ministrations of the New Covenant which began on Pentecost. So also Acts 13:46,47 quotes Isaiah 49:6.

No Christadelphian would deny that these passages (and there are many others) refer to the Kingdom and are applied by the Apostles to the conversion of the Gentiles in a preliminary sense only. The Apostolic message is that if Jew and Gentile alike are to enjoy the mortal blessings of the millennium, then those who are to become the immortal rulers in that day are called to glory by the preaching of the Gospel, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. If we say that the prophets were speaking only of the Apostolic preaching of the Gospel and deny the millennial intention of their words, then the Hope of Israel is a delusion and we might as well join the churches. They have sunk into gross darkness through such spiritualization.

Surely Malachi 1:11 is one such passage, with an unmistakably millennial intention. Zephaniah supports Malachi:-

“Men shall worship him, everyone from his place, even all the isles of the heathen”  
Zephaniah 2:11.

Some suggest that Malachi 1:11 refers only to prayer and service in the Kingdom. True this is included. Incense and offering are physical parables of spiritual principles. But every symbol must have a literal basis (as in Genesis 1-3). Thus when God once more deals with a mass of people, He will use the same teaching methods as He did of old. He will employ a system of ritual offerings, which will require places of worship and mortal priests all over the world. It is surprising that so many brethren now deny altogether the idea of literal sacrifice in the Kingdom.

### **Israel the Holy Nation - Priests to all Nations.**

This local worship “in every place” will be a necessity to link men in their daily lives with Israel’s God. The spiritual nursery provided in the Law to Israel of old will be needful to all mankind on a more regular scale than a very occasional visit to Zion could ever give. Sacrifices daily, weekly, monthly and annual are essential to inculcate a sense of partnership with God, a spirit of humiliation for sin; a resolution to dedicated service and repudiation of the flesh. Sacrifices like this will also memorialise the One who exhibited all these principles perfectly, through whom God has given the victory. They will be necessary so that men may remember that He who then reigns before His ancients gloriously in Zion was once a Slain Lamb.

The writers of these notes have been thrilled to perceive from the prophets more clearly than ever they did before, what a vital role Israel will have throughout the world during the millennium.

The last few chapters of Isaiah are full of the glory that awaits the Israelitish nation. We can only make a few references:-

“For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted. The glory of Lebanon shall come upon thee, the fir tree, the pine tree and the box together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary; and I will make the place of my feet glorious. The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee, The city of Yahweh, The Zion of the Holy one of Israel.” Isaiah 60:12-14.

“And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name. Thou shall also be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God. And they shall call them, The holy people, The redeemed of the Lord: and thou shalt be called, Sought out, A city not forsaken.” Isaiah 62:2,3,12.

There are many other such passages. They show that Israel will be the head of the nations; they will indeed be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. They will be separate; and part of this separateness will be ceremonially reflected in their practise of circumcision, to which we have referred above. Isaiah reveals that the priests of Israel will be known the world over. It is probable that the Levites and the sons of Zadoc will act as mortal priests to the Gentiles in all parts of the world.

“But ye shall be named the Priests of the Lord: men shall call you the Ministers of our God: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves.” Isaiah 61:6.

Such mortal Israelites will be the ministers and attendants in “every place” where, as Malachi and Zephaniah testify, offerings are made. Isaiah 66:21 supports this idea by declaring that after the Gentiles have brought up Israel as a pure offering to Yahweh, he will “take of them for priests and for Levites.” True the idea which predominates in Isaiah 66 is of the worship in Jerusalem - but the main function of mortal Israel is described as priestly. May we not also see in it all flesh worshipping before Yahweh every month and every Sabbath [verse 23], the whole picture of the solemnities at the Temple in Jerusalem together with the worship in “every place.”

The Gentiles will look up to the Israelites- “Ten men will take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew and say, ‘We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.’ With the picture of the priestly race established all over the earth these words in Zechariah 8:23 come alive. The Jew whose skirt is grasped by the respectful Gentile is a mortal priest or Levite leading to Zion a delegation who say, “Let us go speedily to pray before the Lord and to seek the Lord of hosts” (verse 21). This seems the most natural meaning, though of course all the saints are Jews in the highest sense of the word, and they would be the supreme leaders of such delegations to Zion.

Mortal Levites will be scattered all over the world as a leavening influence among mankind (Matthew 13:33). This helps to answer the objection that there would not be room for all the Jews in such a small area as we suggested from the Word in our second number, even though many Jews will fall before the kingdom is finally restored to Israel. But once we realise the major task overseas which is laid down for the Levites this is less of a problem. All the world to be cared for would involve the employment of several million Levites. When there stands up the priest for Urim and Thummim he will sort the genealogies out: he will know who are the priests and Levites (Nehemiah 7:64,65), and in the tribal allotments from the Brook of Egypt to the entering in of Hamath there must be ample room for the rest of Israel.

### **Men of Other Nations can Join Themselves to Israel**

Whilst Israel will be the nation of God’s choice and stands in a special relation to him, the nations generally will, as we have seen, be taught God’s ways and will be offered salvation. The offerings and incense in every place with Jewish priests and Levites officiating will show them the principles of God relating to sin and sacrifice.

But some may seek greater association with Israel. They will be able to become proselytes, as was possible in ages past. “Strangers” and “sojourners” in the land, or the foreign servants of Israelites could become joined to the Lord and partake of the privileges of Israelitish citizenship. This was done if they submitted to the act of circumcision. It appears it will be so again.

“Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people; neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant; even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters:

I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant: even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people.” Isaiah 56:3-7.

It appears then that individuals of the nations will be able to seek a more intimate association with the holy things of Israel. In the same way that an individual Israelite could, in the past, devote himself to God by taking the vow of Nazariteship, so individuals of the Gentiles will be able to “by taking hold of the covenant” become Israelites and enjoy the privileges of Israelitish citizenship; which enjoyment will mean admittance to God’s house of prayer and partaking of the feasts and offerings, which will be a special feature of the Israelitish nation. It is in this way, so Isaiah says that the Temple will be a house of prayer for all nations. People out of all nations can come and join themselves to Israel in the appointed way and enjoy the Temple worship with the “people of the land” (the word “all” as so often in Scripture, does not mean all without exception, but all without distinction).

### **The Feast of Tabernacles**

But what about the feast of Tabernacles which all nations are commanded to observe by going up to Jerusalem from year to year? Is there not in this something which nullifies what we have said above? No! We must find room for all Scripture in our considerations and conclusions.

The command in Zechariah 14 relating to this annual visit is, of course, certain, and cannot be overlooked. But it is in the application of the passage that we must exercise care. Does it mean that absolutely everybody from all nations is to go up? Or does it mean that delegates must be sent out of all nations? The latter is probably true. Dr. Thomas has this to say:-

The prophecy of Zechariah (14:10) is, therefore, to be interpreted with the usual allowance which right reason, ordinarily styled “common sense,” would suggest. It is not to be imagined that every individual will go up to Jerusalem at all; or that more than a very few will go up above once or twice, or that any individual will go up year after year, or that all mankind will go up at the same time.”

It is probable that every nation will be commanded to send representatives to keep the feast of Tabernacles. All the people will not go up but only a selected few.

But will even these selected few actually go into the Temple? Not unless they are circumcised. We have seen that the uncircumcised are not allowed in. It may be that the delegates are those who have actually joined themselves to the Lord in this way and will find, therefore, a ready admission. If they have not been circumcised they can bring their offerings as far as the outer gates and hand them over to the priests for slaying on the blocks provided at the entrance. The circumcised ones can go farther - into the outer court and assemble with the Jews for worship at the door of the east gate and possibly see their offerings offered upon the altar in the inner court.

So, the Temple will be a house of prayer for all nations. Primarily it is for Israel, for the “people of the land.” Everything about it is Israelitish. The Levitical and Aaronic Priesthood is restored; the twelve princes lead the people in their worship; and circumcision is made the deciding factor as to who shall worship in its precincts.

### **Glorious Things are Spoken. (Psalm 87)**

The preparation of this issue has much enlarged our own picture of the character of the Kingdom and the central position of mortal Israel. There is something more befitting the holiness of God that all mankind will not be admitted in their millions to bustle around God’s holy place. We have so concentrated on the Temple in Jerusalem that we have in time past tended to overlook the widespread nature of worship and ritual in the Kingdom. This has led to considering the Temple to be larger than it needs to be; although even if we could not explain why the Temple was to be only 1/6th mile square we should still have to accept



the fact (see issue number 3). Nevertheless it is gratifying to be able to establish the purposes for which the Temple is required, who will use it and what arrangements will be made for those who do not.

Brethren Edgar Wille and Bert Gates.

- - - - -

## EDITORIAL COMMENT

We are very grateful to Brethren Edgar Wille and Bert Gates for their research and dedication to the task of producing this series of seven papers on Ezekiel's Temple and life in the future Kingdom. It has focused our attention on the Age to come and we find we have many differing views between us regarding what we may expect.

Brother Bert Gates is no longer with us, however Brother Edgar Wille has been receiving the Circular Letters since this series began and I here and now invite him to comment on any aspect which may have come to his attention and to express freely his views as he sees things according to his present light.

In the opening paragraph of this last paper we read "for He bought us..." This is substitution, pure and simple- Whenever we buy anything we exchange our money for the goods we want. We go into a shop with money in our purse and come out with our groceries instead. We have substituted one for the other. How simple the truth is; so why is it so strenuously denied? It would be difficult to say our purchases are not substitutionary but were representative! God has indeed chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise!

Under the heading "Incense and Offering in every place" the writers observe "Incense and offering are physical parables of spiritual principles" and here I agree, but not that God "will use the same teaching methods as He did of old - a system of ritual offerings." Why should not the spiritual principles apply in the Kingdom Age? The sacrifices and offerings before Christ's crucifixion were the mode of intercession between man and God, and since then there can be only spiritual intercession through our High Priest, Jesus Christ. When the saints become kings and priests in the future they will intercede for the people as Jesus Christ does for us today. To go back to the "natural" after we have been introduced to the "spiritual" is a backward step. First the natural, then the spiritual, then the natural again? Surely not.

### **Regarding other items:**

In the last C.L. I asked the question, "If God's will is to be done on earth as it is in heaven in the kingdom Age, then what need will there be for sacrifices for sin?"

In Sister Evelyn's reply she says, "I think you are describing the perfect state when all will be immortal."

We know at the end of the millennium reign of Christ that all living will be made immortal, but I don't think this is what Jesus Christ expected His disciples to understand they were praying for (though ultimately it will be so) when He gave them the "Lord's Prayer." Besides, we have other references to perfect obedience to the Law, as in Zephaniah 3:13. This chapter deals with re-gathered natural Israel at the time of Christ's coming and verse 13 states, "The remnant of Israel shall do no iniquity, nor speak lies; neither shall a deceitful tongue be found in their mouth: for they shall feed and lie down, and none shall make them afraid." Again, in Jeremiah 32:39,40 we read "And I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children: and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me."

Also we have Revelation 20:2 - "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years." If we are to understand that the serpent is a personification of man's will when opposed to God's will then this "binding of satan" means that man's will will be "bound,"

that is, it will not be allowed the freedom of the past six thousand years. Verse 3 appears to restrict this binding – “that he should deceive the nations no more...” This is because “the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.” (Habakkuk 2:14).

These things being so one would expect sin to be looked upon as a very serious matter indeed and the breaking of the Law would not be done lightly, thus “a sinner shall be accursed” (Isaiah 65:2).

However, none of this shows the need for regular sin offerings; rather the reverse.

Another reference Sister Evelyn uses is Zechariah 13:1, “In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness.” I see this as symbolic – the fountain being the cleansing work of Jesus Christ, the Fountain of Life. Psalm 36:8,9, “They shall be abundantly satisfied with the fatness of thy house; and thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures. For with thee is the fountain of life...”

-----

A question was put to me recently and I pass it on for comment: The Battle of Armageddon? Is it fictitious, a product of man’s imagination?

The word “Armageddon” occurs once only in Scripture - Revelation 16:16 and the verse reads, “And he gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon.” This has been assumed throughout history as the gathering place for the last great battle - the great Day of God Almighty. However, let us read this with the previous verse:- “Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame. And he gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon.”

So who is gathered to Armageddon?

- - - - -

“O give thanks unto the Lord; call upon his name:  
Make known his deeds among the people.  
Sing unto him, sing psalms unto him:  
Talk ye of all his wondrous works.  
Glory ye in his holy name:  
Let the heart of them rejoice that seek the Lord.  
Seek the Lord, and his strength:  
Seek his face evermore.

Psalm 105:1-4.