

# Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 164

## January 1997

### In this Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2 The Facts People Who Reverence Truth Should Know.	Brother Phil Parry
Page 6 Letter from	Brother Chris Brook
Page 7 Reply to above	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 10 Pardon Me, But My Slip Is Showing!	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 11 Letter from	Brother Grant Pearce
Page 13 Comments on letter of Brother John Higgins	Brother Phil Parry
Page 16 Reply to Brother A.Allfree	Brother Phil Parry
Page 20 Extract from "The Lamp" magazine for Dec. 1873	Brother Edward Turney
Page 23 Some Contradictions of Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts	Brother Phil Parry
Page 26 "The Gospel That Is Never Preached"	Brother Ernest Brady

---

## Editorial

Dear Brothers, Sisters and Friends, Loving Greetings.

During a radio discussion I heard a scientist confidently inform those talking with him that science had now answered all the big questions - only two small matters remained to be explained - exactly how the world came into being and how the human brain works. I was surprised no one laughed at him. This was as good as confessing he understood all the technicalities involved in walking but hadn't yet mastered the art of putting one foot in front of another.

A professor leading a team of scientists announced that they had shown that the chromosomes of Jewish priests all over the world have different characteristics from those of lay Jews, suggesting a single ancestor. Professor Karl Skorecki said: "The research confirms the biblical and religious tradition that the Jewish priesthood originated in a common male ancestor, presumably Aaron and was authentically preserved over many generations of father-to-son transmission, despite wide geographic and cultural dispersion of Jews."

In Jeremiah 32,36,43, & 45, we read about Baruch, the son of Neriah, the devoted disciple and scribe to Jeremiah. He witnessed the deed of transfer of a piece of land bought by Jeremiah from his cousin Hanameel. Later Jeremiah dictated a scroll containing his discourses to Baruch and as Jeremiah had been banned from the Temple area he sent Baruch to read out the scroll to the crowd of worshippers at the Temple, hoping that the grim prophecies in it would cause the hearers to repent. Baruch was then summoned to the palace to read the scroll again before a meeting of officials. Disturbed at its contents they said to Baruch, "Go, hide thee, thou and Jeremiah: and let no man know where ye be." When the enraged King, who had the scroll burnt as it was read to him, ordered their arrest, they were not to be found. At the Lord's command, Jeremiah dictated the scroll over again to Baruch with additions. Lately, it has been reported that Baruch's personal seal has turned up in the possession of a jeweller in London.

Recently I read a piece in a newspaper by Paul Johnson about prayer which I think is worth repeating here:

"...it is my experience that faith waxes and wanes, and sometimes it is so weak as to be almost imperceptible. It is then that one must pray. I pray to make my faith stronger. But may one pray when faith does not even exist? Most certainly. You may not believe in God but you can still pray to Him - pray for that gift only He can bestow. For God exists despite our disbelief.

That is why prayer is the very essence and centre of the religious life. We may be unbelievers or we may be confused by the mysteries, contradictions and improbabilities of faith, and unable to unravel them in our minds. But we can all pray. It is the one resource that can never be taken away from us. We may be impotent, penniless, in prison, bound hand and foot, stricken in all our limbs, unable to move, blindfold and gagged. But we can still pray. It is the last weapon of the weak, the starving, the puzzled and the unsure.

Yet in its own way it is the most powerful weapon of all. When we pray to God there are certain things, each of huge importance, implicit in our action. First there is the acknowledgement that God albeit all-powerful creator of the universe is an actual being who can be addressed in a meaningful way. Prayer is directed to a personal God, who receives it and listens to it - and who may answer it.

Secondly, prayer reflects the fact that our relationship with this personal, receptive God, who hears us, is itself direct and personal. It is an amazing fact that, of all the powerful people in the universe, protected by banks of security guards and secretaries and personal assistants and scrambler phones and ex-directory numbers, the one who is master of them all is totally, instantly and always accessible."

I think it is nearing the time of the year when a brilliant planet appears in the eastern sky before sunrise, this is the morning star - Jesus said: "I am the root and offspring of David and the bright and morning star."

Love to all, Helen Brady.

---

"The true meaning of "redeem" is "to acquire out of the forum" - to purchase as slaves were purchased in the public market place.

Can anything be clearer than that the price which is paid for a thing or person is handed over in exchange for that thing or person?

What could be simpler than the statement of the Apostle Peter that we are redeemed by the precious blood of Christ? His blood, in other words His life which was in His blood, was the price paid to purchase us out of captivity - His life for ours."

Could self-sacrificing substitution be more clearly demonstrated?"

Excerpt from, "A Christadelphian Lifts The Curse."

---

## **The Facts People Who Reverence Truth Should Know**

In recent weeks I have been engaged in the defence of what is believed by Nazarenes to be the true physical nature of man from his creation until the present time. I use the term "physical" by reason of the fact people use the term "human nature" in an adverse way to describe the many vices opposed to the will of God, when in fact human nature can be disposed towards God's will when directed through the channels of His Word. People often say "Oh, that's only human nature," when they should say "disposition," in whatever governs the case.

But we Nazarenes know the origin of these misdirected expressions. They crept into the early Christian Church in a formula known as the doctrine of original sin in the which it was put forth that as a result of Adam's sin his nature had been made subject to physical decay and moral decay causing a greater inclination and bias to sin which was not there before, and also culminating in natural death.

In correspondence on these matters I have been informed that Dr. Thomas the founder of the community called Christadelphians, brought the Truth to light from the darkness of Christendom which was prevailing in his day.

Evidently the light he had received would have been and was, sufficient for he and his close friend Robert Roberts to state categorically to a man holding the doctrine of original sin or changed nature and increased bias to sin, that there was no evidence of this whatever in Scripture - but that the evidence was entirely contrary - there was a change in Adam's relationship to his Maker but not in the nature of his physical organization. (taken from writings of Dr.Thomas and R.Roberts)

Both Thomas and Roberts departed from this scriptural evidence and Truth, to the doctrine of original sin which Christendom had embraced from Apostate Rome and which the aforesaid man had put to them as a candidate for baptism, and they refused him on account of a lack of evidence in Scripture for that false view. It is well known to Nazarenes and it has been well circulated that Edward Turney in his closer study of Genesis, came to the very conclusion that Dr.Thomas and Robert Roberts first believed when purported to have revived the Light of the Truth, and as they had defended and stated to the aforesaid interested candidate, - "there was no evidence in Scripture that Adam's physical nature was changed to a process of decay and defilement and tendency to sin ending ultimately in return to dust as the penalty on account of sin committed by Adam."

Either my correspondent is aware of these facts or he has never read our literature seriously, and pretends he has by attacking Edward Turney's views. In fact he denies any knowledge that Dr.Thomas and R.Roberts held the views of no change of Adam's nature when he sinned, yet those views are in their writings which I have quoted to him. But like most Christadelphians he is comparing both E.Turney's views and those of Nazarenes with the false views adopted after 1869 by Thomas and Roberts and later inserted by Roberts in numbered Clauses in the Christadelphians Statement of their Faith; Clause V being that false doctrine of changed flesh which has caused the eruption and many unnecessary divisions in that community.

Thus these false statements are styled "The Truth," when the real Truth expounded by Nazarenes and Turney, they call "Heresy."

Therefore anything in opposition to the teaching of Robert Roberts including his misrepresentation of Turney's scriptural proven views, is considered to be error. People should read "The Lecture entitled The Slain Lamb, dissected by Edward Turney." Our magazine editor, Russell Gregory can supply it on request free of charge.

Why am I stating all these things? Simply because instead of reading for themselves Edward Turney's lecture "The Sacrifice of Christ," some believe what lies have been propagated by such people who could not receive the spirit's teaching, for in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah as per Matthew 13:14,15 "And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive; for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."

Personal experience has proved this to me.

On this issue of Dr.Thomas and Robert Roberts denying on the evidence of Scripture that a change of Adam's nature occurred after he sinned, my correspondent's comments were, "But even if it were a fact that at one time they held this teaching, it has no bearing on the issue. At one time they accepted much of the false teaching of Christendom, but later, as a result of their study of God's word, they rejected it. It is a pity that those who have espoused the teaching of E.Turney do not do the same."

So he asks me to accept that what Thomas and Roberts first believed as a result of their study of God's word, and the evidence which gives no support to his own views and Clause V, that it has no bearing on the issue? Was it the false teaching of Christendom that they both rejected after 1869? No, it was the true teaching they both held and which they rejected for the false doctrine of Christendom which in 1873 Edward

Turney proved to be false when in conflict with Robert Roberts the man who had degenerated spiritually to the extent of resorting to misrepresentation of what Turney was teaching. Those who have tenaciously espoused the teachings of Mr Roberts, of a condemned Christ of unclean nature, dying to cleanse it for Himself first, and being therefore unable afterwards to die for those He came to save by the giving of His life by the shedding of His blood, are making the same accusations and misrepresentations. They misinterpret the teaching of Hebrews 7:27 by making Jesus a Priest which He could not have been (See Hebrews 8), and worse still making Him inferior to the types and shadows of which He was the superior substance.

One other matter to consider is very important and it is this; Jesus could not have been in the loins of Adam at any time, for if He had been, His pedigree could be traced directly back to Adam on the male side, whereas Adam is recorded as a Son of God by creation from the dust and God breathed-life; and Jesus the Son of God by begetting from a woman of the same Adamic nature.

One other important matter to note is the fact that Eve was not in the loins of Adam; her existence was not by reason of reproduction on Adam's part in the sense of fertilization. She was created by God from a rib of Adam and though bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, she owed her existence to the Creator who presented her to Adam as a helpmeet for him that they might in one another's company and in their relationship to their Creator, enjoy the wonders of His marvellous work of creation. Production of seed in the woman was a physical law of her being appointed by the Creator but of no reproductive value without fertilization by the male. All descendants of Eve were therefore through reproduction of Adamic life; which had come under pledge through Adam's sin. This existence after sin could only be provisional until the real debt to the violated Law of Sin and Death was paid by one who had the freedom from that debt and the means to pay.

The provisional price for Adam, and consequently all in his loins was paid in God's provision of the life blood of the lamb slain in Eden as the type of Him who was to come, even Jesus, who like the typical lamb, was from the beginning of life free from sin.

The fertilizing 'life-power' of the Highest which overshadowed the virgin Mary was not in pledge as was Adam's, which gendered his posterity, yet Mary's Holy child was of the identical flesh and blood nature but not Sin's Flesh, but flesh belonging to God, the Father. This was Edward Turney's contention with Robert Roberts and rather than admit his spiritual incapacity to understand it Roberts accused Turney of teaching that Jesus had different flesh to His brethren whereas it was relationship to God, and the possessive case Turney was teaching and why Jesus, with a life forfeited to the Law of Sin and Death, was able to reconcile believers to God. Hence the meaning of the term "Free Life," for without it there could be no reconciliation.

Our reading of the Scriptures should prove to us that God has been very particular in His choice and purpose from the beginning, especially in regard to "Seeds." But we will relate this to the human content where we are confronted in Genesis with a mention of two seeds which have a bearing on moral character.

Now as a result of what Eve stated about the serpent after her deception, God said to that deceptive agent (the serpent) "I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." Here is presented God's choice of good and evil, the evil represented by men of serpent reasoning and characteristics in opposition to men of humble character and faith in God. Cain was the beginning of the evil and serpent element who had no respect for God's Way; Abel was the good element who had faith and respect for God's Way and showed it in his offering (Hebrews 11:4), and in God testifying approval, Abel being dead yet spoke after Cain had slain him. Now please note Genesis 4:25. Here we have portrayed Eve's knowledge of the fact of God choosing the good seed in contrast with the 'serpent thinking element' in the following of Cain "For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel whom Cain slew." This seed of course was Seth, but this lesson and contrast of the seeds has been maintained continually in God's appointments as we find in the promise to Abraham of a singular Seed of importance, as Paul emphasizes to the Galatians; "To thy seed which is Christ" (Galatians 3:16). Again in Romans 9, Paul is very particular as to the seed by fleshly descent of Abraham and the Seed of promise, for as he says, "The children of the promise are counted for the Seed."

Some people seem to blind themselves to what Paul is teaching in this ninth chapter of his epistle to the Romans which theme focuses on the identity and Divine appointment of the Seed of promise. I think also that certain people have failed to see that the first promise of God to Abraham was that in him all families of the earth would be blessed. This promise put more importance on faith, and the righteousness by faith, than fleshly descent, for as Paul said, "Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." (Galatians 3:7,8). "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham" – not will be blessed, but are blessed, present tense. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free, male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Heirs of the world - Romans 4:13.

Here I am forced to correct my correspondent's statement which is out of harmony with Scripture and what Paul has been saying in Romans and Galatians. I now quote his words from paragraph 6, "In Eden it was foretold that the Saviour was to be 'the seed of the woman;' Abraham was told that 'in thy seed (that is, his natural, fleshly descendants) shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.'"

Despite all that I have previously stated of the contrast between the two "seeds," my correspondent has implied that Baptism by faith into Christ, or even of that faith manifested by Abraham, does not matter if one is a fleshly descendant of Abraham, and not only so, but all the nations of the earth will be blessed even in carnally minded Jews of fleshly descent from Abraham, and anti-Christ.

When believers are baptized into Christ as Gentiles, does this change their physical flesh to that of Jews after the flesh?

Consider again Romans 9 and accept Paul's teaching please

Another matter we are apt to overlook is God's statement to the serpent (the personification of deceitful thinking in opposition to God's Way), "I will put enmity between thee and the woman;" this is the first prophetic utterance from God, and its fulfilment is portrayed in the Scriptures by the faith and actions of many women including Eve. Who believed in a future Seed who would bruise Satan under the feet of His body, the Church. Many names of faithful women come to mind such as Sarai, Rebecca, Leah, Rachel, Naomi, Ruth, Abigail, to name but these, but there were many others even to the time of Elizabeth, John Baptist's mother, also Mary the mother of Jesus and the rest of the women who believed and followed Jesus.

They were all at enmity with those in the Old Testament termed "Satan" and sometimes "sons of Belial." But when we come to the next part of God's utterance, "Enmity between they seed and her seed, it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel," when does this take place? It has been said that by His sacrificial death Jesus bruised the serpent in the head and due to His resurrection the death of Jesus could only be regarded as a bruising of His heel by the serpent because it was not a finality. Yet in Isaiah 53:10 we read, "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him." This was for a good cause of course, and because of Jesus' willingness, also if we take into account Paul's words to the Roman believers, Satan was still active at the time, "And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." (Romans 16:20).

I suggest this could refer to the binding of Satan or the Dragon, that old Serpent which is the devil and Satan for the space of a thousand years, it being seen as a bruise or limitation of evil for the benefit of believers and at the end of that period the serpent power is released for the final bruising of his head. (Revelation 20). See also Revelation 12 depicting God's favour toward the woman and her seed identified in Christ in the fact that He was hated of that serpent generation of vipers and sought for His destruction as soon as He was born, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron; and her child was caught up unto God, and to His throne. This latter fact had already been fulfilled but I believe it was shown to John that he might identify the woman's Seed which was Christ, for in no way could it refer to the ascension of Christ to His Father's throne at some future time.

But the persecution of the remnant of her seed was future and is still in progress even by the people who boast that they are the custodians of The Truth.

One thing I must point out to the people whose creed demands belief in condemned sin-nature, including Jesus; John the Baptist addressed the serpent-thinking element with the words, "And begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our fathers: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." (Luke3:7,8).

This is what I have been stressing - that mere fleshly descent from Abraham is not enough. John Baptist continued his message, "I indeed baptize you with water: but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose." (verse 16). This was considered a base menial service yet John regarded himself unworthy to do it for Jesus, whom he did not know at the time was indeed the Messiah.

Now the other point with which in this connection, I will conclude: Jesus said, "Ye fools and blind; for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?" (Matthew 23:19). Judge therefore, whether is greater, the shoes of Jesus, or the feet that were in them? John judged that it was the man whose feet were in the shoes. Those not blinded by men's false theories will judge the same. Please be guided by the teaching of the Master. Edward Turney was.

Brother Phil Parry.

---

"Redemption is release for a ransom. All who become God's servants are therefore released from a former Lord by purchase. The Purchaser is God; and the price or ransom paid, the precious blood of the flesh... of Christ, as of a Lamb without spot and without blemish."

Dr Thomas, "Eureka," page 30. Quoted in "Apples of Gold in Pictures of Silver."

---

## **Letter received from Brother Chris Brook:-**

Dear Russell, Thank you very much for the copy of the "Netherton Debate" and the July/August edition of the Circular Letter. I have read both with great interest.

I am sure you will receive much correspondence on the substance of the debate and the other material associated with it, so I will restrict my letter to two other matters which concern me and also sadden me, and on which I would welcome your views.

The first concerns the choice of words in the presentation of the arguments. An example will illustrate; in the preface to the Second Edition of the debate document, written I suppose quite recently, Helen Brady says (paragraph 5) "Christadelphians share their pathetic delusion about original sin..." I wonder what is the value and intent of the word "pathetic"? Let me say immediately that I accept the responsibility of both your community and mine to defend and uphold the Truth we believe is revealed in the Scriptures - that has always been our position. I would have no concern if the sentence read "Christadelphians share their delusion..." but the addition of the word "pathetic" seems to me to be unnecessarily insulting. This is just one example and if alone would hardly be noticed, but sadly it is representative of many, many such adjectives which imply that Christadelphians are not just wrong but perverted, insincere or thick - or all three. The inspired writers of the Scriptures could say "Thus saith the Lord;" the Lord Jesus could say "You have read...but I say unto you;" we are neither the Lord Jesus, nor inspired and it seems to me that a gentle humility is an appropriate attitude for those who disagree with others about the interpretation of Scripture, and that we leave the judgment of innermost motive to Him who can see into our hearts. None of this will prevent us from upholding the truth vigorously and firmly.

The second point I would raise and invite your comment is on the content of the C.L.161 (you see I have picked up your acronym!). Having read it I then made a rough analysis of its contents. About 85% is devoted to confounding the Christadelphians; that leaves 15% for exposition and exhortation, including the opening letter from Helen Brady and the analysis of the three-fold corruption of God's Word, both of which

I found very helpful. I recognize that, albeit in a previous generation I suppose, the Nazarene Fellowship sprang out of the Christadelphian community, and I would expect your literature to contain a booklet entitled “an Appeal to Christadelphians” (or similar) and probably other material, and that there might be an occasional article about the errors you identify in our teachings but I am surprised that it amounts to 85% of your magazine. An uninformed reader might conclude that your main purpose is to confound the Christadelphians and I am sure this cannot be what you intend. My concern is for your members who I am sure are sincere believers who need spiritual edification and exhortation from the Scriptures in these last dark days.

You might say that it is none of my business and if you do I accept the rebuke in meekness. I suppose it could also be that C.L.161 is a “special edition” to go with the debate document, and the 162 will be entirely different in character. I hope to read it and have my concern answered.

Come Lord Jesus. With Kind Regards, Chris Brook.

### **In reply to Chris Brooks letter I wrote as follows:-**

Dear Chris, Greetings with Love in Jesus Great Name. It was a pleasure to receive your letter of the 25th September 1996 and I much appreciate the kindness of spirit in which you write, and at long last I have come round to writing in reply. It may be that the two matters you draw attention to have now, to some extent been resolved in the latter issues of the Circular Letters. However, may I take this opportunity of making some observations which may be of general interest and I hope of some help to yourself and readers of the Circular Letter?

Perhaps some readers may feel our comments offend and are somewhat hurtful but that is not our intention or wish of course, and we bear in mind 2 Corinthians 6:3 - “Giving no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed: but in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God...” I am aware that some people will perhaps inevitably feel hurt and it is my personal opinion that this is a matter to be borne in mind when writing but not to the extent of holding back on what ought to be said and using plain speech in upholding the truth. I also believe that it is those who most care about truth will feel the most hurt. Indeed, it is these very people who care most for the truth are the ones we are most anxious to help and this we do by making available the facts which are not often found clearly expressed in Christadelphian literature.

You say ““Pathetic” seems to be unnecessarily insulting” and go on to say there are “many, many such adjectives.” Considering this word “pathetic” for a moment - this denotes pity and sadness; but is not delusion, or false belief, pitiable and sad in any case? The word pathetic is a reiteration of the position. Having spent some time perusing the articles in the Netherton Debate book with your comment in mind I am not sure that adjectives are over used and I am sorry you should feel any of them to be insulting. I don’t think they are. The adjectives we use when dealing with Christadelphian teaching regarding the Atonement are truly descriptive.

It is a very sorry and unsatisfactory situation that we are still having to write as we do about so much of the Christadelphian literature after 120 years, and this is due to the people who write so much confusing nonsense and who feed their flock on pleasant words of false reassurance that what they have is the truth, all the truth and nothing but the truth. It is easy to show otherwise from Scripture to those with ears to hear and eyes to see and prayer in their hearts. There is no virtue in upholding and maintaining their false doctrines.

It is a very common custom and widespread practice amongst Christadelphians to tell the rank and file not to read literature which is contrary to their own teaching. I know this from personal experience as a young man (and indeed not so young), and have heard others being told the same. This makes it easier for them to spread false rumours about what other writings contain. But why should anyone be afraid for the Truth?

It is indeed sad that our beliefs and teachings based on sound Scripture knowledge have been variously attacked with misrepresentations or worse, though we have never been proved wrong. If we seem to boast it is in the same manner as did David in Psalm 44, “In God we boast all the day long, and praise Thy name for ever.” Not a boast of pride but of thanksgiving and praise to our heavenly Father.

You write:-

“The inspired writers of the Scriptures could say “Thus saith the Lord;” the Lord Jesus could say “You have read... but I say unto you;” we are neither the Lord Jesus, nor inspired...”

Just so. We are not inspired but when we see others falsely claiming they teach the true meaning of the Atonement we find it very difficult to maintain a gentle humility and feel a more appropriate attitude is “Be ye angry and sin not,” and our anger rises when we read in Christadelphian writings claims such as these:-

“They were immediately aware of a change. They were defiled... the change which they immediately noticed as they took and ate of the fruit in disobedience of God’s command, was to be confirmed in their subsequent daily experiences, seeing on the face and in the body of their companion the unmistakable signs of decay;” “Sin, then became a physical property of the flesh of the human race...” “eventual death, whenever and however it occurs is the punishment for sin.” “Perfect obedience, even if it were possible...” “Perfect obedience is not possible because our mortal bodies are the cause of sin...” “our flesh is unclean, filthy, defiled and in need of purging and requires atoning for.” “Jesus Christ made in the likeness of sinful flesh.” He “was specially equipped to overcome every temptation to sin... and thereby overcame sin in the flesh.” “Jesus came in the same condemned sinful flesh as is common to all...” “It was necessary for Him to die for Himself...” “He was made sin for us by being obedient unto the death on the Cross.” “Had He not died on the Cross He would have been an actual transgressor never to rise again.” “It was not wrong for Him to die.” “There hung the devil dead.”

And I could go on and on, but suffice it to say that every statement quoted above is assumption and without exception Scripture proves every statement to be false. (Are there sufficient adjectives to describe how we feel?). Gentle humility is the appropriate attitude before God and gentleness before our fellows is also right, especially so with new comers seeking truth, but where we see error we have responsibility, and the error we see is not regarding matters of no consequence but of very great consequence to those who hope to be saved thereby. Those who worship God must worship Him in Spirit and in Truth, and we believe that the right teaching on the Atonement is crucial to salvation. Do we not show great patience and perseverance when for 120 years we have been endeavouring to open the eyes and ears of our friends to Bible teaching on the Atonement, immortal resurrection and freedom from condemnation.

May I take another example of Christadelphian writing? In C.C. Walker’s booklet, “The Atonement,” I quote from page 6 under the heading, “Sacrifice”:-

“The law of God said to Adam, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die” (Genesis 2:17). It may be well in passing to remark that the expression “In the day” does not mean in the literal day, as may be seen from a study of all the texts where ‘B’yom’, the Hebrew expression occurs. This is also to be understood from the fact that Adam lived long after he had sinned, even “nine hundred and thirty years” (Genesis 5:5), and then “died.” Much nonsense has been written about Adam and the “day.” It would be unprofitable to discuss it here.”

What are we to say to this? C.C.Walker was widely respected by thousands and looked to as an authority. In his position as Editor of “The Christadelphian” he had a great responsibility and he should have discharged those duties honestly and accurately. But what do we find? He claims:- ““In the day,” does not mean the literal day, as may be seen from a study of all the texts where “b’yom.” the Hebrew expression occurs”! It may be he hadn’t made a study of the texts but was taking someone else’s word for it. In which case he let his readers down very badly because he should have checked the facts. Or it may be he had made a study of the texts and he had found it wasn’t in tune with his cherished beliefs and he wouldn’t admit to it. Either way he was seriously wrong. He didn’t enlighten his readers to the truth and so failed them as well as himself. Our booklet, “The Usage and Meaning of ‘Muth Temuth’ and ‘B’yom’ gives the study of the texts.

Because by such means many are misled we “Cry aloud and spare not!”

We concentrate on the Christadelphian community because we believe they are the people most likely to benefit from correction. Christadelphians claim a strong allegiance to the Bible and are students of it more so than perhaps any other community. Again, almost all of us have had a close association with the Christadelphian community and know their strengths and weaknesses perhaps even better than they do, so it is only natural we should concentrate our attention towards them.

We wish most sincerely and earnestly to discuss Bible teaching and we welcome any argument which shows we are at variance with Scripture. Indeed, I am sure I can speak for all of the Nazarene Fellowship when saying that if anyone can show us a single point in which we are out of harmony with Scripture we would love them dearly. We most heartily welcome any correction of our understanding and thank God for such edification.

You write:-

“I accept the responsibility of both your community and mine to defend and uphold the Truth we believe is revealed in the Scripture - that has always been our position.”

I see a big question mark over this claim, for while it is the position the Christadelphians may say they hold it is not borne out by the facts which are that they uphold tradition of men in the form of the Statement of Faith which is placed as of more importance than Scripture. The one example of Sin-in-the-flesh, which has never been proved from Scripture but is merely assumed, ought not to be in the B.A.S.F. as it is destructive of Truth. Mortal resurrection is another fallacy and is the cause of unnecessary anxiety. 1 Corinthians 15 is perfectly clear and it is imperative the B.A.S.F. be amended or abolished. Just ignoring it as we know so many do, is burying one's head in the sand and really is not good enough.

Only the other day a Christadelphian friend was saying that while looking forward to the return of Jesus Christ how that she was fearful of the judgment when He comes! Oh! Christadelphians! What are you doing to each other? “Know ye not that there is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus? Why do you make one another afraid of the return of Christ? There is no fear in love. Perfect love casteth out fear and Jesus has perfect love for us. Where is your love for one another in telling such tales?

“Blessed are they that have part in the first resurrection for on such the second death hath no power.” What joy! What comfort in the words of Jesus in contrast to Christadelphian founders who wrote - “We don't know whether or not our sins are forgiven until the Judgment”! What Judgment? Yes, the faithful are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ but this is for the distribution of awards; not for condemnation!

To teach that Christ died for Himself is an abomination which we feel very strongly about because it dishonours God and makes Him the Author of sin for only God was able to change Adam's good flesh into sinful flesh as claimed by Christadelphians. They even boast about it saying that as far as they know there is no other denomination which believes it in the way they do! We, of course, know that no Christadelphian would agree that they neither dishonour God nor say that God is the Author of sin but the only way to avoid the situation is to realize that Adam's nature was not changed; that sin does not qualify flesh, and it is character that God's law is dealing with not flesh. Christadelphians cannot say we have sinful flesh and then say that they do not dishonour God. They cannot have it both ways. God's law is a moral law; morals are clean or unclean and can only apply to flesh in the legal sense, not the physical.

Jesus Christ did not have sinful flesh and neither did He need to die in any sense for Himself. He voluntarily went to His death on the Cross for the joy that was set before Him in bringing many sons to glory.

The fact is that Adam was not put to death on the very day that he transgressed; he did not die that day, and no one can understand why Christ died until they can understand why Adam did not.

The answer is straight forward and simple; it is that Adam was spared the death penalty by the grace of God in order for there to be a human race, and, God slew a lamb to provide covering for Adam and Eve's shame. This lamb slain in Eden was the type of the Lamb of God who was to give His life later in place of Adam's. This is so easy of understanding that a child can grasp it, and there is nothing in Scripture which

teaches otherwise. It is the foundation on which to build - the fact that Adam was not put to death because God knew His Son would offer His life in place of Adam's - and in building on this foundation we keep in harmony with every precept of Scripture.

It is our loving duty to make available all the arguments in support of the Truth to aid the understanding of all those who search the Scriptures. So much supposition is passed off as proven it is difficult for the novice to find the pros and cons of a doctrine and the Christadelphian Office has never given the help it ought in this direction. Affirmation is not proof of any teaching. Let the Christadelphian Office put fairly and honestly the proofs from Scripture which give proper support to their claims. Let them do this in clear language so that everyone can see the truth of their claims. By the grace of God we are well prepared for a rational discussion with them

You write

“I would expect your literature to contain a booklet entitled “An Appeal to Christadelphians” (or similar) and other material.”

In fact, our literature consists of nearly a hundred booklets written over the past one hundred and twenty-four years almost all of which are directed to and pointing out Christadelphian errors they have so stubbornly held on to. Over fifty of our booklets have been reprinted in recent years and photocopies of most others are available; if you or any of our readers have any queries regarding a controversial subject it is possible we have a booklet or two which deals specifically with it and will be sent on request.

Sorry, Chris, but I do not see why you use the expression “to confound the Christadelphians.” Sad to say but they do an excellent job of this for themselves and that is why there are so many divisions amongst them. Their every attempt at reasoning on the subject of the Atonement is confounded by the error of sinful flesh. Our efforts are directed to clear away their confusion, not add to it! Or it may be you are using the word “confound” in the sense of “overthrow,” but again, No. We do not wish to overthrow Christadelphians, but false doctrine. We wish to enlighten Christadelphians.

I hope and pray that the Spiritual needs of all in the Nazarene Fellowship are fully met. We, as much as anyone, need the exhortation and encouragement one of another and being few in number and scattered world wide we are for the most part in isolation and yet are frequently in touch with one another by correspondence. Our publications are only one aspect of this fellowship. But you will know that none of us are alone when we are in Christ.

Your brother in Hope, Russell.

---

“When a Hebrew brought an unblemished lamb as a sin-offering and its life was ended by the shedding of its blood, it was a practical demonstration of his recognition that in strict justice he himself deserved to die, because he had transgressed some point of the Law. But when he made the appropriate sacrifice and confessed his guilt, he was saved from the penalty he had incurred and the life of his sin-offering was accepted instead of his own. This is the principle underlying the law of sacrifice and it provides the key to an understanding of the great sacrifice of Christ which it foreshadowed.”

Excerpt from, “The Great Mystery of The Christian Religion”

---

## **PARDON ME, BUT MY SLIP IS SHOWING!**

In Circular Letter 161, page 15, item 3 in reply to David Nodding's letter I used the terms “mortal” and “immortal” where I ought to have used the terms “corruptible” and “incorruptible”

It is common to find the terms mortal and corruptible or immortal and incorruptible used to convey the same thought or idea. However, it should be borne in mind that the meaning of words can change over a period of time and originally these terms meant very different things.

In Scripture corruptible and incorruptible refer to the physical body as when a person dies his body corrupts in the grave. Regarding Jesus Christ, “God would not suffer His Holy One to see corruption,” and He was raised the third day; He is now incorruptible. I believe everyone understands the meaning of these two words very well.

So far as the scriptures are concerned ‘mortal’ is better understood as a legal term and refers to a person who is subject to death due to transgression of God’s law. Adam in the Garden of Eden was not mortal until he was disobedient. His life was then forfeited to the law. Since then, all born with life descended from Adam have inherited this mortal position, for the purpose of salvation. It is here we see the purpose of the Virgin Birth in the plan of God for we believe Jesus Christ was born in the similar position into which Adam was created. This means then that Jesus Christ was not mortal having a new life direct from His Father, and as He never infringed His Father’s Law He never became mortal.

Thus Adam, though created a corruptible being, was not created a mortal being, but became mortal as soon as he sinned. It is this mortal life which has been passed down to us from Adam. It is this position of mortality which is annulled at baptism into Christ - “He that heareth my word...hath everlasting life...is passed from death unto life” (John 5:24) - and remains so while our names are in the Lamb’s Book of Life. Though we may die and our bodies corrupt in the grave we are destined to be raised incorruptible because the demands of the law were met by Jesus Christ, the One who was never mortal, who’s life was never forfeit, who’s life was His own to give if He chose, and who died for us while “we were yet without strength” (Romans 5:6) and quite unable to do anything about it for ourselves. Jesus Christ was not “without strength.” He was able to give His life in place of our Adamic life even as in the types under the Law of Moses where the lamb died so that the sinner should not. The life of the sacrifice for the life of the sacrificer. Substitution as introduced, adopted and sanctioned by God himself. In such we see God’s unbounded love, mercy and grace, and that of Jesus Christ, “who offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears” in striving to do His Father’s will – and then laid down His natural life for us!

Brother Russell Gregory.

---

### **The following letter is from our Brother Grant Pearce who writes in his own inimitable way:-**

Dear Russell, Thank you for all the info and literature that has been sent throughout the year. This must be a mammoth task and you must be getting a bit sick of it by now. I know what it is like sitting here trying to get a page done by two-fingerism, let alone write a whole book and the C.L.s as well.

Firstly I would like to draw your attention to the last two or three pages in the final part of your reprint of “The Ecclesias of God Down the Ages and Today” (Stallworthy and Wille).

Now it is my opinion now after much research that this angle is very relevant to all the Brothers and Sisters in Christ today, and a point that all should consider.

It appears to me that organizations, institutions, democratically elected hierarchy and political humbug and tomfoolery of such institutional intentions by way of creeds, confessions and statements of faith and B.A.S.Fism, etc, was not the indications of the Scriptures.

During my previous jaunt with the Christadelphians, and of experience too by yourself I bet, there was the execution of Christadelphian standing orders via Christadelphian democracyship; the majority always wins even if it is wrong and for the wrong reasons.

The innocent party maybe was legislated against, etc. etc., rules made and put into effect and the Arranging Brothers went happily on their ways patting each one on the back ‘we howled that bloke over brother, that’ll teach him to get the stitch with us, it’s in the rule book set out by the founding fathers and ain’t we done a good job in the name of the Master...’

Oh yes, I thought to myself, where says so in the Scriptures of truth?

I remember one time, the Hobart Christadelphian Ecclesia suggested as per scriptural example “the drawing of lots” for direction of business and election of hierarchy, for lack of resolve or confidence maybe, the matter lapsed. Maybe it didn’t like the chance that “Providence” for want of a better word, might provide them with a king not to their liking and not of comely feature and stature... or maybe the decision that ole bushie Pearce might be allowed to stay in the meeting when his heretical and heinous crime being his claim that clauses 5-12 of the B.A.S.F, was a cartload of bunk! Like Ernest Brady, I too could write a book of the days of our lives of Christadelphery, and like Ernest Brady, too, it would all be best left unsaid and left to the dusty archives of our lifelong experiences in memory. I too, I hope am a little wiser...

In connection with the reprint aforementioned, sometime ago I got a letter and a small booklet (poor photocopy enclosed) from Sister Edie Howells of Yarrowonga and so I determined to copy it best I could before it was returned to her. I thought the theme of it was very good and an aspect that should be given a fair bit of thought by the brothers and sisters, and closely connected to Stallworthy and Wille points made.

It was noted of course, that the author was tainted with standard Christadelphian indoctrinations human sacrifice of Christ, sin in the flesh, and unable to be obedient, and evil and obnoxious to its Creator naturism, and a couple of odd things about the devil which I can’t remember at this moment.

However, I think it proves the point that Sister Helen Brady made to me sometime ago, that only two or three brothers and sisters here and there may be the real ones who make up the true ecclesia. Anyway see if you can decipher the copy - sorry its so poor but the bowevils got into the middle of it and ate the centre out of the middle pages which is a pity. I know of an old bloke in Melbourne who was Old Paths librarian but I don’t think he would have a copy anyway.

I am pleased you were able to fire a shot at the Logos machine. I reckon they’ve got a cheek and more front than the Commonwealth Bank. Their misrepresentation and misinformation and lack of facts is deplorable. It appears to me their info must have come from the Christadelphian magazine, and even then they’ve got that muddled. Clean flesh is not Nazarene but an epithet termed years later by C.C.Walker referring to Brother John Bell of Australia early this century. Of course their minions will never know any better because no one is allowed to debate them through their magazine. Such is democracy and organization and institutionalism of the Christadelphian phenomena!

I wrote the editor some time ago and while he did not reply to it personally, one of his workers did, not even touching on any of the questions or criticisms rendered at them and their doctrines. The conscientious objector is just of no account. Never mind, it’s a long road that ain’t got a bend in her ole mate...

The Logos Editorial for December made me wild again too, and I reckon they’ll have to get another flea in their ear about that. Their pathetic bleatings about the B.A.S.F. and consequent threatenings about members who break vows in this connection before God are nothing short of intimidation.

I was baptized after an interview with a cow-cockie, a retired railway fitter, a stock and station agency branch manager, two sheep farmers and a auto-motive electrician, all well read of the Scriptures and of reasonable intelligence and brains. I told them the way I saw it, orally - no written bunk or anything like that. At the conclusion one of them exclaimed he was surprised at what I did know about certain things and aspects of their doctrines. This B.A.S.F. bunk I never came across until while clearing out a drawer of a retiring and transferring Recorder. Even before this there was some grey areas in my knowledge that I could never seem to get the pieces to fit. One thing led to another and the ferocious thirst for more information and come flood or famine I wasn’t going to back down and the rest is history.

While still not sure about some things I committed Christadelphian high-treason and informed them some of their teachings was bunk! Then excommunicated for telling them the truth! See what I mean about the majority that cast me out being wrong!

A New Zealand brother that baptized me rang up in a flap after my heinous crime had been advertised (another Christadelphian crime - advertise the sin of another...) for all the world to see and wanted to know what in the earth I’d done. When I told him he was shocked and said, “Oh well, the Lord will judge.” I

thought he might have went in to bat for me. "An Australian problem" he said... so much for democracy and organization. Such is the blind and defeatist attitude we are all familiar with via Christadelphia. Don't make waves or rock the silly lookin' boat, doesn't matter if the kings got no clothes on, I told Hobart the condemned nature business was bunk and that our nature is as God made it for His good plan and purpose, as in the beginning; for good or for evil, choice and freewill, either God's ways or...?? and that the world about us is still perfect for just that, and that I see multitudes of wonderful things everyday. Oh no, they says, it is all corruption and decaying; take skin of an apple and it begins to turn brown and corrupt- So what says I? That's the way it was made to be in the beginning. Christadelphia - a wonder of the world!

Kind Regards, Russell and all the gang,

Grant Pearce.

---

"Redemption and deliverance. These are not twain brothers. You can deliver by any means: war, or selling the black rabbit to its owner. Not so with redemption. No soul can say he has been redeemed unless a price has been paid for him; yet these terms have been indiscriminately rendered redemption no less than ten times in the New Testament, and accurate but once, namely Hebrews 11:35. "Others were beaten to death, not accepting deliverance (apolutrosin)." It had been a glaring blunder to have said they refused redemption.

What prevented their accurate discrimination in the remaining nine times? In Ephesians 1:14 we have the phrase, "Until the redemption of the purchased possession." What further redemption does an already purchased possession require? We are redeemed now, but are not yet delivered. "Come, Great Deliverer, come!"

Excerpt from, "The Lamb of God"

---

## **Regarding John Higgins' letter and my reply reported in C.L.162 (Aug/Sept 1996), pages 4 to 7:**

When John Higgins wrote:- "You people have told us that the Christadelphians believe that Jesus was a sinner," I understood him to mean a sinner in the sense of having committed sin Himself. This we know is nonsense.

However, what did not cross my mind at the time of writing my reply was that Christadelphian teaching makes Jesus Christ a sinner by imputation.

The record is now put straight in the following article - Phil Parry comments on the letter of John Higgins:-

Dear Brother Russell, Greetings in Jesus' Name. I had intended to answer the first comments of John Higgins in our last C.L. but due to other pressing matters omitted to do so. This was connected with his accusation that Nazarene's say that Christadelphians teach and say that Jesus was a sinner in order to create an "Aunt Sally" to knock over, - and he says, "such a statement is absolute rubbish."

We are agreed on one point that Christadelphians have never made an exclusive and blatant public statement to the effect that Jesus was a sinner in a direct and personal sense. Nevertheless, His being imputed a sinner is contained in the teaching of their pioneers Thomas and Roberts, and confirmed by men who have followed their teaching.

I need go no further than quote Hebrews 7:27 wherein Christadelphians corrupt and falsify what the writer is conveying to his intelligent, readers familiar with the rituals of the Priesthood under the Mosaic Law.

The Christadelphian general view of this has always considered it to refer to Jesus as a Priest on earth in the same context as the Priest under the law offering sacrifice for his own sins and then offering for the people, thus inferring that when Jesus died on the tree He offered for His own sins and those of the people, in one act.

The glaring mistake here in their reasoning is the fact that the writer to Hebrews is contrasting the Priesthood of Jesus in Heaven with that of the Mosaic Priesthood on earth where Jesus could not even officiate as a Priest, being of the tribe of Juda not of Aaron, Hebrews 8:4, and also the fact that the Priest was not the sacrificial victim for the cleansing. This was my contention in Bible Class discussions as a Christadelphian, namely that such a false view implied Jesus to be a sinner.

The truth of Jesus while on earth fulfilling the role of the antitypical Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world was being obscured by this misinterpretation and manipulation of the Holy Scriptures and Apostolic Epistles. In fact more distortion and contradiction can hardly be found than in "Elpis Israel" and "Eureka" by John Thomas. M.D. and also in similar writings of his friend Robert Roberts,

Now on the basis that Christadelphians in general insist that Jesus was by nature a son of Adam, I would draw the attention of John Higgins to "Elpis Israel" page 116 under the heading "The Constitution of Sin," halfway down the page:-

"Hence, the Apostle says, "By Adam's disobedience the many were made sinners;" that is, they were endowed with a nature like his which had become unclean, as the result of disobedience; and by the constitution of the economy into which they were introduced by the will of the flesh, they were constituted transgressors, before they were able to discern between right and wrong. Upon this principle, he that is born of sinful flesh is a sinner..."

Whether John Higgins can see it or not, there is a mixture of truth and error in this statement, but seeing that Jesus was endowed with a nature like Adam's, on the strength of this statement by Dr Thomas, a Christadelphian, Jesus must be regarded as a sinner. This is the doctrine of sin-in-the-flesh or original sin whereby it is falsely claimed that when Adam transgressed, God condemned the flesh He had so marvellously created, and made it by some miraculous operational change, much worse and incapable of obedience, than it was before, I hope John Higgins can see from this that God was not dealing with (very good) physical flesh but with the moral actions and character of a man capable of obedience to His Law. There- fore God condemned Adam's sin not his flesh.

Though Dr. Thomas states sin to be transgression of law in the first place he also states that the propensities for good or evil in human beings is the result of Adam's transgression and that "human nature" therefore is synonymous of "sin." "The law of sin and death" which is the power of death, is in its very constitution - so to "destroy that having the power of death," is to abolish this physical law of sin and death, and instead thereof, to substitute the physical "law of the Spirit of life," by which the same body would be changed in its constitution, and live for ever" (Eureka Volume 1, page 248). It was from these lines of reasoning that Clause V of the B.A.S.F. originated and Paul's words in Romans 8:1,2 in their present tense and personal application refuted as unfulfilled.

The sad position is that we can go on reading from "Elpis Israel" and "Eureka" and find much that is acceptable according to Scripture but on the very same pages contradicted and therefore of no value to anyone unless they are exposed by a greater light of understanding given by the Holy Spirit's operation.

I support much of what John Higgins has written, especially on the trial of Jesus in the wilderness which would have been the case with Eve and Adam but less severe of course. But Jesus said He had come to do His Father's will .and delighted to do it, but this did not lessen in anyway the prospect of suffering the crucifixion and what came before as related in Isaiah 53. Jesus had a choice not to lay down His life for the world, for as He said, twelve legions were available from His Father to deliver Him - Matthew 26:53,54, Psalm 91:11-16; and to Pilate, "Thou couldst have no power at all against me were it not given thee from above; therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin" - John 19:10,11.

Was there then injustice in procuring the death of Jesus in whatever way it came about? Christadelphian writers have said, and do say there was not; their reason being that lie was human, a man of condemned sinful flesh under sentence to die on that account; therefore they have conferred upon Him what is now known as Hobson's Choice. If He declined to die on the Tree he would disobey God's Will, and if He decided to die on the Tree he would be cursed of God through breach of the Mosaic law; and yet if He chose not the Tree, His natural death would be the penalty for His Adamic sin-stricken nature. What does this make Jesus? A cornered Christadelphian Rat needing to be put to death through no fault of His own. The cartoon (Frontispiece to "The Netherton Debate") described as totally unrepresentative and malicious depiction of the Christadelphian view pales before the things they write about Jesus the Son of God in their attempt to brand Him a sinner and His death the means of cleansing Himself from His sinful flesh, which in fact He did not do, for His flesh saw no corruption but came from the tomb in bodily life, energized by Spirit not blood.

Jesus had nothing to cleanse in regard to His nature. Even the lamb for a sin-offering under the Mosaic Law had to be clean and without blemish, and it was the body of the lamb which was rendered lifeless by blood-shedding and it was the body of Jesus which was rendered lifeless in like manner and not His character, He gave His life not His character and even your Dr. Thomas has described the blood of Jesus as more precious than any that had been generated by the will of the flesh- We must conclude therefore that the life in the blood of Jesus was generated by the will of God and His power overshadowing Mary and not through the Adamic process of life generated by the will of man in that this life was under pledge, a provisional state of existence which was secured through the typical lamb in Eden slain for the provisional covering of sin, and was to be recognized by Adam's progeny as pointing to the superior sacrifice and covering promised of God as we know now, in the person of His Son Jesus who was not in the loins of Adam.

What did Jesus explain to the disciples on the way to Emmaus? Was it not from Moses, the Psalms and the Prophets how that He should suffer the things prophesied of Him and enter into His glory? Do they speak anywhere of Jesus dying to cleanse Himself from the fixation of sin-in-His-flesh? Did He need to die to remain sinless? You John, have answered this question yourself, and Jesus Himself did not give any such reason such as found in the works of Christadelphian writers but the contrary, so that after Jesus had spoken of Himself as the Good Shepherd having authority from His Father to lay down His life for the sheep (and not because of a devil in His flesh) and to take it again in Spirit nature not blood, - there was a division therefore again among the Jews and many of them said, He hath a devil; others said, These are not the words of him that hath a devil" - John 10:14-21. What then of the persistent quotes by Christadelphians of Hebrews 2:14 to maintain their false view that Jesus had the Devil in His flesh synonymous of sinful inclinations through God condemning Adam's flesh and inferring that Jesus being of the same flesh and blood must be under the same condemnation?

If therefore John Higgins or any other member of his denomination regards the cartoon as totally unrepresentative of their view, then it remains for them to prove this to be the case. If they could do this, then we would have no hesitation in dispensing with the cartoon but they must realize the B.A.S.F. would be done for.

Their present position remains that there will be added to the Ecclesia in Christ such as should be saved.

Therefore salvation is an individual matter where man-restricted creeds are not allowed to control conscience toward God and His Son.

Phil Parry.

---

**“If Jesus had to die in order to cleanse Himself either from “sin,” “defilement” or “condemnation” in Adam, is it not passing strange that there is not even one solitary passage of Scripture which says He did?”**

How is it that we are to take such an important fact for granted, and yet we find so many texts which tell us that it was for “us” He died? If it was needful to repeat it so many times that Christ died for “our sins” how is it, if He were under sin Himself that not a single text points it out?

One fact is quite as important as the other, and if one must be received without testimony, why is there any need of so much testimony to establish and confirm the other?”

The author then quotes about forty passages and says...

“Now, brethren, having presented to you this array of texts, each emphatically pointing us to the love of God in giving His well-beloved Son to die “for us,” where shall I turn to find one text which even fairly hints that He died “to cleanse Himself”? The Word of God is as silent as the tomb, and it is only by some bad inference or other that even a shadow of support can be adduced.”

Extract from, “The Sacrifice of Christ,” page 44 and 47.

---

## **A Reply to Mr.A.Allfree and “Eureka”, Volume 1,**

“There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their own filthiness.” Proverbs 30:11.

### **UNCLEAN, PHYSICALLY CONDEMNED FLESH?**

See “Eureka,” Volume 1, page 248.

“Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! ‘To what end is it for you? The day of the Lord is darkness, and not light. As if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into a house, and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him,” Amos 5:18,19.

### **FEAR OF THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST YET PREACHING HIS COMING?**

In accusing the late E.Brady of not understanding the true meaning of the Atonement and declining to give the meaning himself on the basis of Holy Scripture but directing us to the reading of “Eureka” by Dr.Thomas, and our knowledge after reading this and other matters on the same subject by his successors, Mr.Allfree’s community in general would well fit the words above quoted from two sources of the Scripture and also his own adopted policy in making an accusation, i.e., fleeing to Dr.Thomas from the lion, and meeting a bear in the process. Indeed, in his exposition of the true meaning of the Atonement, Brother Brady was a lion compared to the weak case Dr.Thomas put up for the Lamb of God, for when he expressed the truth in one part of his writings he destroyed it in another part of the same book.

Take for example Mr.Allfree’s statement about Jesus:-

“From his mother Mary he derived all the faculties, propensities and instincts which belong to the first Adam. He took upon Himself the nature of the seed of Abraham that sin might be condemned in the nature that had sinned.”

We pause here to reflect on Mr.Allfree’s mind and thinking. Why did he not say “Jesus took on him the nature of the first Adam that sin might be condemned in that “very good” nature in which sin was committed”? The latter is what Dr.Thomas stated, so why the interpolation in reference to the seed of Abraham unless Mr-Allfree found he had met with a bear?

That bear seems to be his belief in the false doctrine of “changed flesh” or “Original Sin” as defined in Clause V of the B.A.S.F., the mythical nature in which sin was never committed in the Garden of Eden, neither outside it. The Statement Dr.Thomas made was true but whether he realized the true meaning and import of it is not clear judged by other statements in connection with the same subject. For indeed he has stated in “Eureka” that not only was sin a physical element pervading the physical flesh, but that human

nature is "Sin." The following is quotation from "Eureka," volume 1, page 248, (taking into account Dr. Thomas' admission that left to himself without modification to a higher nature of incorruptibility Adam would have perished eventually), he continues his theme: -

"Seeing that man had become a transgressor of the Divine law, there was no need of a miracles for the infliction of death (reader please note!). All that was necessary was to prevent him eating of the Tree of Lives, and to leave his flesh and blood nature to the operation of the laws peculiar to it. It was not a nature formed for interminable existence. It was "very good" so long as in healthy being, but immortality and incorruptibility were no part of its goodness. The animal or natural body may be transformed into a deathless and incorruptible body, but without that transformation, it must of necessity perish.

This perishing body is "Sin," and left to perish because of "sin." Sin, in its application to the body stands for ail its constituents and laws. The power of death is in its very constitution, so that the law of its nature is styled "the law of Sin and Death." In the combination of the elements of the law, the power of death resides, so that "to destroy that having the power of death," is to abolish this physical law of sin and death, and instead thereof, to substitute the physical "law of the spirit of life," by which the same body would be changed in its constitution, and live for ever."

I must say I am sad but nevertheless amused at the following words by Dr. Thomas and I quote part of them:-

"By this time, I apprehend the intelligent reader will be able to answer scripturally the question, "What is that which has the power of death?""

Any intelligent reader would accept the Dr's. statement that Immortality and incorruptibility were no part of Adam's created "very good" nature and it was therefore subject to a physical law of decay like all animal creation by Divine appointment of the species. But from this point on, he is in direct opposition to the teaching of the Apostle Paul who declares "The law of Sin and Death" to be a legal, not a physical constitution. A legal state of bondage to the Constitution of Sin into which he had been sold when in the loins of Adam, and from which he had been made free through the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, without any necessity of a superior change of nature as stated a necessity by Dr. Thomas.

Dr. Thomas failed to understand that sin, being transgression of law was abstract, performed under law by a body of flesh and blood, but could not afterward change from abstract to a physical element and enter the physical flesh as a permanent resident.

One becomes a sinner by transgression of law, not by a change of flesh. Transgression of law is sin and applies to character not flesh; the flesh of a sinner is the same as the flesh of a righteous man.

Abel and Enoch were righteous men, but their flesh was the same quality as that of Adam before he sinned and after he sinned; so also was that of Cain who was a murderer by law.

With any applied intelligence in reading Genesis, Dr. Thomas should have come to this conclusion but instead he went completely off the track and ignoring what God had said would be the penalty, he turns this around by deciding what God needed only to do in order to inflict the death penalty. If then we leave it at that, all that awaited Adam and Eve was the prospect of final death resulting from their corruptible nature as created. There is no release - no coats of skins for sin-covering - the penalty stands and also passes upon all who sinned in Adam. What then of understanding the Atonement. Mr. Allfree, and your advice to our Brother Gregory to read "Eureka" by Dr. Thomas? What were the first words of the Creator to Adam for his continuance of natural life in the Garden? Did He say, "If you eat of the forbidden tree you will be prevented from eating of the Tree of Life by being turned out of the Garden, and you will be left to die in accordance with the operation of the laws peculiar to your flesh and blood nature"?

No! He did not. He said, "For in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. We agree, it needed no miracle for the infliction of death; all it required was an instrument for the taking away of the life in the blood, hence the origin of the shedding of blood and "Sacrifice." This is exactly what we are taught in Genesis and which points to the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world in the type, but slain by wicked hands on Calvary's Tree; in both cases it involved the shedding of blood, and in both cases life was

given, that life might not be taken, firstly in Adam's case and secondly in our case when we become enlightened to the legal position. Dr.Thomas' theory of natural process of decay and ultimate death bears no resemblance to the meaning of the Atoning Work of God in Christ. His emphasis in "Eureka" of the blood of Christ being more precious than the blood of other men by reason that He had not been generated by the will of man but of God through the power of the Holy Spirit, becomes of no importance when he says, "Eureka" volume 1, page 247:-

""Sin" is a word in Paul's argument which stands for "human nature," with its affections and desires. Hence, to become sin, or for one to be "made sin" for others (2 Corinthians 5:21) is to become flesh and blood. This is called "sin or sin's flesh" because it is what it is in consequence of sin or transgression."

We are therefore to accept Dr.Thomas' version that Jesus was Sin's Flesh? GOD FORBID! Here again Paul's teaching is confounded and misrepresented for Paul does not teach that human nature stands for "sin" and he only teaches that unlawful desires and affections can lead to sin but as long as they are kept in check they cannot be styled sin. The Apostle James also confirms this. So here we have the Doctor stating that because Jesus was flesh and blood He became "sin," and that, while a babe. This is another misinterpretation of Paul's teaching based on the Edenic and Mosaic sacrifices which the Apostle understood perfectly after his conversion to Christ. We can therefore understand Jesus being made of a woman and flesh and blood for others, that He might be made sin as were the sacrificial animal types under the Law in having people's sins transferred to them and making them sin-offerings. Thus the animal was described as being "made sin" in the place of the one who had sinned. The same applied to Jesus who was perfect in every way a human being of flesh and blood was expected to be, and at the age of 33 approximately, He was made a "sin- offering" for us in the manner stated and as applicable to the Edenic transgression and the Mosaic, without the shedding of blood is no remission of sin. - a Life taken by this means, and not contrary to Divine Law - that which dieth of itself, natural death as taught by Dr.Thomas, Christadelphians, and most denominations as being the penalty.

God manifested His Power and attributes throughout history in many ways and especially His Holiness through Moses, for He said "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh unto me, and before all the people I will be glorified." He manifested Himself in the Angel which led Israel through the wilderness and warned, "My Name is in Him," also in the Cloud and Pillar of Fire, in Mt. Sinai, in the Tabernacle, the Ark of the Covenant, the medium of speaking indirectly His Holy Word. All a condition of approach; those approaching Him must be in the position of holiness required. Jesus was.

Mr.Allfree accuses our late Brother Brady of not understanding the Atonement and advises a reading of "Eureka" volume 1 under the heading of "Deity manifested in Spirit." Here Dr.Thomas makes a great display of rhetoric by teaching a dual Christ perfect in character but styled flesh of sin in which dwells no good thing and was like our flesh, in all points; weak, emotional, and unclean- He goes on to say "Sin had to be condemned in the nature which had transgressed in Eden," but he makes a complete hash of Scripture by stating that in the nature in which Adam sinned there dwelt no good thing and was therefore unclean, whereas God said it was "very good." Not only so, but Paul says; "God sent His Son in the likeness of this flesh which had become Sin's possession or sin's flesh, not by reason of being changed, but through Adam changing to another master and serving him whose wages is death (Romans 6:20-23). There was no difference in the quality of Adam's flesh after transgression and Dr.Thomas recognized this through lack of evidence to prove otherwise in Genesis; hence the use of the word "likeness" by Paul who could discern by the Spirit what Dr.Thomas could not, this being the importance of ownership and relationship. Jesus was God's Son by begettall through the Holy Spirit; a New Man sent with a mission from His Father which was necessitated by Adam's failure.

Nowhere in Scripture does it say of Adam that he bore God's Name, for Adam did not qualify to that exalted position unlike Jesus, who said to the Jews:-

"And the Father Himself which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen His shape. And ye have not His Word abiding in you: for whom He hath sent, Him ye believe not... And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life" (John 5:37-40).

The latter should appear rather a presumptuous statement to any who believed Jesus to be owned by "Sin" and styled "Sin's Flesh" needing to be released from this Lord and Bondmaster, to become God's Servant. Nevertheless this is the position in which an intelligent reader of "Eureka," volume 1, page 247, and of "Phanarosis," also by Dr. Thomas, would find he had placed Jesus.

How could any intelligent reader of the Holy Scriptures conceive the idea of Deity manifesting His Word and Name in one inhabited by the Diabolos (or Devil)? Where the need for God to prepare a body if it was not to be a body free of Adamic life under pledge through sin, so that Jesus could freely give such a life to pay the debt?

No preparation of a body was necessary according to Dr. Thomas if sin-in-the-flesh or the Devil was already in Adam's flesh and the flesh of all his posterity. Any descendant of Adam would meet the case if self-destruction or otherwise resulted in death, for Dr. Thomas maintains in "Eureka" this power of death is the process of decay and changed nature resulting from Adam's sin in Eden, and he describes it falsely as "the Law of Sin and Death" from which a person can only be made free by a change to incorruptible spirit nature. I say falsely because Paul, while in flesh and blood nature, informed the Roman believers he had been made free from the Law of Sin and Death through the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ, so that neither of these laws related to the workings of the physical body, but the legal and moral relationship through the effect of sin by Adam, or the imputed Righteousness of Jesus, the two Federal positions - Federal Sin and Federal Righteousness. We also have, like Paul to leave the former to be under the latter by the knowledge and belief in the Atonement correctly understood.

I know for certain and without boasting, that the Spirit of Truth working in me has scored points for the Word of God in contrast with the words of men. But the motive is not to boast or to score points but to show where the Truth is to be found and that Mr. Allfree will appreciate the exalted position pointed out by Dr. Thomas of Jesus manifesting Deity in the highest way possible but reject his final mistake of dumping Jesus into the dung-heap of condemned sinful flesh.

In "Eureka," volume 1, page 101, I quote Dr. Thomas and his "Dual Christ" error:-

"Did the union of Spirit with flesh annihilate that Spirit and leave only flesh? Was the holy thing born a mere son of Adam?, or "the fellow" and "equal" of the Deity? The latter unquestionably."

If as Dr. Thomas argues, the product (flesh and blood) was Deity, why the mention even of Adam, let alone a mere son? Yet reading on from page 108 Jesus is brought down to the level lower than Adam in nature by His being clothed in the garments of filthy flesh, etc. etc., and I take it that Mr. Allfree refers this to be the body God prepared by which He could, in dying to condemn its "sin-content," take away the Sin of the world, and also destroy him that had the power of death - which if it be the decay peculiar to our nature is still with us. I beg you, Mr. Allfree, read the Bible and compare its truth against the errors we were all taught by men.

Our late Brother Brady and the Nazarenes accept the meaning and 'reaching of The Atonement as stated by Dr. Thomas in "Eureka," volume 1, pages 20 to 21, beginning at bottom paragraph and commencing with the subject of Redemption. His only mistake we find, is his belief that "The Law of Sin and Death," is the corruptible and decaying nature resulting in natural death, As I have pointed out, Paul said he had been made free or released from this legal predicament yet was still alive as an active servant of God. Therefore, if our Brother Brady and his brethren and sisters in Christ believed and understood Dr. Thomas' version here referred to on pages 20 and 21 as in harmony with Paul's statement, what then is your understanding of the Atonement, Mr Allfree? Does Dr. Thomas teach two versions for our choice? The Scriptures only teach one and this is the one which Brother Brady understood and taught, and booklets are obtainable from Brother R.V. Gregory and myself.

Yours Sincerely in Jesus' Name and defence of The Truth, P. Parry.

---

“It is well nigh impossible for us to entertain any hope of eternal life without an understanding and appreciation of the scriptural teaching of the Atonement. Of all the teaching contained in Scripture the understanding of this subject carries more influence upon the character than any other. The fear of the Lord may be the beginning of wisdom, but the love of God is wisdom herself and “happy is the man that retaineth her.”

Excerpt from “The Work of God in Christ”

---

## Extract taken from “The Lamp” magazine, December 1873:-

### Intelligence:

**Birmingham:** Brethren from Nottingham, Leicester, and Maldon have lately visited this town in the interests of the truth, and are able to report that the statement made that the views concerning the Christ as propounded by Brethren Handley and Turney have not been “vanquished.” On the contrary there are thirty who have embraced them, and a still larger number who are carefully examining them.

**Deal:** Sister Risien reports the Immersion of Sister Reynolds’ daughter who was recently immersed by Brother David Brown, after making a highly satisfactory confession of her faith. The ministrations of Brother David Brown have been of great service in this town, and are much appreciated by those in the Truth there. All in this Ecclesia have embraced the new views without exception.

**Devonport:** Brother Dashper writes, “What a glorious Truth, dear Brother, a Christ of our flesh and blood, but uncondemned and therefore mighty to save. I think I may say all here are satisfied on this important point.”

**Glasgow:** Brother Gray writes. “There are now ten of us who meet on the basis of an uncondemned Christ, and greatly rejoice in that glorious Truth. We have been greatly strengthened by the reading of Brother Turney’s published lecture, it clearly shows the fallacy of our opponents, especially in reference to the Types. We think it well calculated to enlighten the minds of many on the points in dispute.”

**London:** Brother Watts writes, “It has been determined, at my request, to invite Brother Handley to London, to hear him explain his so-called “Heresy.” He is to discuss with Brother J.J. Andrew in quarter-hour speeches for one or two nights and then each to submit to be questioned. Brother Andrew to commence each night. After that Brother Andrew is to be allowed to go to Maldon, and before the Ecclesia there carry out the same course of procedure. I can reckon on ten or twelve who have thoroughly made up their minds about the subject, and see with us an uncondemned Christ in the teaching of the Word, and will I think be prepared to go with Him outside the camp and bear the reproach if necessary. One of them goes so far as to say that he cannot fellowship those who eat of the Christ believing Him to be condemned, and he will remain outside until some decided step is taken.”

**Liverpool:** Brother Ellis in a letter to Brother Turney says, I am happy to say that I am still increasing in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, so that you may still rejoice with me in thanking our heavenly Father for blessing us with a more perfect knowledge of Himself. I have seen your lecture and read it once. You must not get vain when I tell you I consider it a master- piece, and quite exhaustive- I suppose you have got “The Christadelphian” and noticed the new position taken by Brother Roberts and others - “The Law of Moses could give eternal life to one already condemned in Adam.” This no doubt is the logical sequence of the idea that the Son of God was more the son of Adam than Son of God. Brother Ellis is quite willing to discuss with Brother Roberts.

**Leicester:** Misrepresentation has been rife in this quarter as in others. Brother Lester informs us that there are twelve in that town who have laid hold of the new development of the Truth concerning the Christ.

**Maldon:** In this town there are only six who have not as yet embraced the Truth as we now understand it.

**Mumbles:** Brother Clements, writing to the editor, says, "I am heartily glad that you, though like myself much persecuted for conscience sake, have consented to publish a monthly periodical. From what I know of you I do not think its pages will ever be used to speak evil of innocent brethren, and then refuse them an opportunity of justifying themselves."

**Nottingham:** The Sunday evening lectures in this place continue to be extremely well attended, the number of attentive listeners increasing. The subjects of the last four lectures delivered in the Synagogue have been as under: "The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, - Where, when and how used." Brother Watts. "The Faith and Hope of a Convened Jew." Brother C. Handley. "Who Says the Soul is Immortal? What is The Soul?" Brother Hayes. There are some cases of Immersion pending and several interested enquirers. A tea meeting was held on the 2nd instant, at which several short speeches were made by the Brethren present, two of whom were visitors from a distance. A pleasant, and it is hoped not an unprofitable evening was spent. The seceders from the Ecclesia on the subject of the present controversy number only thirty-five. More than a hundred remain, meeting together at the Synagogue and rejoicing in the further acquisition of knowledge concerning the Christ

**Stoke - South Devon:** Brother Moore writes, "I do most heartily endorse the view concerning the Sacrifice of Christ set forth in Brother Turney's published lecture. I have given the subject a thorough searching, and I am convinced that Brother Turney is correct. The members of the Ecclesia here are giving the subject a careful examination. This is as it ought to be."

**Stourbridge:** It had been incorrectly stated that fifteen had separated themselves from this Ecclesia on the subject of the present controversy. We are happy to inform our readers that the number of seceders is only nine.

**Birmingham:** The following forwarded to us for publication, we have been obliged to condense for want of space: - "The brethren here have been very much agitated on the question of the sacrifice of Christ since Brother E. Turney gave his published lecture on the subject on August 28th, and those who embraced or favourably regarded his teaching have had to put up with much unbrotherly conduct from Brother Roberts, who, from the time the "theory" of an "uncondemned Christ" was promulgated from Nottingham, has assailed it and its upholders with exceeding bitterness of spirit. The intention of Brother Roberts after the lecture referred to was to attack week after week the "uncondemned theory" at the usual meetings for Bible reading in the Athenaeum. He so over-exerted himself, however, in delivering his lecture on the "Slain Lamb" on the first night of his intended campaign, that he became seriously ill, and was compelled to withdraw altogether from public controversy. Thus incapacitated, he apparently thought no one else capable of defending his view of the Doctrine of Christ, for he requested the ecclesia during his absence not to listen to the enemy, but to wait his return, refreshed to wage the war anew. This advice was strictly followed, for a Brother wishing to address them on the question, was not listened to on the plea of sympathy for Brother Roberts in his illness. In this attitude of waiting, not for the Lord from heaven, but from Brother Roberts from his retirement, as the Samson alone competent to assail the Philistines, he had recourse to a ruse which has been designated the Christadelphians "Coup d'etat." This ruse was revealed in a printed circular sent to all the brethren (see last Month's "Christadelphian"), in which, after endeavouring to justify himself for acting contrary to the rules of the Ecclesia, he requested all who agreed with him to sign a declaration of withdrawal from certain brethren, to remit the same to him, and to meet him at the Athenaeum on Thursday, October 30th for the purpose of taking such further steps as might be required. On the Sunday morning after the issuing of this circular Brother Butler requested the brethren to remain a short time after the meeting, as he wished to address them on a matter of importance. The presiding brother on the occasion (C. Smith) remarked that no one need stay unless he liked, and he and many others left instantly on the conclusion of the service. To as many as remained, however, Brother Butler spoke drawing attention to the unconstitutional character of the plan unfolded in the circular, and showing that, whatever its main object might be, it involved an unlawful seizure of the property and funds of the Ecclesia, and asking them not to tolerate such usurpation of authority by any individual among them. Brother Hadley attempted a defence of the course pursued by Brother Roberts but admitted the impropriety of coming to a final decision without calling a general meeting. Those who protested against the unrighteous course thus pursued afterwards held a meeting, at which a formal protest was adopted and forwarded to Brother Roberts. Finding the Declaration he had first drawn up was so vague that almost every brother could sign it, Brother Roberts issued another circular for the purpose of presenting a more definite declaration, in which he said he knew exactly what he

was about, and those who did not unite with him need fear no injustice. The meeting he had called was, he said, a private meeting, and no one would be admitted to it except those who gave proof of their sympathy with the object contemplated. It will scarcely be credited that when this “private meeting” took place – a meeting from which a large section of the Ecclesia was excluded - they began to exercise legislative functions, as if it had been a general meeting of the Ecclesia, properly convened.

This private meeting “dissolved the Birmingham Christadelphian body in a legal sense.”

This private meeting vested the funds and effects of the Ecclesia in Wm. Whitcomb (Secretary) and C. Smith (Treasurer), “in trust for appropriation as to be directed.”

This private meeting ordered an inventory of funds and effects as aforesaid and the transfer of a proportional share of the same (having felt the force of the changes made against them) at the end of the three months to those who may re-form themselves as an assembly on the basis of the doctrine that has emanated from Nottingham. “All debts now due being first paid.” From the rate at which these debts are being run up, including, as they no doubt will, those incurred by the author of the circulars in exercising his private rights, it is evident the intention is to make the “proportional share” as small as possible. All these decisions affecting the Ecclesia in its corporate capacity were arrived at this private meeting, and this was called withdrawing from an assembly whose fellowship has become corrupted.” A printed intimation to the above effect was sent “to those who had not signed the Declaration; and they otherwise learned that admission to the Lord’s Table on the following Sunday would only be by ticket. A number of the excluded, however, determined to present themselves, in order to protest against the unrighteous course above outlined, and went accordingly to the Temperance Hall for that purpose. On arrival they found four of the most stalwart of the brethren at each door leading to the floor, for the purpose of barring entrance. Admission being refused by those special constables, who by this “passive act” of violence manifested their disposition, it was thought best by the excluded to go up into the gallery, and there await the opportune moment for protesting. Barricades had been placed so as to prevent access from the gallery to the floor of the Hall, and the doors were closed and the barricades erected by those who had “withdrawn” themselves at the private meeting from the fellowship of the body hitherto worshipping in the Hall. At the close of the meeting, like an “orthodox” minister, he advised his flock not to wrangle or discuss with the “heretics” anywhere, but to keep entirely away from them, and above all to preserve their tickets. In the afternoon, as many as could be got together, assembled in the house of Brother Rayer, when the majority decided to abandon the weekly protest; those present numbering twenty-three, constituted themselves an Ecclesia, and arranged for a meeting on the following Thursday for its consolidation.

**London:** The discussion between Brethren Handley and Andrew took place on Monday and Tuesday evenings, November 3rd and 4th, and occupied about two hours each night. Nothing untoward occurred until the close, when there was an altercation as to the mode of conducting the discussion in Maldon. Brother Handley contending for the necessity of admitting the public, and Brother Andrew being as strongly opposed to it. It was ultimately decided that the first arrangement, which was to discuss before the Ecclesia only, should be carried out. Of the discussion itself it is needless to say much, and our space is very limited. No fresh arguments were adduced. On the side of Brother Andrew they were very similar to those already brought forward in “The Christadelphian”, and which entirely fail to prove the point at issue. There was one statement made by him which Brother Handley expressed himself unable to comprehend, namely, that Jesus was the Son of God physically. It arose from Brother Handley contending that what we became by adoption, that is, sons of God free from the law of sin and death; Jesus was by birth. Brother Andrew accepted this proposition, but perceiving probably that he had admitted too much took refuge in the strange statement above alluded to, that Jesus was the Son of God physically.

The shocking perversion of Scripture by his opponent in reference to passages quoted from Romans 7 and Hebrews 5 was clearly pointed out by Brother Handley. In his concluding speech Brother Andrew compared the present state of things among the Brethren to what occurred in the first century, in which their faith was being put to the test, not by a literal but by a sort of spiritual persecution, and warned them not to be misled by it. The false charge of denying that Jesus came in “mortal flesh” was again brought forward, proving one of two things, either that Brother Andrew misunderstands his opponents, or wilfully misrepresents them. It is quite evident there are many blindly following a leader, who take sides on a question they very imperfectly understand. Such may serve to swell the ranks of a party, but are otherwise of no account whatever. Their proper position at present would be that of neutrals in the controversy.

Stourbridge: Brother F.N.Turney, writing November 14th, has the pleasure to announce that the Truth is progressing in the place, and records four additions to their number, namely: Herbert Hammond, Jane and Charlotte Hewitt, and John Hope. The attendance on Sunday evenings, is on the increase and there are several interested inquirers. We are all, he says, of one mind, and rejoicing in the light of the Truth, as now understood among us.

Editor: Edward Turney.

---

## **Brother Phil Parry writes on**

### **Some Contradictions in the writings of Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts**

**in which Dr. Thomas says that God created man corruptible having “an inherent tendency in your nature to return to the dust,”**  
**while Robert Roberts claims man “as God created him... would not have returned to the ground,”**  
**yet they both misunderstood the simple teaching of Genesis 2:17 - “In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”**

John 5:43 “I am come in my Father’s name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.”

There can be no doubt that Dr. Thomas made some irresponsible and blatant errors in regard to the teaching of Scripture. On the subject of Adam being created a natural creature of the dust dependent on the life in the blood continuing to circulate the body to retain natural existence, he spends an enormous amount of space in proving this, but more space even than this, to refute the doctrine of immortal-soulism. He then states,

“The penalty was “Dying thou shalt die,” that is, “you shall not be permitted to eat of the Tree of Life in arrest of dissolution; but the inherent tendency of your animal nature shall take its course, and return you to the dust whence you originally came.” Mortality was in disobedience as the wages of sin, and not a necessity. But if they were not mortal in their novitiate, it is also true that they were not immortal. To say that immortals were expelled from the Garden of Eden, that they might not live for ever by eating of the tree, is absurd. The truth is in few words, man was created with a nature endued with certain susceptibilities. He was capable of death; and capable of endless life; but, whether he should merge into mortality; or by a physical change be clothed with immortality, was predicated on his choosing to do good or evil.” “Elpis Israel” - “Man in his Novitiate” page 65.

The truth is what God stated, not what Dr. Thomas said, “In the day thou eatest” thereof thou shalt surely die.” And Dr. Thomas believed in a day of 24 hours. The truth also is, “Adam was capable of death; but he was not capable of endless life. And what does he mean by the description “Merge into mortality”? Surly he is confusing the moral and legal choice of status with that of the physical? In fact what he is saying is that by Adam’s sin, and thereby merging into mortality Adam’s already corruptible created nature was now become the penalty for that sin. This being so and if we are to accept this version from Dr. Thomas, then the penalty upon Adam and his posterity stands and there is no hope for their future. The only thing for his followers to do is to re-examine Genesis and pray to God for a more consistent and correct interpretation and understanding. It would be possible then to discern between the death that came by Adam’s sin (inflicted upon the animal substitute for the provisional covering) and the death as a result of created corruptible nature from the dust, of which all are capable whether in Adam or in Christ, prior to His second advent.

None can honestly leap from Adam to righteous Abel, Seth, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David and all the Prophets and ultimately Jesus the Messiah by whom God ordained Redemption and forgiveness of sins, if there were no place for Jesus in Eden for Adam and his posterity, The true answer must be found - "Why did Jesus give His life?"

Adam was subject to death by violation of Divine Law, that is, death by taking away of his life in the blood. This position lasted from the time of his sin to the provision of skins for a "sin-covering" when he became conditionally reconciled to God by faith in wearing those garments.

If this position of guilt is what Dr.Thomas means by merging into mortality I can understand that, but as to mortal or mortality being the proper phrases to use is another matter, for all that Dr.Thomas is saying is that the effect of Adam's sin did not alter his nature which was capable of dying by decay, but simply left him to the physical law of decay peculiar to his nature. In other words, still mortal, and not because of sin but because created so. Therefore mortal cannot be a description of a sinner, which is the teaching of Dr. Thomas and Christadelphians.

Disobedience made no difference whatever to Adam's nature, but it did to his character, relationship, and status in the sight of God. He was immediately under the penalty of inflicted death. What God said concerning "In the sweat of thy face, ...till thou return to the ground," was the result of Redemption through which he was enabled to continue his natural life until he died by reason of the physical law peculiar to his nature at creation; this was not the penalty, how could it be if it was already operating from the time of Adam's creation and, as Dr.Thomas rightly said, the partaking of the Tree of Life would have arrested dissolution? Yet Robert Roberts in "The Visible Hand of God" refutes what Dr. Thomas has written on this subject and he also refutes the true teaching on the subject of Adam and the consequences of Adam's sin. (Pages 32 and 33). Robert Roberts is saying on page 32:-

"Death did not come into the world with Adam but by him after he came; that at first, he was free from the action of death in his organization - death did not await him in the natural path - his was an animal nature that would not. die left to itself - left to himself as God had made him he would not have returned to the ground."

I have stated the words of Dr.Thomas of which this is a serious contradiction and in fact a gross error. I repeat them again:-

"You shall not be permitted to eat of the Tree of Life in arrest of dissolution; but the inherent tendency of your animal nature shall take its course and return you to the dust whence you originally came."

Again Robert Roberts attempts to be wise beyond what is written, "Thou shalt die" (Genesis 2:17), this was not the prospect apart from disobedience" Where is the proof of this in Scripture? Is it not logical to assume that if Adam had remained sinless for, or unto, the limit of his nature God could have allowed him to die, yet this could not be termed death by Sin? And is not this what could have been the case with Adam after his redemption and reconciliation through Jesus the Antitypical Lamb of God?

It is certain from reading "The Visible Hand of God" that Robert Roberts did not know what he was talking about and could not have been in agreement with Dr.Thomas, the latter believing all animal and human species to have been created with the same nature. Robert Roberts on the contrary, that for God to apply the death sentence on Adam "It required what men call a miracle to depress to the level of the beasts that perish the noble creature made in the image of the Elohim."

Again he says, "Death did not await him at the time of his sin but had to be introduced as a law of his being before he could become mortal."

So it is from this false theorising that Clause IV and Clause V of the Christadelphian Statement of their Faith originated in opposition of Dr.Thomas and worse still in opposition with the Holy Scriptures. All ye that pass by, that boast in these two men, is it nothing? Are ye so blind? How blind must Robert Roberts have been in quoting 2 Corinthians 1:9 ("The Visible Hand of God," page 34), "We have all to acknowledge with Paul the sentence of death in ourselves," by taking Paul's words out of their context and applying his

words to refer to corruptible nature as being due to Adam's sin when in fact Paul was referring to himself and his fellow disciples being in danger of the death sentence by those who opposed their teaching!

How could this be in any case with a man converted to Christ who had in the words of Jesus "Passed from death to life" (John 5:24). And Paul's own words, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ hath made me free from the law of sin and death"? (Romans 8:1,2). Neither Jesus or Paul are connecting corruptible nature with their statements, but the legal state of alienation and death by Adam's sin.

But I find on examination of the writings of both Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts, together with Christadelphian literature in general that they do not accept either of the statements of Jesus and Paul which I have referred to, these being John 5:24 and Romans 8:1,2. And no wonder when on page 35 of "The Visible Hand of God" he states of Jesus at His second advent (not before it)?

"He will confer the fellowship and participation of his victory on those who come unto God by him. He will do it by the power God has given him. God has given him power over all flesh with this view (John 17:2). By it, he will change the bodies of his people that they may be conformed to the likeness of his own glorious body. The Spirit of God, changing the mortal to the immortal, will thus blot out the sentence of death written in Eden. Thus one miracle will undo the effects of another."

Oh what a denial of present Redemption in Christ! What a denial of John 1:11-13, "To them gave he power (or right) to become the sons of God"! How disgusting to read the three lines at the bottom of page 34 and the top ten lines of page 35. It is a stupid statement for any student of Genesis to say as he does, "Death is written in our present nature. It was written in Eden. It is the writing of God; no man can blot it out. God can and will in the cases He chooses."

We answer, "Yes, in a moment in the twinkling of an eye God can do it in respect of the corruptible nature people have inherited from the first created man Adam. But R.Roberts is not referring to this nature but an invented one of the Apostasy, flesh defiled and condemned of which there is no evidence in Genesis.

He should have asked himself before writing such nonsense, "What death did Jesus abolish" (2 Timothy 1:10)? Certainly not the common death experienced by all natural creation, no, it was that death which He himself was not amenable to, that is, the death that came by Adam's sin and passed legally upon all who were in Adam's loins, which excluded Jesus. It was from the 'Death by Sin' that men needed to be redeemed- Jesus was not in this category, He was sent to Redeem, not to be Redeemed, as R.Roberts falsely states. Jesus could have remained sinless all His life and died a natural death in accordance with the physical law of His nature and God's Righteousness could not be questioned, but obedience requiring death as the declaration of Jehovah's righteousness, and the condemnation of non-existent sin in the flesh of Jesus or anyone else, is to declare God's unrighteousness. This is indeed Roberts' at his worst, or is it? Did God require the death of Adam in order to fulfil obedience? Did He not require obedience to avoid Adam's death? 0 what a tangled web has been weaved by these two men, Dr.Thomas and Robert Roberts!

Religion began in Eden, explained in Genesis, enlarged upon by the Light of the World (Jesus), continued by Paul and his fellow workers. Thomas and Roberts are beyond correcting their hash of things into which people have been drawn, yet the subtlety still continues in Christadelphia; this false teaching still continues in the guise of "The Truth," - their worn out phrase.

The summary is, that on the strength of the erroneous doctrine of Dr.Thomas and Robert Roberts not one of their adherents is Redeemed, for they taught Redemption as being fulfilled by a change of physical nature at the second coming of Jesus Christ.

P.Parry.

# TEN SHORT PARAGRAPHS EXPLAINING

## The Gospel That Is Never Preached

ANSWERS THE ETERNAL QUESTIONS  
WHY ARE WE HERE?  
WHAT IS LIFE FOR?  
WHY THE CROSS?

### 1. The Bible Needs Explanation

What did John the Baptist mean by the strange statement “Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world”? What was the sin he referred to and how did Jesus take it away? The answer to this question is the key to understanding the Gospel, but it can only be discovered by putting together a number of apparently unrelated facts scattered through the Bible. These are outlined here, together with a few of the relevant texts and though our interpretations will come as a surprise to most people it is suggested that the reader should make his own test of their soundness by comparing them with what he knows of Scripture. We do not think it is practical in these days to expect people to discover the truth by reading the Bible for themselves and it is only with the benefit of a study of the controversies which have raged during centuries of Christianity that we can today put together a coherent and logical explanation of why God chose to base our hope of salvation upon the awful death by crucifixion of the man who was His Son.

### 2 Sin and Death in Genesis

Adam was created at the beginning a man of flesh and blood of the same corruptible nature as all other living creatures, and in order to develop character he was placed under a law requiring simple obedience. He disobeyed God and incurred the penalty of sin. The account in Genesis is almost universally misunderstood, but the usual theory is that it was the sin which caused Adam to become corruptible and that natural death which we all inherit was the punishment he deserved. But if we read what actually happened it will be seen that this is not so. He had been warned that, in the day he sinned he would surely die, yet in fact he lived for more than 900 years! What is the explanation? Did God change His mind? If we look up other instances of the same expression, e.g. 1 Kings 2:37-42, we find that “dying thou shalt die” implies an inflicted death, and under the Law of Moses a presumptuous sinner was to be put to death (see Genesis 20:7). This is what Adam had actually incurred and he knew it because he was afraid. But how could he possibly escape if God was not to be untrue to His word? The explanation is in the plan of Redemption, whereby he died in law but under a typical sacrifice his life was spared and he lived to become the father of the human race. Adam was delivered from imminent death as Isaac was delivered when Abraham was about to kill him, by the offering of a substitute. God did not change His mind but He made it possible in His own wisdom and mercy to open to man the hope of regaining by faith the life which had been lost by disobedience.

### 3 Bom Under Sin

Most Christians believe in original sin. We believe this is completely wrong because it would mean that God is responsible for us being sinners. Children are not born sinful but they need to be taught to behave properly. Human nature is morally neutral and natural needs and desires are not evil, but they can become the cause of sin when they are uncontrolled. But there is a scriptural doctrine of sin which we must understand because it affects all responsible people. In the letter to the Romans the apostle Paul shows how God has chosen to regard all men as involved in the sin of Adam, “By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.” We were not made sinners in the sense of being created evil or obliged by nature to become sinful. The meaning is that we are legally classified as under the reign of sin in a similar way to that in which we are by law citizens of the country in which we are born. Paul says death “passed upon” all men, implying that the sentence of death incurred by Adam hangs over all his descendants, since all who share his life would have perished in him if he had been put to death on the day of his sin. We would never have existed. So that Adam is not only the one from whom we are all physically descended, but he is also nominated the federal head of all who are under the reign of sin. This is the relationship of being in Adam,

or alienated from God, and its vital importance is because if we remain in it, that is, unredeemed, we are inescapably destined to perish-

#### **4 Justice and Divine Law**

Law is the basis of the Divine Plan- The will of God is that we should not perish but have everlasting life, even though because we are all personally sinners we cannot earn it. God wishes to be merciful and show His love towards us, but He will not do so at the expense of the supremacy of law. That is why it is decreed that we are in Adam and under his sin, so that we can be covered by the process of redemption which saved him. So there is a double problem - to show mercy and at the same time uphold a just law which must condemn sin - and it is solved in a very wonderful way by the sacrifice of Christ. Many sincere believers cannot bear the idea that they needed to be saved by a sacrifice involving bloodshed and they think that we can be saved by the simple exercise of unconditional forgiveness, but this can never happen because it would not establish the high principles of justice and law which must prevail and which must be recognized by those who hope for the reward of faith. We must follow God's way or perish! Under the supreme law of a righteous God, a man who is a sinner does not deserve to live; he has forfeited his life, which means that the death which came by sin is not primarily a punishment but a debt. A sinner owes that which he cannot pay without perishing; he owes his life. The principle of the Atonement which is defined in the laws of sacrifice, is that if a repentant sinner brings his offering in faith, its life can be accepted in discharge of his debt. God brought Jesus into the world for this purpose, as He declared - John 3:16, "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

#### **5 The Sin-Bearer**

When Jesus submitted to His enemies and denied Himself the deliverance He could have asked for, He made Himself the sin-offering, translating into reality the typical salvation which took place in Eden when Adam was clothed with the skins of slain animals. His death was therefore an exact substitutionary sacrifice, His life given in place of the one forfeited, not, as people once thought the infliction of undeserved punishment on the innocent in order that the guilty might escape, which would have been utterly unjust and abhorrent. God did not bring about or demand the death of Jesus; He foresaw what wicked man would do to Jesus, who voluntarily allowed Himself to be taken and condemned, because He saw Himself as paying the price of the redemption of the children of Adam, who was His brother. He was innocent, "holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners," the counterpart of the perfect unblemished lamb offered under the Mosaic law. As even Pilate His judge recognized, there was no just reason to put Him to death, but Jesus had realized that He alone could pay the price of deliverance by the sacrifice of His own unforfeited life.

#### **6 Why The Virgin Birth?**

The accounts in Matthew and Luke are explicit and there is a very special reason why we must accept them as revealed truth. The disbelief of many present-day Christians arises from their failure to understand why Joseph could not be the father of our Saviour. Jesus was a man like other men in every respect except for the origin of His life; He was in no sense divine or different in nature. The circumstances of His birth did not give Him extra power to resist temptation which other men do not have nor did they exempt Him from the weakness and suffering common to humanity. He was made and tempted in all points like His brethren, He had no existence previous to His birth of Mary (except in the sense that He was in the purpose of God from the beginning of the creation), He was not God nor a God-man but one like ourselves. The true reason for His divine origin can now be made clear,

#### **7 A Man but not a Son of Adam**

Born of a woman He came into the world as a child like the rest of us, but He was a new creation of life, the same corruptible flesh and blood but begotten by the Holy Spirit, a new life direct from Heaven and not a continuation of the Adam-life. The significance of this is that He was a man born outside the state of captivity explained above in paragraph 3, and therefore His life was His own to start with, and during His trials and temptations He was sinless so that He was never under the dominion of sin. This point about Jesus having His life in His own possession seems difficult for some people to grasp but it is really very simple and it is the only possible explanation of why Jesus was God's Son and why He alone could save us. He

said that He came to give His life a ransom for many. The original Greek word, LUTRON (Matthew 20:28) means a price paid, and this price was His life; therefore it had to be His own to give. The apostle Paul says that God sent forth His Son to redeem them that were under the law (Galatians 4:5), and this word EXAGORAZO means to acquire out of the forum for a price; so again, this is how God redeemed us, by sending His own Son into the world to buy us back to Himself. It is of course a figurative transaction, because a life cannot be paid to anybody, but it is a very real purchase because it was completed by the literal pouring out of His life in the blood which was shed upon the Cross, a life which He did not get back because He was raised in the Spirit. The difference between the life that Jesus had as the Son of God and the life that we have as descendants of Adam is a legal one, not a difference in quality but of origin and possession. This is the distinction Jesus was making when He said - John 8:42-44, "I proceeded forth and came from God... ye are of your father, the devil."

## **8 The Truth About The Devil**

There is no supernatural tempter called Satan, but in the Bible sin is personified as the Devil, because the abstract principles of good and evil which we can recognize today would have been incomprehensible to primitive people. In Hebrews 2:14 it says that Jesus came in flesh and blood "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." The devil was not literally destroyed because he has never existed, but the reign of sin and evil he stands for is ended for all those who accept Jesus as their Saviour.

## **9 The Future Life**

As we have shewn, under the Divine Plan of Redemption we can be saved from sin and death, but what are we saved for? In this present existence we are part of the natural creation and subject to the change and chances of an uncertain life. We are made in the image of God, in that we have free will and within our capacity can do whatever we please. But like all natural things we have only a limited span of life and no soul or immortal part of us which goes to heaven or anywhere else after we are dead. When we die we cease to be, our consciousness is at an end and our bodies return to the dust. But this creation is only the beginning of the purpose of God. The Bible shews that He intends the earth to be inhabited by an immortal happy people under the reign of Jesus Christ who will return from heaven to be its King, and it seems likely that this will be the centre of an infinite extension of the glory of God throughout the universe in immeasurable future ages. This chosen people of God, most of whom are dead and forgotten by the world, will be raised to life again in the resurrection when the day of the Lord dawns. They comprise the faithful from earlier ages, chiefly Jewish, together with those both Jew and Gentile, who have accepted Christ as their Saviour, having died in the symbol of baptism (Galatians 3:27) and been reborn as the children of God. These will be raised incorruptible in the first resurrection and share with Christ in the practical process of cleansing and reforming the whole earth for the benefit of the millions of oppressed and ignorant people who have suffered for so long under the greed and stupidity of self-serving rulers. During this reign and though still mortal, all nations will be able to enjoy the blessings of wise government, bringing the peace and security so desperately needed, and guided and taught by the Saints will ultimately be able to attain by faith and obedience to immortality. Finally, we learn from Revelation 21 that God Himself shall be with them, shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; that there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, - neither shall there be anymore pain: for the former things are passed away.

## **10 The Nazarene Fellowship**

The few who call themselves by this name are of course Christians but we are not a sect. Our members are scattered about the world but are united by their acceptance of the Bible as the Word of God and in their understanding of its teaching. We have no formal organization or places of worship; no ministers or creed; we baptize in the name of Jesus but anyone who believes can do this; we do not organize charities or collect money, but, recognizing that the present state of society and the world is clear evidence that these are the last days of the present order - or disorder - we do what little we are able, at our own expense, to explain to our friends the true Gospel of Salvation. We do not hold meetings, but we break bread from time to time in our homes in accordance with the command to do this in remembrance of Him "till He come." The message of hope comes from God and only He can call us, but it is our conviction that all those who sincerely believe in Him and whose common-sense tells them that there must be some great and good purpose for which He has

brought us into this world and life, will sooner or later be led to discover what it is and have the opportunity to share in it. Perhaps reader, that is why this has fallen into your hands. May it be so.

Ernest Brady (1979)

---

“Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will working in you that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.”

Hebrews 13:20.21.