

Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No.185

September/October 2000

In this Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2	Letter to our Christadelphian Friends	Brother Phil Parry
Page 5	“Take My Yoke Upon You”	Brother Fred Rogers
Page 6	Final instalment of “A Review of The Slain Lamb”	Brother Fred Pearce
Page 8	Further comment on “The Nature of Man & The Work of Christ - Some Passages Considered.”	Brother Phil Parry
Page 12	A Trinity Debate between Reverend J.O.West (C.of E.) and J.Todd (Christadelphian).	
Page 27	“Life and Death”	Brother Douglas McKinlay

Editorial

Dear Sisters and Brothers and Friends, Loving Greetings.

October 2000 marks an anniversary for the Circular Letter. It will be twelve years since Russell took over the responsibility for editing, printing, writing for and posting to our readers world wide. Now would seem a good time to remember and pay due tribute to those faithful servants who went before Russell and in whose footsteps he most creditably follows.

Our long departed brother Fred Pearce began the Circular early in the 1940's I think. He did all the work for it in a shed in his garden in south Wales. After he left the mines he was a night watchman in a factory that made tin products and it was during the night whilst he was on duty that he was able to find time to study and write. When Fred got in touch with my father, Ernest, sometime in the 1940's, they collaborated on several pamphlets and I remember as a child there was a letter almost every day from Fred enlarging on some aspect of Scripture that they were presently discussing. Fred had the most dog-eared and tattered Bible I have ever seen. How it held together I shall never know and he knew a lot of it by heart. He stayed with us many times over the years and the Bible was seldom out of his hands except when eating a meal or taking our dog for a walk, nor did Fred talk about anything but the Scriptures, they were his whole life and a completely all consuming passion.

When Brother Fred died my father took over the Circular Letter. At the time he was running his business so he did all the work for the Circular Letter during the evenings. A lady in Devon typed it and produced the copies and she sometimes made quite favourable comments about what she typed. But on one occasion she rebuked my father for passing a scathing remark about faith healers. Then I think probably in the 1970's brother and sister Linggood took on the task for several years. Our late brother Harvey did all the running about that it entailed, getting the matter printed and copied and posted, as well as with sister Evelyn editing and writing for each edition. They did a splendid job maintaining the vital contact between all our scattered members and keeping the light of truth burning.

When Russell came on the scene he had not yet left the Christadelphians, but he had become an increasingly difficult problem for the managing brethren of his meeting to deal with, not to mention the problem they were becoming to him. Russell, I think realized that his days as a Christadelphian were numbered and indeed, he was eventually “examined” and found wanting and thrown out. So it was with some trepidation that he assumed responsibility for the Circular Letter. It has become almost a full time occupation for it also involves, as it always has, answering letters of various kinds, sending out booklets when requested, as well as all the work entailed in producing a Circular Letter every two months.

In the last few years as we know there has been an explosion of new technology in the field of computers and word processors, photocopies, fax machines, mobile phones, satellite communications. For once, some of these advances have been really useful to ordinary people in their own homes. Russell has taken full advantage of these new technical marvels and become adept at producing the Circular to a very high standard. He has also reprinted all the old pamphlet titles in between times. However the medium is not the message and 90% of the Circular Letter is brain work requiring as it always has, into whose ever hands it fell whether bro. Fred Pearce, Ernest Brady, brother and sister Linggood or Russell, careful thought and patient concentration, something all the editors of the Circular have possessed in abundance. Nor do we forget the particular debt owed to those who send interesting written contributions; in this connection we want to mention our brother Phil Parry who is tireless in producing pieces on every aspect of Scripture to all our benefit and this is in addition to all the private correspondence he deals with year in year out.

In the sixty odd years that the Circular Letter has been in existence it has always been sent out free of charge, as has all our literature. Considering we have never been anything but few in number this is remarkable. But of course our readers are very generous, only a month or so ago we received a £200 contribution from Australia. To everyone who helps us in any way we are most appreciative and thankful. I have mentioned before that sister Eileen Gregory does all the proof reading with Russell, yet another vital contribution. Russell's wife too is very patient and tolerant in that a whole room in their house is given over to the paperwork and machinery needed to produce the Circular Letter and booklets.

It would be good to think that there will not need to be another editor for the Circular and that soon the Lord Jesus Himself will be here and we can then set about doing whatever He directs so that the world will at last be filled with the glory of God as the waters cover the sea. With all our readers and contributors this above all is what we look forward to, in the meantime we send our warmest wishes to everyone.

Helen Brady.

BROTHER PHIL PARRY WRITES TO OUR CHRISTADELPHIAN FRIENDS: -

Why is it that some people who profess they preach the Gospel of Salvation through the death of Christ have not a clue why this was necessary?

There are those who accept the teaching that His death was to condemn the sinful inclinations of His nature, or as they term it, sin-in-the-flesh. Both these theories are false being based on a lack of understanding of what is taught by the Spirit in the Prophets and Apostles.

This weakness of perception lies in the misconception of what is taught in the record of Genesis concerning the first man Adam, who was created from the clay a living soul. Mention to the above people that Adam was a body having within it an immortal soul which could survive death and continue onwards in the realms of Heavenly bliss and Oh, where do they direct the reader? Where else but where it is stated that man was created a living soul and that it is stated in another passage of Scripture that a soul can die or can be put to death?

What then can be learned here? Is it not that Adam was by nature subject to decay and ultimate death if left to himself as God had made him? Is not this a true scriptural description of Adam a living soul? And should not this be accepted by those who deny the immortality of the soul?

Why then is it taught that this living soul already subject to death in a neutral state of innocence was condemned for having such a nature and yet needed a change for carrying out a sentence of death as a penalty for sin?

One well known writer said, "It needed... no change of nature for the penalty for sin to be carried into effect - left to himself this very nature God had created very good, could become the very penalty for Adam's sin."

While another writer held the opposite view that this nature which was already of a capability of death by decay, was changed to become so inclined.

Neither view is correct; each are a complete contradiction of what is recorded in the Genesis account; the authors of confusion being John Thomas and Robert Roberts, in "Elpis Israel" and "The Visible Hand of God" respectively. The truth lies in God's statement to Adam concerning the forbidden eating of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil - "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Does this not mean dying by judicial infliction at the time of disobedience, especially as it is said by the one author that before Adam's disobedience, left to himself as God had made him Adam would have died in any case, unless he was made or changed to incorruptibility? Also the same author in stating there was no need of a change of Adam's nature to carry out the sentence of death, not only ignored the fact that the judicial sentence for disobedience was to be inflicted in the day of eating of the forbidden fruit but took on board the very opposite teaching, namely, that natural death by reason of a corruptible nature as created was the penalty God had imposed for the sin.

If the Genesis account was read intelligently and without bias, it would show that God did not take away the life of Adam in the day or time of his eating of the fruit, and it is wrong to add to or manipulate the word to explain that God meant a day of one thousand years. He did not, but meant as He stated for Adam's own understanding - a day of 24 hours. The language of the Old Testament Scriptures and their meaning has never been changed; the "surely die" of Genesis has the same language and meaning as that of Ezekiel and other books. It meant the taking away of the life of an already corruptible and dying person, so that when Paul the Apostle, in accordance with revelation received, states, "By man came death," he means "the death by sin" and not the death by creation, which was not and is not the penalty which God passed upon Adam and all in his loins when he sinned. On account of the sin-covering through the taking of life (the shedding of blood) the penalty upon Adam was set in abeyance until the real Antitypical substance foreshadowed in the lamb slain for the sin-covering appeared at the appointed time. The removal of Adam from the garden and the various things he would experience including the death resulting through his creation from the dust of the earth lasting 930 years was an appointment of God and a result of failing at the time to qualify for incorruptible life.

The Apostle Paul knew the difference between the two deaths which are revealed in the Holy Scriptures to those who have eyes to see and the ability to read with understanding. Jesus asked the question of a young man, "What is written in the law, how readest thou?" So then it is essentially a matter of how we read the Scriptures ourselves, not how others read them and pass on to us what could be, I say, could be, a misconception of what is meant and taught.

The death to which Adam was subject at his creation was not the result of a sentence passed upon him by the Creator, but a physical condition whereby in the foreknowledge of God's plan, the earth could be replenished with people, which was not possible with incorruptible beings. God's plan still stood by this natural means of Adam and Eve but only by reason of another man of like nature but not under the sentence of the death that passed upon Adam legally through his disobedience and from which he was spared by the shedding of the blood which typically in the lamb foreshadowed this other man's death, Jesus the Son of God (Romans 5:11,12).

Throughout the Scriptures, this work and shedding of blood is recognized by the term "Atonement," whereby people are reconciled to God through His Son, and thereby become part of Him who needed not a woman to produce the many sons in His likeness to replenish the earth as God planned.

As Adam's deep sleep resulted in the production of Eve, a helpmeet for him, so from the wounded and bleeding side of Jesus a multitudinous throng in His likeness will fill the earth. So as Paul says, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God." Paul declared, "If by the offence of one man many be dead"- could the many be dead in the physical sense when Adam sinned, when the many were non-existent? Surely Paul must have reasoned on the same lines of imputation as in

Hebrews 7 concerning Abraham giving a tenth part of the spoils to Melchizedec when at the time Levi was in the loins of Abraham and though unborn, was accounted as having paid tithes to Melchizedec though under the Aaronic Priesthood he was receiving tithes himself from the people. In the same way those who were in the loins of Adam and unborn when he sinned, were imputed of God to have sinned yet not personally guilty. This is known as the Federal position - one sin and all concluded under it; and one act of righteousness by one man, Jesus Christ, that all by faith in Him and His sacrificial death might be justified and imputed righteous in Him; not of works but by the grace of God. Out from Adam and into Christ by justification and faith.

This federal position has nothing to do with the physical quality of the flesh; we are either federally in Adam or federally in Christ without any change of our physical nature which has remained the same from Adam's creation from the dust. If people cannot or will not accept this then they have been following cunningly devised fables preferring the doctrines and precepts of men void of the Spirit of God.

I quoted Paul's words from Romans 5:15, "For if through the offering of one many be dead;" - this cannot be physically dead, and therefore must be as I said earlier, by imputation of a Just and Merciful God.

Jesus, when disclosed by John at the Jordan, became from then on the Word of God, the Bread of Life, upon which men should feed to retain the life gained by His death, seeing that they are already reckoned as dead by imputation and must die unto that dominion into the death of Christ in symbolic immersion in water recognizing that the shedding of blood was the death Adam had incurred and from which he had been spared by the love and mercy of God. Jesus said, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of God and drink his blood ye have no life in you.'

"He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." "As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father (not will live); so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me" - John 6:

This is surely not the testimony of a man of the company of the many that were said to be imputed dead by the disobedience of Adam. It is not the authoritative words telling people to feed on His supposedly unclean and condemned flesh as taught and believed by the die-hards of the Thomasite and Robertsite history down to the present day.

You may wonder where all this has been leading to and it may also be a little puzzling on account of what you have been led to believe as "The Truth." Perhaps you have not considered that in contrast with Adam who failed of himself to qualify for everlasting life, God provided another Son to pay the price of Adam's sin with the equivalent life Adam owed. It was necessary therefore that Jesus should be in the same relative position and nature as Adam was before he transgressed. Hence the words of Jesus found in John 3:16 "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." If this does not speak of sacrificial voluntary shedding of blood for the salvation of the world which God loved in the beginning when He created man, I don't know what does.

I have led you to the very point where you are now obliged to examine yourselves before eating and drinking at the table of remembrance, because if you reject that Christ gave His life in the place of Adam's, the death by sin, then you are not discerning the Lord's body and blood, for it was not a natural death which Jesus experienced in the place of Adam's natural death but the judicial death Adam had merited by sin. Jesus did not give His life to prevent Adam or us from experiencing the death common to all, as many falsely believe, and on account of this they reject the death of Jesus as a substitute for natural death to which Adam was already physically subject at his creation.

It is obvious therefore that the typical animal sacrifice on the Day of Atonement was a substitute for the judicial death under which all were concluded. In like manner the Antitypical sacrifice of Christ was substitutional in order that God might conclude all under righteousness, therefore not of works but by Grace. Deny this and you reject the Gospel of Salvation taught by Paul in the Roman and Corinthian Epistles on the essential shedding of the blood of Christ as the basis of Atonement and forgiveness. You are consequently left with martyrdom of a man who was of condemned flesh as you believe and justly condemned for it - thus sacrifice is rejected for the eating and drinking of damnation to yourselves not discerning the Lord's body, the Bread of Life and the life in the blood, of which Jesus said before His death, not after, "Except ye eat the

flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” And as the Apostle Peter declared, “Ye have been bought with a price, even with the precious blood of Christ.” What then? Who provided the Price? Whose superscription did it bear? That of Master Sin? Or that of God the Owner? It is high time those who deny Jesus was a substitute for the debt to the law Adam violated, should discard the blasphemous teaching of a Christ raised up in the (so-called) condemned line of Abraham and David, for if this were true, then God offered up to Sin what already belonged to Sin.

Will you eat and drink to that?

Think again and think soberly what Paul is teaching and warning of in 1 Corinthians 11:23-29. The fact remains Jesus told Paul that His body and blood was given for His disciples and also for all who partook of that symbolic bread which was on the table and drank also of the wine. Consider then verse 26 “For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come.”

How can anyone shew the Lord’s death if they cannot discern the Lord’s body? Is it not then eating to themselves and drinking to themselves damnation?

Listen then to the advice of Paul while there is yet time - Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith, prove your own selves by your own conscience and conclusions.

I have not addressed people who cannot read or reason, therefore I have delivered my soul. Ezekiel 3:18,19.

Brother Phil Parry.

“TAKE MY YOKE UPON YOU”

The word “yoke” conjures up into our minds something irksome that restricts and curbs. It would seem that after promising rest, Christ makes a disconcerting qualification that implied a fresh burden of a different nature; was this to be some new duty, some painful observance to be practised? I suppose this idea is common currency among those whose thoughts, speech and actions, undisciplined by the laws of God or man (excepting such points that are made obligatory by the rigour of the laws of the State), imagine the follower of Christ, shackled to an ancient creed without the right of self-expression, spiritless creatures. Indeed we have the Christian apologists making a virtue out of life narrowed by petty restrictions, formulated by the mistaken zeal of some ascetic enthusiast. What a ghastly misunderstanding, that a follower of Christ purchases his or her salvation by a life of joyless self-expression. At one period it was a practice when referring to the Roman power that held all the world in thrall, at the time of our Lord’s ministry, as the “Roman yoke.” This is intended to convey the idea of the restrictive discipline that Rome used to govern conquered peoples, in figurative language, and this idea of a yoke came to be applied to the Christian yoke. The Roman yoke was in point of fact, something quite different. In the first place, it was not figurative at all but an actual device for the humiliation of a beaten opposing military force. An early Roman General by the name of Cincinnatus, when accepting the capitulation of the Aequian army, was credited with its invention. It consisted of two spears planted upright in the ground, a third tied across them and beneath this tiny arch the surrendering army crept, the object of scorn and contempt. Off had to come the crested helmet, the brazen accoutrement: all rank had to go and acknowledge the supremacy of the Roman army. The yoke was called *jugum*. Although very well known at the time of our Lord’s ministry, this was not the yoke referred to in the passage in Matthew (11:29.30). The yoke Jesus alluded to was the *zugon*, something of which He had a personal contact in His early life.

The *zugon* was an open wooden collar from which projected two arms and from which the suspended burden, pendant fashion, was to be carried. This distributed the weight, saving the strain of the burden and fatigue of the arms and shoulders. A similar device cradled the beasts in their task of ploughing and hauling to lighten their labours. The fashioning of these yokes was part of the craft of the village carpenter of which

of course, was Joseph, Jesus' foster father. When our Lord used this expression, in His mind's eye He could remember the care and the patience devoted to the yoke to make it fit without chafing the beast; perhaps as a teenager consulting the elder craftsman, listening to his instructing, watching skilful fingers. Now, as God's Son, with power and wisdom, He took this yoke to wonderfully illustrate an eternal spiritual truth.

The burden was now the deadly weight of the consciousness of sin. He saw the degradation of the life of the harlot, the lust for money, and the pitiless means of extortion used by the publican and tax-gatherer, the public pride and secret excesses of the Pharisee; the bloody hands and murderous intentions of the zealots; the cold, heartless brutality of the soldier, all the hatred, pride, insincerity, injustice, bigotry, malice and spiritual cowardice which man practices in thought and intention, and indeed these were the burdens. The sorrow and the pain, the longing for the unobtainable, the remorse, the hopelessness, these are the burdens that afflict the life of men. "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me." Our Lord exhorts all to learn of Him. Therein lies the answer. What shall we learn of Him? A new way of life; a life that has different values, different aspirations, and a different goal to be obtained. We take His point of view; we live according to His principles. Man made evils have no place in His scheme of things. Where, in the life of Christ's disciples, is there room for the hatred, bitterness, cruelty, greed and ruthless ambition? These things belong to another world. Instead of these we find love towards God and man; we find no resentment against our enemies. There is a willingness to alleviate suffering and the desire to share our blessings with others; our only ambition to be more like our Master, with a hope of everlasting life that buoys us up through the dark vicissitudes of life. Learn of Christ and we will find what He means by His "yoke." We find it is a balance that takes the cares of this life and mitigates their burden. As the physical yoke prevented strain and fatigue, so the spiritual yoke takes the cares of this life and by comparison with the nobler Christ-like life, prevents them fatiguing our spiritual life, by portraying their comparative insignificance we can assess the value of earthly things and balance their demands against our desires to love and serve God and find how insignificant are the former and how all-pervading is our yearning to live in harmony with Christ's teaching, then we have learnt of Him and taken His yoke upon us.

The late brother Fred Rogers.

We now complete Brother F.J.Pearce's booklet:-

"A Review of The Slain Lamb"

We hear such as the following - "We know that Scripture says Christ died for us, but this means on account of us, not instead of us. The Scripture also says that Jesus died for our sins and this cannot mean instead of our sins," etc. The context should ever decide. We will put it in another form - "I have bought this cake for your tea." Do I mean that I bought the cake instead of your tea? This doesn't contradict the fact that it was for you. It is our duty to ascertain whether for, *GAR*, *HUPER* (on behalf of), or *ANTI* (in place of) are antagonistic. It is a simple task to demonstrate them to be like David and Jonathan, the closest bosom friends, that these propositions can perform separate functions. We will suppose that you, like Adam, were, through adverse circumstances, reduced to beggary. Your creditor, the devil, to secure his own, demanded the sale of your possessions - life and inheritance. Well, along comes a dear wealthy friend with the solution to your difficulty. "Cheer up, Tom," he says, I have plenty to spare, more than I shall ever require" (John 12:24; Psalm 69:4). "I will square the bill for (*GAR*) you, on behalf of (*HUPER*) you, in place of (*ANTI*) you." Would any law force Tom to pay it again? This is exactly what Jesus did. For (*GAR*), on behalf of (*HUPER*) and in place of (*ANTI*) Adam. Can any logical person wrench asunder this threefold cord? Thus, *GAR*, *HUPER*, and *ANTI*, defy the power of darkness to blot out the divine ransom being instead of Adam. "He restored that which He took not away," Psalm 69:4. (A.L.Wilson).

Page 23, paragraph 2. "He is pleased for Christ's sake to forgive us. He is not obliged to forgive us. Christ has given Him no satisfaction, paid no debt in the commercial sense. Christ's birth and death was the arrangement of His own mercy." We verily agree with R.Roberts that it was all of God's mercy. Were it not, the whole human race would have been blotted out in Eden. But where does the fallacy

lie in his statement of Christ giving God no satisfaction; paid no debt in the commercial sense? It lies just here – the assumption is that God demanded satisfaction that the debt was paid to Him. Why, God gave the ransom price. He did not pay Himself. If He received the price back where would sacrifice come in? Why, this is the reverse of truth. The ransom was the paying off of sin's claim, not God's, for us. God produced the price (Jesus). Jesus laid it down. R.Roberts is far behind Peter who says, the just for the unjust (1 Peter 3:18). He also objects to the commercial sense, but we hardly need remind you that it is scriptural usage. We were sold under sin; we are bought with a price - not redeemed with gold and silver but by the precious blood of Christ (1 Peter 1:19). Those are the commercial terms that we use. **R.Roberts says, "The scheme of salvation is never comprehended by those who embrace this free life heresy."** We reply that we could not comprehend it if we believed the free life theory to be what he is trying to gull his brethren into believing that it is. What is more, we are convinced that apart from Jesus having a free life in the sense that we have contended, His sacrifice cannot be rightly nor scripturally understood. The advocates of sinful flesh call the sacrifice of Christ a difficult study, a subtle question, etc., which is used as an excuse for pigeonholing the sacrifice of Christ and our work.

Page 23, paragraph 3. R.Roberts' reference here to certain individuals who have accepted what E.Turney taught is indeed a bit of self praise. He is so certain that E.Turney was among the false brethren who came in privily to spy out their liberty and that he himself is among the true ones, that he finishes the paragraph with a flourish, viz., **"I will die if necessary to stem this tide of corruption which is streaming in and sweeping away the brethren."** Of course he said this in "writing," but though he said he would die if necessary, doesn't it seem strange that he should refuse to debate with E.Turney before the brethren? We know that the Scriptures can be brought forward to support anything. But we also know most assuredly that the condemnation passed upon man can be removed now, while we are still corruptible beings and that we have therefore passed from death unto life in harmony with Romans 8:1. If this is what false brethren taught, thank God for them. Few are to be saved, as it was in Noah's day, and there are many more Christadelphians who believe the free life theory but somehow haven't the courage to stand alone if necessary but say that they can do more good by remaining in the body. They never will do any good while man-made constitutions keep them tongue-tied. We verily believe that R.Roberts laboured a great deal to uphold Christadelphian teaching and also that he suffered physically, and we appreciate much that he has taught. He was ever ready to fight against the errors of Christendom. But we do think that he was very unfair to misrepresent E.Turney in "Slain Lamb" instead of meeting him before the brethren. E.Turney did not privily spy out their liberty. He conscientiously joined their body and as conscientiously left it when he discovered their error and manfully sent it abroad for all to hear. He was quite open as everyone should be who has an honest conviction. His lecture at Temperance Hall was not of his seeking. **R.Roberts says, "I will stand alone."** Yes and the writer can say the same. There are learned men in all religious bodies, but their learning will land them nowhere if it cannot stand an analysis by God's truth. We are more than thankful that we are not among those wise ones, but are of the poor Galilean type. I will stand by myself when I see the truth, yet not alone, as God is my witness that I speak the truth as I understand it, and lie not.

Page 24, paragraph 3. This paragraph is another example of the misrepresentation of what we teach and believe. How can we believe that Jesus had a different flesh than Adam when Paul says there is one flesh of men? Jesus was independent of Adam in His legal relationship. R.Roberts does not say that He was born in direct Adamic generation but says "in the channel," meaning here that He was born in Adamic generation because He was made of a woman. We have laboured to show the fallacy of this. The human race was in the ditch, we agree, being under legal condemnation (not physical) in Adam. We also believe that God, through Christ, came down to lift us out of the ditch and remove the condemnation. But if Jesus was under condemnation (**which R.Roberts says is physical**), then He would have been born in the ditch Himself and would be in need of redemption. He could not be the ransom and the ransomed. Instead of being in the ditch, Jesus willingly went into it to lift us out. This was help from outside, as none could be obtained from within the ditch, all being in the same condemnation. It was while we had no strength to get out. The death of Christ is not in our understanding a violation of divine principles. It is the Christadelphian understanding that does such. The Christadelphian understanding makes Christ physically condemned apart from His laying down His life in sacrifice. It was because we could find no scriptural support for physical condemnation which would involve the Son of God, we could not subscribe to the Birmingham constitution.

R.Roberts' reference to the outrage of unforfeited life subjected to the fate belonging to forfeiture only we have dealt with. The just for the unjust answers it. Regarding what R.Roberts says here is impermissible

in the Renunciationist theory, viz., that the resurrection of Christ was impossible if the debt we owed was eternal death and Christ paid it, we will repeat in brief. The life Jesus laid down to pay that debt was the life of His flesh which was in the blood. He received that life not again, or it would have been a mere loan and not a sacrifice. It ceaseth forever (Psalm 49). He was put to death in flesh, quickened in spirit (1 Peter 3:18). **If, as R.Roberts says on page 8, that it was a body that was prepared for sacrifice and not a life,** we ask, was His body the price of release? If it was, He had it back. "Handle me and see." The life of Jesus was given instead of Adam's and we, as in Adam, not that it would prevent us dying by natural laws, but that we should not perish - and this, all of God's love (John 3:16). If this free life theory is contradictory and self-destructive, as R.Roberts says, there is indeed little hope for us. We leave the reader to be fully persuaded in his own mind regarding this, and we invite him to rightly divide the words of truth to discover which theory is the most honourable. We have expressed our views with the same zeal for God that we had as Christadelphians. We repeat that they do not see eye to eye with themselves over this important subject of the sacrifice of Christ. Hence the trouble in the body. This question will probably be asked, "Why write a review of "Slain Lamb" in 1934 in reply to a book written in 1873? Besides the author has been dead since 1898 and therefore he is not alive to reply to your review?" We answer thus; Scripture says, "Abel being dead, yet speaketh (or is spoken of)." Why have we used this passage? It is in another connection, we admit. We have written brethren upon this matter and we have received the following reply: "Slain Lamb" answers all your sophistries." Therefore we have answered "Slain Lamb." This is written with the prayer that God's blessing will rest upon our small effort and that others may see light in His light, and not (unfortunately in most cases in ignorance) condemn the Saviour of the world.

Jesus lived unto God before He died unto sin. We must die unto sin before we can live unto God.

APPENDIX.

These notes were written in 1934. Since then many others have contributed to them; therefore the writer does not claim any honour. I compiled same as my loving duty and hope the sacrifice of Christ will be understood more clearly and that the love wherewith God loved us may engender within us the power to give unto God our lives or bodies as a living sacrifice well-pleasing to Him.

F.J.Pearce.

Further Comments on:

"The Nature of Man and the Work of Christ.

Some Passages Considered."

INTRODUCTION

Dear Brother Russell and all concerned in the Lord's Vineyard, Praise be to The Lord and His Son, together with greetings in The Name.

We hope you are all well and looking forward to the time when our labours will be channelled through the medium of incorruptible nature and people will be more ready to accept the message of the Gospel of salvation through the Grace of God in His Son.

I say this by reason of our having to contend for the true faith once delivered to the saints, not a plurality of deliverance after being adulterated through perversion and precepts of men and claimed by certain people as being the revived Truth brought to the surface from amongst the darkness of pagan and Apostate religion.

On the basis of the fact that “Testimony” writers such as Tennant, Carr, Meadows, Palmer and others, have been familiarized in no uncertain manner with the views of Nazarene writers shaming them for their lack of knowledge, understanding and perception by their leaning to the contradictory views expressed in their “Statement of Faith,” binding upon them a basis for the acceptance of fellowship with all its adherents, and not that Fellowship with the Father and His Son for which Nazarenes have always contended.

I find that Brother Cave has been too lenient in his reply to Tony Benson than I could now be, on account of suggestions he, Tony Benson, makes in reference to passages of Scripture and using alternatives and questions about them in order to evade the inevitable facts of the Truth we Nazarenes teach and understand (1 Corinthians 2:12,13).

There is no direct statement from Tony Benson of what he believes; he resorts to the evasive language of politicians, not a “yes” or a “no.” Jesus said, “Let your Yea be Yea and your Nay be Nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.” When faced with a dilemma, R.Roberts was a prime example of evasiveness.

“The Testimony” Editor, Tony Benson.

This article reproduced in the Nazarene Circular Letter No 184, July/August 2000, strikes me as being very evasive and non-explanatory of what Tony Benson has gained from correspondence he has received. I find on examination that he has advanced no further beyond the confused teaching and traditions of Christadelphianism. He has confirmed in no uncertain manner, after our allowing him space in our magazine (which he denied to our Sister Helen Brady requesting him to print in “The Testimony” her father’s views on The Atonement, on the grounds that those views were not on the basis of their Statement of Faith), that all he has intended in this article is his support for Chris Maddocks and in some places, the clauses in that document.

He says, “I have dealt with the passages in the order of their occurrence in Scripture and not in relation to any particular piece of correspondence received. I have tried to deal with each one without any preconceived ideas as to what they mean, considering carefully each verse in its context.”

Now in the paragraph on Psalm 58:3, he contradicts his very statement that he has no preconceived ideas. He speaks of the innate wickedness of human nature. Has not this expression “the wickedness of human nature” emanated from a preconceived theory taught by Christadelphian pioneers and their successors as a result of accepting the Apostate doctrine of Original Sin or defiled flesh as opposed to character, so that with every transgression of law the “physical flesh” or “human nature” is blamed and not the person’s character under responsibility to Divine Law, as was the case with Adam? Or is it that he accepts the view of his Pioneer, Robert Roberts, that the Creator produced a man (Jesus Christ) of inferior nature than Adam’s, to rectify and complete His original purpose with the earth and man upon it? Surely it is complete nonsense and illogical to reason so.

Human physical nature today is Adamic human nature as God made it in the beginning, capable of dying, being of that nature not of Angels, yet under a restriction he was able to respect by obedience.

This fact Jesus proved in His own conduct, being (contrary to the view of Robert Roberts, Claus 5) in the identical flesh and blood nature of Adam when created (Genesis 2:7). I have stated before that this expression “human nature has been used and is used incorrectly to describe certain thoughts or acts opposed to that which is right; that the correct phrase should be “human disposition,” the physical flesh being abstract or an abstraction, from a mental conception so formed.

This false description of human flesh and blood nature has been the cause of strife and division from the time that the early church went astray and embraced the Apostate doctrine of Rome despite the efforts of one Pelagius to oppose and correct it. The Christadelphian pioneers likewise embraced it also through a misconception and misinterpretation of the writings of the Apostle Paul in thinking he was teaching of flesh condemned, not character. Sad to say “The Testimony” writers including its present editor Tony Benson and the Logos element have made a bigger meal of it than could have been imagined; even a D.D. of the Anglican Church has condemned it as deplorable to have entered in such a way, also that the words of Paul

in Romans 7:18 could not apply to himself as a converted Christian in Christ, and shameful on the part of those who profess to understand his teaching to think so and make it an excuse for disobedience.

If Tony Benson had taken into account how religion originated through law and that Adam's legal position and ours as a result of his sin was an appointment of God for the purpose of changing that position, without interference with the physical flesh, he would not have found it necessary to embark on his derogatory comments of Christ offering Himself for crucifixion as a demonstration of what was due to His nature, which in the Christadelphian Creed was sinful and condemned. With such theories of this kind they cannot preach nor even believe that Jesus offered Himself up as a willing sacrifice to redeem Adam and all in him.

I have no intention of adding to the reply to your article by brother Eric Cave which should have convinced you of your errors on several matters for as he says, "I believe your considerations to be more notable for what is omitted than for what you have written." In fact you have written many things and quoted from the Scriptures with no attempt to explain on your own part what they mean. You have quoted for example 2 Corinthians 5:21 and you ask, "In what sense was Jesus made sin? Does it refer to the fact that He had our sin-prone nature, or is there some other explanation?"

Certainly there is some other explanation and it does not need any beating about the bush and adding what I corrected you for by using the unscriptural term "sin-prone nature."

There is only one answer; Jesus was made sin for us when the Sin of the world was laid upon Him and carried to the Tree of Calvary; if it had been at His birth then He could not be an offering for sin nor a sacrifice, especially in your belief that He had condemned sinful nature. Is it that you do not want to admit that Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts were incorrect in saying He was made sin contaminated and condemned flesh at birth, and in order to defend your Statement of Faith errors which state that God, contrary to His principles of offerings under the Priesthood, violated those principles in making an unclean Christ of blemished flesh an offering for sin to make us righteous? Do you still stand by the document that makes a mockery of God and impugns His wisdom and justice?

In regard to Romans 8:3 and the term "likeness," it refers to Jesus being of the same quality of flesh in the physical sense as those who were regarded as the servants of Sin personified as a Master and were therefore styled by Paul as "Sin's flesh" or "Sin's possession," i.e. belonging to Sin. It was in this sense that Jesus took the place of the sinner (Isaiah 53), and also in the words of Paul (Romans 6:10), "For in that he died, he died unto sin (Master Sin, in our place) once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God."

Is this your belief, Tony? Have you died unto sin and risen to newness of life in Jesus? Forget your unscriptural and invalid terms, e.g. "in prospect", either you have or you have not.

The position of a person in Christ is a legal and spiritual one - it is valid as long as the person remains faithful unto the coming of Christ Jesus; of such persons Paul says, "Reckon yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Romans 6:11) - the previous verses explaining the reason. The answer is simple enough, Jesus was of the same physical or likeness of other human beings of flesh belonging to 'Slave Master Sin' but He was not Sin's flesh; He was God's flesh never having been in Sin's possession as a servant (See Romans chapter 6). Jesus was God's Son and His faithful servant, "Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth."

You engage yourself on the subject of the High Priest offering first for his own sins and then offering for the sins of the people and you try to draw a parallel with the High Priest under the law of Moses of the tribe of Levi and of Jesus who was of the tribe of Juda after the flesh of Mary. Where do you read of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement for example, slaying himself first on account of his committed sins, or for that matter, as you falsely term it, his sinful nature? What then could he offer for the sins of the people, he being dead? Why cannot you see the animals as types of Jesus slain by the sinners to make atonement for their souls? Jesus Christ was the victim, not the Priest; not only for the Jews but for Gentiles also, for both were instrumental in the slaying of Jesus, inadvertently of course but nevertheless His death by the shedding of blood validated, by faith, their Atonement in the purpose of God.

Indeed God allowed them to do it because Jesus willingly offered Himself without spot to God as the ransom price whereby God could Justifiably redeem, or purchase Adam and all in him, from the Law of Sin and Death, the legal sentence of death having passed upon, not into, all men that by faith in Jesus, the appointed Way, they might pass from death to life without dying literally and without change of nature. Mark this, Tony, "To the poor the gospel is preached" - it is simple to understand when the cobwebs of the confused doctrines of men are brushed aside.

Although this was all in the prophetic messages in the Scriptures. Jesus did not have to lay down His life under compulsion from His Father, for as John the Baptist told the Jews who boasted themselves as being the seed of Abraham, "Think not within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham." Also, as Jesus stated, "The flesh profiteth nothing;" yet ye judge after the flesh of Abraham who was the same flesh and blood as the Gentiles." (My own explanation of course).

Jesus was intent on fulfilling the will of His Father and His Plan from the beginning, and concerning His sacrificial death set before Him of which He prayed and also declared "How then shall the scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" It was not compulsory, the Father would have given Jesus twelve legions of angels if He had prayed to be delivered, yet you, Tony, and your "Testimony" writers reject this in your teaching that Jesus had to die on account of wearing the condemned nature of David and Abraham (and why these two are singled out is not explained) and to be obedient unto a penalty due to Him and that God might show Him as an exhibition of what was due to sinful flesh, your admission that He had to be of condemned sinful flesh in order to show God's condemnation of it. Dr Thomas was also guilty of this lack of understanding.

This is the general Christadelphian held blasphemous doctrine which is foreign to the Holy Scriptures. Then you, Tony, continue to show your lack of perception by saying Jesus prayed earnestly for salvation out of death when the Apostle says that Jesus offered up prayer to God with strong crying and tears to Him who was able to save him from death and was heard.

Have you deliberately avoided what is said of Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane so that you can peddle the same old errors of your Pioneer Robert Roberts and also uphold your whole Statement of Faith which you cannot justify? You support the teaching that the dead are unconscious and without thoughts and memory. Why then present Jesus as a man fearful of being dead in the tomb after suffering death, and sweating as it were great drops of blood in tears and prayer to His Father to save Him out of a state of sleep in which He would know nothing?

Are you so blind as not to realize Jesus had told His disciples in advance of the Gethsemane experience that He would suffer death and rise again the third day? How much more of the Spirit's teaching are you prepared to consign to the rubbish bin to bolster up the false reasoning you display to your readers in support of your Statement of Faith document?

Hebrews 7:26,27; This is speaking of Christ as High Priest in Heaven who needs not to offer for His own sins or those of the people, for this latter thing He did once, not as High Priest but as a victim; an unforfeited life in the place of the life forfeited to sin in Eden. He could not therefore be the antitype of the Priest, otherwise the Priest to be a type would need to lay down his own life which was already concluded under sin and without strength (Romans 5:6-11).

If you are still in doubt as to what Jesus did once for the people, it was as I have stated and is also proved in Ephesians 5:2 that God might offer Him up freely for all; "And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." Where is your polluted condemned Christ dying for Himself? Is that a sweet-smelling savour?

Please note the context; Jesus was alive when offering Himself to God!

I am completely nauseated by the contents of your final paragraph; it is the same old doctrine of falsehood and the most antichrist doctrine imaginable and the most shameful, yet needing compassion and

thought of the people must be determined by the decisions you come to upon the questions of character. Ever since the Christian religion came to man this question has been debated. The debate is not ended yet. We shall continue to discuss it. Therefore, it is a living issue, and being such the intelligence of man is demanded, at any rate towards the best settlement that can be reached.

It is my duty simply to introduce to you tonight the two debaters and to tell you the rules which will govern our procedure, Mr. West (a well known name in Bristol now), will defend those views of the Trinity which are upheld by the Church of England and who is so earnest a member of that Church. He will speak to us for thirty minutes. Then Mr. Todd, the representative of the Christadelphian line of thought, will speak to us for thirty minutes. At the conclusion of this, we shall have a collection and let me remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that we are hoping, strongly hoping, that a considerable surplus of money will be placed at the disposal of the friends who have taken the trouble of this meeting. They desire to hand over that surplus to the Bristol General Hospital; so that now, ladies and gentlemen, you have a double interest, not only an interest of intellectual value, but of supporting one of the greatest and most useful institutions. After the collection, Mr. West will have the opportunity of questioning Mr. Todd; Mr. West will ask questions and Mr. Todd will reply. Following that, Mr. Todd will have the opportunity of asking Mr. West questions and Mr. West will reply - fifteen minutes each in both cases for the questions - and finally there will be a concluding speech by each of the debaters of fifteen minutes in length, with this condition, that in the concluding speech no fresh matter must be introduced. The speakers must confine themselves in both cases to matter already touched upon. The principle of the whole thing being that the matter laid before you must be based upon the Scriptures and defended from that point of view. If you, the audience, choose to express your opinions too strongly and take up any time of the speakers that time must be allowed them as considered to belong to them. Now I have much pleasure in asking Mr. West to open the debate of this evening.

Reverend J.O.West's Opening Speech:-

Mr Chairman, Dear Friends, Let me make a brief statement as to how it is that I occupy this exceptional position tonight. I belong to the Christian Endeavour Society, which is a large Society embracing Christians of all denominations. Last Whitsuntide we held a great convention in the Colston Hall. After one of the meetings - that upon Sunday morning - as I was coming away from the meeting, a paper was put in my hand and upon it there was an attack virtually upon the faith that I hold to be the faith of God and duty led me on the following Sunday night to preach in my church on a question that is a matter of deepest moment to men and women, on points of difference which were upon that paper, with what is called Orthodox Christian faith. To this sermon I found, apart from my knowledge, a meeting arranged for, the speaker, announced and that he replied to my sermon. I do not think it was in my power to be at the meeting but when I heard of it, in order to show my perfect fairness and willingness to meet those who differ from me, I at once wrote to the Christadelphians saying I was willing, if arrangements were made, to state publicly my reasons and to hear the opposite side; so that is the reason why I am here tonight and I will at once begin by proceeding to state that the doctrine of the Trinity, that is a Trinity of Unity, is the doctrine of the Church of England. Mark, not simply the doctrine of the Church of England but we may consider that the Catholic Church throughout the world embraces this as the truth, what we believe to be the nature of God that is held by what is usually termed Orthodox Christianity.

Now why should we object to the term Trinity? I at once admit the word is not to be found in Holy Scriptures but because the word is not found there, is therefore the doctrine implied in the Trinity - is the doctrine therefore false? Certainly not, because we have it in our power to coin fresh words. Ten to twelve years ago, how many of you knew there was such an article in the world as radium? I did not, and yet the name had to be found to describe the most wonderful material that has yet been discovered. So as time went on, after the Holy Scriptures were written it seemed to be an advisable thing to express the faith held by Orthodox Christians as being Three in One - Trinity - and therefore I hope no quarrel will be made upon the use of the word.

The question is, "Is the doctrine in Holy Scripture?" If it is, let us find out where it is and be prepared to accept it, believing that it is a possible thing for the Being of God to transcend our finite capacity, He being eternal unchangeable, all wise and perfect in every way - we being mortal, we being weak, we being finite and therefore unable to cope with the great and wondrous idea of the Most High and Almighty God.

Here let me express my conviction, that the Christadelphians hold a measure of truth; they honour Christ, they hold that He has been raised from the dead, and that He is coming in His Kingdom; and in that faith I thoroughly agree. He is to my soul King of Kings and Lord of Lords and I believe that He will be King over all the earth, supreme in God's good time. But the question, after all, is the nature of Christ, and the nature of the Spirit of God; because we agree in worshipping and honouring the Unity; we believe in One supreme God Almighty Who is all wise; and therefore it is a good thing for us to have a common stand-point in which we can hold fellowship and agree.

Therefore the points we have to discuss are these. I have not to refute the atheistical standpoint or the Higher Criticism tonight, but rather to prove if I can, from Holy Scripture, the Trinity in Unity. I submit to you that from Holy Scripture I have to prove the Godhead of Christ, and the Godhead of the Spirit of God. The Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ in the first place. Had He a being before He was in this world? Not as Jesus Christ, He could not have a being as Jesus Christ because He was born of the blessed Virgin and therefore His humanity could only have a beginning as a child born, and the Son of God. But He states Himself in John 6:36, "I came down from heaven," therefore He of necessity was in Heaven before He came therefrom; what was He in Heaven? We are told that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." The gospel of Luke tells us in the fourth chapter where the genealogy is treated upon that Adam was the Son of God and therefore what are we to understand by Christ being "the only begotten Son of God"? I take it that it means that He was the only Son of God. You and I who are fathers here, have children practically of our own nature, they are in one sense the same essence of ourselves. So the Father has one Son, called in the Epistle to the Romans, "His own Son, the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Twice that expression is used in the gospel of John concerning our holy and blessed Lord. What Christians (we who belong to the Church of England) say the Godhead of our Holy Saviour means is, He had a prior existence as God or Son of God before He came into this world. Was there a time when He was not? Was there a time when God in His Unity existed apart from all personality - that is, from the Persons being in the Godhead? I hold that it is an impossibility. I will give you the reasons in a few moments. He was in the bosom of the Father (John 1:18), "The only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father He hath declared Him." Further, that the expression used concerning Him, "the Word of God," implies the heart utterance of God. "In the beginning was the Word, the Word was with God, and the Word was God." And then we find in John 1:14, "The Word became flesh," which is the exact force of the Greek verb, "and we beheld His glory, the glory as the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

But it might be affirmed that there was a time when the Father begat the Son, if so, if He begat the Son of His own nature and His own essence, He must have been God, but looking at it from another point of view, He could not create God; God is increate; to be God was to have no beginning. God is eternal and therefore, if the Son began to be at any time, mark, I do not say when, at any period at all, He must of necessity not be God, the two ideas cannot be made to agree; so when we have His own words (John 17) in which we see how that Christ our Lord, as He is speaking to the Father (I do not know a more remarkable chapter of the outpouring of the heart of the Son of God to the Father than this), He says in the fifth verse, "Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self with the glory I had with Thee before the world was." Scientists tell us this earth has been in existence for millions of years. Now millions of years is a stupendous portion of time; if in some form or other this earth has been in existence millions of years ago, here in these words the Lord Jesus Christ states definitely and clearly that He had glory with the Father before the world was.

We will pass on to His very own words in regard to Himself and you will find that the chief revelation from Himself to man of His nature is in John 5 and 10. In John 5:20 therefore you will see that Christ says "The Father loveth the Son and sheweth Him all things that Himself doeth, He will show Him greater works that ye may marvel." Also in the 21st verse, "For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will... all judgment is given unto the Son, that all may honour the Son as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father that sent Him. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life."

We have learned thus far, Christ hath perfect knowledge, is the perfect Son of God, He hath perfect life in Himself, as Christ Himself says, "as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." He hath perfect authority, for before Him all must appear, "for the Father hath committed

all judgment to Him;" He hath perfect honour, that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father; He has perfect power because He tells us in the last chapter of Matthew, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Thus we find therefore, in those thoughts, perfect knowledge, perfect life, perfect authority, perfect power. We find these statements made by Christ when He was here amongst men, how that He had these attributes Himself, with what result? We find that when He made these statements which I have shown that He did make, I affirm they constitute the claim of Godhead. "The Jews took up stones again to stone Him. Why stone me," said Christ, "for a good work?" "We do not stone Thee for a good work, but we stone Thee that Thou being a man makest Thyself God." Did Christ deny it? He admitted it. His time to die had not arrived and He escaped out of their hands and vanished out of their view; they were powerless to take Him.

In Matthew 11:27,28 (here we have the earliest gospel, so far as we know), you will find Christ making use of the words "All things" (speaking of the Father), "have been delivered to Me of my Father, and no one knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Hark at that tremendous statement that Christ made in John 14:6, "No man can come to the Father except by me." Then He says, Matthew 11:28, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Words so wonderful, words so magnificent as these, no religious teacher that has appeared has ever dared to use. Here we see the Christ of God declare that all that are heavy laden are to come to Him; and that He will give them rest. How can a finite being respond to infinite need?

Now I pass on again. Let us think of the circumstances when He was crucified between two thieves on the Cross. I ask you to turn to the gospel of Mark, 14:60-64, there we find Him appear before His judges, a prisoner at the bar. What do we find there? The High Priest stood up in the midst and asked Jesus saying, "Answerest thou nothing? What is it that these witness against thee? But he held his peace. Again the High Priest said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said unto him, Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, coming in the clouds of heaven. And the High Priest rent his clothes and said, Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death." Turn now to Luke 22:69,70, there you will find the same scene recorded with slightly different points; but these words are very important, "Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Then said they all, Art thou then, the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am." The margin has (R.V.) "Because I am." The result to Him was the crucifixion. He is nailed upon that cross of wood because He had done no evil thing, no violence was found upon Him; simply upon the capital charge, the greatest charge that could be laid to any Jew, He "blasphemed" - hence His crucifixion. Well, it was either true or false. If the charge was a true charge, the Jews were right in inflicting capital punishment upon Him. If the Jews were wrong, they were guilty of the most awful murder that ever took place upon this earth. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles charges them with being "the betrayers and murderers" of the Christ of God and we note here from the word before us, that the Son of God that went before His judges said "I am the Son of God."

Let me pass on; I have other witnesses which I wish to dwell upon. You remember in the walk to Emmaus (Luke 24) that the two disciples who were leaving broken-hearted, thinking their cause was utterly hopeless and gone; you remember a third person joined them and that that third person was the resurrected Christ and that He explained - took them to the Bible, the Old Testament (the Old Testament was written hundreds of years - at least 250 years - before Christ came; therefore when He opened the Scriptures; it was not the gospel; it was the Old Testament Scriptures. Now in the Old Testament Scriptures there are four (there are more really, but I give four) chief passages in regard to the nature of the Lord Jesus Christ and the first is this - Isaiah 14:21-23, there we find the statement made by God Himself that salvation was in His hands; "a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me; look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else; by myself I have sworn, and the word is gone out of my mouth: unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."

Will you turn to Philippians 2? There we find a most remarkable passage called "the emptying;" "He, being in the form of God" - Christ being in the form of God, "thought it not robbery to be equal with God" (and the Greek exactly translated is "thought it not a prize to be grasped, to be on an equality with God") and made himself of no reputation, but took upon Him the form of a servant," and therefore, because He humbled Himself, "God hath highly exalted Him, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow; of things in

heaven and things on earth, and things under the earth; that every tongue shall confess to the glory of God the Father.”

Then I ask your thoughts to another Scripture, Isaiah 6:1-5, there we find before Isaiah the astonishing manifestation of the glory of God sitting upon the throne and then we have the cry raised by the Seraphim, one crying unto another, “Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory. Then said I, Woe is me, for I am undone; I dwell among the people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts.” Now what do we find in the latter part of the gospel of John (12:37-41)? We have had the appearance of the glory of God to Isaiah, and John, in his interpretation of that passage tells us in this “that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? He hath blinded their eyes, lest they should see with their eyes, and I should heal them.” Those words are taken from the very chapter of the prophet, “These things said Isaiah, when he saw His glory. Isaiah saw the glory of Christ when he saw the vision hundreds of years before Christ came.

We will turn to Psalm 14. David was a prophet as well as a king- He is in that remarkable Psalm saying, “My heart is inditing a good matter. I speak of the things which I have made touching the King.” The verses I want to refer to are the sixth and seventh, “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a right sceptre.” Turn now to the 1st of Hebrews; there we find the statement distinctly made - Christ as the Son of God referred to, “Again when he bringeth the first begotten into the world, He saith, Let all the angels of God worship him, who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. And to the Son he said, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.”

I have not touched upon the personality of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost. I will give these statements- The names of God are given to the Lord Jesus Christ. He is called “Our great God and Saviour.” For instance, the attributes of God are given to the Lord Jesus Christ. Eternity; “I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.” “Jehovah of hosts, the first and the last.” Omnipotence (John 1:3), “All things were made by the Word.” Hebrews 1:3, upholding all things by the word of his power. Omnipresence, “Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there I am in the midst of them.” Matthew 28, “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the age.”

Then the acts of God are ascribed to the Lord Jesus Christ - Creation and preservation. The epistle to the Colossians (I have not time to dwell upon the remarkable testimony contained in this epistle), but in Colossians 1 Christ is described as the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation, by him were all things created in heaven, upon earth, things visible, and things invisible. Power is ascribed unto him, for all things have been created through Him and unto Him, and He is before all things; in Him all things consist. So we notice therefore, that the apostle in writing thus concerning the glory of Christ has exalted Christ unto such an height that, unless He is God, I cannot by any possible means understand who Christ is, for it says, “In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” Therefore when I look at the Lord Jesus Christ and find the works of creation ascribed to Him, I appeal to creation as being actual evidence that He is God, He proves that He was sent from God and therefore the Son, having power over all creation - for there was nothing that was needed in the way of power over nature, over disease, over suffering or over death, that Christ did not exert - and as we look at His character, as we look at His ways, as we look at His death, as we look at His resurrection, and as we look at His works, I see the truth embodied in the expression “I believe in Jesus Christ that He is very God of very God.”

Mr Todd’s Opening Speech:-

Mr Chairman, Mr West, Ladies and Gentlemen, The subject for discussion is “Is the doctrine of the Trinity as believed in by the Church of England a scriptural one?” Now I submit to you that Mr West has not defined what the doctrine is as believed by the Church; so we propose to read from what is called the Book of Common Prayer, in order that you may see for yourselves what the doctrine is as held by the Church. It reads (page 49):-

“Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith, Which faith except everyone do keep whole and undefiled; without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the Catholic Faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and

Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one, the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate: and the Holy Ghost uncreate. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible; and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet they are not three eternals; but one eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated; but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty. And yet they are not three Almighties: but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Ghost is Lord. And yet not three Lords but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every person by himself to be God and Lord; so we are forbidden by the Catholic religion to say there be three Gods or three Lords. The Father is made of none; neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers, one Son, not three Sons, one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other; none is greater, or less than another: but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together; and co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid; the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity,”

Now in the first of the thirty-nine articles it says “There is but one living true God, without body, parts or passions.” My friend, Mr West, this is a fair definition of the doctrine of the Trinity as believed by the Church - it is from the Church’s own Prayer Book.

Just briefly we will refer to one or two of the arguments that Mr West has thrown out, before we elaborate our own argument upon the negative side of the question. He has introduced to your notice Radium. He said when discovered we had to find a name for it. The point he seemed to have in view was as though Christ left new truth to be discovered after He left the earth. Surely Christ revealed all the light there was to be revealed. There has been no new divine truth revealed since Christ left the earth. Therefore his argument concerning Radium will not hold good. We say there has been nothing discovered in the shape of divine truth since the Lord Jesus Christ left this earth.

Mr West then spoke to you about some men in Christ’s day condemning Him (see John 10:32-36). Jesus answered them “Many good works have I shown you; for which of these works do ye stone me?” The Jews answered Him saying, “For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because thou, being a man, makest thyself God.” How did He make Himself God? Listen to the text and we shall see. “Jesus answered them. Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If He called them gods unto whom the Word of God came (and the scriptures cannot be broken), say ye of Him whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?” Note, not God the Son; not the second person of the Trinity; not one of the Trinity beings; but “because I said I am the Son of God.” It was among the Jews considered to be an equality when a person claimed to be the only son of a certain man, and as Christ claimed to be the Son of the Lord God Almighty, they considered He had blasphemed.

Mr West quoted John 5:26, “As the Father hath life in himself, even so hath He given to the Son to have life in himself.” If Christ were God, ought not He to have had it? Then before He gave it to the Son, the Son had it not. Then again, “All power in heaven and in earth is given unto me.” Then, before it was given unto Christ He did not possess it; showing that Christ could not have been equal with the Father. If He had been equal, He would have had the power apart from the bestowal. Mr West has quoted from the Hebrews where it says “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.” Now in the first chapter of Hebrews and the sixth verse, the Authorized Version reads like this, “And again, when He bringeth the first begotten into the world. He saith, and let all the angles of God worship him.” The Revised Version alters that a little and it reads, “When He again bringeth in the first begotten into the world.” So the Lord is coming, as is shown by

the wording, "When He again bringeth in the first begotten, let all the angels of God worship Him." That is when that hymn

"All hail the power of Jesus' name,
Let angels prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown Him Lord of all.

will be sung.

Well, now trace the things further down to the 10th verse of the same chapter and we read, "And Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish, but thou remainest." Now the word 'Lord' does not refer to Christ or Jesus. We affirm that the creation spoken of here are not the literal heaven and earth, for there must be no contradiction in Scripture. Concerning the literal heavens and earth, it is written, "One generation passeth away and another cometh: but the earth abideth for ever" (Ecclesiastes 1:4). Now if the passage means that the literal heaven and earth are to pass away, there is a conflict, and concerning the sun, the moon and the stars, it is written, "they shall continue for ever before me." (Psalm 72:17) and in addition to this Christ said, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth" (Matthew 5:5). But if you believe the earth is to be blotted out, there is no point in Jehovah's declarations. What heavens and earth are they? In short we say they were the Jewish heavens and earth, which were ready to vanish away in the days of the apostles, as Peter said that the heavens were about to be on fire; they were to melt with fervent heat and be dissolved. But he says, "Nevertheless, we, according to His promise (God's promise) look for a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Peter 3:10-13). Now if you were to apply that to the literal heavens and earth, would you be prepared to admit that in heaven where God dwells, sin exists? It is not the heaven where God dwells, but the promise is "Behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy" (Isaiah 65:18). Then he quoted from Colossians where we have Christ styled "the image of the invisible God." We wish to point out that Christ was the image of God, and not God Himself. How could He be the image of Himself? Utterly an impossibility. With regard to the creation referred to: Christ is the Creator in the question, but mark the things that are to be created. They are called things in heaven, and things in earth, thrones, dominions, principalities and powers, etc. (Colossians 1:16). Please note neither heaven nor earth, but things in heaven and things in earth; they are social things. Can we conceive for one moment that Christ created the literal, natural heavens and earth? No indeed we cannot. Did He make the hills, the mountains, the seas and the rocks? No! He did not. The things that He is said to create are here, namely powers, principalities, dominions and thrones, which are all social things. And how did He do it? Let the Word speak. The question is to be decided by the Word of God; it is not what we think. Here is the verse: "And having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself; by Him I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven." (1 Colossians 1:20). So the reconciliation, the creation of this new order, was brought about by the death on the Cross, that is when Christ was crucified He brake down the middle wall of partition and united Jew and Gentile; the creation is a spiritual creation and not a literal one. Christ is styled "First-born"; "He is the first born of every creature" (Colossians 1:15). Was Christ born before Adam? Adam was created 4000 years before Christ and yet He is styled here in the fifteenth verse as being the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature. Adam is the first of the Adamic stock, the federal head of the human family; whereas Christ is the firstborn from the dead, the first of a new order, the first to put on immortality. What Christ is, the saints hope to be. We will not spend any more time referring to Mr West's speech or else we will have no time to elaborate our own argument. So first of all we should like to read from a little pamphlet which we wrote ourselves, so we shall be allowed to quote from it.

"We do not understand the Athanasian Creed; we do not think anyone else does; it is not the mystery of godliness, but the mystery of foolishness. The most fitting name we can apply to it is "confusion confounded." From such let us earnestly pray "Good Lord deliver us." We are pleased to say the Good Lord has delivered quite a number of us. Let us keep free from such a blighting influence."

Now the doctrine of the Trinity as believed by the Church - that is the doctrine I have read - is most confusing, most confounding. There is no man that can explain what three Persons in one God means. We were reading a book today in which there were two friends speaking. The one said to the other, "I cannot believe in the doctrine of the Trinity." "Why?" said the other. "It is so contradictory." The Trinitarian

answered “It is only like a thing I saw today.” “What did you see today?” “I saw three men in one cart.” But the man answered, “It would have been nearer the purpose if you had seen one man in three carts.”

Now the doctrine of the Trinity carries its own refutation with it. The plain statement of Scripture is “This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent” (John 17:3). But concerning the Trinity it is admitted to be incomprehensible, an absolute mystery. Therefore in the eyes of the doctrine of the Trinity as believed in by the Church of England, the whole world is damned.

(Cries of “No! No!”).

The words just quoted are the words used by Christ and we do not know why you should have shown your rejection of the same (Mark 16:16).

In Deuteronomy 6:4 the children of Israel met at the foot of Mount Sinai, They had just been brought out of Egypt where they had been for hundreds of years. They were about to receive a code of laws which should govern them for all time. The first great and grand law or commandment given to them was (4th verse), “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord” (not three). When the young man came to Jesus as reported in Mark 12:29, one of the Scribes came and having heard them reasoning together and perceived that He had answered them well, asked Him, Which is the first commandment of all? Jesus answered “The first of all the commandments is, Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.” So that Christ confirmed Moses, the Scribe who well understood the Holy Scriptures confirmed Him also, for the Scribe said, verse 32, “Well, Master, Thou hast said the truth; for there is one God and none other but He.” Again, 1 Corinthians 8:5, we read, “though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many), but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.” In Ephesians 4:6 it is written “There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.”

Now, Mr West quoted from John 17:5, “Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self with the glory I had with Thee before the world was.” Now I have a passage to put by the side of that which is found in Revelation 12:8, which refers to Christ as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If Mr West will hold to the idea that the Lord Jesus Christ literally as a person had glory with the Father before the world was, it is quite as reasonable to hold that He was literally crucified and slain before the world began.

Again, Christ said, “The glory which Thou gavest me, I have given them” (the disciples). What for? “That they may be one, even as we are one.” So if the passage Mr. West advances is to prove that the Lord Jesus Christ had this glory before the world was, we also prove that the Lord Jesus Christ was crucified before the world was. Again we are told (Titus 1:2) that God promised eternal life before the world began. Now how could God promise us eternal life before the world began? It was in prospect, and in the same sense He had glory with the father, namely, in prospect and not in reality. Again Jesus said, “I came down from heaven: My Father sent me.” Therefore Mr West says He must have been there to have been sent. The same style of testimony is written concerning John: “There was a man sent from God whose name was John.”

Did John pre-exist because this style of language was used? Not at all. And yet the same words are used. Again, it is written concerning Cyrus that God had called him by his name. “I have called thee, though thou hast not known me.” (Isaiah 45:4). God selected Cyrus and had his name put down two hundred years before he was born. Did Cyrus pre-exist? No, only in the same sense as Christ, namely, in the purpose of God. Concerning Jesus Himself we are told in Galatians 4:4 “When the fullness of time had come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law.” How could a son be made that was made? It is impossible. But Christ, we are told, was made. We read in Luke 1:35 that He was born, therefore it says, “that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” Not God the Son; not the second person of the Trinity; not one of the Triune Beings; but His name shall be called the Son of God. Now Jesus did not know all things. His own words confirm this (Mark 13:32), “Of the day and the hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” Now if there were things not known by Christ and they were known to the Father, how could Christ be equal to God? Jesus could not do all things apart from the power of God, as His own words testify (John 5:30), “I can of

mine own self do nothing.” This was one of the Almightyies referred to in the Athanasian Creed. Fancy one of the Almightyies, one of the Trinity, could do nothing of Himself. This surely brings ridicule upon this creed. We are told that Christ was tempted in all points like unto His brethren (but God cannot be tempted) yet without sin. If He were Very God of Very God where would be the wisdom of those last words? Could a Very God sin? Of course He could not. Christ could but did not. All honour to His Name.

Reverend J.O.West questions Mr Todd:-

There is just one thing I should like to say with regard to what has fallen from Mr Todd’s lips. It is hardly courteous for any debater to condemn in language such as he has chosen. It may be he may think so; sometimes our thoughts are better kept to ourselves because they may give pain. When he described the Athanasian Creed as “mystery confounded” maybe he was carried away by the heat of the moment, therefore I can forgive such an expression. Whilst to a large extent I do not hold to the condemnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, I prefer The Judgment to deal with that, and with those who reject the gospel, and I am certain that I am not bound to acknowledge all that is said to be gospel for gospel; therefore I prefer leaving the judgment of those who do not hear the gospel in the hands of Him who cannot err. How could Mr Todd reconcile the fact that John, the first chapter states that Christ by the Word of God, Who is the Person Incarnate (we are told here He became flesh) that without Him was not anything made that was made? I notice that he referred to the epistle of the Ephesians 2:14 when he said it was breaking down of the barrier between Jew and Greek; that thus all this could be reconciled to God; but it appears to me that he has not dealt with the fact that in the gospel of John we have it clearly stated...

Chairman: Excuse me, Mr West, but this time must be devoted to questions and answers.

Mr. West: But cannot I make explanation?

Chairman: I think questions and answers is the more interesting.

1. How do you account for the meaning “all things were made by Him” (by the Word of God)?

A: That word “for” should be “on account of” Him, as you very well know sir.

2. The question of Hebrews 1:10 - how do you account for your statement as to the person spoken of, “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth”?

A: Because the word “Lord” represents Jehovah and not Christ.

3. In the sixth verse of this chapter, “When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, let all the angels of God worship him, but unto the Son He saith, Thy throne, O God.” (“and thou Lord” applies to himself)?

A: There are two persons referred to, “Again, He (God) bringeth the Son into the world; then let all the angels of God worship him;” whereas you make that apply to God. The other applies to God Himself, namely, “Thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the foundations of the earth.”

4. You referred to John the Baptist; you coupled John on an equality with Christ. John said that the one that cometh after me is mightier than I?

A: Messiah was higher than any apostles. He was greater than all the apostles. John acknowledged that “He that cometh after me is preferred before me” for He, Christ, was before him certainly.

5. Define the expression that “Christ was before me”

A: In God’s purpose it must have been, because John was born first.

6. How do you account for the prophetic announcement with regard to Messiah and the very words used in the 45th chapter of Isaiah, “There is no God beside me; a just God and a Saviour; the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return; that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear”? The very words used by Jehovah in this 45th chapter are clearly applied to Christ (Philippians 2:10,11).

A: Christ must reign until He hath put down the last enemy; after which Christ shall deliver up the Kingdom to the Father, when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power, that God may be all in all. At the end of the 1000 years every knee shall bow and every tongue confess, as it is written.

7. The Hebrew, in the appearance of the glory of God as ascribed in the triangular “Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord God Almighty,” and the Hebrew in the first of Genesis, clearly speaks of a plurality of persons in the creation. How do you account for the plurality of persons in the creation and the use of the threefold benediction, when the High Priest of the Jewish economy came out to bless the people; threefold ascription, all holiness to God? And then we find that John states plainly that Isaiah asserts that he saw the glory of Christ. If Christ has no pre-existence, I am wondering a little, how do you account that His glory was seen by Isaiah and that it was Elohim (plural) that created the world indicated in Genesis?

A: Here the prophet foretold the sufferings of Christ and the glory which should follow.

8. I have asked for a plain answer to the question as to the personality of the Creator in Genesis 1. It is a plurality distinctly, “Let us make man in our own image”?

A: I shall question my friend upon that presently, but will say in the meantime “Lord God,” the “Lord” represents Jehovah and “God” is Elohim and is plural, therefore we account for the plurality.

9. If you return to Zechariah 13:7 you will find there a statement I should like you to answer as to how it was fulfilled. “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts. Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered,”

A: Who was the fellow of Jehovah? The Lord Jesus Christ - and the saints are likewise. We are fellow-workers with God.

10. In Zechariah 12:10, “I will pour upon the house of David” (Jehovah is the speaker) and He says “They shall look upon me whom they have pierced.” When was the piercing of Jehovah?

A: I have not that in the passage. The passage refers to Jesus.

11. I admit the passage refers to Jesus. “I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem.” Who was the pourer?

A: Christ was pierced by the Roman soldier when He hung upon the Cross and it says in the age to come, they shall behold him. It was Christ that was wounded.

12. “I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and supplications and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced.”

A: That is a prophecy. It is not yet fulfilled. It is a prophecy concerning Christ who was pierced by the spear of the Roman soldier when they came to brake the legs of those crucified. They said concerning Him “This man is dead,” but the Roman soldier pierced His side with a spear, thereby fulfilling the prophecy, and in the age to come if He had never been pierced they could not look upon Him.

13. Then who do you admit that the speaker, the pourer is, who says, “I will pour”? Whose words are they?

A: God’s words through Christ.

14. If the actions of God, as I have said, the works of creation were ascribed to Christ: if life, if judgment, if creation, if preservation, all that we own to be divine as applying to duty exclusively, do you say that Jesus Christ, when He was born had these things given to Him?

A: No, I do not. Decidedly not. Some of the things have not been given to Him yet – the throne of His father David, for instance. “He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever.”

15. Can you give a definite time when perfect knowledge, perfect authority, perfect honour were given to Christ, because in the fifth chapter of John He stated plainly He had them?

A: Could I give a time when they were given to Christ? If ever there was a time when they were given to Christ it shows Christ was not equal to God to have been the recipient of those things.

Mr Todd questions Reverend J.O. West:-

There is just one remark I should like to make. Be it far from me to hurt the feelings of my opponent. Be it far from my mind; but I spoke as I believed to be true concerning the Athanasian Creed and I quoted Christ's words "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." I repeat it that in the eyes of the Athanasian Creed the whole world must be damned.

Chairman: It is a great temptation to enter into explanation of subject. The audience will excuse Mr. Todd in yielding to it. Mr. Todd will now keep strictly to question and answer.

16. Mr. West, do you believe God is a Spirit?

A: I do.

17. Is God substance?

A: He is not.

18. Then I say my friend is not bound by the Church's Creed which says we are not to confound the Persons. Is God a Person?

A: A Trinity of Persons in One person.

19. Now Mr West admits God is a Spirit and God is a Person. Now can you have a Spiritual Person without body, parts, passions?

A: Certainly. I believe there are spiritual forces in this room which we cannot see.

20. Is the word "Trinity" in the Bible?

A: I have told you that already.

21. Is the expression "God the Son" found in the Bible?

A: The expression "God the Son" is not found in the Bible.

22. Is the expression "God the Holy Ghost" found in the Bible?

A: No.

23. Are any of the following phrases found in the Bible? "Trinity in Unity," "Unity in Trinity," "The Triune God," and "The Eternal Son," etc.?

A: The first three are not found in the Bible but in regard to the Eternal Son I have an idea there is a passage but cannot fix it at the moment. Christ became the Author of Eternal Salvation.

24. If none of these phrases are found in the Bible does not that prove the doctrine as believed by the Church is unscriptural?

A: No.

25. How do you prove there are three persons in one God?

A: (Holding up decanter) I cannot prove there are two glasses in this water, but I am certain there are.

26. In Genesis 1:26 it is written "Let us make man..." How do you decide that this refers to three Persons?

A: I cannot decide that it refers to three Persons; but there must have been more than one or the words would not have been "Let us make man..."

27. May there have been 300, or 3,000, or 3,000,000?

A: We have no light in the Word of God in regard to that. The forming refers to the Son and the Spirit.

28. What did Christ mean when He said "If I pray to my Father He will give me twelve legions of angels"?

A: Christ was perfect man; He was perfect humanity; our humanity. As a man He hungered, as a man He was weary, as a man He wept; as a man He suffered. If He needed twelve legions of angels, the perfect humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ does not arrogate - or does not affect - the perfect glory He had as God.

29. But seeing you say there were only Christ and the Spirit in heaven, how could there have been the number of angles?

A: I have never said the angels were not there.

30. Then may there not have been more than three, seeing the word is plural?

A: I say there may have been more than three if we have the light to show; but in heaven there are orders, seraphim, principalities and powers, of which we know nothing.

31. Are we not told that the sons of God shouted for joy when God laid the foundations of the earth?

A: I believe it because He created intelligences. Originally there must have been sons of God - only sons; but we affirm Christ was in the bosom of the Father, He was the Word of the Father of whom John tells us that He was God and infinitely superior to all the sons of God spoken of.

32. Does Jesus say His Father was the only true God?

A: Yes He did.

33. Could Jesus be God if His Father was the only true God?

A: He could be God manifested in the flesh.

34. Could He be God?

A: I hold He could be.

35. Did Jesus ever claim to be God?

A: I say He was crucified because He claimed to be God.

36. Did they not crucify Him because He claimed to be the Son of God?

A: The Son of God is equal to His Father as touching His Godhead.

37. Did Jesus Christ exist as a Person before He was born of the Virgin Mary?

A: The Son of God existed as a Person before He was born.

38. Can a son be as old as his father?

A: I reply to that, that when we have the Most High and the Eternal Son, our conception of Sonship cannot be in line with the conception of what an Eternal Son is.

39. What is it to be born?

A: To begin a fresh state of existence. We are born first of our mothers and we are born again when the Holy Spirit regenerates.

40. We are speaking of a literal birth. Could Christ come into life if He was already in life?

A: Yes. He could in His human nature. God could not die, but Christ could die.

41. It is written in Hebrews that Jesus was tempted. Do you believe that?

A: Yes.

42. Could God be tempted?

A: He cannot be tempted.

43. Does not that prove that Jesus was not God?

A: It appears to me that Jesus was tempted as a man.

44. Did Jesus die?

A: Jesus did die.

45. Was Jesus God?

A: Jesus Himself, the humanity, died.

46. Was Jesus God?

A: Jesus Christ was God manifested in the flesh.

47. Did God die?

A: He could not.

48. On your own admission that God could not die and Jesus did die, does not that prove that Jesus was not God?

A: I said that the humanity of Jesus could die but the divine of Jesus could not die.

49. Which was Jesus, the humanity or divine?

A: Humanity.

50. The humanity was Jesus?

A: Human form that clothed the Son of God was Jesus. Jesus was crucified. Jesus Christ died.

51. Then you admit that the humanity was Jesus and so Jesus died. Did not Jesus deny that He was God when He said, "Why callest thou me good; there is none good but One, that is God?"

A: He did say that; but the question is, did He deny that He was God? He did not deny that He was God; He wanted to bring home a teaching.

52. I never denied Jesus was good. Did He not disclaim that He was God?

A: Not necessarily by those words.

53. Do you believe He was made in all points like unto His brethren?

A: I do.

54. How could He be if He already existed?

A: He could be made in regard to human nature.

55. You have admitted His human nature was Jesus; the divine nature clothed itself with Jesus?

A: As Jesus He was human nature. He had to be born of His mother, the Virgin Mary.

56. My friend admits that as Jesus He could not have existed before He was born?

A: I answered the question as well as I was able.

57. You simply said that there were two parts of Christ?

A: The human part could be separate from the divine.

58. Which was Christ, the human or the divine?

A: Both

59. Which was crucified, the human or the divine?

A: Both.

60. Can the divine be crucified?

A: The divine could be crucified but could not die.

61. I thought to be crucified was to die.

A: (no answer)

62. If there were two parts belonging to Jesus, the divine and the human, and only the human part could die, did Jesus die at all?

A: He handed His spirit over to God and said, "Into Thy hand I commend my spirit." Therefore when He was forsaken by God He was forsaken as a Son, offering the death of the soul of Jesus. His soul was poured out unto death, which had to take place as an offering acceptable to God. We agree upon this point that God Himself could not die. If He clothed Himself for the purpose of our salvation with human form and human soul and body, He could suffer death.

63. If Christ died, does it not prove that He was neither immortal nor omnipotent?

A: No; because Jesus as man was clothed as God and became the Son of God as a triumpher over the world, the flesh and the devil.

64. If Christ died does it not show that He was neither immortal nor omnipotent?

A: The act of death could be in the mind of God and be carried out on the Cross for God's own purpose; and He Himself accept the sacrifice of the death of Christ for our salvation and His Godhead was completely laid aside.

65. If Christ died could He be immortal or omnipotent?

A: Both

66. Can immortality die?

A: (No answer)

67. Seeing that Christ possessed at this time neither of these divine attributes, was He equal to God?

A: He could lay aside His immortality and He could lay aside His omnipotence.

Reverend J.O. West's Closing Speech:-

I am rather sorry in one sense having to defend as I have. Why have I contended for the honour of the Lord Jesus Christ in the way that I have? Shall I tell you why? Look at the sun in the heavens and as you see that sun in the heavens, supposing we have a hundred parts of heat and light coming from that sun, should I be content to have one part and not the other ninety-nine out of the hundred? Ought not I, if I can, to enjoy the full light and heat of the glorious orb when I have an opportunity? Now look at the question of my salvation: I am a traveller here on earth; I am a sinful man; I need a friend that can warm ray heart and can gladden my soul in this needy and suffering world and if I have a good Friend to rejoice over and can bask in that Friend's love and sympathy when I put my head upon my dying pillow and look ahead, I am very thankful and grateful.

Now I hold our friends the Christadelphians have sufficient Light to save in Christ. I remember asking one of them in Birmingham (Christadelphians are stronger there than here), I remember asking one who belonged to that body whether his sins were pardoned and he told me they were. We agree there is salvation in the Lord Jesus Christ; there is pardon for sin through His atoning death; and that He will be God's vicegerent here on earth as the man Christ Jesus. But when I look at the glory of Christ and think of the amazing power there is in Him, according to my interpretation of what the gospel teaches, the gospel teaches me that Christ is to have the honour of salvation and this world entirely at His feet in order that it may be His for ever.

I won't quarrel about using such terms as "God the Holy Ghost," etc. If He is God, He is God, whether you call Him the Son of God or God the Son, and therefore when I think of the honour of Christ, I don't want to look upon my Saviour as being a perfect man only, for He had an existence before He came into this world, according to the statement I have made. The names of God were given to Him, take for instance Isaiah speaking of Him, and John when he said that he himself was simply a voice declaring, "There cometh one after me mightier than I," and such a contrast between Him and me "that I am not worthy to stoop down to loose his shoe latchet." And then we find directly afterwards John saying, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." So that when I have the names of God being ascribed to Him, actions of God being ascribed to Christ, I say that St. Paul's words (1 Timothy 3:16) are perfectly acceptable to our hearts. "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness." Mr Todd has asked one of the most difficult questions. We shall have to leave such until the perfect Lord is in the world, when knowledge will be full; for now we know in part; now we see through a glass darkly. We declare that we cannot understand the doctrine of the Trinity but is it false because I cannot understand it? Mr Todd will bear with me (I don't speak this in any unkind spirit).

On the Cross the Lord Jesus Christ veiled His Godhead; He hung there, the bleeding, dying man. Verily God did atone. When I look at the doctrine of the Atonement for the sin of the world, when I think of this sacrifice of a human being, perfect human body and a human soul, sinless and spotless and perfect God;

when I think of that fountain of which Zechariah speaks, "In that day there shall be opened a fountain for uncleanness" and find the glory of God is one and the same with the glory of the Lamb, is joined with God, that every creature in heaven and earth bows down before the throne of God and the Lamb, I cannot apart from the Godhead of Jesus Christ understand that God would abrogate His right. There must have been a time when things were given, but when? The perfect knowledge, the perfect love, the perfect authority, the perfect power, that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father, if I understand that aright, means the most wondrous person who ever trod this earth. Was there ever so remarkable a murder, so wonderful a victim that ever poured out His soul, His life, on behalf of others? He did pour out His soul unto death. The Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ was the altar upon which the manhood was sacrificed, so that the dignity of the person of Christ renders His salvation open to the vilest, to the poorest, to the most needy, to all sorts the wide world over, because He is able to save to the uttermost. "Christ is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him."

There is also this thought; did the Father when He gave all power, all judgment, all knowledge, all life - did He abnegate? Did He hand it over to Christ and lose it Himself? He could not do it. When He handed it to an equal; when He gave perfect knowledge, perfect power, perfect authority to His Son, He imparted that of which He lost nothing Himself.

There is another thought and it is this; I see throughout the whole of the Scriptures that salvation is a direct act of God, how that we are told "The Lord is my light, and my salvation; the Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid?" (Psalm 27:1). In that day thou shalt say "I will praise Thee though Thou wast angry with me: thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortest me. Behold, God is my salvation." Did the Lord Jesus Christ become the Saviour of men after His death upon the Cross? He was declared to be the Son of God with power by the rising from the dead. Has God then, handed over His sovereign power into the hands of an inferior? If the Son is inferior to the Father, the Father has handed Him the glory of His majesty.

As to The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world and "The glory which I had with Thee before the world was," I cannot see how that the thought of the Lamb slain should affect the glory. We know that the Lamb was slain at a definite point of time. We haven't a definite point of time with reference to the glory, because it carries us back into the ages of eternity. It is because, to me, Christ has been these forty years the precious Saviour of my soul, I bow before Him. "All hail the power of Jesus' Name." What power? God's power to save all those who look unto Him.

Mr. Todd's Closing Speech:-

In the reply Mr West has just made, first of all he tried to evade the subject at issue and spoke to you about the glory that Christ is to have in the age to come. We, that is, I am in perfect agreement, Christ is coming; He will take unto Himself His great power and reign and subdue all things unto Himself and finally He will deliver over the Kingdom to God, that God may be all in all (1 Corinthians 15:25,28).

Mr West says that if Christ was a mere man, God has appointed one inferior to Himself. Did not Jesus confirm that when He said "My Father is greater than I"? Now we submit to your notice how is it possible to have two equals if the one said "My Father is greater than I"?

Mr West spoke to you about my referring to John and that Christ was a greater personage than John. Certainly Christ was greater than John, but they were both sent of God. Christ was greater than John because John was a mere Apostle but Christ was a Son and more than a Son, He was the only begotten Son (Matthew 17:15). God has thousands of sons and daughters but they are all sons and daughters by adoption; but Christ alone is Son by begettal, as it is written "Thou art my only begotten Son, in whom I am well pleased." (Matthew 3:17, Acts 13:33). Therefore Christ was greater than John, decidedly, because Christ was God's Son and John was not.

We wish to point out that Christ was anointed of God, as it is written, "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power, who went about doing good." (Acts 10:38). Jesus received all things from God when He said, "All power in heaven and earth is given unto me" (Matthew 28:18). Jesus was raised up of God; God raised Him from the dead; He was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father

(Romans 6:4) and so throughout the Bible you will find that whatever Christ said, whatever He did, God was responsible (John 12:49), "The works that I do are not mine own, but the Father who sent me. He doeth the works."

My friend seemed to prove, or tried to prove that because we have the personal pronoun "He" that Christ pre-existed, or that the Holy Spirit is a person. Now we say throughout the whole of the Bible there are many things personified which are not persons. There are mountains, wisdom, waters, riches and trees, all of which are not persons, but still personified and when Peter was cast into prison and he was liberated by the angel, when he had passed the first and second ward, he came to an iron gate which "opened unto him of his own accord" (Acts 12:10). Here is an iron gate personified. So that we see that because the personal pronoun is used there is no reason why the Holy Spirit should be a person. We read they laid their hands upon them and they received the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:17). I wonder if they received a person? In the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, it says, "when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind and it sat upon each of them." I wonder if that was a person? If so, how could one person sit upon over 100 people at one time? Simon, when he saw that by the laying on of hands the Holy Spirit was given, he said, "Give me also of this power" (Acts 8:19). Mark you "this power" and not a person; but the apostle answered, "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; thine heart is not right in the sight of God,"

Now my friends, we have submitted to you some plain, simple, understandable statements from the whole of the Scriptures. They are plain statements that a child can understand, as unlike the mysterious, incomprehensible doctrine of the Trinity, as white is unlike black. God has never given us a creed like that; if so, we should all be damned. We cannot understand it, and yet it is plainly stated, "This is life eternal to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (John 17:3). Can we know what we cannot comprehend? And can we comprehend that which we cannot know? Therefore, there is no man or woman who can comprehend or know the God of the Athanasian Creed; and in the light of it there is no hope for humanity. But when Jesus, as our Guide, says, "My Father is the only true God, and in Him there is life," let us then my dear friends, turn away, turn our backs upon this mysterious, bewildering, confounding doctrine, for the plain, simple, childlike teaching of the Word of God.

Let us keep to the Scriptures. The Jews, to whom was given the oracles of God, they had the law of God with them over 3,000 years; the prophets for 2,000 years, and not a Jew ever believed in the Trinity. Would not the Jews, who were the custodians of the Holy Word, know more about the Holy Scriptures than St. Athanasius who lived about the fourth century? The Jews to a man did not believe in the Trinity for the simple reason that all through their history, the prophets - all the prophets - laboured to teach them there is one God and one alone. My earnest and sincere prayer for you, my friends, is this, that you will turn from vain tradition to the Holy Scriptures, and read therein for yourselves, for they are able to make you wise unto salvation.

* * *

Mr Todd then proposed a vote of thanks of the meeting to be given to the Chairman.
Mr West seconded it amid applause, and the proceedings terminated-

(The above debate is taken from a Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter dated June 1957)

“LIFE AND DEATH”

INTRODUCTION

The two Greek words *psuche* and *zoe* are both translated "life" in the New Testament and the article which follows has been written to show how they differ and how each should be understood.

For many years I have been aware of the meanings of these two words but found what I thought was a contradiction and didn't spend any more time sorting out the problem.

So when writing in C.L.174, page 3, I said;- "It is my opinion that our second birth took place when we were convinced of the need for baptism and at baptism we died to Adam and rose to newness of life..." I knew this newness of life was our *zoe* life, or our life in Jesus Christ. Then in C.L.177, page 27, I wrote:- "The idea that if Jesus gave His life for ours then He should not have risen and we ought not to die, is easily refuted, for it was Jesus natural life which He laid down... He was raised to spirit life," I knew it was Jesus natural, or *psuche* life which He laid down and took not again, and it was His spirit or *zoe* life to which He was raised. And again, in C.L.181, page 24, I wrote:- "What was it that Christ paid? It was His life - life in the blood which He shed on Calvary," this was His *psuche* or natural life - life in the blood.

So then *psuche* is our natural life and *zoe* is our spirit life or life in Jesus, but the problem I imagined arose in two or three passages such as 1 Corinthians 15:19 - "If in this life only we have hope..." surely we would expect this to be *psuche* or natural life, but it isn't; Paul used the word *zoe*. Again in James 4:14 we read "Whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapour that appeareth for a little while, and then vanisheth away." Here, James is not referring to our natural life for the word he uses for life is not *psuche* but *zoe*, our life in Christ. Another is from Luke 1:75 "All the days of our life." The word for life is again *zoe*.

It was my loss not spending more time sorting out this subject, and now I am most grateful to Brother Douglas McKinlay for sending me his treatise on "Life and Death." I am sure anyone following his article will see there is no problem and that the word *zoe* is the obvious one in each of these three quotations and more than this, for my part, I feel I have a better understanding of the whole plan and purpose of God.

Russell.

* * *

LIFE AND DEATH

The Scripture speaks of at least three different conceptions of death, and these express important and fundamental truths that may be overlooked if these differences are not recognized and failure to distinguish between them leads to confusion and contradiction.

For life, the Bible employs two different words in both the Old and the New Testaments, These differences are likewise lost in the English translation yet are crucial to our understanding as we seek to determine the details that surround and open up the Bible teaching of the Atonement.

In the Old Testament we have -

- a) *nephesh*, which relates to our natural life. This same word is also translated soul; and
- b) *chay*, which refers to the life of God given to those who are His.

In the New Testament we have -

- c) *psuche*, which is equivalent to the Old Testament *nephesh*, and
- d) *zoe*, which is equivalent to Old Testament *chay*.

In Genesis 2:7 we read that "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (*chay*); and man became a living soul (*chay nephesh*)." We see then that from the beginning Adam had not only his natural life but also life which God gives to his children - the *chay* life, equivalent to the New Testament *zoe* life.

All life is a gift from God as Job recognized for we read in Job 12:10 Job answered "In whose hand is the soul (*nephesh*) of every living (*chay*) thing, and the breath of all mankind." While in the Acts of the

Apostles, 17:28, Paul tells us, “For in him we live (*zao*) and move and have our being; as certain also of your prophets have said, for we are also his offspring,”

The portion of *nephesh/psuche* life that natural man has been granted is activated by the blood - “For the life (*nephesh*) of the flesh is in the blood and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement” (Leviticus 17:11), but *chay/zoe* life is activated by the Spirit - “Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God... born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God” (John 3:3-5). “God hath given us eternal life (*zoe*) and this life is in his Son.” (1 John 5:11).

Man can pass on *nephesh/psuche* life to his progeny, but only God grants *chay/zoe* life. Examples of this are found in Psalm 66:9, God “which holdeth our soul (*nephesh*) in life (*chay*),” and Acts 20:10, of the man who fell from the third loft and was taken up dead, “Paul... embracing him said, trouble not yourselves, for his life (*psuche*) is in him.” However, when man’s allotted time comes both his *chay/zoe* life and his *nephesh/psuche* life expire. “Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it.” (Ecclesiastes 12:7).

Zoe is that fullness of life that those in Christ have now and it is held in trust by Jesus - “He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life (*zoe*) and shall not come into condemnation” (John 5:24). “Ye are dead and your life (*zoe*) is hid with God” (Colossians 3:3). Our *zoe* life is written in the Book of Life to be revealed in all its fullness at the return and revelation of our Lord, “for he is not the God of the dead, but of the living (*zao*); for all (the quick and the dead) live unto him.” (Luke 20:38).

By implication this portion of life (*chay*) was made known in the promises made to the fathers and was made manifest in Jesus Christ - John 1:4, “In him was life (*zoe*); and the life (*zoe*) was the light of men.” Again, 2 Timothy 1:10, “Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death (as wages for sin) and hath brought life (*zoe*) and immortality to light.”

The principle conceptions of death used in the Bible are:

a) Natural death which is the end of a corruptible body, as for example Ecclesiastes 3:19,20, “For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth so dieth the other; yea they have all one breath.” Again in chapter 9 verse 2, “there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked.”

b) Spiritual death. While a) above is the end of life for the natural person, many are also dead while they live as Jesus confirmed when He said, “Let the dead bury their dead” - Luke 9:60. Again, Paul in writing to Timothy (1 Timothy 5:6), said, “But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth.”

c) Judicial death, as being put to death for law-breaking, the death by sin, as for example, “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” In the Old Testament we have the example of Koran, Dathan and Abiram, of whom Moses said, “If these men die the common death of all men, or if they be visited after the visitation of all men: then the Lord hath not sent me” - Numbers 16:29. This typifies the second death which those who have known God and rejected Him will suffer. Again in Romans 1:32, “Who, knowing the judgment of God that they which commit such things are worthy of death, and not only do the same, but take pleasure in them that do them.”

But God is merciful and we can be forgiven our sins as was David - 2 Samuel 12:13, “And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord, And Nathan said unto David, The Lord also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die.” David did die a natural death of course, so it was judicial death which was his due, for under the Law of Moses he ought to have been stoned to death, but this death he did not die. In God’s mercy his life was spared and his fellowship with his Maker was restored.

So we come to the New Testament and read in 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 (*zoe*).”

Jesus was appointed of God to be the perfect antitypical offering - the substance to the various shadow offerings under the Law. A Lamb without spot or blemish. "For this cause came I into the world and for this cause was I born." "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" - John 1:29. John says "in him is no sin" (1 John 3:5). Peter says "He did no sin" (1 Peter 2:22). Paul says "He knew no sin" (2 Corinthians 5:21). The writer to the Hebrews says "He was apart from sin." In short, Jesus was that Holy thing born of the Virgin Mary to be called the Son of God (Luke 1:35). Because of His Paternity He was empowered to do for us that which we, because of our paternity, were without power to do for ourselves - that was, to reconcile us to God. Romans 5:6,10, "For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."

This was foretold in Psalm 80:17, "Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the son of man, whom thou madest strong for thyself" and confirmed by Paul in 2 Corinthians 8:9, "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich."

So we see Jesus Christ dying the judicial death, the death for sin, "the Just for the unjust that he might bring us to God" (1 Peter 3:18).

Jesus died the wages of sin for me. Romans 6:10, "For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." For had He not died so that by the grace of God I might share in that death unto sin through the symbolism of baptism, then I would have to die the judicial death for myself. Hebrews 2:9, "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." 2 Corinthians 5:14,15, "For the love of God constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all then were all dead."

The fundamental difference between receiving the reward of either life or death forms the basis of and the justification for the two sovereign laws under which mankind live out their responsibility to their Creator.

- 1) The Law of Sin and Death defines the condemnation of Romans 5.
- 2) The Law of the Spirit of Life in Jesus Christ defines the Justification of Romans 5.

In Jesus there was life (*zoe*). Being born by direct begetting from the Father left Him untouched by the condemnation. In that sense He was from above, while we, born of blood by the will of man were from beneath - John 8:23, "And he said unto them, ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world; I am not of this world."

We see from Romans 5:12 that in man there was judicial death - "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; so death passed upon all men, for that (margin - in whom) all have sinned."

In the words of the Old Testament parable - 2 Samuel 14:14, "For we must needs die, and are as water spilt upon the ground, which cannot be gathered up again; neither doth God respect any person: yet doth he devise means, that his banished be not expelled from him," we see Jesus as the means devised by God that we may be gathered to Him.

Though being physically the same as us and being subject to temptation as unto God's law yet Jesus was so very different. John 1:18, being, "the only begotten son, which is in the bosom of the Father" He was always the beloved Son and needed not to be brought nigh and be reconciled to God. We were afar off and needed to be brought nigh and be reconciled. He was strong - Psalm 80:17, "Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the son of man whom thou hast made strong for thyself," while "we were yet without strength," yet "in due time Christ died for the ungodly." Jesus was the Redeemer, we the redeemed. All of these differences and His willingness to use them to do the will of His Father allowed Jesus to do for us that which we were without strength to do for ourselves. Had there been no difference, Jesus would have had the same need as ourselves - to be reconciled to God. Redeemed means to buy back. Jesus, by His sacrificial life bought us back from the slave-master Sin unto whom our forefather Adam had sold us - 1 Corinthians 6:20, "For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." Again 1 Peter 1:18, "Forasmuch as ye know ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver

and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ.”

Matthew 20:28:- “Even as the son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.”

We might well ask which of these deaths did Paul have in mind when he said “Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures” (1 Corinthians 15:3). The Scriptures which Paul was appealing to would be the Old Testament and the most explicit of these would have been Isaiah 53:10-12, “Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him... when he shall make his soul an offering for sin... he shall bear their iniquities... because he poured out his soul unto death.”

Let’s ask and answer the question, What life did Jesus sacrifice to buy back and so reconcile us to God? It is Jesus who supplies us with the answer - John 10:11-17, “I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life (*psuche*) for the sheep.” This then answers another question: It has been said that if Jesus paid the debt owing by man (judicial death) - Matthew 18:27:- “Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him and forgave the debt” - then He could not rise again without destroying the analogy. But Jesus rose in all the fullness of His *zoe* life, leaving the remnants of His *psuche* life in the tomb - “Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life (*zoe*)” (Romans 6:4).

“...this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son hath the witness in himself---” 1 John 5:9-11.

“That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death.” Philippians 3:10.

Now if we can accept this we are able to be renewed in the Spirit of our mind and have our focus shifted from being poor weak creatures of the dust to being accepted in Jesus, the beloved - Ephesians 1:6:- “To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved.” “He that doeth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought of God” (John 3:21.)

“I can do all things through Jesus Christ which strengtheneth me” Philippians 4:13. John 8:32-36:- “And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free... whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin and the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever. If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.”

Thus having our doubts and uncertainties replaced by the conviction that sustained the Apostle - 2 Timothy 4:8 - “Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing.”

“Fear not little flock, for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.” Luke 12:32.

And be able to answer our Lord’s question, “Believest thou this? Yea Lord, I believe,” we might add, “help thou mine unbelief.”

“Look to yourselves that we lose not those things that we have gained (margin) but that we receive a full reward.” 2 John 8.

Brother Douglas McKinlay