

Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 189

May/June 2001

In this Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2	Appendix to "Jesus, The True Substitute for Adam's Penalty of Death by Sin"	Brother Phil Parry
Page 6	Our Relationship To The State	Brother Douglas McKinlay
Page 12	Romans 7	Brother Fred Pearce
Page 20	Continuing our Correspondence with the Editor of The Logos magazine	Brother Graeham Mansfield
Page 20	Reply	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 22	2nd Reply	Brother Phil Parry
Page 25	"TO THE POINT"	Brother Robert Roberts
Page 26	"Thus it Becometh us to Fulfil All Righteousness"	Brother Eric Cave
Page 27	"The Atonement" X-Rayed (3rd instalment)	Brother A.L. Wilson

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Friends, Loving Greetings

It is easy to understand the words Elijah spoke when feeling he was the only believer and servant of God alive in the world "...and I even I only am left." The earth must have seemed to him then much as it does to us now, a place full of Godless self interested unbelievers. But the Lord God told Elijah there were in fact seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal. We cannot know how many people belong to God in our time. I suspect there are more than we think. Yet as we view the scene particularly through the various media available to us, it is difficult not to feel deeply pessimistic about the human race alive in the earth now.

I was pleasantly surprised therefore to read several excellent pieces that appeared in the press before and during the recent Easter weekend. Pieces by writers that professed a joy in the belief in the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ the Messiah.

One piece was prompted by the three part television programme called the Son of God. The writer remarked how small a stir was created when the reporter in the programme claimed to have reconstructed the face of Christ and he compared it with the mighty stir that would have occurred if the bones of Christ had been unearthed- If Jesus' bones had been found the writer thought there would still be a case for Christianity as a cultural artefact, as a matchless fount of history, government, charity, art and civilization. What though would be the point of it? If Jesus didn't rise from the dead, He was simply a good man and a wise teacher. But the story of Judaism is full of fine people and it would surely be unbearable to worship one on the basis of a lie. The world turns on the truth of the Resurrection. The heart of the Easter celebration is that a man dies upon a cross but His tomb is found empty. Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those that have fallen asleep. "For as by one man came death, by a man has also come the resurrection of the dead."

In the same publication I read another piece by a reporter who witnessed what he called a "strange event" in Parliament during Prime Minister's Questions before the Easter recess. Evidently the Reverend Ian Paisley challenged Mr Blair to call a national day of prayer to give the people an opportunity to confide in 'their Sovereign God' at this critical moment in the farming emergency. This produced, as you would expect, an outbreak of giggles among the arrogant and irreligious persons present. The reporter remarked that it was heartening to hear a clap of fundamentalist thunder in the very temple of equivocation and spin. It appears that the Church is now so far out of touch with public sentiment that the mere mention of Almighty

God - even in Parliament - evokes a mirthful snigger. Having observed this unedifying spectacle the reporter decided, via the magazine he worked for, to poll every diocese in England to pose a fundamentalist question: - Does the Bishop believe in the physical resurrection of Christ?

He found that the poll elicited quite a range of responses. Bafflement, suspicion, hilarity, evasiveness. The Bishop of Lincoln said 'The answer is yes.' A posh sounding gent in Newcastle replied 'Yes is the answer.' 'You believe in the actual physical literal resurrection, do you?' 'Yes' 'Is that the Bishop?' 'YES!' At Ely a giggling woman said on behalf of the Bishop of St Albans 'Yes, of course he does.' 'So he believes in the physical resurrection?' 'What other sort is there?' The Bishop of St Albans answered 'An unqualified yes. And I can make out a good case too.' The Bishop of Leicester was also a firm yes, though he had an interesting view of the distinction between our Saviour's form before and after He died. 'It was widely believed that He had physically risen, but at first He wasn't recognised, so He wasn't quite the same. For instance He could walk through doors. I believe there was a physical resurrection, but He had changed in some way.' The Archbishop of York's media adviser emailed a press release. 'The Archbishop believes that the physical body of our Lord was raised from the dead and that it assumed a spiritual form.' From the Bishop of Rochester came this: The experience of the disciples was not just mental or spiritual. It was an experience of an embodied being.' The Bishop of Liverpool was certain and cogent with 'I believe in the physical resurrection of Jesus for both historical and theological reasons. The fact that Jesus appeared to over 500 people at one time shows that it was not a subjective but an objective experience. The fact that God raised Jesus bodily shows that matter matters to God and the material world is as important, as the spiritual.' And finally the head man himself, the Archbishop of Canterbury, 'Jesus Christ is risen. That is a fact. Does that answer your query?'

11 Bishops failed to answer repeated calls made by the reporter. The dioceses where the Bishops', as far as could be ascertained believed in a physical resurrection, were Blackburn, Carlisle, Canterbury, Chester, Coventry, Doncaster, Durham, Ely, Leicester, Lichfield, Lincoln, Liverpool, Newcastle, Rochester, St Albans, Sheffield, Truro, Wakefield, Winchester, and Worcester.

More 'subtle' positions appeared to be held by the Bishops of Bath and Wells, Bristol, St Edmundsbury and Ipswich, and York. Those who refused to answer included Bradford, Oxford and Southwell.

It was news to me that there were so many bishops in the country to be asked such a question and it is also interesting to note that it seems that 75% say that they believe in a physical resurrection while 25% say maybe.

May the Lord whose hand is gracious to those who seek Him be merciful to us all.

Love from Helen Brady.

APPENDIX TO "JESUS, THE TRUE SUBSTITUTE FOR ADAM'S PENALTY OF DEATH BY SIN"

It must be noted that the knowledge and understanding of the truth of the Gospel at this present time must harmonise with what Jesus and His Apostles taught on the basis of the Old Testament Scriptures inspired by holy men of God - the prophets of Israel. It is also said by certain people that what St. Paul feared would happen after his decease did gradually take place. Grievous wolves entering into the church not sparing the flock and turning it away from the Truth. In other words, apostate doctrine changing the truth into a lie, darkness prevailing instead of Light.

I have been led to understand that a certain sincere man revived this Truth from the darkness of Apostate error, this being so I think it may be profitable to quote from some of his writing by reason that I was amazed that another man professing to hold the same views, actually wrote the very opposite of this man's views on a certain subject at least.

Chapter one and verse 1 of Genesis speaks of Light being essential to life in the natural order of things. Light from doctrinal darkness of Apostasy is also essential to a knowledge and understanding of the Truth concerning God's Creation and purpose with man. The following is the result of studying the work of Creation recorded in Genesis for our own benefit making it clear that the heavens and the earth were created in the beginning, but that through some intervention by the Creator the earth had become void and without form, and darkness was upon the face of the waters which covered it. Light was now necessary and work began through the power and Spirit of the Creator.

I now quote from the writings of the first man I mentioned earlier:-

“Our terrestrial system before the fall” - “Death and corruption then is the fundamental Law of the six days; seasons of decay and death were institutions existing before the fall. Adam and Eve and all the other animals born of the earth with themselves, would have died and gone to corruption if there had been no further interference with the physical system than Moses records in the history of the six days.”

I find this completely in harmony with other Scriptures but sadly the writer goes on to confuse and contradict himself; so what happened to the Truth he is said to have revived from the darkness of Apostasy? It amounts to no more than a little of it here and there which was always the case but was not the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

(The man I have quoted was John Thomas MD. Author of “Elpis Israel”).

Keeping in mind then his true statement that decay and death were institutions existing before the fall, and noting that disobedience brought the penalty of death “Surely die,” in the day of eating the forbidden fruit, should he not have realized from what God pronounced would be the penalty for sin, that Adam's natural life must be ended there and then unless God found a just and merciful way out of the situation; for how could God's institution of decay and death be made a penalty for disobedience when it was already in existence before sin entered? Dr. Thomas agrees that there was no interference with the physical flesh of Adam after he sinned, he has written to that effect yet was trapped by a dilemma of his own making and statement of truth about the terrestrial system. He was forced to alter the Divine edict to Adam with a statement of his own rather than accept that God could change His mind if a just and merciful way out could be found. He then says that the sentence was that Adam was prevented from eating of the Tree of life so that his nature should take its course of 930 years; he did not even consider God's “substitute” to prevent inflicted death in the day (24 hours) of eating. He also wrote, “It required no change for the infliction of the penalty, left to himself as God had made him he would have returned to the ground.” In this he was mistaken - the penalty was neither “prevention from the Tree of Life” nor “left to himself as God had made him.” It was judicial death in the taking away of his life in the blood in the day of eating of the forbidden tree as God declared to Adam.

Surprisingly, the man who supposedly in 1854 got the Truth from Dr. Thomas's works, does not agree with him on this subject at least. But before I show where he is in opposition, I will quote his words from the inside cover of a booklet entitled “Eureka at a Glance,” by E.H.V. Williams and Frederick Bilton:

“I got the Truth from reading Dr. Thomas's works 15 years ago. That event put me on the track of Bible study, which I have ever since followed. I discovered nothing for myself. There was nothing to discover. Having fallen in with the Truth I early felt impressed with the duty of disseminating it, and my efforts in this direction have succeeded to an extent I never dreamt of.

But the first cause as far as human agency was concerned was Dr. Thomas, whom I hope to see before many hours have gone.

All things are of God, but the actual relation of things established through human agency is not to be ignored.” - R. Roberts in 1869.

How strange and incredible therefore that this very man who declares he got the Truth from reading Dr. Thomas's works should write the following in his own book "The Visible Hand of God," p.p. 19,20: "It required what men called a miracle to depress to the level of the beasts that perish the noble creature made in the image of the Elohim." (= the penalty for sin?)

Now hear Dr Thomas, "Seeing that man (Adam) had become a transgressor of Divine Law, there was no need of a miracle for the infliction of death" - "Eureka" vol.1 page 248. This is consistent with what I first quoted from Dr. Thomas. What then had Robert Roberts discovered when he already said "there was nothing to discover"? And how could he decide to disseminate (to sow, to spread abroad, to scatter) a doctrine of Dr. Thomas's which was in opposition to what he was propagating in his own book? How true those concluding words: "All things are of God, but the actual relation of things established through human agency is not to be ignored"!

I say to the worshippers of these two men, if "all things are of God," for indeed they are, why have you settled for the confusion of doctrine they have been responsible for, instead of listening or reading the doctrine presented to you from God even if it be through human agency under Spirit Guidance?

It is freedom from under the Law of Sin and Death men require for salvation and Eternal Life. Dr. Thomas has rightly said, "Passing through the grave cleanses no one." This is also true of those who believe the flesh to be physically condemned and physically unclean yet think their immersion in water nullifies their position, when in fact they rise from the water in that same condemned flesh inhabited (they believe) by sin.

Such error and false theories have evolved from the teaching of R.Roberts in his lecture "The Slain Lamb" where he writes:

"If there had been a Jew who had kept the law in all things, having done the will of the Father from the very beginning of life to the end of it, he would have been in the very position of the Lord Jesus Himself, it would have been in his power, by dying, to cleanse himself from the Adamic condemnation, and his righteousness would have caused his resurrection from the dead."

What a display of scriptural ignorance and falsehood! I give God praise for His Light out of such darkness, and gross darkness indeed! Is it too late to learn the Truth? Where is the true reason for Christ's sacrificial death here, and for Baptism into it if such a symbolic death has no relation to physical condemnation of the flesh? It is absolutely invalid, and ye are yet in your sins.

The baptism by belief into the substitutional death of the Lord Jesus Christ is the only hope of salvation. To reject it is to reject the One who provided Him for that purpose. God sent not His Son to condemn flesh or to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved.

I know of no other people who reject this more than any other denomination than the supporters of the Christadelphian B.A.S.F., their two pioneers and subsequent teachers and leaders.

The Apostle Paul declared, "If there had been a law given which could have given life, then verily righteousness should have been by the law." Robert Roberts said there was such a law for righteousness for a Jew, as I have quoted, I now quote Paul again, "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." In effect R.Roberts admits Jesus kept the Law in all things, and I venture to add that nowhere does the Law say a person's death is a part or ingredient of the obedience to it. But here Paul is speaking of righteousness being imputed through the death of Christ to those for whom He willingly died, Christ having pleased his Father from His birth till the offering of Himself to His Father as a free-will offering that God might offer Him up to the violated Edenic Law, to redeem Adam and all imputed sinners in his loins, their redemption being through the shedding of His blood, the Just for the unjust.

Jesus speaks of righteous Abel - Matthew 23:35 and Luke 11:50,51. If then Abel together with all men, was constituted a sinner in Adam, how did he obtain such a merited title "Righteous Abel"? Was not the Edenic Law of sin and death imputed to him also?

Paul teaches that it certainly was and explains the way out of this position through the Grace of God in Christ and not by works in the first place, reconciliation to God being necessary before any service to Him could be imputed for righteousness. We cannot ignore Paul's teaching in Romans 5:17, "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ."

This is the only way Abel could be constituted righteous by his faith and acknowledgement that the lamb slain in Eden was a typical covering for Adam's sin and the only way of reconciliation to God and to live in newness of life then, and hope of a better life to come.

Was not Abel's offering confirmation of the fact that without the Lamb of God he could not be constituted righteous nor justified? Was not his offering a more excellent sacrifice than Cain's, God testifying to the fact that it bore witness to the shedding of blood in the place of Adam's? And also by this he being dead was reckoned to live and to speak? ("Thy brother's blood crieth to me from the ground"). There can be no doubt that Abel had been taught about Adam and Eve's experiences and the true meaning of their redemption and release from Judicial, inflicted death through the provisional lamb and who it foreshadowed. In what other way would blood offerings have any significance or meaning especially for the Apostle John who declared Cain's works to be evil and Abel's good? - 1 John 3:12. Abel's offering was a firstling of his flock with the fat thereof, proof that it was slain, while Cain's offering involved no blood - Genesis 3:3. Incidentally, it was not the ground that was cursed for Cain's sake but it was the ground which received Abel's blood which cursed Cain. We must also understand that Abel's offering was not for sin, but in acknowledgement that he was alive due to the lamb slain in Eden, and I would think the same could be said for those which Noah and Abraham offered; had they been for sin the Lord would not have smelted a sweet savour - Genesis 8:20,21. Neither Abel nor Jesus were ever under Adamic condemned nature as taught by Robert Roberts. The position of Abel at birth was an imputed legal state from which it was possible to be released. Jesus was not in that position, He was the Son of God free-born and able to release all who accepted His death as the Ransom price for freedom from the Law of Sin and Death, His righteousness was from birth to His sitting at the Right-hand of God. Therefore imputed righteousness cannot be compared or equated with the personal righteousness of Christ. This is where Christadelphianism has failed miserably.

After the decease of John Thomas whom they claim to have revived in 1848 the Apostolic doctrine and faith of the first century (which is not true but is an introduction of new theories of condemned physical flesh resulting from the transgression of Adam with added theories unsupported by the Scriptures), their basis for fellowship is founded upon these and other added theories of Robert Roberts by whose dictatorial methods and unscrupulous use of the Scriptures they were brought into bondage. What further example of his stupidity do you need than what I quoted, that Jesus who was the free-born Son of God of our nature was sinless and righteous from the beginning of His life to the end did not qualify for everlasting life until by death He destroyed the very nature in which He had by conduct obtained the title of "The Lord our Righteousness."?

I acknowledge that once I was blind, but now I see, and it is due to the Love and Mercy of God and taking heed unto His Word, not that of men who interpret it according to their biased traditions. Some may not like the tone of this letter, yet the Psalmist said God's Words were sweet unto his taste and true. Judge whether therefore I have spoken truth or falsehood. Jesus through the Grace of God, tasted death for every man. Belief and Baptism removes any taste of it for those who understand true substitution. Reject this fact and all that remains is "the second death."

In conclusion let us analyse the statement Robert Roberts made in his lecture "The Slain Lamb" about the possibility of a Jew keeping the Law of Moses in all things, having done the will of the Father from the very beginning of life to the end of it would be in the very position of the Lord Jesus Himself; it would be in his power, by dying to cleanse himself from the Adamic condemnation, and his righteousness would have caused his resurrection from the dead:

This is putting the cart before the horse. No one apart from Jesus at birth, could be in a position to serve God or approach unto Him under Adamic condemnation; reconciliation comes first and as Paul said, "If righteousness come by the Law then Christ died in vain," And what of this dying business? For it is a physical death he is talking about and condemnation of physical Adamic flesh, which doctrine is alien to

Holy Writ. Even the wise man of Proverbs 12:28 knew better than R.Roberts by being in harmony with the teaching of Jesus which had nothing to do with physical condemned flesh doctrine but the acquisition by faith of the present position and status of everlasting life and in the event of falling asleep, awaiting to be raised up of Jesus at the last day - John 6:47, 54 & 40. And what of the quickening power of His word - John 5:21 & 24? I now quote Proverbs 12:28, "In the way of righteousness is life; and in the pathway thereof there is no death." Roberts has said the opposite, therefore I implore all whom it concerns, to refuse his condemned Slain Lamb and accept the Slain Lamb of God from the foundation of the world while there is time and opportunity. See Galatians 2:19 to 21 which should commence and read: For I through the law of the spirit of life in Christ, am dead to the law of sin and death, Mosaic and Edenic. Also verses 20 & 21.

Brother P. Parry

Our Relationship To The State

We today live in a world that is far removed from the one in which our Lord and His followers lived some 2000 years ago. The sophisticated control governments seek to, and do impose upon their citizens threatens to become all pervasive. The danger for those whose loyalty has been committed to that other King, one Jesus is in the insidious nature of its imposition. Exodus 23:33. It will surely become a snare. The Bible I believe speaks of this as a snare. Luke 21:35, Proverbs 29:25. The basic challenge to the followers of Jesus however, is I believe, the same to-day as it was then. It is one of ownership. Whose we are and whom do we serve, for no man can serve two masters because their demands or allegiances will ultimately clash. The apostle stated this equation in Romans 6:16.

The question arises in the context of our heading. Can we determine precisely and scripturally our responsibility to the State in which we live, particularly in times of crisis when the State would mobilize its citizens to protect its national security.

I would suggest that the first step and the essential step in doing this is to firstly and rightly and scripturally determine our responsibility to our God. When we do this we find that the national security of any particular State is none of our business and we cannot allow ourselves to be mobilized as one of theirs to protect that which God is ultimately going to destroy. (Revelation 18:4). For the very good reason that we are no longer our own and therefore do not have the option to give that which we do not possess. (1 Corinthians 6:19,20).

When an apostle wanted to instruct and protect his readers from the dangers that could distract them in their walk unto the Kingdom he drew upon the example and type of Israel. Their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt and their probationary journey through the wilderness were experiences that must be duplicated in our deliverance from the bondage of sin and death. (1 Corinthians 10:12). We shall use this precedent when we examine Israel's favour and fortune as we seek lessons for ourselves.

Another point of reference is our Master's parable of the Good Shepherd, - John 10:4,5. This parable of our Lord suggests two questions within the context of our title:

- 1) How did Jesus go before His sheep? And the answer is in John 15:18 - 20.
- 2) Who are the strangers whose voice the sheep do not know and will not follow?

To answer number 2 we shall call upon Paul's letter to the Ephesians, chapter 2. When we belonged to the land of our birth as their citizens we were without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ (having died and been reborn from above) the position is reversed. We are no longer the strangers and foreigners from the commonwealth of Israel but fellow-citizens with the saints... and the Gentile powers that be of the land of our birth become the strangers who we will no longer follow.

Our citizenship is now in heaven - our names written in the Lamb's Book of Life. While the stranger's citizenship and allegiance is in and to the land of their birth and their names written in the earth. (Jeremiah 17:13).

Let us now return to the type of Israel and let the apostle Peter lead us to it. 1 Peter 2:9, Peter is here speaking of such as you and I, citizens of an international community, a new creation created In Christ Jesus from out of every nation, kindred and tongue. 1 Peter 1:18,19.

Redeemed means to buy back. Dr Bullingers Lexicon - "to release for a ransom."

Having briefly established our true standing before God, Peter now uses the very terms to the redeemed that once was the opportunity exclusive to Israel. The point that I wish to emphasize is that if Peter could and did use those terms that once were exclusive to national Israel of the Old Testament and apply them to Spiritual Israel of the New Testament, surely then it is right and proper to go to the Old Testament and see the responsibilities that such favour imposed upon them. Then after we have done that we can and must accept Peter's application of such favour to ourselves - but we shall also know and accept the responsibilities which that favour obligates upon ourselves. We cannot or should not claim the favour and ignore the responsibilities.

Let's begin our investigation with Exodus 8:1, "Let my people go that they may serve me... Verse 28, I will put a division (redemption) between my people and thy people. Exodus 15:9, Pharaoh seeks to repossess (margin) them. Exodus 15:16, God had purchased them. Exodus 19:5,6.

As the priests represented God to the nation, so in the purpose of their selection and opportunity, the nation should represent God to their neighbours - Jeremiah 13:11. Their fortune has meant the obligation has been passed on to us. (Matthew 5:14-16).

We shall now look at some of the obligations such purpose imposed upon Israel and by implication imposes upon us:

They were not to be reckoned among the nations - Numbers 23:9

They should be separated from all people - Exodus 33:1-6.

They were to be a special people unto God - Deuteronomy 7:6.

They were to make no covenant with their neighbours, lest it be a snare - Exodus 23:32,33.

They must not return unto the country from whence they came out - Hebrews 11:13- 15.

The point that I am making is that if we accept, as we must do, the favour that Peter gives to us, then we must also accept the conditions of the favour. That means that we are no longer citizens of the country of our birth, but citizens of the commonwealth of Israel with our citizenship in heaven. The death that we died in the waters of baptism has made us free from the allegiances of the past. (John 8:32, Galatians 5:1, 2 Corinthians 5:14,15).

In times of peace and prosperity these issues may appear to be somewhat irrelevant in 2001. But unless they are discussed and taken on board when peace turns to war we may find that this snare has tightened and we shall be unprepared to meet the challenge that will present to our faith - Romans 14:5, "Let everyman be fully persuaded in his own mind."

CITY AND CITIZENS - TENT AND STRANGERS

Some thoughts on the divide between the above. City = *polis*. Citizen = *polites* from *polis*. Citizen implies belonging.

The city or state undertakes to protect and defend its citizens and demands that its citizens protect and defend it in whatever manner it may allow.

While a negotiated form of compliance with this requirement may seem harmless enough, nevertheless it is an acknowledgement of belonging to a system unto which one died and in death has been made free. Jesus

tells us in Matthew 6:24, “No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon,” while in Romans 6:16-18 the apostle tells us, “Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness,” and in Galatians 5:1, “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.”

As a peg upon which to hang the following thoughts I would quote Jesus: Matthew 5:48 - “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect,” while Isaiah 28:9 reads, “Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? Them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts.”

I understand the word Jesus used for ‘perfect’ to mean ‘mature, grown-up’. Paul said, 1 Corinthians 13:10,11. “But when that which is perfect is come. then that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things.” The letter killeth; it is the spirit that giveth life, and again, first that which is natural, afterwards that which is spiritual.

Using this licence to interpret things natural unto their spiritual content I would commence my thoughts on the above title at Genesis 4:13-15, “And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me. And the Lord said unto him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him.” But Cain couldn’t summon the faith to trust in God’s protection and so began implementing his own. Verses 16:17 - “And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden- And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his son, Enoch.” Cain builded a city - defined as a place guarded by a ‘waking’ or a ‘watch’ in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, a town with walls.

Next we read Genesis 10:8-12, “And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord. And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. Out of that land went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah: the same is a great city.” Nimrod a mighty hunter in the earth built Nineveh - the same is a great city. That was to be this mighty hunter’s protection. The man made covering of fig leaves. See Jonah 3:3, “So Jonah arose and went unto Nineveh, according to the word of the Lord. Now Nineveh was an exceeding great city of three days Journey.” Nineveh became the capital of the Assyrian empire and Assyria became Babylon and in Isaiah 23:13 we are told, “Behold the land of the Chaldeans; this people was not, till the Assyrian founded it for them that dwell in the wilderness: they set up the towers thereof, they raised up the palaces thereof; and he brought it to ruin.”

In Genesis 11 we read of how they Journeyed to Shinar where Nimrod had dwelt with the intent of building a city for their protection that they might make themselves a name in the earth. But the Lord came down and thwarted their purpose, therefore is the name called Babel - which means ‘Confusion.’

Now it is worth noting that God eventually destroyed Babylon, lest they fill the earth with cities. Isaiah 14:21, “Prepare slaughter for his children for the iniquity of their fathers; and that they do not rise, nor possess the land, nor fill the face of the world with cities.” Again, see God’s complaint about Judah - Hosea 8:14, “For Israel hath forgotten his Maker, and buildeth temples; and Judah hath multiplied fenced cities: but I will send a fire upon his cities, and it shall devour the palaces thereof.” That is, they lacked the faith to trust in God’s protection and placed their trust in their own devices.

In Genesis 12:1 we read how God appears to Abram, unto whom the gospel was first preached (see John 8:56) and announces the essence of the gospel message - Get thee out of thy country and come unto a land that I will shew thee. Then in Genesis 13:11, we find Abram and Lot part company. Lot chose him all the plain of Jordan, then in verse 12 finds him dwelling in the cities of the plain, and the next step finds him in

Sodom and reluctant to accept deliverance. His wife lingered that far behind in her attachment to the city that she became indistinguished from the sulphuric outcrops of that place.

Meanwhile Abram dwelt in his tent: Genesis 13:18, "And Abram removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron, and built there an altar unto the Lord."

Now 'tent' is not a New Testament word but in the Old Testament, 'tent' and 'tabernacle' have been used interchangeably. Same word in the original. Tent is defined in the Old Testament as a covering. Tabernacle in the New Testament is defined as a tent.

So we read of Abraham in Hebrews 11:9 that "By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise." By faith he dwelt in tabernacles, or tents, and verse 10, "For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." That is, Abraham, the father of the faithful, scorned to put his trust in the things of men, See also Genesis 14:23, "...that I will not take from a thread, even to a shoe latchet, and that I will not take any thing that is thine lest thou shouldst say, I have made Abram rich."

Atonement, defined in the Old Testament as to cover. In the New Testament as restoration. I am suggesting that Tent in its spiritual context that we are considering is the Atonement or covering that we have in Jesus and that can only be impaired if we look to our rights as a citizen.

1 Peter 2:11, "Dearly beloved I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul." Strangers is defined in the Concordance as a 'By-dweller, alien resident, foreigner.' In the lexicon as a 'By-dweller, sojourner, without the rights of citizenship.' So we read Hebrews 11:13, "These all (the faithful)... confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Verse 14 to 16, "For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned." Now the implication could be that if one doesn't fulfil the role of a stranger then maybe God is ashamed to be called their God, because they, like Judah have placed their trust in cities (citizenship). (Hosea 8:16).

Hebrews 13:13, "Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach. For here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come." One whose builder and maker is God. So let us now be a tent dweller as our father by faith, Abraham, was.

Hebrews 11:16, "But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city."

I have heard it said that we must separate spiritual things from natural things. That spiritually our citizenship is in heaven, Philippians 3:20, "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." but legally and physically our citizenship belongs to our(?) country. I believe this to be a very immature understanding of the obligation of our new birth. 1 Corinthians 6:20, "For we are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and in your Spirit, which are God's." We are no longer our own and have not the liberty to return to the country from which we came out. e Exodus 15:9, "The enemy said, I will pursue, I will overtake... my hand will destroy them" - margin says, "Repossess them." Exodus 8:1, "Thus saith the Lord, Let my people go that they may serve me."

Ephesians 2:1, "You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins" and verses 11,12,13,19, "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh..., that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ... Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." Now here the position is reversed. No longer aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenants of promise, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God (those faithful who confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth). Now in Christ Jesus they are aliens and strangers in the land of their birth. In Jesus they have died unto their past nationality and have risen a new creation where there is neither Jew nor Greek (Australian or other) but ye are all one in Christ. Also Galatians 3:28, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free,

there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” 2 Corinthians 5:17, “Therefore if any man be in Christ he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new.” Ephesians 4:22-24, “That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.”

Philippians 1:27, “Only let your citizenship be as it becometh the gospel of Christ...” Philippians 3:20, “For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.”

Genesis 12:1, “Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew thee.” Colossians 3:11, “Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all and in all.”

The physical Babylon of the Old Testament (confusion) was destroyed. But Babylon, the institution or system of the N.T. lives on and we meet it in the Revelation of our Lord where the destruction of the Great City of those who succumb to its demands upon them is forecast - Revelation 14:8-12, “Babylon is fallen...If any man worship the beast and his image... the same shall drink of the wrath of God... Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandment of God, and the faith of Jesus.” Here is the patience or endurance of the saints. Matthew 24:12,13, “And many false prophets shall rise and deceive many.” Revelation 18:4. “And I heard another voice from heaven saying, Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues.” See 1 Corinthians 11:31, “For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged”. Genesis 19:15, “And when the morning arose the angels hastened Lot, saying, arise, take thy wife, and thy two daughters, which are here; lest thou be consumed in the iniquity of the city. ” Isaiah 1:27, “Zion shall be redeemed with judgment and her converts with righteousness.”

Let’s acknowledge a truism (if that is the right word): One can be a citizen, but if one is, then one is not a stranger. On the other hand, one can be a stranger, but if one is, then he is not a citizen. You can be one or the other but you cannot be both.

The temptation is to go on but there is a proverb that comes to mind: He that is first in his own cause seemeth just but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him.

There is one more quote that I would like to use however and it comes from Psalm 107 where we have a prophecy that could well sum up all that I have been trying to say:

<p>Psalm 107:1, O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good: for his mercy endureth for ever.</p>	<p>Hebrews 13:15 - By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thank to his name</p>
<p>Verse 2: Let the redeemed of the Lord say so, whom he hath redeemed from the hand of the enemy.</p>	<p>1 Peter 1:18 - Forasmuch as ye know that ye were redeemed not with corruptible things as silver and gold from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.</p>
<p>Verse 3: and gathered them out of the lands from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south.</p>	<p>Psalm 18:17-19: He delivered me from my strong enemy and from them which hated me: for they were too strong for me. They prevented me in the day of my calamity: but the Lord was my stay. He brought me forth also into a large place; he delivered me because he delighted in me</p>
<p>Verse 3: and gathered them out of the lands from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south.</p>	<p>Revelation 5:9,10 - And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals, thereof: for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth.</p>

<p>Verse 4: They wandered in the wilderness in a solitary way; they found no city to dwell in.</p>	<p>Revelation 12:6: - and the woman fled into the wilderness where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her a thousand two hundred and threescore days.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Hebrews 11:14-16: Through faith Sara herself received strength to conceive seed and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised. Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable. These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off and were persuaded of them and embraced them and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare openly that they seek a country.</p> <p>Hebrews 13:13,14 - Let us go therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach. For here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come.</p> <p>Revelation 18:4 - And I heard another voice from heaven saying, Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues.</p>
<p>Verse 5: Hungry and thirsty, their soul fainted in them.</p>	<p>Matthew 5:6 – Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.</p>
<p>Verse 6: Then they cried unto the Lord in their trouble and he delivered them out of their distresses.</p>	<p>Matthew 18:26,27 – The servant thereof fell down and worshipped him saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion and loosed him and forgave him the debt.</p> <p>Psalm 102:17-20: He will regard the prayer of the destitute and will not despise their prayer. This shall be written for the generation to come: and the people which shall be created shall praise the Lord. For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the Lord behold the earth; to hear the groaning of the prisoner; to loose those that are appointed to death.</p>
<p>Verse 7: and he led them fourth by the right way, that they might go to a land of habitation.</p>	<p>Hebrews 11:6 – But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for He hath prepared for them a city.</p> <p>Proverbs 18:10 - The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it and is safe.</p> <p>Isaiah 26:20,21 - Come my people, enter thou into thy chambers and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast.</p>
<p>Verse 20: He sent them word and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions,</p>	<p>Isaiah 53:4,5,- Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.</p> <p>Job 33:23-30, If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter, one among a thousand, to shew unto man his uprightness: then he is gracious unto him and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom.</p>

<p>verse 43: Whoso is wise, and will observe these things, even they shall understand the loving-kindness of the Lord.</p>	<p>His flesh shall be fresher than a child's; he shall return to the days of his youth; he shall pray unto God and he will be favourable unto him; and he shall see his face with joy: for he will render unto man his righteousness. He looketh upon men and if any say, I have sinned and perverted that which was right and it profited me not; He will deliver his soul from going down into the pit and his life shall see the light. Lo, all these things worketh God often-times with man to bring back his soul from the pit, to be enlightened with the light of the living.</p>
---	---

This seems to be a satisfactory place to end my attempt to partake of the honour of kings.

Douglas McKinlay.
December 2000

The following article by Brother Fred Pearce was written up from his notes by Brother Ernest Brady. It is not a finished work but we feel it is nevertheless a very well worthwhile study.

ROMANS 7

The 7th chapter of Romans is a very difficult chapter to explain and understand. The reasons are many. The expressions of words do not make up for the Spirit of understanding. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God... because they are spiritually discerned" - 1 Corinthians 2:14.

Much could be written on the foolishness of the doctrines of men from this chapter, believed by the majority of professing Christians of all denominations. Original Sin, the inability to live a Christian life, these are the root of the trouble, which blinds the mental eye of understanding. We believe this chapter can be understood in harmony with itself and the general teaching of the Word of God, so we make another attempt at its elucidation verse by verse.

We agree that upon a superficial reading, even by the people who profess Christianity, that what the Apostle Paul writes in this chapter is the experience of himself under their very own experience. A little reflection will prove that the wretchedness of Paul was before his conversion and not afterwards.

We have no doubt that when we say that if any Christian thinks Paul is expressing his wretchedness as a Christian and that it is their experience, then they have not been born of the Spirit, therefore, they are none of Christ's.

We all have experienced in some measure the wretchedness of Saul of Tarsus, but we should also experience the unspeakable joy of Paul the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

We know that Paul said in this chapter "I find then a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me." Also "In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." This cannot be truly said of the worst sinners. I have seen traits of character in the worst of drunkards and gamblers which I have admired above their fellow workmen who profess they are Christians.

I am not advocating goodness of character or justification by works apart from the free unmerited gift of God, but simply to show there is some goodness even in the worst of us. That Christians are tempted and fall short of the glory of God is proved from Scripture, but this is no excuse for self-consolation.

Let everyone ask themselves such questions as “Is there one record in the life of Paul after conversion that he either in word or deed did that which was contrary to the Spirit of Christ? Is there any one commandment that cannot be obeyed - have we not proof that every one of them has been obeyed by one or the other of God’s saints?”

Many are the exhortations from the epistles of Paul to be followers of Jesus and himself. Again, how many of our learned men in every sphere of life, who criticize the Scriptures yet who have a high standard of morals and living?

We ask you to read chapter 6, leave out chapter 7 and follow on with chapter 8. There you have Paul as a Christian indeed: -

1. Freed from sin. 2. Raised in newness of life. 3. We must not continue in sin. 4. Ashamed of the things he did before conversion. 5. No condemnation. 6. The mind of the Spirit. 7. All things work together for good. 8. More than conquerors.

Now let us read chapter 7 as in brackets or parenthesis. Look at Paul talking of when he was Saul of Tarsus, giving his own experiences or that of a Jew or kinsman according to the flesh, unregenerate by the grace of God and trusting in the mere works of the Law. Just see if you can fit in such passages as these to Paul as a Christian. “I am carnal, sold under sin;” “O wretched man that I am.” These two passages are key passages that unlock the fundamental principle of the chapter and the necessity of being first redeemed. Paul says in 1 Corinthians 2:2, “For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified.” Why this important factor?

Why the necessity of redemption through Christ Jesus?

The 5th chapter of Romans explains in glowing terms how Adam by one act of disobedience “many were made sinners; likewise we have how by the one act of Jesus “many were made righteous.” The chapter should be studied in this light and in conjunction with others.

Let the Emphatic Diaglott help you. Paul had been taught by revelation that all were sold under the one sin of Adam (Romans 3:9,7,14,11,32 and Galatians 3:22), likewise that all are bought with the price of the precious blood of Jesus by that one act on Calvary.

Sold Under Sin

These are the words from the Emphatic Diaglott: “But I am fleshly, having been sold under sin.” (Romans 7:14). Now the words “having been sold” is proof that he (Paul) was not “now” sold under sin, and that he was speaking of the time when he “was” sold under the sin.

The sin is personified as a king reigning over those who are under his dominion. They are bondservants, or slaves, they are captives or prisoners. They can do nothing to release themselves from that wretched state of bondage. It needed One outside the prison to accomplish their release from sin. Hence the vital necessity of the blood of Christ to Redeem or Ransom them from the power of the sin of the world (John 1:29). Jesus paid the price of their release. He set the captives free. This is the free gospel of the free unmerited grace of God, who purchased us with the blood of His own Lamb (Acts 20:24-28). This is God’s right wayness: “Being justified freely by His Grace through the redemption and faith in His blood (Romans 8:24, 25). Thus we are counted, reckoned or imputed righteous without works (Romans 4:1-8).

We have access on being introduced into Christ by faith, yes when we were without strength, while sinners and enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son through His shed blood.

Paul had learned the lesson that “if One (Jesus) died for all, then were all dead” (1 Corinthians 5:14). Does this mean literally dead? No, they were legally dead on the federal principle by the one sin of Adam. Jesus said to the Jews “Ye have no life (*zoe*) in you.” They were literally alive but spiritually dead. Here is where Romans 5:15 proves that through the one offence, the many be dead. So through the one righteous act, sentence came on all men to justification of life (*zoe*). Romans 5:18.

Here are two classes of people but of the same flesh; one sold, dead, or in bondage to the sin, the other bought, alive, or freed from sin.

“O wretched man that I am”

Bible students know of the Egyptian bondage, how that the children of Israel were put under task masters, afflicted and made to serve with rigour. Their lives were made bitter and hard; beaten for no fault of their own. Words fail to give an adequate description of the miseries and torments through which they passed.

Paul does indeed in this 7th chapter give the wretched state of those under sin.

Dr. Adam Clarke gives the following comment on this 24th verse: “To render his state more miserable is not only encompassed by the slaughter, but chained to a dead body, for there seems to be here an allusion to an ancient custom of certain tyrants, who bound a dead body to a living man, and obliged him to carry it about till the contagion from the putrid mass took away his life.”

This cry of Paul’s is even worse than all human suffering. Sin will finally hold any for ever in corruption but of the redeemed there is hope even in death.

Surely the passage cannot apply to the sons of God. They, like Paul, rejoice with joy unspeakable in that they have been redeemed from so great a death. So Paul could say, as we can, “Thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord for this unspeakable gift.”

Now for the 7th chapter of Romans:

Verse 1. “Know ye not brethren (for I speak to them that know the law) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? 2. For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth, but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. 3. So then if, while her husband liveth she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead she is free from that law; so that she is no an adulteress, though she be married to another man.”

These three verses are not difficult to understand, but are nevertheless very important in their application to a right understanding of the chapter.

Let us remember that the Gentiles were never under the Law of Moses. Law is the governing factor. It has power over those that are under it. By the figure of marriage, a man and wife are bound to each other while they live. If one died, then the other could marry again.

Verse 4: “Wherefore my brethren ye also are become dead to the law (of Moses) by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruits unto God.”

Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one who believeth (Romans 10:4). Since the death of Christ, Jews and Gentiles who believe are under grace. They became dead to the law and are married or joined to Christ. They are made free from the law, and are at liberty under the law of grace to walk in newness of life and bring forth fruits of righteousness unto God.

Verse 5; “For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.”

Here is a very important and key passage which explains a difficulty which those who believe in original sin or sinful flesh cannot understand, "For when we were in the flesh." The word "flesh" has an important bearing here, for it is used particularly for the Jews of verse 1 and Romans 9:3.

There is only one literal flesh of men (1 Corinthians 15:39), Jews and Gentiles. The word is used to denote relationship.

Paul was of the same literal flesh as a Jew and as a Christian. We are not left even to our own reasoning here for Paul tells us in Romans 8:9, "But ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit." The whole context of Romans shows that it is one of relationship, bound to the Law of Moses, or bound to Christ.

They that are in the flesh (mind or relation) walk after the flesh. The mind of the flesh is death. Those in the flesh are not subjected to the law of God; they cannot please God. Do these passages apply to Paul when regenerated? They do not.

On the other hand we have "But in the Spirit." We belong to Christ if the Spirit of Christ dwell in us. We have been born again (John 3). We have been born of incorruptible seed - the Word of God (1 Peter 1:23), born from above (James 3:17). Do not these passages apply to Paul when regenerated? They do.

Undoubtedly then this verse 5 did apply to Paul when unregenerated. He, like all others before regeneration, "brought forth fruits unto death."

What is sin? Are desires and propensities sin? If so, then Adam had them before he sinned. No, sin is transgression of law (1 John 3:4).

Verse 6: "But now we have been delivered from the law, that having died (to that law) wherein we (Jews) were held; that we should serve in newness of the spirit and not in the oldness of the letter."

Let us take the first half of this verse. Have the Gentiles been delivered from the Mosaic Law? Is not this another proof that Paul was speaking as a Jew? Cannot we see that the opening verses prove this very fact. They had died to the law. The law of ordinances was nailed to the Cross, therefore released. In Romans 6 we have a fine example of how believers died to the sin and associated themselves in the death and burial of Christ in baptism.

Paul says, "For I through the law am dead to the law that I might live unto God" (Galatians 2:19). Is this not a parallel to this verse 6? Did not Paul serve in newness of Spirit and not in oldness of the letter as he did when he persecuted the church of God in ignorance, but upholding the traditions of the Jews?

Much more could be said re works of the law and works of faith but it will make this consideration too long. Just a few: "The just shall live by faith (Romans 1:17); "He is a Jew which is one inwardly" (Romans 2:28); "Justified freely by grace" (Romans 3:24). Reward not of works, imputed righteous (Romans 4:5). Access by faith (Romans 5:2). "Not under law but grace." (Romans 6:14).

Verse 7; "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust (coveting) except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet."

This needs no explanation. Where there is no law there is no transgression. Only through law is sin possible.

Verse 8: "But (the) sin taking (or finding) occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence (coveting). For without the law sin was (or is) dead."

This is a continuation of verse 7. It is only when we are forbidden, we know what coveting is and means. It is only by law we know what is good for us and where we must draw the line. There are uses for every desire but abuses are condemned.

Verse 9: “For I was alive (apart) without the law once, but when the commandment came (the) sin (lived) revived and I died.”

Is not this the experience of us all? Though laws exist naturally and morally, we just simply live without any responsibility and pay no attention to them- Could this apply to Paul as a Christian? He admitted he did things in ignorance (1 Timothy 1:12-17).

The second part of the verse: the commandment came (singular) can mean the law, but THE sin, lived, or revived, show that the singular is comprehended in that law. The first sin of Adam as contained in Romans 5 brought condemnation and death into the world. Paul tells us that what applied to Adam as an individual, also applied to the Jews nationally and to all Gentiles collectively. The law entered that the offence might abound (Romans 5:20). That ALL Jews and Gentiles are under the sin of the world, proves that though the law of Moses was a law of sin and death, to them under it it was not the law (Edenic) which passed upon all men.

Before the Law of Moses, under the Law of Moses and after the Law of Moses.

The Christadelphians render this verse thus: “And I was formerly living apart from the law, but the commandment having come (THE) sin lived again and I died.” Jesus said, “This is the condemnation that LIGHT is come into the world (John 3:19). It is only when the eyes of our understanding are open that we are responsible. Though Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts 22:3) and more exceeding zealous (Galatians 1:14) he only saw the letter of the law and left out the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith (Matthew 23:23).

It was only when the eyes of his heart were open that he could see that he was wretched, carnal and sold under THE sin. He realized that faith in the Gospel of the grace of God in the death of His beloved Son upon the Cross was the only thing that mattered (Galatians 2:20 to end, 1 Corinthians 2:2). The law was only efficacious when faith was manifested in it. Just read, “Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid, we establish the law (Romans 3:31). See also Romans 9:32, Hebrews 4:2).

No one will ever see the truth however learned and zealous, who will not see God’s righteousness through faith (Romans 10)

This should be clear that we are all under the legal condemnation of THE sin. Alienated from God. This light or knowledge shows how we are sold under sin and are poor, naked, wretched and blind (Revelation 3:18); “And I died.” This is the duty of all.

Romans 6 shows how we are to die to THE sin. “For he that is dead (or died) is freed (or justified) from THE sin (verse 7), “Knowing this that our old man (the body of Adamic relationship) is crucified with Christ, that the body of THE sin might be done away, destroyed and rendered powerless; that we might no longer be enslaved to the sin.

Look at the following in this light. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them in Christ” (Romans 8:1). “Seeing that we have put off the old man, with his deeds and have put in the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him” (Colossians 3:9,10), “And shall not come into condemnation but is passed from, or out of, death (in Adam) into life (in Christ)” (John 5:24). This is how Paul and everyone else became dead and alive by enlightenment and obedience to the faith.

Verse 10: “And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.”

This seems strange but nevertheless true. It is fully explained in the verses to verse 14, but for the sake of dealing with it fully we will make a few comments on each verse and then a conclusive summary.

If the commandments (either single to Adam or in the many to the Jew) was not obeyed in the spirit of faith as God's requirement, it would mean death to them and not life. There was death and life in the same law.

Verse 11: "For (The) sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived (or beguiled) me and by it slew me."

Paul, like all others were deceived. The natural man only sees the letter and not the spirit. The newness of spirit of faith was the primary object of the law to bring them to Christ. (See Romans 2:20, Galatians 3:24).

The natural man may be a good citizen but it will only profit him in the natural order. Without faith it is impossible to please God. There is no life (zoe) in it, so that the person remains legally dead or killed by remaining in that position.

Verse 12: "Wherefore the law (Edenic and Mosaic) is holy and the commandment Holy and just and good."

The commandments were given by God, therefore Holy etc. They have the power either to give life or death. Life if obeyed in the spirit, death if not obeyed in the letter and spirit.

Verse 13: "Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But (The) sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good, that the sin by the commandments might become exceeding sinful."

The law which was good was not the cause of death. It was the sin which the law made abound and the transgressions, sins, that brought forth death was the cause of being either legally dead or subjected to the penalty of the Law. It is only through the federal law or moral laws that we know what sin is and what it requires of us, and that we are sinners by law.

Verse 14: "Besides we know that the law is spiritual:"

This is the final statement which proves all we have said upon it; the remaining part of the verse we have dealt with previously.

Now Paul in Romans 6, in harmony with these verses, shows in what sense we are sinners. "His servants ye are to whom ye obey," - servants of sin or servants of righteousness. We cannot serve two masters. We will either serve, or belong to one or the other. When we belong to sin, we have nothing to do with the righteousness of God. So when we belong to Christ we shall have nothing to do with sin. If we try to serve God and mammon we make God a liar and the truth is not in us. The laws through faith show whether we are sons of God or sons of the devil or sin. Is there any doubt as to which class the apostle Paul belonged? In the following verses you will get this contrast:

Unregenerated: "I cannot do the things that I would."

Regenerated: "I can do all things through Christ."

Verse 15: "For that which I do I allow not (R.V: know not): for what I would, that I do not (R.V: practise): but what I hate, that I do."

The Jews right down through history have had a zeal for God but not according to knowledge. They drew near with their lips but their hearts were far from Him. They, like professing Christians of our day, delight to worship Him in their own way. They were, in fact, servants of sin. They were a people in whom there was no faith. Paul included himself here.

In the unregenerate state we do things in ignorance. Because we think wrongly we do the things we ought not to do (John 16:2, 1 Timothy 1:13). Therefore we have no power to resist. We do things against

our better self. We hate ourselves and say, “What a fool I have been and then do the same thing again. Can any say this of Paul after regeneration? Did not the spirit of Christ dwell in him (Romans 8:9)?

Verse 16: “If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good.”

The law condemns sin (v.7) but he consented that the law was good (see Deuteronomy 4). Mere laws and formalities have no spirit or life in them. Faith which worketh by love serves in newness of spirit (v.6) and fruits unto holiness. The unregenerated could not do this.

Verse 17: “Now then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.”

“As a man thinks in his heart, so is he.” The fleshly man minds fleshly things (Romans 8). The spiritual man minds spiritual things. We simply follow the natural desires when the spirit word is not dwelling in us. When we are servants of sin, sin has possession of us and indwelling in us. The reverse is the same. When God or the Spirit of Christ, dwelleth in us, we have power to resist sin or the devil and he will flee from us. The actions (good or bad) will manifest themselves to whom we belong. Just think of these words and apply them “It is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do his good pleasure” (Philippians 2:13). So the natural man worketh his natural desires when unregenerated.

Verse 18: “For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me: but how to perform that which is good, I find not.”

We have commented somewhat on this, but we draw your attention to verse 5. The literal flesh is not meant in this verse, neither is it meant here. They that are in (doctrinally) the flesh cannot please God. If literal flesh is meant here then Jesus, Paul nor any other could please God. We have Hebrews 11 to prove that plenty did please God.

Dr. Thomas says that Paul spoke here of himself as an unregenerated man. Islip Collyer also. We have referred to good men, we also ask you to read Acts 10. We have also showed good works apart from justification through faith in the blood of the Lamb cannot justify any. Therefore there is no goodness as accountable in any unregenerated person. It is only God is good in the absolute sense.

When God’s word dwells in us and we reproduce it (Philippians 2:13) faith is made perfect by works (James 2:22) or in other words “He that doeth righteousness is righteous.” (1 John 3:7, Revelation 19:8).

Paul had learned by experience as all true Christians that there is no good accountable to God in the unregenerated man. We have all experienced the will to do good, but have not performed it. It is an impossibility while doctrinally in the flesh.

Verse 19. “For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.

This is somewhat a repetition of the same thing. “A double minded man is unstable in all his ways” (James 1:8). If we fulfil the desires of the flesh we shall not inherit the Kingdom. If we walk in the Spirit we shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. If we sow to the flesh in opposition to the Spirit we shall reap the reward of corruption. Paul, when regenerated had crucified the flesh and was crucified unto the world. (Galatians 6:14, 5:24).

Verse 20: Now, if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.”

How many times have we heard unregenerated people say “I have tried to do this, or give up that but I cannot.” The will to know what is right or wrong and even desire can be seen in most people. Where a true loving faith is lacking through the grace of God there is no power.

Verse 21: “I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.”

We have shown and proved that many natural persons can and do some good. Just look at Christianity, so called, and place it alongside the religion of Christ's day. They profess belief in God and yet can make guns and make war. Paul was such an one.

Now look at a conscientious objector. It is easier to run with the stream - look how foolish you are and what people will think of you. Love your enemies? No, that is most foolish.

The answer is very different when you think of Jesus. They hated him without a cause. A man that always did those things that pleased the Father, persecuted for righteousness sake. All these things are against the natural mind and while we maintain them we will not do the good God requires and the evil is ever present and seeming easy way out.

Verse 22: "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man."

This verse is proof to some that Paul was speaking of himself as a regenerated person. To delight in God with the inward man could mean nothing else to them. What we have said of the Jew recorded of them delighted to approach God (Isaiah 58:2, Matthew 23:23). The facts before us of present day professing Christians only prove that the inward man can mean the mind of such. The inward man is the mind of the man and not necessarily the new man created in Christ Jesus. Paul gives the lie to such religion (Philippians 3). They say and do not - proof that the spirit of Christ is not in them. Study this chapter and see how Paul counted all things as dung for the righteousness which is of God in Christ Jesus. This is the only thing that will work in us to will and to do His good pleasure.

Verse 23: "But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members."

Here Paul, as in Romans 8, shows the mind, natural or spiritual, is the inward man. "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he" - his statement that he was in captivity of the law of sin (v.5) sin had dominion over him. Paul did not contradict himself (Romans 6:16). Peter confirms this when he said "For of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage (2 Peter 2:19). If Paul was in captivity or bondage he was doomed and not free as he said so many times in Romans 6 and other places.

Verse 24: "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from this body of death?"

Keep in mind Paul's allusion of a dead body chained to a person. The body of death is outside of our bodies. So we can see it is the Adamic body of many members under which all are concluded. Natural death is not the end of the sons of God, but to die in Adam as condemnation as a responsible person will meet with the wages of sin even a second death, or if we die in ignorance we remain in the grave.

Dr. Adam Clarke quotes a verse by Pitt:-

What tongue can such barbarities record
Or count the slaughter of the ruthless sword?
Twas not enough the good the guiltless bled
Still worse he bound the living to the dead.
These, limb to limb and face to face he joined
Oh, monstrous crime of unexampled kind.

Verse 25: "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind, I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin."

Jesus Christ is the only hope of a perishing world. If we gain the whole world and lose the (zoe) life Jesus offers, it would have been better never to have been born. The glory, joy, and full meaning of love (the half has never been told) of God's eternal Excellency when there shall be no more death, pain or sorrow, but peace and righteousness shall be the stability of the times. This has been made possible to all through the loving sacrifice of Jesus who died upon the Cross that we might share in that Kingdom. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through out Lord Jesus Christ.

“Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.” – 1 Corinthians 15:57.

F.J.Pearce.

Continuing our correspondence with Graeham Mansfield, Editor of “Logos” magazine, we received the following letter dated 26th March 2001:-

Dear Russell, I read the first half of page one of your letter, and tried to work out about what you are talking. I am entirely confused by your statements. You appear to say that God did not keep His word, inasmuch as that when He told Adam he would die for “breaking the law of sin and death” - which law was not in vogue at the time of creation since it was later found “in the members” - that God then killed an animal instead! Adam must have been greatly relieved, but would have been given the impression that God does not mean what He says. In this case, there would be some credibility in the serpent’s reasoning. Nowhere is Adam told that he would die even had he not sinned - which seems to me to make the consequences of sin exceedingly easy to avoid. The consequences of sin in this instance is, according to your letter, immediate death. But Adam now waits until God kills an animal and then Adam could continue to live until he died. This gives an altogether erroneous interpretation to “death came by sin” (Romans 5:12), which is a very clear statement without the verbiage you are attaching to it. You speak of a “Judicial death.” It must also mean that the sin was a “Judicial sin,” since the terms of one must relate to the other. Cause and effect must be directly related. If the sin is “natural” (i.e. actual), it means the death is “natural” (i.e. actual). Conversely if the death is “judicial,” then the sin is “judicial” - and this is entirely confusing.

Did Adam receive a judicial death for a natural sin - or a natural death for a judicial sin? I am not at all sure that Adam would have understood that he was just being given a judicial death, and not a natural (real?) death. And since he was forgiven when the animal was slain, why should he then have died a natural death later in life, since he had been told nothing about that eventuality? There is something distinctly unrighteous in all this. An animal dies because Adam sins, and Adam dies because he is forgiven?

When you reference Romans 5:12, wherein Paul is talking about death, you say that this is “judicial death.” You further comment that Jesus died a “judicial death” in taking away the sin of the world. You will need to clarify what you mean by this. Do you mean a sacrificial death, the “death of the cross” - since that was altogether a real thing.

Again, how can we be “concluded under the sin of Adam” if this is not the inherited flesh of our birth? Yet “sin’s flesh” is obviously the flesh resulting from sin, and was not in that condition before sin entered the world. So then, “flesh” has a different condition now from what it once was. That difference came about by sin - the sin of Adam. Since Adam was not created with “sin’s flesh” but brought it about by transgression, in what way is the “flesh of sin” different from the “flesh without sin” with which he was created? You will need to clarify this for me in clear terms before it is of any use proceeding further in this discussion.

Sincerely, Graeham.

Reply to Graeham Mansfield, dated 4th May 2001 :-

Dear Graeham, Thank you for your letter of 26th March and I am most sorry you found my statements confusing. I will do my best to clarify the points you mention;

The Apostles Paul uses the term “flesh” in two ways:

- a) The literal flesh which God created.

b) The figurative flesh which is a synonym for the carnal mind, the desires of human beings, e.g. the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life. Walking in the flesh is opposite to walking in the Spirit, yet whichever we do we are still literal flesh.

Since the time of Augustine Christendom has embraced a third use of the term “flesh” which is not found in the Bible. It was believed by some that evil was to be found in matter, that we are trapped in evil matter by our bodies. Not a very intelligent concept but nevertheless one that caught on and permeated Christendom and captured its imagination with its mystique, not to mention the excuse it gave people for doing evil on the pretext they couldn’t help themselves.

There is one verse in Scripture and one verse only which appears to lend support to this idea of evil being found in matter and it is in Romans 8:3, where we read that Jesus “condemned sin in the flesh.”

However, as the notion that we are trapped in evil matter is fictitious we must find a better understanding of Paul’s words. I believe Paul meant that Jesus condemned sin while He was in the flesh. This is not adding to Scripture but “gives the sense” of it. (e.g. Nehemiah 8:8). In this I take the lead from the Apostle Peter when he tells us “Forasmuch then as Christ suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God” (1 Peter 4:1). From this I understand Christ suffered for us when He condemned sin while in the flesh. And this He did by overcoming every temptation, thereby showing that it is possible for us to be sinless too, that is, to cease from sin for the rest of our lives. He demonstrated that obedience was possible and thereby He could justly condemn sinners for their failings.

One thing is absolutely certain - there is no such thing as literal sinful flesh, sin in the flesh, evil in matter, Original Sin or by whatever name one cares to call this doctrine. It was not believed by Jesus and the Apostles and so it was not taught by them. It is foreign to Scripture and to common sense.

Adam and Eve entered a natural world:

Scripture gives us no other indication but that Adam and Eve were created natural beings like other animals with a natural life span in which they would mature, grow old and die of old age if their life was not cut short by some other means. There is no reason to suppose that Adam and Eve did not see birth, growth, maturity and death in nature. They would have understood what God meant when He told them that “in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” And neither should we stretch the meaning of a day by saying it is a thousand years, for God has never told us this. (See Psalm 90:4).

The death due to Adam and Eve for their transgression was similar to the death suffered by Ananias and Sapphira when they died at the feet of the Apostle Peter (Acts 5:5 & 10). They too would have died of old age if nothing else had shortened their natural life span. However, because of their sin they suffered judicial death. Judicial death then is being put to death for transgressing God’s law. Korah and company suffered judicial death (Numbers 26:10). The people of Nineveh were also to suffer judicial death but God was merciful to them when they mended their ways. Adam too was due to suffer judicial death but God in His mercy provided a temporary covering for his sin in the death of the animal slain in Eden, which slain animal prefigured Jesus who would in due time voluntarily suffer the judicial death due to Adam.

Definition of Judicial:- “Of or pertaining to proceedings in a court of law; of or pertaining to administration of justice; resulting from or fixed by a judgement in court.”

Transgression pertains to proceedings in a court of law and is therefore judicial. Cause and effect are related and so the putting to death for transgression is also judicial.

God only ever condemns sin and nowhere in Scripture do we find that literal flesh is condemned. Again, natural death is never the punishment for sin. For the faithful it is a rest from one’s labours until the resurrection at the return of our Lord from heaven (Daniel 12:13).

You ask:

“How can we be concluded under the sin of Adam if this is not the inherited flesh of our birth? Yet sin’s flesh is obviously the flesh resulting from sin, and was not in that condition before sin entered the world.”

Scripture teaches that we are all concluded under the sin of Adam in the legal sense as Paul explains in Galatians 3:22 where he is talking of the law and righteousness and faith, not the physical flesh. The inherited flesh of our birth is no different to the flesh with which God created Adam and Eve and there was no change in Adam’s flesh resulting from sin. It is error to talk of the condition of Adam’s flesh being different after transgression than before.

Again you write:

“Since Adam was not created with ‘sin’s flesh’ but brought it about by transgression, in what way is the ‘flesh of sin’ different from the ‘flesh without sin’ with which he was created?”

“Flesh of sin” and “flesh without sin” are not opposites. “Flesh of sin” is “flesh owned by sin” as you stated in your letter of October 25th last, and it is not “flesh with sin.” Flesh is always without sin since sin applies to character, not the literal flesh as I have been at pains to point out.

I have done my best to make my views clear but if there is any point which you find inadequately explained do please let me know and I will try again.

With my sincere regards, Russell.

* * * * *

Also a response from Brother Phil Parry:

To whom it may concern or is interested. Some comments arising from a reply from Graeham Mansfield to a letter from Brother Russell Gregory:

From reading the first half of page one of Brother Gregory’s letter, Graeham Mansfield confesses confusion and no wonder since he has followed and believed the false teaching of “sin in the flesh” and condemned nature, instead of true doctrine of ‘condemned sin’ through violation of Divine Law.

If the matter of Divine Law is kept in mind there would be no need to use such phrases he has put forward to endeavour to defend the erroneous teaching that natural death and the capability from creation of dying became the penalty for disobedience which is absolutely illogical.

The false basis of his beliefs makes Graeham’s reasoning and his statements so confusing that he gets caught up in his own web and therefore cannot entertain or understand our correct reasoning from what the Scriptures of Truth reveal when they are rightly divided.

In violation of what his own acknowledged Christadelphian pioneer John Thomas says of Adam before disobedience, that “left to himself as God made him, Adam would have died and returned to the dust. The animal nature will sooner or later dissolve. It was not constituted so as to continue in life for ever, independent of any further modification,” John Thomas M.D.

Graeham says, “Nowhere is Adam told he would die even had he not sinned.” Why should he be told this? The fact is that Paul says so in 1 Corinthians chapter 15 and John Thomas accepts Paul’s teaching, hence the quotation from “Elpis Israel” of which book the majority of Christadelphians and especially Logos readers of their own magazine appear to be ignorant and merely satisfied with what they have been told without question, that all that John Thomas wrote could be accepted as Truth. But in this instance Graeham Mansfield is disinclined to accept the view expressed of Adam’s corruptible nature by John Thomas in “Elpis Israel,” page 64. There is from their history all this doubtful disputation in Christadelphia.

The law of sin and death became a legal position under which God concluded all in Adam's loins when he sinned, so that being constituted sinners by this means of imputation, they were not considered guilty until enlightenment to the position gave them the option of being redeemed by faith even as Adam was redeemed from judicially inflicted death through the typical lamb slain in his stead. The purpose of God was to people the earth through reproduction by Adam and Eve so that in redeeming them from 'inflicted death by sin' their posterity owed their very existence to the Love, Mercy and provision of God, who in His foreknowledge knew that His only begotten Son of a human mother (Mary) would willingly suffer the death that came by Adam's sin and not the death Adam experienced through his common created nature, the judicial sentence having been revoked.

It was impossible for any man concluded under Adam's sin to lay down a life under that legal imputation in the place of Adam, hence the reason for the virgin birth by the will of God and not the will of man. Incidentally, the virgin birth was not, as Christadelphians have been taught, to give Jesus extra strength as a 'God-man' to overcome trial and temptation impossible to the ordinary descendant of Adam concluded under his sin, but, by begetting of God, to give immunity from the sin of the world which entered through Adam that He might, through sacrificial death, take it away. "The Just for the unjust" - if this statement by Peter could really sink into the hearts and minds of those who change it into "The condemned for the condemned," and Graeham Mansfield is well aware of what I mean, for it is taught in the Logos Magazine. Graeham confidently quotes Romans 5:12 "Death came by sin" but he has in mind the death Adam experienced at the age of 930 years which Paul is not talking about. Paul is talking about the sentence of inflicted death that became operative upon Adam the moment he sinned and had nothing to do with his corruptible nature which was already of limited duration by creation, "Dust thou art," said God to Adam, and Abraham confirmed the same nature for himself, so proving that sin had not been the cause of that nature.

"You speak of 'judicial death'" says Graeham, "it must also mean that the sin was a 'judicial sin' since the terms of one must relate to the other, cause and effect must be directly related." We agree entirely in that Divine Law governs the case. But you are trying to evade this fact of law by resorting to natural acts causing natural death. You say "If the sin is 'natural' (i.e. actual), it means the death is 'natural' (i.e. actual). Conversely, if the death is 'judicial,' then the sin is 'judicial' and this is entirely confusing."

Well Graeham, if it is confusing it is your own statements that have caused your own confusion, we have no difficulty in our understanding of Scripture that sin is transgression of Divine Law and in Adam's case it was the eating of the fruit (actual) which made it a 'judicial sin' worthy of 'judicial death' (i.e. actual, or inflicted) the eating was a natural action as with all permitted other trees for sustenance, but the sin lay in the violation of the Law. You must not forget the death passed upon all men and if the death Adam experienced at the age of 930 years was the "death by sin," then the sentence had not been removed, Adam died a sinner's death in your view, and not only so but you also, Graeham, will experience the same natural death as Adam because you believe that to be the death which passed upon all men. If you do not accept this to be the case show me where your case and that of your members can be different since you are of the same nature as Adam and in your teaching a nature, not a character, condemned.

I must now correct you in the words you use in relation to flesh. You talk of the flesh as being a "condition" acquired by sin when it is actually a "position" described by Paul as "sin's flesh" or flesh belonging to or owned by "Sin" personified as a Master. This is even accepted by some Christadelphian writers but are afraid to take it to the logical conclusion, i.e. the rejection of the B.A.S.F. and the remitting of number 27 under "Doctrines to be rejected," that there is no sin in the flesh.

You ask, "How can we be concluded under the sin of Adam if this is not the inherited flesh of our birth?" The answer is simple. The inherited flesh of our birth is the same quality of flesh Adam was at his creation and it is the false teaching of changed flesh you have inherited from Robert Roberts and his successive followers which is the cause of your misunderstanding and confusion. How in the name of Divine justice and reason could God condemn the flesh of Adam having given him a law for obedience which he was quite capable of keeping in that very flesh nature? Further to this you make the vague and most subtle statement that sin was found to be in Adam's members in order I take it, to support a false view of sin as an element in the physical flesh instead of the law of Sin as a Master. I will return to this point later where Paul explains it

more clearly in his epistles but now we must answer your question on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, not on the false theory and basis you have inherited from your Statement of Faith and some of its clauses.

Is it not clear that when Adam sinned it did not affect his flesh which was a very good creation? Can you not see that Adam's character became flawed and defiled in the sight of God through transgressing the Law? When Cain slew righteous Abel did his crime cause a change of Cain's flesh in contrast with the flesh of Abel? In like manner when Adam sinned would God have been justified by condemning a man of flesh whom the Psalmist declared was fearfully and wonderfully made? Though we were accounted sinners in the loins of Adam we could not be said to have committed sin personally and consequently require individual redemption and reconciliation. This problem was solved in the way that God chose to impute the personal sin of Adam to all in his loins regarded as members of his body when he sinned. Thus, by concluding all under that one act of sin, God in His Love and Mercy was able, through their faith in the one righteous act of His Son to conclude them under Righteousness, the flesh being unaffected. This is known as a legal and Federal position, not a condition of physical flesh, an obsession that has been falsely injected as it were into the minds of past and present candidates for membership of the Christadelphian community in general.

As a Christadelphian I could never see the justice of God condemning Adam's posterity to death as a result of his sin, but on understanding Paul's teaching in Romans chapters 3 and 5 of "imputed sin" and "imputed righteousness" without works, it was gratifying to understand the wisdom of God and His justice toward mankind in giving all who chose, the opportunity to come out of Adam into Christ without the physical flesh being affected. I was never shown this teaching of Paul under the two Federal Heads, Adam and Christ, involving the Atoning work of God in Christ. The teaching and lecturing on the meaning of Christ's sacrifice was avoided but I can certainly say now that they were not backward with their false reasons for His death but the word "sacrifice" could not be rightly used with those reasons such as dying for Himself on account of His condemned 'sin nature'! May God forgive the ignorant and irresponsible; of the responsible God will also judge. Coming back now to your early and subtle statement i.e. That after Adam sinned the law of sin was found to be in his members which was not there at his creation. Is it not plain in the record that until Adam was placed in the Garden no law of conduct was given to him and when it was given, Genesis 2:17, it was not infused into his flesh and blood as an element that could be inherited through reproduction, or as your pioneer R.Roberts stated of God' Son, "Sin ran in his blood which ran in the veins of Mary." If this were so how could Paul say that he had been made free from sin including the Roman believers he was addressing in his letter? Romans 6:16 to 23.

Was the law of sin in Paul's members after his introduction into the body of Christ by symbolic crucifixion with Him? Did he not say, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me"? Again, "Let Christ dwell in your hearts by faith." How then could sin, or indeed the law of sin, be in his members? I understand Christ had put away sin's dominion over us and that we of true faith are under his law, not the law of sin and death. Paul told the Roman converts that they had been the servants of Sin but had obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered them. If you are at a loss to understand Paul's teaching, how can you and former Editors profess to having the Truth, especially when Jeremiah 17:9 is quoted out of context in the general sense, yet in application to your own members and community under the B.A.S.F?

In conclusion and relief, since I may have been wasting my time, God forbid; I direct you to Psalm 37:30,31 which teaches us where the law of God resides to the exclusion of the law of Master Sin. "The mouth of the righteous speaketh wisdom, and his tongue talketh judgment. The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide."

How forcible are right words! But what doth your argument prove? Is there iniquity in my tongue? Cannot my taste discern perverse things? Surely silence is not the answer!

Brother Phil Parry.

In “The Christadelphian” dated November 1st 1873, on page 520, Robert Roberts published the following assertion:-

TO THE POINT

PROPOSITION - (Who will contradict it?) When the apostles spoke of “the flesh,” they meant the mortal flesh of men.

FACT - John declares that those who confess not that Jesus is come in the flesh, are deceivers and anti-Christ (2 John 7), and he forbids believers to receive such into their house or bid them God speed.

ANOTHER FACT - Renunciationists deny that Jesus came in the mortal flesh of men.

CONCLUSION - Therefore they deny that Jesus came in “the flesh” of apostolic discourse.

RESULT - Consequently, they belong to the modern deceivers and antichrists and are not to be received. - EDITOR.

As I pointed out in my letter to Graeham Mansfield (see page 21), the term “flesh” is used in two ways in Scripture: 1) the literal “flesh” in which we are created, and 2) the figurative “flesh” which is used of men of corrupt minds, who yield to the lusts of the flesh, and do not “walk in the Spirit” but “walk in the flesh.”

It is obvious that the figurative use of “flesh” never applied to Jesus who said “the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him.” (John 8:29).

Robert Roberts was aware of these two uses of the term “flesh” for on the very next page of “The Christadelphian,” page 521, second paragraph, he writes of “the children of the flesh, who think nothing extravagant and indiscreet that is done to feather a nest and provide for ease in this present evil world.”

Because he knew of these two uses for the term “flesh,” he either wished to apply both to Jesus, which would be unconscionable, or else he believed his ‘PROPOSITION’ was at best only half true, and if only half true or worse, then he also knew it would hoodwink his readers!

Any argument built upon such an uncertain ‘PROPOSITION’ has to be questionable.

The ‘FACT’ which quotes 2 John 7 is correct of course as a scriptural statement but here it is wrongly used to support a bad argument.

‘ANOTHER FACT’ is misleading because Robert Roberts knew very well that Renunciationists believed and taught Jesus Christ came in the same literal flesh as all other men, and his ‘CONCLUSION’ is really straining his credibility, while his ‘RESULT’ is deplorable.

However. Robert Roberts purpose in making the above declaration was to oppose Edward Turney in whatever way he could and regrettably it was regardless of scriptural accuracy.

One thing I find surprising is that it seems there was no one prepared to show Robert Roberts his error and I can only suppose that if anyone had had the courage to do so they would have been accused of betraying the Christadelphian cause and of being a “Turneyite.”

How long will Christadelphians follow Robert Roberts errors?

Russell.

“Thus it Becometh us to Fulfil All Righteousness”

The above was the answer of Jesus in response to the Baptist’s assertion “I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?” What did Jesus mean? Mark says “John did baptize in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.” But Jesus was sinless, He had nothing for which to repent. So why did He seek baptism? John we read baptised “all the land of Judaea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.”

It was of course an acted parable. The people came to John to wash away their transgressions by immersion in Jordan and arose from that symbolic ‘death to sin’ cleansed in preparation to receive as John said, “One greater than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to lose” and when Jesus went down into Jordan pure and sinless, He took upon Himself, He clothed Himself with those sins which the people had left behind. “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” - John 1:29. God “laid upon him the iniquities of us all” - Isaiah 53:6. Like the Old Testament prophets He acted out in parable the work He was to accomplish at Jerusalem before He began to preach, before He did any miracle to confirm the truth of the gospel. He emphasised His willingness to “lead many sons unto glory” of His own free will “for the joy that was set before him,” and in the full knowledge that the cross must come before the crown.

What was this “sin of the world” that Jesus “took away”? That burden He took upon Himself and carried throughout His ministry until He “nailed it to his cross” at Calvary? We read that “God hath concluded all under “Sin” that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe” (Galatians 3:22), or as in Romans 13:32, “God hath concluded them all in unbelief that he might have mercy on all.” But why should God do that when Ezekiel 18 is so emphatic that every man should die for his own sin, the father shall not die for the sins of the son, nor the son for the sins of the father”?

The answer to this paradox lies in Genesis. When Adam transgressed and alienated himself from his Creator, he became the possession, the property of ‘Sin’ for, “His servants ye are to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey.” He became a bond slave, he surrendered all he himself possessed, for bondslaves cannot own any property - wife, children and all subsequent progeny are technically and legally the property of their new master, whose only wages is ‘death,’ unless the slave is sold to a new master, as Joseph was sold to Potifar. But the Mosaic Law allowed a “near kinsman” to redeem, i.e. to purchase his brother from slavery, whether or not the owner chose to sell. Both Jesus and Adam were “sons of God.” Only Jesus was in a position to redeem Adam and we were all in Adam’s loins when he sinned. Jesus was never in Adam’s loins. God was His Father and no man ever had two fathers. Had He been in Adam, He Himself would have needed redemption, but He wasn’t for ‘When there was no arm to save His (God’s) own arm brought salvation’ and he provided a son who of his own volition chose to redeem the world from ‘Sin’ so that “for those that believe” who keep themselves “in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life” who is able to present us “faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever, Amen. - Jude 21-25.

Jesus was the Buyer; the price, His own precious blood. Not the blood of bulls and goats which only gave a temporary covering of sin for those under the Law. He has redeemed (literally, to purchase out of the forum, to deliver) those who were in bondage. He took away that condemnation for “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit” - Romans 8:1.

“Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ” - 1 Peter 1:2.

Brother Eric Cave.
(February 2001)

Third instalment of

“The Atonement” X-Rayed

by Brother A.L.Wilson

THE FEDERAL PRINCIPLE

Our last section closed with the Divine consolation that Jesus tasted death for every man. We ask, how could Jesus in justice to our creditor, the devil, taste death to redeem that 144,000 by the life blood of one man. They ascribe to Him the glory and honour in the New Song, “Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed (*egorasas* - bought us back) to God by thy blood. Had they sung “Thou wast slain to redeem thyself from thy sinful flesh and we came through all that thou came through,” the Conductor had called “Halt” on-the spot.

The Federal Principle alone explains and solves the one for many in both sections. Where one involved all, it is divinely just that one should extricate whosoever will. (Romans 5, 1 Corinthians 15).

Had God declined a ransom for Adam we had never drawn the breath of life. Or, had God-adopted the Individual Principle then every individual sinner had required a separate individual ransom. In that case, as Paul truly points out, “Jesus must often have had to suffer since the foundation of the world” (Hebrews 9:26). But on the Federal Principle. “once at the close of the age hath he appeared to put away sin offerings by the sacrifice of himself.” One ransom sacrificed for one Federal head, whose many members can be saved by faith and obedience to the appointed symbol of His crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection to a new relation and life in Christ (Romans 6). Our Adamic relation we leave in the symbolic grave of Christ.

The question must therefore ever be not the quality of our flesh, which God alone made; but in what relation do we stand toward God? Are we His sons and daughters? (1 John 3:2) The possessive case (Romans 8:3) God’s Fundamental Law of Private Ownership (genitive case) (Romans 8:3).

DELIVER AND REDEEM

God knew the accurate definition and distinction between these terms when He commanded His Elohim to “deliver him from going down into the pit, I have found a ransom” (Job 33:24). He well knew that to deliver Adam it would cost Him no less than the life blood of His own Son. Did not God, therefore, in type, slay His own Lamb in Eden? (Genesis 3:21, 22:8, Revelation 13:8, Ephesians 1:4. John 3:16, Isaiah 53). Otherwise we had never drawn the breath of life. Will not Calvary witness to all eternity the love of God and His Lamb? (Revelation 5:6).

You next string together three texts into which you sling in your fallacious implication that Jesus was under the curse.

On page 18 you say:- “So by His bearing of sin, He is Himself saved out of death, through death, through the blood of the covenant.”

Now, please permit an analysis of your implicated triune assumption. First, Hebrews 5:7 contains not the ghost of a hint that “the blood of Jesus required to be shed on His own account,” but it is a glorious

confirmation of the ransom (in place of - *anti lutron*) man. He had previously merited His title to immortality. Had you been expert on the Greek middle voice, and our English nominative absolute, you ought to have known that our Lord, before He voluntarily laid down His life's blood a ransom in place of {*anti lutron*) man, the hour had come when He should have been glorified, but had this taken place before laying down His life a ransom for man, He says He had remained alone (John 12:24). Could the Beloved One have made it plainer? The Greek middle voice, and our English nominative absolute, establish this Divine truth beyond refutation, e.g. "Having obtained a rifle, James shot the lion." Now, an infant in grammar knows that the obtaining of the rifle preceded the shooting of the lion. So Jesus also having obtained eternal deliverance {*aionian lutrosin*) entered once for all into the Holy Place" (Hebrews 9:12. See also verse 15, *eis apolutrosin*).

Now, what was God's specific purpose with His Grain of Wheat? I reply, to raise a crop. What was God's next requisite in the process? I reply, before a crop can be raised, God's own Grain must first die. But if God had sown not His Grain, what had the result been? I, with Jesus, reply, it had remained eternally with God (John 12:24). Is there a soul under heaven so dense, so grossly blind to the Divine deduction that the sacrifice of the life blood of Christ was not by any means for Himself, but for the crop of wheat? Does not God's wheat field become interesting the more so when the devil came on the scene with his tares - his condemned representative association?! Thus, the present tense, both of the Greek middle voice and that of our English nominative absolute, runs parallel with the past tense of the principal sentence. This peculiarity to many sounds a paradox, yet is simple indeed; e.g. "Coming (present tense) over the stile, I fell (past tense) and broke (past tense) my leg." Now, the function of both can be filled by a simple adverbial of time, e.g. "(When I was) coming over the stile I fell and broke my leg. It would not do to say, "Coming through the garden, the grass wet my feet," because the grass did not walk through the garden!

ATONEMENT

On page 18 you say: "So by reason of His bearing of sin, He is Himself saved out of death, through death, through the blood of the everlasting covenant."

Let us now test whether you adorn this theme, and ascertain whether Jesus by bearing His own supposed sinful flesh was saved out of death, through death, through the blood of the everlasting covenant.

I have not yet found in God's Book where blood had anything to do as a debt claimed against Jesus, neither against His character, nor against His flesh, nor that His resurrection depended upon His own shed blood, but I do find that it was because "He loved righteousness and hated iniquity, that God could not suffer His Holy One to see corruption" (Hebrews 1:9). Paul goes direct counter to your conception of the case. In your attempt to prove your fatal charge against Jesus, that His salvation from His supposed cursed flesh depended on His own shed blood, you expose your inference to the contempt of every honest philosopher. Inductive logic is ever 95% doubtful, for the simple reason that it forces you to reason from the known to the unknown and man is ever prone to bring in too much.

John declares "In Him is no sin." You say, He was sinful. Let us then, test whether Jesus was saved from His supposed condemned nature through the blood of the covenant (Hebrews 13:20):

ADJECTIVAL	A GENERAL ANALYSIS	ADVERBIAL
	PRINCIPAL	
	God	
of peace, who brought again from the dead the Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep	Make you (not Jesus) perfect	in the blood of the everlasting covenant

Your blunder consists in applying the adverbial phrase "in the blood of the covenant" to the verb of a subordinate adjectival clause instead of applying it to the verb "make" in the principal sentence. This will be seen if, for the moment, we strike out (he adjectival clauses, e.g. "God make you perfect." If we ask how, or by what means. God accomplished this, then the adverbial phrase "in the blood of the everlasting covenant"

settles the question for all time. Besides, had the apostle wished us to understand “that the blood of Jesus required to be shed on His own account.” then he would have used the preposition *dia* - through, but he did not, the terms he employs is *en* - in. How consistent, then, to read, “Now may the God of peace in the blood of the everlasting covenant make you (not Jesus) perfect.” This truth stands irrefutably intact, altogether independent of the adjectival clauses and pronounces Jesus clear at the Bar.

FOR US

On page 19 you say:- “It is true that Jesus died for us, for the ungodly, for all; but “for” here means “on account of.” “on behalf of,” as in the case of making intercession for us. Why should the innocent be put to death and the guilty allowed to live? Substitution would be unjust.”

Before I deal with your preposition “for.” permit me to point out that your last pronouncement fixes you in the tightest dilemma any soul was ever clenched. If it would be unjust on the part of God to put the innocent to death and allow the guilty to live, this would prove either, first, that Jesus was guilty; or second. God was unjust. Which horn do you choose? Whether you would say “Jesus was guilty,” or “God was unjust”? Could a condemned representative assist you? The sooner you quit that association the better for you and all enslaved by it.

Peter specifically declares that “He was put to death, the Just for the unjust,” “bruised for our iniquities” (Isaiah 53).

I agree that in a case of deliberate, malignant, defiant crime, it would be unjust to put the innocent to death and allow the guilty to live. Substitution in such a case would be diabolical. This argument powerfully betrays your indiscrimination and demonstrates your inability to separate things that differ; the dullest brain will perceive that the above is a case of crime, demanding prompt retribution. We must not confound this with “the grace of God” in His provision of a ransom (*anti lutron*) in place of man to prevent the annihilation of the race (John 3:16). Jesus by the grace of God, tasted death for every man. The substitution of the life blood of the Beloved One for Adam was the exact opposite in motive to the brutal motive you miserably read into it. His case was to “restore that which he took not away.”

Another brutal case is found in Matthew 5:38. Literally, the law said “an eye in place of (*anti*) an eye” but the wicked aggressors eye did not restore the sight of, nor replace the victim’s eye. Both eyes perished. An instance where the just Law of God demanded that the wicked aggressor shall suffer the exact loss for his wicked crime. It requires no special mental alertness to detect irrelevant cases, independent of which *anti* ever performs its own function.

PRIORITY, ANTAGONISM, OR IN PLACE OF, FOR

On page 19 you string a list of texts containing the preposition “for” (*gar*), as an onion vendor strings onions for sale. This procedure, while it indicates the direction of the wind, fails lamentably to demonstrate Divine truth. Our first duty here is whether “for” (*gar*), “on behalf of” (*huper*), or “in place of” (*anti*), are antagonistic. You are exceedingly eager these prepositions should be antagonistic, otherwise your sinful flesh hobby should be reduced to a will-o’-the-wisp. Instead of these prepositions being antagonistic, the simplest task on earth is to demonstrate them to be the closest “bosom friends,” though they have separate functions. Let us suppose that you, like Adam, through adverse circumstances, were reduced to beggary, your creditor, to secure his own, demands the sale of your possessions (life and inheritance). Along comes a kind, wealthy friend with the salutation, “Cheer up, dear C.C.Walker, I have plenty to spare, more than ever I shall require (John 12:24), I will square your bill for (*gar*), on your behalf (*huper*); in place of (*anti*) you.” Is there a Law Court under heaven could force you, dear friend C.C.Walker, to pay it over again? This is exactly what Jesus did for (*gar*), on behalf of (*huper*), in place of {*anti*} Adam. Thank God! I ask you, friend Walker, do you possess the strength to wrench asunder this threefold cord? (Exodus 4:12). Thus *gar*, *huper*, and *anti*, defy the powers of darkness to involve Jesus under the curse, and blot out the God-provided ransom and the Divine oath that He restored that which He took not away.

A WEALTHY FRIEND

Let Paul now speak:- “Though He was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that we, through his poverty, might become rich.” Thank God again!

Does not common sense alone force the Divine deduction that a condemned representative would irrevocably be as poor as those He came to save? I therefore counsel thee to quit the association of a condemned representative and buy of Jesus, our Surety, Substitute of the better covenant, gold tried in the fire, if you desire to become rich and wear white raiment instead of sinful flesh that the shame of thy nakedness in your rendering of Romans 8:3 do not appear, and anoint thine eyes that thou mayest see that a condemned representative would be blasphemously unfit for the purpose for which God brought Him into existence and hopelessly powerless to redeem Himself, to say nothing of another human soul!

Hitherto you pronounce ransom unjust and profanity, while you retain audacity to use the term yourself, but should an anxious enquirer ask your favour to define the term, then, to the most subtle double dealing on earth he would hearken. If it unjust on the part of God, and profanity to table down a ransom price in order to buy back to Himself (Dr. Thomas’s definition), how much more heinously unjust is your assumption of God’s handing over One whose very nature, you declare, was obnoxious to the curse? You strongly impress me that you are concerned neither about Just nor unjust, so long as your sinful flesh hobby can trot. Would to God the dumb beast would once more break the silence and in man’s voice forbid the madness of the prophet.

On page 19 you cite an instance of what you imagine God’s intolerance of substitution, viz.,

“When Israel made the Golden Calf, Moses interceded for them saying to God, If Thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not blot me, I pray Thee, out of the Book which Thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my Book.” (Exodus 32:32).

Then you comment:- “Substitution was not tolerated.”

To clench your accuracy of this intolerance you ask the following questions:-

First, “If Christ died instead of us, why do we die?”

Second, “And why did Christ rise?”

Third, “And how can God be said to forgive sins for Christ’s sake?”

Here again you skim the surface of things. I ask, did God repudiate substitution, or repudiate Moses as the substitute? Irrefutably the latter. He could not tolerate Moses as the substitute because Moses required to be redeemed, bought back as much so as Judas Iscariot. (Ponder Romans 5 where this truth is reiterated no less than seven times. Moreover, no soul who has some sins could substitute others with more sins. Besides Moses had been eternally blotted out of the Book of Life. Like Paul, who also could have wished himself accursed from Christ for his brethren’s sake, who had a zeal of God but not according to knowledge. Hence this hyperbolic emphasis, both of Moses and Paul, if literally put into effect had landed both companies, with their noble leaders, in an eternal grave.

The substitute man required was one who could give His life’s blood a ransom (*anti lutron*) in place of man and rise and sing, “O death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?” This One God alone provided: “Unto us a child is born! Unto us a Son is given!” The stone cut out of the mountain without hands accomplished the glory of God, which you, hitherto, have failed to touch, even the hem of His garment.

The prophet says, “No man can by any means redeem - buy back - his brethren.” Jesus confirms, “No man cometh unto the Father but by me.” “I am the door,” the second Adam. “I come not to be served but to serve and to give my life a ransom (*anti lutron*) in place of many.”

I now undertake to reply to your questions which you imagine puts substitution out of the question. You ask, if Christ died as our substitute, or instead of us

WHY DO WE DIE?

I reply, why did not Enoch and Elijah die? It has not yet dawned on you to enquire why do we live? Had the Gracious God declined a ransom for Adam we had never drawn the breath of life (Revelation 13:8, Ephesians 1:14, John 3:16). Permit the Master to answer your query why we die. He declares "He that committeth sin is the servant of sin, and the servant abideth not in the house to the age" (*eis ton aiona*) but the Son abideth to the age (*eis ton aiona*). If therefore, the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." If they must go through the grave on account of your sinful flesh, do you not blankly contradict the Master here? Paul substantiates the Master: "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Does the soul breathe who will refute the possibility of escaping death on the fulfilment of the conditions herein stated?

WHY WE DIE

Jesus declared: "If any man keep my word, he shall by no means see death" to the age (*eis ton aiona*). The Jews, like our Christadelphian friends, replied, "Now we know thou hast a demon, Abraham died, and the prophets, but thou sayest, if any man keep my word, he shall by no means see death to the age (*eis ton aiona*). Art thou greater than our father Abraham who died, and the prophets: Who is this son of man?" Cannot you perceive your conspicuous photo among those Jews?

Again Jesus declared: "This is that bread which came down from heaven, so that any man may eat of it and not die (*me apothenee*). Here is a positive declaration which is demonstrated by the cases of Enoch and Elijah. "Enoch was translated that he should not see death." Why? "Because he was well pleasing to God." Now hear Jesus but once more: "He that keepeth my word shall by no means see death to the age (*eis ton aiaona*). Thus, instead of wearing the gloomy crepe shroud of death which you cast over Jesus and His people by your "perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3," we receive the garments of praise for the spirit of heaviness, garments smelling of myrrh (Isaiah 63:1. Psalm 45:3), to be kept clean - that is, in Paul's words, "put on Christ."

WHY DID CHRIST RISE?

You next ask "If Jesus died as our substitute, why did He rise?"

This question, hitherto, has perplexed many but before I reply to your question permit me to ask another, do you imagine your sin-claimed representative an improvement here? Permit a test: if Jesus, by rising, cease to substitute for us, does not your sin-claimed Representative, by rising, equally cease to represent you? This weapon cuts equally well both ways. Instead of shaking hands with yourself, therefore, you ought to have prayed for light - but a more total subtlety lurks concealed in your very question which you hitherto have failed to perceive, viz., a condemned Representative would prevent, not only His own rising, but also that of every other human soul. How do you escape the dilemma? You attempt it by resorting to a tricky ambiguous middle term. You say, "We have yet to do with the death of Jesus, inasmuch as an apostle hath said, "I am crucified with Christ, buried with him in baptism" (Booklet page 32).

This is smart, but one little question will expose your fallacy, viz., do we require to go through literal crucifixion? Now your trick stands naked! This leap from the literal to the symbolic is a subtle quibble with Divine truth, which diverts the mind of the innocent, unqualified discriminator. Your pretence by a symbol of going through all Christ went through, by an apparent "thus saith the Lord" has played itself out. Is our baptism of equal legal value as the literal crucifixion? Then, I ask why did the Beloved One die at all? Had He turned to "Christendom Astray," page 114 and your booklet, page 32, He had discovered a tricky escape from literal crucifixion.

I now reply to your next question, viz. - "If Jesus died as our substitute..."

WHY DID CHRIST DIE?"

It gives pleasure to point out how Christ could and did substitute us in death, and triumph over the grave. This is the express purpose for which the gracious God sent Him into the world: “The Son of man came, not to be served, but to serve and to give His life a ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) many.” Is there a Greek scholar on earth who will refute this? (Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:45, 1 Timothy 2:6). Here is irrefutable evidence that this was so, but you pronounce it unjust to put the innocent to death and allow the guilty to live. I cannot help that but I can believe that Peter was no juggler, viz., “Christ suffered for sins, the Just for the unjust” (1 Peter 3:18, Isaiah 53).

His own Father, depend upon it, did not commence to “build His house without first sitting down and counting the cost” (Luke 14:28). Then “He laid in Zion a stone, a tried stone, a sure foundation. Judgment also He laid to the line even righteousness to the plummet, and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies (of those that pronounce this Stone under a double curse.” (See Malachi 1:12-14, 1 Corinthians 12:3, Hebrews 10:28, 29). “And the waters shall overflow the hiding place (Ecclesia).” Your covenant with death, even your agreement with the grave shall not stand (on a Condemned Representative).

WHY JESUS ROSE

He rose in accordance with previous Divine oath and the law of just ransom, as He had previously sacrificed His life’s blood in place of man in accordance with Divine oath (Isaiah 53). The Divine right, provision and conditions were first, “He was God’s own Son,” a truth you, by your “perfectly good rendering,” blotted out of Romans 8:3 and preferred sinful flesh; second, the Divine condition was “Not my will, but thine be done.” Did Jesus do this? “In him was no sin.” At this stage He declared, “The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified,” but unless He, like the grain of wheat, first die, He should remain alone (John 12:24). Hence it was not possible God should leave His Holy One to see corruption (Hebrew 1:2-9).

I now climax the foregoing from your own pen - “Sin, the Prince, the Devil, had nothing in Jesus, no death claim, no real fault to find. Even Pilate said, I find no fault in Him. No, nor even Herod, and Pilate washed his hands of the case.”

I ask, when will you wash your hands of this case? Could you give a more infamous exhibition of juggling with the Word of God, to declare at the same time that “His very nature was obnoxious to the curse”?

You quote. “He came not to be served, but to serve and give his life a ransom for many” and that “the devil had nothing in Jesus, no death claim.”

What prevented your definition and exposition of the term ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) many? That very term settles the question. Will you open the pages of your Magazine for my affirmative and your negative? If, as you admit, “the devil had nothing in Jesus, no death claim,” His blood was either pure, a just ransom price in place of (*anti lutron*) man or the most brutal murder ever committed under heaven! And blacker still if it was on His own account!

It is a remarkable fact that neither the term “representative” nor “substitute” occurs in God’s Book, while the synonym of both permeates the Book from Alpha to Omega, e.g. type, antitype, representative, surety or substitute, shadow, substance, etc. I agree that a representative can render you an obligation, but not in this case. Permit a test: “And it came to pass in those days that decree went out from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed, and all went to be taxed, every man to his own city.”

Now suppose you had been an invalid unable to go: your representative could oblige by taking with him your cash which would entail him no extra trouble seeing he was irrevocably bound to go and pay his own account - a black hole in which to land the Beloved of God!

Now you must not forget that it is cash Caesar, the devil, ever demands- Also don’t forget that even in this case, you must first furnish your representative with your own cash; otherwise he cannot even represent you. If he pays your tax then he substitutes his cash to square your debt. This is exactly what Jesus did for

Adam, on behalf of (*huper*), in place of (*anti*) Adam. He became surety (*egguos*) or substitute of the better covenant (Hebrews 7:22).

The Gracious God also arranged a taxing (Romans 5) but the exact opposite to that of Caesar. God decided to pay the tax for all (John 3:36, Romans 8:3) and He still pleads, “him that cometh unto me, I will by no means cast out,” but will freely hand him the receipt (1 Peter 1:18). Has not God been gracious? But if God had accepted your stratagem of paying this account by handing over to his black majesty one of his very own coins, one whose very nature, you declare, “was obnoxious to the curse,” could you point out to me in history a blacker fraud?

When the two Greeks came up to Jerusalem at the Feast to worship, who desired to see Jesus and came to Philip stating their request, Philip told Andrew and both took the Greeks to Jesus who replied: “The hour in come that the Son of man should be glorified, but except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit” (John 12:24).

Just permit your assumption here: C.C.Walker: “Excuse me, Lord, you could not remain alone except you first go through execution for yourself. Your very nature is obnoxious to the curse. You require to attend our Birmingham Lectures and become acquainted with our Basis of Fellowship.”

The severest test to which a pet assumption can be subjected is to read it into God’s Word, Even pure deductive logic is then forced to take a back seat. Can you not perceive that in the above interview with the Master, how forcibly He demonstrated that He had a reserve in the Bank upon which He could fall back? He well knew that His own Father was an honest Banker. Jesus at this stage, by perfect obedience to His Father’s will, had safeguarded His claim to incorruptibility there and then, His birthright, and like the grain of wheat, in a position to surrender His natural life blood a ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) man.

It was not, therefore, possible the Just God could suffer His Holy One to see corruption. This answers your question how Jesus could, and did, substitute us in death, and exclaim, “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?” I warn you once more, and implore you to deposit your treasure with this Banker also. It is not a question of sinful flesh but sin’s flesh - belonging to sin. Read Romans 8:3 once more and you will there find that Jesus belonged to God and that the Gracious God, by the sacrifice of His own Son in flesh, condemned sin. It was not sin in flesh but Jesus in flesh who was sacrificed to accomplish this. Peter clenches Paul’s declaration beyond refutation: “He was put to death in flesh (*sarki*), but was quickened (made alive) in spirit – (*pneumati*)” 1 Peter 3:18).

Thus your assumption that Christ’s very nature was obnoxious to the curse, demanding His execution on His own account is absent from God’s Book. Commercial transaction with the Word (John 2:16) will shortly vanish. When He returns the merchants (*emporos*) no more buy (*agorazo*) sinful flesh (Revelation 18:15); you artfully blot out the possessive case in Romans 5 and sling in your favourite adjective “sinful,” a horrid dish for infants’

to be continued...