

Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No 192

November/December 2001

In this Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2 Letter from	Brother Phil Parry and Sister Rene Parry
Page 4 Continuing correspondence between	Brother X and Brother Eric Cave
Page 7 No Memorial Name	Brother A.H.Broughton
Page 11 Extract from "Basic Tenets of Islam" leaflet distributed in 1990 by	Leslie & Edith Johnson
Page 12 The Terrible Urgency of Repentance	Brother Viner Hall
Page 14 Brother Phil Parry writes: -	
Page 16 The Case Against "The Two Sons of God" and other "Clean Flesh" Literature.	Author unknown
Page 24 Commentary on above	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 31 "I Remember Ewe, Thought the Sheep"	Dr. Kendrick

Editorial

Dear Brothers, Sisters and Friends, Loving Greetings

I don't know how many of us reading this, when we pick up a Bible, pick up the King James Bible also known as the Authorised Version. I rather suspect most of us. Because for those of us of a certain age it is the version we were brought up with and so the one that is most familiar to us. It is also unquestionably the most beautiful and majestic in the language that it uses.

It may not be as readily accessible as other more modern versions and so it requires careful study and attention and some knowledge of ancient idioms. But there is something supremely appealing to read about our Creator in a language other than the one we use every day to our friends. It seems more respectful and it reminds us of the humility and thankfulness that is due to God and seems entirely appropriate when contemplating what He has planned for us and what He has seen fit to reveal of Himself and His beloved Son.

Bearing this in mind I was interested to read the other day about a plan the Queen has for her golden jubilee year. She intends evidently to renovate each of the chapels in the royal palaces. But here is the really interesting part - this plan was to have been allied with another religious project of wide-reaching consequences - a royally decreed revision of the King James Bible.

For some time Prince Charles has cherished the idea of revising the King James Version with a view to removing its inaccuracies and repackaging it for a new generation. The Authorised Version was published in 1611 after a seven-year translation process ordered by James 1. It contains a number of mistranslations and textual inaccuracies which the last 400 years of scholarship have uncovered. Apparently Charles had no intention of altering the Tudor language but he did for some reason want to remove certain rude words. This seems unnecessary to me, however the plan was also to present, the new version in a modern typeface and layout, allowing the poetry to be set out in stanzas, and hymns in verses, and permitting quotation marks.

When Charles presented this idea to Her Majesty she was much taken with it, seeing the updating of the KJV to be her jubilee present to Church and state. She consulted the Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain senior bishops were sounded out but they were all lukewarm, muttering that the Church should be about going forward, not backward, and arguing that current modern 'inclusive language' translations without archaic English were just fine, thank you very much.

Downing Street was tipped off about the project and one of Blair's friends questioned whether a constitutional monarch could order such a work without parliamentary consent and pointing out that Blair wasn't about to entangle Parliament in such a project.

So, unfortunately in the face of such obstruction and apathy the Queen was forced to give up. This seems strange for when James 1 commissioned the original translation he needed nobody's consent.

Love to all, Helen Brady.

Letter from Brother and Sister Phil Parry

Dear Editors, Greetings and Love in our Saviour's Name.

We both thank you for the Circular Letter which proved very interesting especially the personal letters and replies. It is very evident that despite our efforts to convince people that we believe Adam was a corruptible creature at his creation capable of dying if not given an incorruptible nature, and that we believe Jesus was of the same unchanged nature as Adam, they still seem unable to grasp this fact of truth based on the Scripture records but allow themselves to be led away by invented theories of men who once knew better in 1869.

The inaccurate conception of the "Death by Sin" has made the true understanding of the death Jesus suffered as a Substitute to form, it seems, three theories of which only one can be correct. The Christendom theory is out; the Christadelphian theory is out; these oppose each other on the meaning and matter of baptism but neither is accompanied with belief, understanding and faith, so that we who profess the clear concept of the Substitutionary death of Jesus are left to preach and uphold its meaning and truth on the basis of the Word of God. The only true basis.

Gordon Cooper accuses us of being confused on this matter and I can understand that by the fact that he returned to the Christadelphian Central Fellowship three years ago, the members being either confused through lack of perception or willingly confused in order not to rock the boat.

Then we have Graeham Mansfield accusing me of not comprehending the Genesis account regarding Adam, and in the same statement confirming that I do. Hence Brother Eric Cave's noticing Graeham's error and asking "Is Saul (Graeham) also among the prophets?"

Who is confused Mr Cooper? And what possessed you to leave your former position? Was it that the supposed strong Fellowship" you speak of was merely related to an approved society of certain members reluctant to accept doctrinal change - the true Fellowship with the Father and His Son based on the Holy Word being the least important in order to keep the peace? Perhaps this is the reason for your return to the Central Fellowship as founded upon Robert Roberts and defended by Michael Ashton, for it appears you love to have it so.

You ask why is our Church so empty for it seems we rely on past members deceased to make up our numbers? Well, is not this a fact, that the Body of Christ is made up of people from the time of Adam to the time when it will be complete, a glorious Church having the seal of God, built and founded upon His Spirit, without sound of tools of man, people that we do not know from registers and marks in their foreheads or right hands but known to God?

Of dear, Gordon, I am allowing my pen to carry me away, forgetting you no longer want any more of our magazines in which we condemn the statements of responsible people which in effect deny that Jesus was the Son of God, among other errors of doctrine. Now you say we lack faith!

From the time of facing the false accusation of holding the so-called 'Clean Flesh' doctrine, how many lacked faith under the threats of being cast out of the camp? Did they not in faith go out as Abram, not

knowing what lay ahead but confident through love of the Truth and faith in God that they had chosen what was right in going forth unto Jesus without the camp bearing his reproach? For indeed to believe in Jesus as a condemned son of Adam is to reproach Him and He who sent Him.

How good it would have been to have dwelt in unity of the faith once delivered to the saints, a possibility to have been achieved if they had listened to Edward Turney in 1873 and improved on his work! But no, the only alternative became separation and isolation, a trial of faith as it has been from the beginning including women of great faith by knowledge, wisdom and understanding, of whom the Scriptures bear witness and not forgetting those of our faith and left widows, who had supported their husbands in this trial of faith being much more precious than of gold that perisheth though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ; whom having not seen, they love; in whom, though now they see him not, yet believing, they rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: receiving the end of their faith, even the salvation of their souls - 1 Peter 1:5-9.

These are the women of our faith past and present whom we must not forget or neglect in their loneliness and trials in isolation. Paul in his day appreciated their work and labour of love toward his companions labouring in the service of the Gospel, especially towards his own needs.

We who are known as Nazarenes have, since 1873, lacked the amenities of large buildings to hold meetings and to worship and give praise to our Heavenly Father; isolation and miles of separation makes it more difficult so to spread our Gospel message we have to resort to the pen and paper, whereas if we were welcomed to speak to a large or medium congregation, more could be learned and understood more simply.

There would also be less misrepresentation and less misunderstanding and perhaps less accusation by letter writing and forbidding further replies and retreating to avoid acceptance of defeat, as recently experienced.

Our Love and Sincere Regards in Jesus' Name,

Phil and Rene Parry. [16.10.2001]

* * *

Brother Phil Parry is by far our most faithful and prolific contributor to the Circular Letter, indeed it is difficult to imagine what the C.L. would be like without him. At the moment Brother Phil is not very well and we would sympathize should he wish to take a rest from writing. He and Sister Parry have asked us to send their love to all brothers and sisters and meanwhile we send our love to them both. Our prayers are for them and particularly for Brother Phil's return to health and strength. Sister Evelyn Linggood, who is 94 and very frail, is also in our prayers. At the time of writing she is in hospital. We send her our love.

“Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour,
especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.” - 1 Timothy 5:17.

Helen and Russell

In spite of not being well Brother Phil recently sent us this short comment regarding the letter from Brother X in the last Circular Letter: -

The Letter from Mr X was more of a “hit and run” than a constructive definition of the teaching of Jesus and His Apostles and his reference to Christadelphians being a sinking ship sounds rather nonsensical when he supports most of what they believe. I always believed that when a ship was sinking its passengers and crew took to the lifeboats and got away from it while there was opportunity.

He appears to me as a know-all giving advice on what we should do instead of wasting our time and resources trying to set the Central Fellowship right (an admission they are wrong) and also his assumption that they are superior to unbelievers and we should concentrate on preaching to unbelievers. But for what

purpose? Do not Christadelphians claim to be doing that - consequently inviting their converts to board a sinking ship? Furthermore we do not contend with Christadelphians because of ill-treatment, past or present, we earnestly contend for the Faith once delivered to the saints to show the contrast between that Apostolic Faith and what Christadelphians profess and teach out of harmony with Scripture, especially their reasons for why Christ died - apparently to destroy the devil in His flesh, but Mr X fails to explain this statement he made of Jesus dying on Calvary but supports the unscriptural doctrine of sin in the flesh, which is not in those who walk in the Spirit and was not in Jesus whose inclination by knowledge and wisdom was to do the will of His Father which He did up to the time of His words in John chapter 17 "I have glorified Thee on the earth, I have finished the work thou gavest me to do."

Sister Helen's and Brother Cave's replies were according to Truth and not for the sake of being antagonistic but against hypocrisy, error and misrepresentation of Nazarene belief and faith. Thank you both for the words expressed by the Spirit of Christ.

Brother Phil Parry

Eric Cave received another letter from X which we publish below, following which is his reply:-

Dear Eric, Thank you for your letter. Greetings also to Helen, Russell and others as I'm sure you'll pass this on. It is refreshing to encounter genuine brotherly sentiment and courtesy as opposed to being ignored, treated with pious hypocrisy or outright aggression as has been my experience in engaging with the Christadelphian Establishment. If they've no ammunition left for you it's probably because its already been expended on me and my 'accomplices' ... argument of force, not force of argument I hasten to add!

This said I'm sorry to have to continue to disagree with your position. Jesus could not have 'bottled out' from the cross and remained sinless. James 4:37 - "anyone then who knows the good he ought to do and doesn't do it, sins." Avoiding being the saviour of humanity would be the ultimate sin of omission! Jesus had already prophesied that He would go to the cross, to have failed to do so would have made Him and His Father liars. It is news to me that one can do the opposite of God's will and inherit immortality!

"If it be possible let this cup pass from me..." It wasn't! You accuse us of calling Jesus unclean, yet you in effect say that it is possible for God to lie and that sin isn't sin! Motes and beams, please!

The repeated Nazarene claim that it is pure coincidence that everyone bar one has sinned thus far is akin to discussions of how many angels can dance on a pinhead,.. Produce one person who happens not to have sinned yet and then let's investigate whether their flesh is 'clean' or not. This is an argument about words! We're sinners, Jesus provided salvation.

The fact that God made man 'very good' has no moral bearing at all. The serpent and the earwigs and amoebae were all created 'very good' too! Robert Roberts overstated the case far too much but the Nazarenes have simply gone to another wrong extreme. If our nature isn't sin-tended, I cannot see what place you find in your theology for Romans 7 where Paul teaches an evil instinct in us beyond our conscious volition - modern biology has identified this for us, the unconscious, instinctive 'reptile brain' (!) that urges those aspects of our personality which humans perceive as 'evil' - cruelty, selfishness, greed, etc. As this part of our brains also governs heart beat and breathing (blood?), this explains why 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven' (1 Cor. 15:50) (Jesus attained to it by shedding his blood, and his blood also provided for us. He needed to escape this 'body of death' as much as us). Jesus wasn't the devil but unless the devil was part of Jesus (e.g. temptation in wilderness) then what is it? Your theology cries out for a personal devil.

Jesus never got His blood back and His flesh was transformed. Before His death He could be tempted. Afterwards He had God's nature. Something undesirable had perished on the cross. He'd destroyed His share of the serpentine legacy; or is Genesis just talking about snakes biting people and people treading on snakes?

Romans 5:13 tells us that sin was in the world before even the law regarding the trees - did the immature Adam and Eve really conduct themselves at all times as God would have them have done? Even Jesus was made perfect (in the sense of mature) by suffering (Hebrews 2:10). I suggest that Hebrews 5:7-10 is utterly incompatible with your assertion that Jesus could have simply undergone apotheosis whenever He felt like it. In the desert it was a choice between the devil's visions of 'Super-Caesar' (lust of flesh, eyes and pride) or the road to the cross, never a suggestion of being received into heaven alone.

Don't rejoice over the dying Central Fellowship. Your splinter sect will disappear even before its parent body, both having missed the way. Christadelphia in all its forms has been obsessed with theological correctness before all else - it sounds fine (Pharisaism always does on paper!) but it is not the Bible's priority! You have simply adopted an even more exclusive position than our own pathetically isolationist sect. Success for you would involve peeling off significant numbers of brothers and sisters willing to get excited over such a theological quibble - exactly the sort of people who are running the community into the ground at this moment. It's a lose-lose scenario.

Drop this doctrine - it's wrong, unhelpful and a dead end. Your realization that the BASF and the Establishment are past their sell-by date is far more valuable. The free congregations/left-wing/progressive Christadelphians - call them what you will - could do with every body we can to try and save that which is worth saving in our movement. Remember at present rates of decline alone we're decimated in 10 years and gone in 20, if it doesn't tear apart long before that. How long will you last? It will take a miracle to turn this around but I'm willing to hold out for it a little longer.

Love in Jesus, Brother X. (23rd September 2001)

* * *

Reply from Eric Cave, dated 6th October 2001:-

Dear Brother X, Greetings in Jesus our Lord.

Thank you for your letter of 23rd September and some of the sentiments expressed. I trust you will respond and advise me where I am wrong in the following further observations on our differences; although I am confident that you will do so in view of your own observations on the habits of the CDN 'establishment' which we share.

You have contended that Jesus could not have 'bottled out' from the cross and remained sinless. I take it that you will agree that the scripture only knows one definition of 'sin,' namely, "transgression of the law." When James wrote that "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin" then this was because the law enjoined goodness upon those to whom the law applied. But which law? For it is the privilege of the Lawgiver to alter or amend 'Law' according to times then present. Let me illustrate:-

In the garden the only law applicable was that which forbade Adam and Eve to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. But by the time of Noah it is obvious that God had required men to distinguish between clean and unclean animals, as is demonstrated by the differing numbers taken into the ark. But with the new age commencing after the flood God said "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you, even as the green herb have I given you all things." The Law for the next 'age' (*aion*) re-instated the distinctions between clean and unclean animals for 'meat' as is so carefully defined in the laws received by Moses at Sinai, only to be cancelled again in the next 'age' when Peter was told "What God hath cleansed, call not thou unclean" and Paul told Timothy that God had created all meats to be received with thanksgiving by those who believed and knew the truth (1 Timothy 4:3). Nevertheless the Mosaic Law remained in force until Jesus rose from the tomb in the glory of His *zoe* life and replaced the old Mosaic Law with the 'law of Christ' for believers. Therefore when Jesus freely gave Himself for the sins of the world He was under the Mosaic Law, "which of you convinceth me of sin?" His freedom to choose good or evil was nothing to do with 'law,' which laid down no instructions concerning self sacrifice and where no law is there is no transgression. I conclude therefore that Jesus could not have sinned even if He had 'bottled out' from the terror of crucifixion.

James then was quite correct under the law of Christ when he contends that when we know the good and fail to do it we are sinners, and how blessed we are that our Judge is “faithful and just to forgive us our sins” and equally it is true that when Jesus prophesied that He would go to the cross, then if He had subsequently failed to fulfil His own words He would have been a false prophet, but it would not have been a ‘transgression of the law’, it would not have constituted a ‘sin’ for the law of Christ was still future.

Next Romans 7 and what you term ‘Nazarene theology.’ It is true that in all English Bibles there is a change of tense in the middle of verse 14 which continues to the end of the chapter. But this arose because all Christendom, including King James translators and the Christadelphian ‘establishment’ remain believers in “Original Sin.” Whereas the verb tense in English is completely ‘time orientated’ (unlike Hebrew and Greek). In English the verb tense clearly confirms all action as either past, present or future. This does not apply in Greek where except for the future tense the tense is not concerned with ‘time’ but with the nature and state of the action as any Greek grammar will confirm. The context normally decides whether a translator renders the passage as past, present or future. Ask yourself the question, Could the man who writes in Romans 7:5, “For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.” Could such a man follow that glorious contention with the statement that “I am carnal sold under sin”? Could such a man have exhorted the Corinthians “Be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ”? Impossible! The whole of chapter 7 from verse 14 should have been in the past tense when translated, and I believe would have been had Christendom not been deceived by “Original Sin” or “Sin in the flesh” as Christadelphians term it. Why does the very next verse (chapter 8) declare “There is therefore NOW no condemnation (Greek *katakrima* = down judgment) to them which are in Christ Jesus who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit”? Was Paul “in the Spirit”? Of course he was; he was “in Christ” from the moment of that baptism following his experience on the Damascus road.

Next for what you term our ‘reptile brain’ or as I would term it “unlawful lust” or “unlawful desires,” lust and desire being the same word in Greek although sadly understood differently in Christadelphia who think that lust is sinful and desire has a different connotation. Jesus, for example, said “With desire (lust) have I desired (lusted) to eat this Passover with you before I suffer.” It was not wrong for David to admire the beauty of Bathsheba when he inadvertently saw her ablutions. But it was wrong when he permitted that admiration to covet her and became sin when adultery resulted from their meeting, for the law had said “Thou shalt not commit adultery” and it was doubly wrong when he connived at the murder of Uriah for the law had said “Thou shalt not kill,” and trebly wrong when the law said “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours wife” or as James puts it “Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished bringeth forth death.” John Thomas was quite correct when he asked “In what sense was creation “very good” and answered “In an animal and physical sense.” We share with the beasts the necessity and desire for food and drink, rest and sleep, sex and in some cases territory. Only when these necessary lusts are abused in defiance of divine law in the case of humans do they become sin.

You have misunderstood Romans 5:13 when you claim that sin was in the world even before the law regarding the trees (of Eden). Paul is speaking of the law meaning the Moses variety, not the prohibition given to Adam, as the context confirms. Likewise I contend that you are incorrect when you refer to Hebrews 5:7-10 where the scripture reads in verse 7 “him that was able to save him from death,” the Greek preposition is *ek* which means ‘out of rather than ‘from’ - the passage should read “him that was able to save him out of death” not merely the *psuche* life which Jesus surrendered on the cross. “Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upwards, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?” His *psuche* life was indeed left in the tomb, but His *zoe* life ascended unblemished to His Father whose power raised him in the glory of the sprit life, which He now has in fact and we have by promise.

When Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 15 of flesh and blood not inheriting the kingdom of heaven he is speaking metaphorically of the natural man whose nature will be changed in the twinkling of an eye when Christ returns if he has walked in the spirit and not in the flesh, and those who are asleep in Christ will be raised immortal, for “this mortal (those dead in Christ) must put on immortality, and this corruptible (those then alive and living in Christ) must put on incorruptibility.”

I think I have written enough for the time being and sincerely hope you will advise me where I have been unscriptural or illogical- But one further observation. You have said “Success for you would involve peeling off significant numbers of brethren and sisters” Wrong! Nazarenes in my experience are not interested in numbers. Sufficient to know that the Master declared “No man cometh to me except the Father call him.” God knoweth those who are His. “Many are called, but few are chosen.” Paul claimed that he had sown, and Apollos watered but God giveth the increase. God giveth the increase, not the preaching of fallible men, but the Word which is able to make us wise unto salvation.

You have raised many points and I have only responded to the more important ones as I have judged them. Thank you again for an interesting letter. May grace and peace be with you.

Sincerely your brother in the Master’s service, Eric Cave.

No Memorial Name

It is a mistake to speak of the “Memorial Name” of God.

1. That mistake arose through overlooking a Hebrew idiom. That idiom is this - whenever the word ‘this’ (*ze* masculine, *zath* feminine) occurs twice in the same connection, the first signifies ‘this’ and the other ‘that.’ In modern English we would write ‘the one’ and ‘the other’ or maybe ‘the former’ and ‘the latter’.

See any Hebrew Grammar, e.g., Davidson: Introduction Grammar, section 13(4);

Davidson: Hebrew Syntax, section 5; Teach Yourself Hebrew; page 60 - yet Gesenius’ Lexicon, Tregelles, curiously overlooks this idiom and cites Exodus 3:15 in the usual way.

For examples of this idiom in the Old Testament see Appendices B and D.

2. So Exodus 3:15 tells us that “I AM” is God’s name and “the God of your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob” is His title. In other words, “the former is My Name and the latter is My Title.”

On the Name “I AM” see appendix E.

3. David saw this distinction between the Name and the Memorial - or Description: “Thy Name, O Lord endureth for ever;

“Thy Memorial, O Lord, throughout all generations” - Psalm 135:13.

See appendix A for mention of Isaiah 26:8.

4. I have given above the English form of the Hebrew phrase. In Hebrew the words “the God of” have to be used four times in Exodus 3:15, for otherwise the passage would mean to a Hebrew - “Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the God of your fathers” – four individuals. But in English we say “the God of your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.”

5. The Queen of England has a name and several titles. (For the full list of her titles refer to the 24 lines of small type in Whittaker’s Almanack) She has a name and titles. She has no Title-name or Memorial-Name. Neither has the Most High. His Memorial, or Description, or Title, is not His Name; it is “The God of your Fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.”

6. The Hebrew root has the meaning of remembrance. As a verb and noun it occurs nearly 300 times in the Old Testament and always has the significance of memory, memorial, remembrance, remember, etc. E.g. Esther 6:1, the Book of records: Malachi 3:16, a book of remembrance.

7. But we do not in English speak of one's description as his 'memorial.' We usually say 'description.' Sometimes such descriptions are in fact titles: e.g. Lord Mayor of London, Dean of Canterbury, Admiral of the Fleet, etc. So it is justifiable to speak of the 'memorial' of the Most High as His Title.

This is not a case of irreverence but of simple grammar. I have the more confidence in putting forth this rendering of 'Title' seeing that Parkhurst gives that definition, among others, of the Hebrew word, thus -

“A memorial, title, to be mentioned by. Exodus 3:15”

Notice that he uses that word 'title' in connection with the passage we are considering. •(see Note below)

8. How humble is the Most High! He could have chosen as His Titles “The God of Heaven, El Elohim, Lord of Lords” etc., etc. (For a fuller range see Psalm 136), but instead of such titles, true ones, He has chosen the Title “The God of your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.”

9. That Psalm 136 shows the humility of God in a subtle manner. On the first reading it would seem that the first and the last verses have been transposed inadvertently. If those two verses were exchanged then the Psalm would give the Titles of the Most High in perfect order. “God of Heaven, El Elohim” etc. So that the actual order of the verses shows that God would rather be praised because He is good rather than because He is the God of Heaven. Does that also not mean that He would rather be good than the God of heaven?

10. The Name and Title appear several times in the Old Testament, eg. Exodus 4:5, Deuteronomy 1:11,21, 4:1, 6:3, 27:3, 2 Chronicles 14:4, 28:9.

11. There is one verse which in some English versions appears to contradict the rendering of the Hebrew word which in this article I have submitted- It is Hosea 12:5 and is dealt with in Appendix C.

* **Note:** Since this article was written the NEW ENGLISH BIBLE has been published. In Exodus 3 the Hebrew word is given as 'title'. But the Hebrew idiom has been transferred into English as “this... this,” instead of being translated as “the one... the other.”

* * *

APPENDIX A **Isaiah 26:8**

The Revised Version reads:- “To thy name and to thy memorial is the desire of our soul”

Young's Literal:- “to Thy name and to Thy remembrance.”

Revised Standard Version:- “thy memorial name is the desire of our soul” - this RSV rendering ignores the presence in the Hebrew and in the Septuagint and in the Dead Sea Scrolls of the conjunction “and”. It is one of the flaws in, as a whole, an excellent translation.

LXX: *epi to onomati sou, kai epi te mneia*

Dead Sea Scroll has the conjunction, but instead of 'memory' it reads “law” - “to thy name and to thy law”

Since this article was written the NEW ENGLISH BIBLE has been published. At this verse it reads:- “thy name and thy memory are our heart's desire.”

APPENDIX B

Some examples of the Hebrew idiom in the Old Testament

Ecclesiastes 3:19;- “as the one (*ze*) dieth, so dieth the other (*ze*)”

Exodus 14:20:- “The one (*ze*) came not near the other (*ze*)”

1 Kings 3:23:- “The one (*zath* == ‘this’ feminine) saith, and the other (*zath*)...”

Isaiah 6:3;- “One (*ze*) called to another (*ze*)”

Ecclesiastes 6:5:- “This (*ze*) hath rest rather than the other (*ze*)”

The same idiom occurs in the plural “these” :

1 Kings 20:29:- “One (*ale*= these) over against the other (*ale*)”

Daniel 12:2:- “Some (*ale*) to everlasting life and some (ie. *Ale* = others)”

Zechariah 2:4 in Hebrew Bible (R.V. 1:18-21):- “Those (*ale*)...” [i.e. the horns], v.19

“and these (*ale*)” [ie. the smiths, v 20].

Psalm 20:8 (R-V. 20:7):- “Some (*ale*) trust in chariots and some (*ale*) in horses.

A double example appears in 2 Samuel 2:13: -

“These (*ale*) on the one (*ze*) side, and the others (*ale*) on the other (*ze*) side”

Another double occurrence is seen in Joshua 8:22:-

“Some (*ale*) on this (*ze*) side and some [ie. the others] (*ale*) on that (*ze*) side”

The same idiom appears in the Chaldee:

Daniel 2:43:- “not cleave one (*dne*) to another (*dne*)

Daniel 5:6 :- “his knees smote one (*da*) against another (*da*)”

Daniel 7:3 :- “four great beasts... diverse one (*da*) from another (*da*)”

APPENDIX C

Hosea 12:5:-

“The Lord is his memorial” (Revised Version). Whose memorial? Jacob’s! But let us examine the verse closely.

The LXX reads:- “He prevailed with the angel, and was strong; they wept, and intreated me: they found me in the house of On, and there a word was spoken to them. But the Lord God almighty shall be his memorial” i.e. Jacob’s memorial.

The Syriac reads:- “Jacob... prevailed... the Lord God of Hosts has remembered him” i.e. Jacob.

But, as in the case of other readings which appear to contradict a true teaching, there are several variants. Here are some renderings:

Fenton:- 'The Lord who remembers'
Zamenhof:- 'The eternal is His name'
RSV:- 'The LORD is His name'

In passing it is interesting to notice in the LXX the reference to 'the house of On.' This word 'On' is the one that appears in Exodus 3:14 LXX as the name of God: "*ego eimi ho On*" = "I AM the Existing One" and in the Apocalypse 1:8, "*ego eimi... ho On.*"

APPENDIX D

In Genesis 28:17 there is another occurrence of the Hebrew idiom referred to in these pages. As it has been overlooked by the translators, I am recording it here. Notice the context - "*IEUE (Yahveh)* stood upon it" i.e. the stairway (Hebrew, *sim*) that reached to heaven.

LXX:- "The Lord stood upon it."
Syriac:- "The Lord stood above it"

There was Jacob, on 'a certain place' (v.11) and the stairway was 'set' upon that place and the top of it was 'to' heaven.

Then Jacob exclaims, "surely this is the House of God! and that is the Gate of Heaven!" - referring firstly to the place whereon he stood and then to the top of the stairway that reached to heaven.

For 66 years I wondered how Jacob could say of the ground whereon he stood that it was the Gate of Heaven. The translation of the Hebrew idiom explains everything.

This Hebrew idiom also appears in the Greek of John. This may indicate that it has been imperfectly translated from an Aramaic original; alternatively, that John was thinking in Aramaic while writing Greek. The phrase in our Greek text reads - John 19:18:- "*enteuthen kaf enteuthen*" = 'hence and hence'. In English, 'this side and that.'

APPENDIX E **The Name "I AM"**

The Authorized Version is correct here. The Hebrew *aeie* is simply the verb 'to be' first person singular, imperfect form (or the 'incomplete')- This word appears very frequently in the Old Testament, of course. The previous occurrence is in verse 12 - "certainly I am (*aeie*) with you."

This was not merely a promise for the future. A similar promise was made by our Lord in Matthew 28:20:- "I am with you all the days." In both cases the promise is a present one - "I am." The context in both cases implies that the presence would be an ever-present one.

As to the change of the name *AEIE* to *IEUE* (He is) in the rest of the Old Testament and the Name as it is given in the New Testament at Revelation 1:4, 8:4,8, etc.. and in the Septuagint and other versions, all this and much more is considered in another essay.

A.H.Broughton (February 1968)

From - Basic Tenets of Islam

Territory. The spreading of Islam is by territorial conquest. Once Islam has controlled a territory or area it is regarded as always Islamic. If the territory should be subsequently lost to non-muslims then the nature of Allah has been diminished and the territory must be retaken

In relations between nations, Muslim nation to Muslim, there is the concept of “The House of Peace.”

In respect of Muslim nation to non-muslim nation there is “The House of War.” No nation can get out of the “House of War” except by becoming a Muslim nation; i.e. by having a Muslim leader.

Peace. True peace cannot exist between Muslim and non-muslim nations. The concept of Jihad (Holy War) is always in force to spread Islam through territorial conquest. Territories lost to Islam (as Israel and Lebanon) must be reclaimed. In Islam vengeance does not belong to God, but to the Muslim community which must avenge Allah. Therefore there is no possibility of peace with non-muslims in the Western understanding of peace as co-existence between societies or as pluralism within society.

Israel. Islam can never accept the right of Israel to exist in Palestine. First and foremost Israel is ruled by Jews, making it a Jewish state, not a Muslim one. That places Israel in “The House of War.” Secondly Israel became a state in the post Ottoman period which was Islamic. In fact Muslims conquered the area in AD 638. Therefore Allah was diminished when His (!) territory was taken over by non-muslims and it must be reclaimed for Allah by the Muslim community. It is immaterial that the land was given to the Jews by covenant with God BC 2000 as recorded in Genesis and that the Jews have prior historical and religious claims to it, all such arguments are rejected as lies by a religion which asserts that the Bible has been corrupted to hide the predictions of the coming of Muhammad. The truth for a Muslim is that God first gave the revelation of Truth to the Jew who perverted it, then to the Christians who also perverted it, so He gave it to Muhammad the last of the prophets who superseded all others. To a Muslim, Christians and Jews are inferior to Muslims and are therefore second class citizens (dhimmis) in an Islamic state and must submit to Islamic Law.

The qura'n is the constitution of a Muslim nation; Government and theology are the same. There can be no democracy as the west understands it, not any separation of church and state. Governments are therefore dictatorial and theocratic as expressed by the leader, the servant of Muhammad. Iraq is called a ‘democratic republic’ but is total despotism. Saddam Hussein gained power by personally shooting his predecessor in the head. He rules by the bullet and not the ballot and because everything that happens is the predestined will of Allah (which leads to fatalism) submission is demanded (in fact Islam means submission) surrendering all to Allah. Muslim clergy cannot talk or write about their faith to non-muslims, nor question the teaching of Muhammad.

Islam is based on five pillars

1. WITNESS. This consists of confessing that “There is no God but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet.

2. PRAYER. To be performed five times a day facing Mecca and the sacred Ka’ba. Prayer is submission. Prayer is not created by the individual but consists of recitation from the Qura’n with appropriate gestures.

3. ZAKAT. Almsgiving to the poor and to the Mosque.

4. SAWM. Fasting during daylight hours in the month of Ramadan.

5. HAJ. Pilgrimage to Mecca at least once in a lifetime.

Some add a sixth pillar, **JIHAD.** Exertion in the way of God or Holy War. It has a personal application in the continuing inner exertion against the tendency to stray from the tenets of Islam and a global

connotation in the on-going war against the enemies of Islam and the a struggle to spread Islamic Truth, i.e. the "Household of Submission." This relates to territory govern by Muslims under "Shari'a (Muslim Law). Any Muslim killed in a Jihad ascends to paradise immediately.

Circulated by Leslie & Edith Johnson 1990

We are grateful to Brother Phil Parry for sending in the following report of an address by Brother Viner Hall which he came across with other literature from either the late brother Pearce or the late brother Ernest Brady. It is reprinted from the "Harrogate Advertiser" for Saturday, October 5th 1940.

In his article it will be seen Viner Hall claims belief in the gospel followed by baptism brings us into a saving relationship to God and unites us with Christ; that baptism is necessary because we derive our lives from Adam and so need cleansing to free us from our death-condemned nature; that by uniting us with Christ it enables God to favour us in the forgiveness of sins; that Jesus also needed baptism for the same reason - to cleanse Himself from His death-condemned nature and unite Himself with His Father and presumably, as He had no sins, our salvation is assured by our being united with Him. This is Viner's view of the atonement in making good our relationship with God but he has done away with the need for the crucifixion of Jesus Christ on Calvary as, it seems, the death of Jesus achieved nothing : -

The Terrible Urgency of Repentance.

Current Events Show its Necessity

What repentance means. On Sunday, at the Farmer's Hall, Knaresborough, Mr Viner Hall of Weston-super-Mare, gave an arresting lecture on "The Terrible Urgency of Repentance." Explaining that scriptural repentance meant change of mind leading to reformation of character - according to the standard of Christ - Mr. Hall said that those so repenting were assured of God's protection from the perils and dangers of the present troublous times and of final deliverance from the coming destruction.

The speaker drew a parallel between past times of apostasy and wickedness and the present time - in which the same iniquities were universally acknowledged to be rampant - and said that God was about to punish the world by a visitation of judgments far more severe, and that we were now witnessing the human beginnings of those judgments.

Religious Decay. Eminent writers and speakers agreed that "a great deal was wrong with the world; otherwise it could not have plunged into the catastrophe of general war. We have neglected God and His laws. The paradox of English culture regarded faith in God as a dispensable indulgence, reaching its climax in our educational system which is religiously neutral," as Dr Temple stated.

Evolution Banishes God. The Bishop of Birmingham showed how this religious decay had come about. He said, "The decay is a result, in my opinion, of Darwin's teaching. The actual, if unavowed attitude of probably a large majority of men and women throughout Europe is that evolution has banished God. We are (say those who are willing to lay bare their thoughts) transformed animals and we must build the State on that knowledge. If this belief is true our civilization is doomed. If belief in God goes, the mainspring of our civilization breaks. For millions of European men and women it has already broken."

Return to God the only hope. Continuing, the speaker said these statements and admissions proved that "the whole world lieth in wickedness," as it did in the first century; and the signs of the times proved that we were living at the end of the present world or age.

This brought him to the heart of his subject and showed the pressing necessity for repentance - for a return to God. The means provided of God to that end were shown to be very precise and very definite: "He that believeth (the Gospel) and is baptised shall be saved... Repent and be baptised... in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins... and save yourselves from this untoward (perverse) generation."

Significance of Baptism. The significance and object of baptism (by immersion) was then explained. Baptism was a symbolic burial (one had to die before being buried) and the coming up out of the water was a symbolic resurrection, or re-birth, to newness of life. The reason why God requires obedience to this ritual as the condition precedent to His favour in the forgiveness of sins, to which even the Lord submitted, saying, “Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,” was because of our derivation from a sinner, whose death-condemned nature we wear. In baptism we acknowledge that, in Adam, our life is forfeit, that we are under sentence of death by God’s appointment - and Christ Himself was required to make the same confession (in spite of His Divine begettal and sinlessness) for precisely the same reason - because He possessed the flesh of sin from a daughter of Adam, because He was “the Son of man.” And no one could have any saving relation to God until he had intelligently submitted to the ordinance of baptism after a belief of the Gospel. The object was to cleanse the sinner in uniting him to Christ. By this act the convert renounced his citizenship in the old Adam order and became a “fellow-citizen with the saints and of the household of God.” With this change of relationship he is subject to a new law and rule of life which he covenants to follow during his probation, for the definite object of fitting him for a permanent place in the Kingdom of God.

Good News. Mr. Hall here explained that the Gospel of the Bible was the good news of the plan and purpose of God to establish a literal political Kingdom on the earth, to be centrally established in Palestine, where Christ would visibly reign as universal King. This Kingdom would be administered by men and women who had united themselves with Christ and who, like Him, had subjected themselves to Divine principles. By their obedience to these ennobling principles they had developed the character of Christ and fitted themselves intellectually and morally to act as sympathetic, merciful and efficient kings and priests, who having been made immortal would rule omnipotently in righteousness and with unerring wisdom over the mortal nations of the world during the Millennial reign of Christ.

* * *

Bible Not Responsible for Errors of Christendom.

It will be found upon investigation that the Bible is not responsible for the errors of Christendom, but that it propounds a system of doctrine which commends itself to the moral instincts of every fully developed mind. To aid you in this investigation you are earnestly invited to send for a 50 page booklet entitled “A Declaration of the Truth Revealed in the Bible as Distinguishable from the Unscriptural Theology of Christendom,” which exhibits the faith promulgated by the apostles in the first century and may be had, together with further literature in the defence and advocacy of the truth as originally delivered by the apostles of Christ, free from Mr. Viner Hall.

* * *

Brother Phil Parry also sends the accompanying notes: -

I feel sure the average Christadelphian reading Viner Hall’s words under the heading “Significance of Baptism” would not recognise the fact that in his view the death of Jesus was unnecessary; all we have to do is repent and be baptised as a result of believing the Gospel of the Kingdom of God and recognizing that, baptism was symbolic of our own natural death, a sentence by God’s appointment (therefore we have to die before being buried) “and the coming up out of the water was a symbolic resurrection, or re-birth, to newness of life. The reason why God required obedience to this ritual as the condition precedent to His favour in the forgiveness of sins (to which even the Lord submitted, saying, ‘Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness’) was because of our derivation from a sinner, whose death-condemned nature we wear.”

Need I repeat any more? Jesus has recognised and submitted to His need for God’s favour as with all Adam’s descendants whose lives had been forfeited through Adam’s sin and now under sentence of death by God’s appointment, and for precisely the same reason Christ Himself was required to make the same confession. Now, having submitted to the ritual of God’s appointments and fulfilled all righteousness, Jesus and ourselves should no longer be under sentence of death, yet Christadelphian teaching has always been that Jesus died for Himself to cleanse His condemned nature, which Viner Hall says had been accomplished through baptism prior to that death.

It makes one wonder how through baptism one can be cleansed through One who needs cleansing by death, after being baptised. What a state to be in - obtaining by God's favour forgiveness of sin and then having to die because of a condemned nature for which we have not evidently been forgiven.

There is no acknowledgement by Viner Hall that the body of sin has been destroyed in Christ crucified as a substitute for Adam's death penalty; it still exists and baptism did nothing for Jesus in his view and nothing for others, for both are under sentence of death for having this condemned nature, and Jesus though sinless was required to make that same confession- Paul tells us as believers we have been baptised into Christ's death, but Viner Hall says baptism comes before Christ's death for it is precedent to God's favour in the forgiveness of sins to which even the Lord Jesus submitted, which in effect makes Jesus a sinner.

Where is the "Good News" explained by Mr. Hall? It is absent by reason that a man who was born to save and redeem mankind from the alienated position and dominion of Sin was, in his view and doctrine, powerless to do so.

Further on we have the heading, "Bible not Responsible for Errors of Christendom." I agree. Neither is the Bible responsible for the gross and blasphemous theories expressed by Viner Hall - the guilty ones are those who refused the counsel and wisdom revealed to E. Turney and much more in harmony with the Truth as originally delivered by the apostles of Christ.

Brother Phil Parry

Brother Phil Parry writes:-

I have recently received a magazine entitled "Shofar" from Christadelphians. Editorial Staff are Richard Pursell, Paul Pursell and Alan Pursell.

When I received the first issue of this Magazine I thought by the words of introduction stating its motive of "Searching the Scriptures whether these things be so" it would be divorced from the usually held precepts and traditions of certain deceased men whose teachings and theories have for the past 150 years or so been held in very high esteem and almost beyond criticism by the Christadelphian community of which I ceased to be a member over 49 years ago due to the very fact of searching the Scriptures and consequently finding out that things were not as scripturally based as I had been led to believe.

If it had come to a stage of my being out of harmony with Scripture the Ecclesia would have been powerless to prove it. The only thing they could do (and actually still do) would have been in my case to have accused me of opposing the Christadelphian Statement of Faith, but I was refused the opportunity to state my case before the whole Ecclesia so I and my wife resigned on account that the majority of the members would be ignorant of the views we expressed because the said views had already been misunderstood and misrepresented to them by their early pioneers and subsequent leaders and writers. Thus the basis for casting out certain members is not the teaching of Jesus, the Holy Apostles and Prophets inspired of God, but their generally accepted Statement of Faith full of error and confusion in its presented clauses.

With the "Shofar" I thought to myself, here is a magazine devoted to free thinking and closer examination of the views held by the Christadelphians in this area of the U.S.A. by various members writing to its editors in order to accelerate spiritual progress and Truth. How disappointed and dismayed I am by the fact that when I discern in some comments and statements some points of Truth relating to the real Jesus Christ bodily and spiritually, up pops that erroneous satanic phrase "Sinful flesh" and destroys what little progress has been made and this Shofar magazine becomes nothing more than a pretence like the Central Christadelphian Magazine has been for years. It contains and retains the false theory of "changed flesh" on account of Adam's sin, thus rejecting the words of Jesus in Mark 10:6-9 and the words of Paul in 1

Corinthians 15:45,46 where it is stated that Jesus and ourselves were the same flesh nature as Adam was at his creation and only the nature of Jesus was changed by His resurrection. Nowhere does it say that God joined together 'sinful flesh' but flesh without sin, so if as believed by Shofar Editors the flesh God created has now become a changed substance of flesh full of sin then it is not what God joined together in Eden and therefore not in existence and impossible for man to put asunder.

It is obvious to me in reading Editor Pursell's comments relating to the temptations Jesus experienced and also the case of Adam and Eve at their creation, that he, like many more, does not understand fully the subject he is supposed to be dealing with and even his mention of the so-called "Clean flesh" theory is a misrepresentation. I will quote him from page 87 under the heading "**CONCLUSION**" -

"If Yeshua was truly a man, then our Lord must have had occasional thoughts contrary to what he knew was right. However, we know he never allowed sinful thoughts to 'conceive.' Teaching that our Saviour needed an external tempter opens the door to either one or two unsound ideas: 1. He was not really "like unto his brethren," and was not tempted in the same way as we are, or 2. An external tempter causes all men to commit their first sin. The latter premise is to say that we do not inherit a proneness to sin from our father Adam, which many will recognise as a feature of the "clean flesh" theory. One trait of this theory is the suggestion that each man is born as if he were a "New Adam," i.e. without proneness to sin and lacking an inherited fallen status in the eyes of God."

It is evident there is a confusing here of the legal state and the physical state of which the so-called "clean flesh" theorists cannot be justly accused and if the Shofar Editors had ever read and understood their literature as it has been produced by the late A.L.Wilson, F.J.Pearce, E.Brady and others of like faith, the Shofar magazine and the other Christadelphian magazines would not be in existence at the present time.

The truth is that Adam was created from the ground a living soul capable of dying unless changed by his Creator to a superior nature and possessed a free will to obey or disobey when such a precept or law came into operation and contrary to what Alan Pursell says "that when placed in the garden of Eden man could not discern between good and evil, nor had he been cursed with a sinful nature," he must have had the discernment to name the animal species, to understand the consequences of violating God's command not to eat of the forbidden tree on pain of death in the day he ate of it - a mode of death to be understood in our reading of Ezekiel 18 in contrast with the common death animals and humans were related to by creation.

Eve, in her "very good" nature could have desired the forbidden fruit and such desire was not wrong, but it was the fact of being restricted by Divine Law and its penalty that her eating of it was a sin, for sin is transgression of law. Add to what Alan Pursell says of Adam "not having yet been cursed with a sinful nature," he makes the Creator the author of sin and the compulsory continuance of its operation in all of Adam's posterity, not only so, but in such an outrageous statement he involves the Son of God and makes void all that is said of Him concerning His power to save in His being born free, A NEW MAN, yet related to the first Adam whose nature from creation never changed, only his relationship to God, through his sin,

Jesus, like all other men, had free will to obey or disobey, why then make free will to mean a proneness or bias to sin? Sin is not an element in the physical flesh and cannot exist without Law, why then accuse God of making it a physical law of our being, transmittable to our posterity thus making those who marry and produce children more guilty than those who do not. This is the result of the physical condemnation of the flesh doctrine which would include all that are mentioned in Hebrews 11 and even Jesus Christ, the Son of God by birth and of the same physical flesh who in such a state could not be a fit offering for sin.

I could go on and on about these false doctrines and theories but I doubt if many will hear the Trumpet of warning that has been sounding for Christadelphians since 1873 when Robert Roberts refused to listen to its certain and warning sound for the battle against false doctrine and the misrepresentation of those who love Truth.

When seeking remission of sin, a blood offering was made by the sinner but being animal blood not human, it could not take away the sin for ever and as under the Law of Moses there was a remembrance of sins every year. The Apostle Paul said that according to the Scripture God had concluded by law (not by a

physical condition of the flesh) all under the sin of Adam and styled “the law of sin and death” - Galatians 3:22 and Romans 8:1,2.

The reason for God concluding all under the one sin of Adam was for the specific reason that the one offering of a righteous man could become operative upon all, firstly for natural existence and then by faith after enlightenment, unto eternal life. This taught by Paul we know as the Federal Principle, bondage under Adam’s sin but freedom under Christ the sinless. Paul could not have declared in Romans 8:1,2, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which 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” if “the law of sin and death” was a physical condition of the flesh, and perhaps you will appreciate Galatians 3:16 to 29 and also that there is no “new covenant” to come into effect, it is already operating as prophesied by Jeremiah in chapter 31, verse 31 to 34 and confirmed as in operation through the sacrifice of Christ, a second covenant, in Hebrews 8:7-13. Sins are to be remembered no more by the believer but his redemption through the Love of God and the Blood of His Son.

Phil Parry. (October 2001)

The following type-written article was sent to me some years ago with the name of the author having been cut off the bottom of the page. I believe this article is perhaps the most comprehensive challenge to Nazarene Fellowship understanding I have come across; however, not a single point made against Nazarene Fellowship teaching holds good when scriptural common sense and reasoning are applied.

The Case Against “The Two Sons of God” and other “Clean Flesh” Literature.

The subtlety of Turney is seen in his warning against speculation beyond that which is written (see page 11, paragraph 4), only to indulge in it himself to an extreme degree. His favourite words are “probably” and “perhaps”! (Page 3, paragraph 4).

He writes, “It appears probable...that the natural tendency to decay inherent in corruptible bodies was retarded; but when they (Adam and Eve) ceased to eat (of the Tree of Life) the course of their nature proceeded gradually and brought them again to dust.”

So according to Turney they were created subject to corruption and death! Does not God say He imposed these upon them as a condition of evil, as part of the punishment for their transgression? According to Turney they had their sentence before they sinned!

The whole argument turns on the change that occurred as a punishment for Adam’s transgression. Genesis 3:17 shows that the change was quite sudden - “...in the day that thou eatest thereof dying thou shalt die.” Through the transgression their minds had been changed to know good and evil and as a result their whole bodily constitution was then made subject to death. Even when this sentence had begun in their natures they might have thwarted God’s punishment by eating of the tree of life, so He drove them out of the garden and closed it against them with angelic power to guard against their re-entry.

The divine comments upon this sentence of death confirm the change in the nature of our first parents. “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and even so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned” - Romans 6:12.

In spite of this Turney writes, “But the return to the ground is not, strictly speaking perhaps any part of the penalty” (Page 5). Notice the “Perhaps” (!) This devious and unscriptural statement is said to be “the key to the understanding of the Atonement.” (Preface of “The Two Sons of God”)-

But James says “Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death” (chapter 1 verse 15). Paul says, “by man came death” (1 Corinthians 15:21).

For clarification we put Turney’s so-called “key to the understanding of the Atonement” against God’s word:-

“...the return to the ground is not, strictly speaking perhaps any part of the penalty.”

“Because thou hast eaten of the tree... dust thou art, and unto dust Thou shalt return.” Genesis 3:17-19

Far from being a key to the understanding, we shall find it unlocks a veritable box of verbal tricks! By basing his ideas on this fallacy he is compelled to turn and wrest all the New Testament references on this basic subject to support his erroneous assumption. We will expose his misuse of Scripture as we proceed.

All we need to keep in mind is that basic truth of Scripture, that death and dissolution into dust, is the penalty of sin,

We will now illustrate Turney’s method of mishandling Scripture. On page 11 he states “We do not think Isaac typical of Christ as an offering.” Yet the Apostle says, “Abraham... offered up his only begotten son... accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure” - Hebrews 11:17-9.

The clue words are “his (Abraham’s) only begotten son” which proves beyond all cavil that Christ, the only begotten Son of His Father, was the Lamb provided by God and offered as the sacrifice. In spite of the apostle’s words here quoted, Turney says, “but in the apostle’s notice of this circumstance in Hebrews he neither affirms nor denies it” (that Isaac was a type of Christ). Now follows his subtle suggestion to further bemuse his readers on this point. He closes this section by adding that, “It is true that to Abraham’s mind his son was as good as dead; but it has been suggested by some writers that Paul’s allusion was not to this; but that it was to the extraordinary conditions of Isaac’s birth (Romans 4:19).”

But this verse in Romans speaks of Abraham’s body not Isaac’s: “...he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old.” So by checking up on Turney’s references carefully, we discover his methods. He is putting his readers off the scent. Notice he says, “it has been suggested by some writers.” He thus hopes to mislead by means of this suggestion which refers to Isaac’s birth - and not to his offering up by his father. Observe also that the suggestion is “by some writers.” We ask which writers? No writer of any authority or of sound scholarship would so misconstrue the text. We will now quote two writers who know better: “After Isaac had been laid as a victim on the altar and, by means of the substituted ram, figuratively slain, he was restored to his father like one that had been raised from the dead - and that Abraham’s faith was by it instructed to look forward to “the day of Christ.” (Dr William Kay). “The clause may therefore be translated thus; ‘Accounting that God was able to raise him up from the dead, from whence he had received him, he being in the most imminent danger of losing his life. It is not, therefore, the natural deadness of Abraham and Sarah to which the apostle alludes, but the death to which Isaac on this occasion was exposed, and which he escaped by the immediate interference of God.’” (Dr Adam Clarke).

It should be evident now that Turney uses any device, even anonymous suggestions to bolster his unsound assertion - “We do not think Isaac typical of Christ as an offering.”

What is Turney trying to prove? These slanted comments, such as that above on Isaac, are attempts to support such previous assertions as “It was not physical but legal defilement for which man needed to atone;” “The breach of law did not make man constitutionally worse;” “The Almighty is not like man; He does not require to improve His work: all He makes is perfect of its kind.” (Pages 7 and 8).

If man’s constitution or nature is “perfect” how is it that chapter 11 of Hebrews ends with these words - “that they (the faithful worthies) without us should not be made perfect”? Again, in chapter 5 verse 9 -”and being made perfect (after resurrection) He became the author of salvation” etc. ?

If words mean anything, “made perfect” must mean a change from that which was previously imperfect. As Jesus was without sin, as to character, the imperfection can only concern His flesh. This was the infirmity (weakness) of the flesh. In Romans 7, Paul writes of two laws. One is God’s law of ordinances, which was holy, just and good. The other was “another law,” a totally different law, which was an imposed principle of congenital evil, or ill, i.e. “in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.” This law was a moral and physical degeneracy in his members making him cry out to be delivered from “this body of death” (margin). In Romans 8:3 it is styled more fully “the law of sin and death.” Note! God is not of course the author of sin as transgression but He is the creator of evil as disciplinary punishment - “I create evil.”

“Consider the work of God: for who can make straight, which He hath made crooked?” - Ecclesiastes 7:13. Answer: Only God.

The principle of evil as penally imposed upon man by God is a condition of life. It is a natural law lasting some 6,000 years to be curbed in its effects for the millennium and then eradicated. While in operation it is designed to be a testing condition in which and by which God selects those who are disciplined under it.

Although man is fearfully and wonderfully made he is imperfect from the divine view point, even as a biological specimen. In Scripture the mind and body of man are interrelated and interdependent. Together they are man. Together they were “made subject to vanity” because of transgression, and in this state “the called” are put to the proof by God. This is the change in the mental and bodily constitution of man that occurred as a result of God’s sentence upon Adam and Eve.

Listen to the Spirit in Solomon - “This sore travail hath God given to the sons of man to be exercised therewith” - Ecclesiastes 1:13. Hear the apostle to the same effect - “For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now” – Romans 8:20-22.

Whatever man was in mind and body before his transgression, the above Scriptures speak very clearly of an imposed change falling upon them and all their descendants. This “bondage of corruption” is both mental and physical. Paul speaks of the unregenerate mind as “corrupt according to the deceitful lusts” - Ephesians 4:22. The original word indicates decay and is applied as well to the moral as the physical man.

We repeat the need to keep in our minds the distinction between God’s law through Moses (and later through Christ) and the physical or natural law of sin and death in man’s members, which is the “sore travail” or “bondage” in which man groans. It is so regrettable and reprehensible that Turney confuses these two aspects and misleads his followers in so doing.

Let us apply scriptural reasoning to the problem in hand. Nothing is plainer than the teaching that in Jesus there was no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth. None could convict Him of sin. In this sense He was the offering without spot or blemish. His triumph over the emotions and temptations of sin emanating from the heart or mind was His victory. That He was born in the nature and “flesh of sin” with its infirmity gives His perfect obedience such great significance. Many great truths of Scripture are poised between two apparently irreconcilable opposites. So with this paramount doctrine which harmonizes what at first seems a contradiction,” For He (God) hath made Him (to be) sin for us who knew no sin” - 2 Corinthians 5:21. The literal Greek, or word for word translation reads - “For him who knew not sin, he made sin for us.”

There are some who have wished to alter the sense of this essential Scripture. Not accepting the true doctrine of the true nature of Jesus they insert the word “offering” so making it read “He was made a sin-offering,” but that is to add to what is written. The word sin is “*hamartia*” in the original and is translated “sin” 172 times and stands alone in this passage. The word “offering” is “*prosphora*” and is not in the original here.

To know the true God and to know Jesus the Christ is life eternal, says John. The great truth about Jesus being made sin is the essential part of knowing Him truly. That this is so can be proved by bringing alongside a parallel passage - "He shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation" - Hebrews 9:28. Literally rendered it is "apart from sin." Let us repeat as strongly and clearly as possible "He did no sin," wittingly or unwittingly, in thought, word or deed!

Having made that plain as Scripture does, in what sense will Jesus reappear without sin? We are shut up to one and only one conclusion. He came first in the flesh of sin but He will come again in the Spirit and power of an endless life. The body of sin has been transformed into a body of glory and incorruptibility, that is, "without sin" or "apart from sin." Turney is playing with words in "The Two Sons of God" page 8 paragraph 2 - "The Almighty is not like man; He does not require to improve His work; all He makes is perfect of its kind..."

If Jesus was born as a healthy Jewish child He was a "perfect" biological specimen. In that limited sense he was perfect. If that nature needed not to be improved why was it changed and made perfect, or to use the phrase from the Hebrews, "more perfect"? The word perfect is therefore relative in meaning and must always be used and understood in its scriptural context. The wolf is perfect but his whole fibre and being will be changed so that he will not prey on the lambs of the flock. The lion is perfect, but he will be changed (improved?) and eat straw instead of eating the ox!

The clean flesh error first arose in the ecclesias around 66 A.D. and John warns against false teachers (prophets) who "confessed not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." He repeats it in his 2nd epistle, verse 7, "For many deceivers are entered the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." Now, every so-called Christian sect great or small confesses that Jesus came in flesh so what is the serious point of John's warning? The whole turns on what is meant by the flesh in which Jesus was born. The great Apostasy holds that His flesh was immaculate, without that infirmity which the Scripture associates with man and his sentence to mortality.

Having invented an immaculate Jesus their limited logic invented another deceit to account for this so they declared Mary the mother of Jesus to be immaculate also. But why should they stop at Mary? If she had to be immaculate to produce her son with similar clean flesh what of Mary's mother and grandmother and so on through all the mothers back to the mother of them all? Logically they all needed to be immaculate from Eve onwards. This is the nonsense to which one is led by the antichrist.

How tragic and disastrous therefore that the modern clean-flesh theorists have indulged in a comparable error. Having seen the dilemma of making Christ of superior flesh or nature to that of man, they have sought refuge in the idea that all men have an uncondemned nature and that any inherited evil in man's propensities is not actual but merely legal in terms. Not real but ritual uncleanness. The effect of this elevation of the flesh gave rise in the first two centuries to the confusion of Christ with His Father. The Trinity developed from this but it began with a "duality." Christ and the Father were equal in substance and power said they.

Thus the great Monotheistic doctrine of the supremacy of the Father over the Son was eroded and finally lost; all stemming from this basic error that "human nature is not a defiled thing" (Turney). We can see this same development today following the same pattern as in the first century declension. It is plainly seen in the closing sentence of the type-script, "The Work of God in Christ" by O.E.H.Gregory, Salcombe. Please read carefully:- "May the love of Christ constrain us to honour the Son even as we should honour the Father, and worship them both in the beauty of holiness." There you have it - equal honour and equal worship! But what does Paul say on this? "When he (Christ) shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father...then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him," - 1 Corinthians 15:24-28. The word subject means subordinate. Of course Christ is worthy of honour and acclaim but not, "even as" we should honour and worship the Father. "Even as" expresses equality, sameness, without difference or distinction.

Let us then go back to examine the very root of this question of the nature of man and thereby the nature of the Son of man. Those who believe that there has been no change in the mental, moral and physical nature of man since the moment of Adam's creation, assert that Eve was exactly the same before her transgression as she was after the sentence for sin had been put into operation. If men now show devilish

thinking from whose hearts or minds proceed every evil thought from adultery to murder, etc., etc., then they were created with this mode of thinking and acting. It was their nature. Then if that is so why did another agent come into the scene to put very subtle half-truths to Eve which enticed and beguiled her? Did God create some dull and stupid pair who could easily be deceived? Were not Adam and Eve magnificent creatures before centuries of sin marred their fine qualities? As Paul says, the serpent beguiled Eve by his subtlety, confirming Moses who wrote, "The Serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field."

Two questions arise. How then was the serpent able to persuade Eve with her fine intellect? We believe this shows that she was quite different at that time from what she became after her condemnation. Up to the time that she was put to the test of whether God really meant what He said, she was without experience. At that time she had not "the carnal mind." She had not then "the thinking of the flesh." The motions of sin in her members was not there in her constitution as yet. Had it been the serpent would have been quite unnecessary, for her own desires, if they were in her members, would have enticed her and brought her to the test of obedience.

The second question is why did a speaking serpent become the instigator of the temptation? A creature endowed with perception, sagacity, cunning and the gift of reasoning but with no moral qualities? Eve's transgression, in partaking of that which was forbidden by God, set in motion in her that same mode of thinking as the serpent. The serpent thus became the symbol and figure for SIN being the promoter of the lie that caused the transgression. Why else should the Scriptures employ such phrases as "sin in the flesh," "Sin that dwelleth in me," and "the law of sin which is in my members"? They describe the condemned nature of man whose thoughts and desires incline to evil.

We would point out here that Edward Turney and his successors take these many meaningful passages and employ the most puerile methods of changing their true sense. Unsound scholarship is called in; "authorities" are quoted with little or no standing or reputation as to soundness. Turney quotes Latin and even French, together with many suppositions in a display of pseudo-scholarship. We mention this because many that are deceived by these ideas have not the means of checking these assertions and therefore do not detect the subtle shifts and switches of meaning employed.

Let us further examine some passages of Scripture which only make sense if we understand that sin in the flesh is the direct result of the weakness or infirmity of that flesh. The total man; that is both mind and body, being mutually dependent and interacting together, is unclean in God's sight and at enmity with Him by nature. The emanations of the mind of flesh is the "*diabolos*" or "accuser" of God - the Bible devil.

This is the devil Jesus destroyed. Had He not been born of a woman He would not have inherited man's sickness or infirmity. His nature would not have generated thoughts that tempted Him to act contrary to God's will in such case He would not have been tempted in all points like His brethren; and mark well - He would not have destroyed "him that had the power of death"! The *diabolos* or the mind of the flesh which tempts to sin, is that which produces death, or "has the power of death." Had it not been in the very nature and being of Christ it would not have been there to be overcome and then to be destroyed in Him.

This is the great teaching on the nature of Jesus, and His triumph over it as given in Hebrews 2:14 and confirmed in Romans 8:3-8 where Paul affirms that the mind of the flesh is enmity against God, and was condemned in the flesh of Christ. BUT - because He resisted and conquered that enemy within, being without fault in the spirit of His flesh, He effectively destroyed the body of sin and the grave could not hold Him.

Therefore to say as Nazarene literature does, "It is not physical but legal defilement for which man needed to atone," is to confuse the train of reasoning. The deception here is that the terms used are wrong through misapplication and so their conclusions are bound to be incorrect also. The inbred principle of sin in the flesh is not of the physical body only. It includes the thinking part of the flesh as being the driving force of the flesh, that is also involved in the total make-up of the creature called man. To say that "it is not physical defilement" therefore, is to state less than half of the case. Even flesh as "mere" substance, though fearfully and wonderfully made, is very much the subject of disease and decay. It is the nature of it now. But to say as Turney does that the defilement is legal only is to nullify the meaning of God's sentence upon

mankind. To use the word legal in this context is to say that the defilement is technical merely and not actual or real. It is like saying that God's sentence was only implied and not factual.

Go tell a man dying of an incurable sickness that his condition is really only technical (or legal) but not in his very being and he will not waste his panting breath in answering you! If a man commits murder, of what use is it for him to stress that his offence is but a breach of the legal code? What judge would accept this as making his crime a mere case of legal infringement? Man's defilement is very real in God's sight and to say it is only legal; is effectively to deny it as a fact plainly taught by Scripture.

The words legal and judicial are used in such a deceptive way that they obscure the realities of God's sentence upon man. The work of Christ as "the one who destroyed the *diabolos*," or sin in the flesh, as given in Hebrews 2:14 is hardly mentioned in Nazarene literature and nowhere do we find a true exposition of this vital passage of Scripture. As Paul has it in Romans 8:7, "The carnal mind (or mind of the flesh) is enmity against God. It is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." If words mean anything it is plain that the mind of man cannot be subject to the will of God, unless it is brought into subjection by the influence of God's Word, and even then the natural motions of sin in the flesh so often prevail in the struggle against its promptings. In scriptural terms therefore, this indwelling principle equates with human nature which is equivalent to the *diabolos* which is sin personified.

Surely this gives point and meaning to Paul's words "For as by the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners" - Romans 5:19 (Literal translation). So man is accounted sinful on two counts; by constitution or hereditary nature, and by actual transgression,

In denying the sinfulness of human nature the followers of Edward Turney's ideas are compelled to affirm that man was not changed as a result of his disobedience. They say man was created with a corruptible nature, "that corruptibility was as true of man before sin as after it." And again, "The Almighty is not like man; He does not require to improve His work: all He makes is perfect of its kind." Everything, say they, was created "very good" and remained that way and was not altered on account of the transgression.

Let us look again at this and test it by Scripture and by experience. Comparatively few men die of sheer wear and tear or old age. Most are the subjects of fatal sickness or disease. If the nature of man is subject to infection, what are these organisms, disease germs and viruses that are such fatal enemies of his flesh? Let us list some of them: Malaria, tuberculosis, typhoid, small pox, fevers, polio, influenza etc., etc. Examine some of these micro-organisms under a microscope and you see amazing structure and design.

Who created these micro-bacteria? There is only One Creator. Are these organisms perfect? Many of these diseases can cause death in a very short time, so they are perfectly deadly! Are they not "the ills that flesh is heir to"? Surely this fact alone declares the sore travail to which fallen man has been subjected. Was man created subject to all these evils with their attendant pain and sorrow? The answer is, no! For when Paradise is restored man will be healed of his sicknesses, and for the faithful their "vile bodies" will be changed. These bodies of humiliation will be made like unto Christ's glorious body. It is obvious that Adam and Eve were not created subject to these fatal attacks and therefore the "clean flesh" theory falls down on this argument alone.

Such a perversion of the truth is bound to give rise to other contradictory ideas. For instance, in "The Work of God in Christ" O.E.H.Gregory writes on page 3, "Abraham saw God as the Redeemer and Christ as God's Lamb whom He offered to "sin" to buy us back..." Please note, he is saying that God offered Christ to "sin"! One error begets more errors. The Scriptures are not only repudiated here - they are reversed!

To whom were offerings made then? In Genesis 4:3-5 the first offerings recorded, of Cain and Abel were offered "unto the Lord." Also of Abraham God said, "Seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from Me" - Genesis 22:12. O. Gregory knows better in saying God's Lamb was offered "to sin." The Scriptures are diametrically opposite; "Christ... hath given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God," Ephesians 5:2.

It may now be helpful to pin-point the moment of change in the nature of the first pair while in Eden, especially as the Nazarene hand-written notes contain the following on page 5, "God did not condemn human nature which He had created, but sin... Adam was a natural body with propensities or natural appetites, otherwise he could not have sinned in the first place; the fact was he had no experience of good and evil when first created, and was innocent until the unlawful desires conceived and brought forth sin..."

We have already pointed out that they were not created with a mind of "unlawful desires," as it required an outside tempter to promote the desire to take of the forbidden tree. Now, as soon as they did eat the change in their natures occurred, as God had warned them. Before this moment they were unclothed and yet not subject to any notions of embarrassment. Once they had eaten of the tree of knowledge which God had invested with the power to confer awareness, the sentence pronounced began to operate in their beings. Their whole natures were imbued with this change. Both mind and body were affected. Their disobedience produced shame in their minds, being aware of motions in their bodies which were not there before, impelling them to cover their nakedness. Adam was not created in this condition. It was imposed as the sentence for disobedience. Before, they were completely dependent upon God, physically, mentally and spiritually. Being seduced by the lie of the serpent, they experienced the effects of sin and shame. They had achieved their independence. They foolishly sought their knowledge of good and evil independently of God, in a way forbidden by Him. Dependence upon God is the basis of godliness, but to renounce it is the very essence of godlessness. Thus man became estranged from his Maker through allowing himself to be deceived by the serpent, to seek for wisdom, power and happiness in self. Self-dependence is to be seen as the underlying factor of all sin. It is the abandonment of dependence upon God.

Having departed from God by their fateful choice they were delivered into the power of that evil which thenceforth worked in their members. Nothing is plainer than this most marked change in their make-up, to a condition of sin and shame as a direct result of their disobedience.

If Adam was created with these "propensities or natural appetites," as the Nazarene writer insists, there was no imposed change in his nature, and there was no change in the ground or soil either. Paradise must have been created with weeds, as nature is to-day; with thorns and thistles. Like the noxious germs and organisms that affect man, which we have previously mentioned; the ground was similarly affected. Why? "Because thou hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee saying. Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." Two things stand out - the curse on the ground and the sorrow which Adam was to suffer as a result of his fatal choice. All speaks aloud of change. The sentence, "dying thou shalt die" took effect. The deadly fruit poisoned the whole man, and mortality commenced to operate; the penalty was a change in Adam's system and life became a living death. So death reigns. All is now subject to vanity and vexation, the creation groans in travail.

These vile bodies, or bodies of our humiliation need another change, from flesh to spirit, to be made perfect. The sentence of death rendered literally from the Hebrew is "a death shalt thou die." which is seen to be a dying state. Every minute of man's life can be said to be an act of dying until at last the animating breath of life departs as he expires. Some who think Adam was created so perfect that he had no need to increase in knowledge take a wrong view. He was made with a great capacity and ability to increase his learning - and knowledge is power!

There was a lawful and an unlawful means of obtaining that knowledge and having chosen the latter, man pays the penalty. But even the present state of man, afflicted with infirmity and subject to the evil. is evidence enough of his original excellence before the transgression. Consider his mental powers as he could name all the wonderful creatures according to their characteristics and qualities. He could name them because he could discern, like Solomon later, their innate functions and properties. When Eve was presented to him he discerned what she was, and who; also why she was made, yet he was in a deep sleep when she was formed. But when he had contracted guilt in mind and body he does not seem to know that the all-seeing Deity knows all things, and endeavours to hide his guilty self among the trees, thinking to escape His piercing eye. What a fall! Compare his state before and after his transgression and one might be excused for saying "is this the same person?" All the descendants of the guilty pair take after their first parents and reenact their original sin.

The basic transgression is continued in their offspring. Man still seeks knowledge by unlawful means. He still endeavours to be independent, to live without God in the world. Being without the true knowledge of God, he loves darkness to cover his evil deeds, thinking that God is like unto man with mortal eyes that cannot penetrate.

Further proofs of their changed and wretched state are seen in their excuses before God, for what they had done. Adam blames Eve - "This woman whom Thou didst give to be with me," and also God, indirectly for giving him such a companion. When Eve is questioned she blames the serpent and God, for she says by implication, God made the serpent too subtle for her simplicity. The fault is His, who made the serpent so clever and me so simple. Are not these very excuses incontestable evidence of change? They emanate from the thinking of the flesh just begun. Blaming God and shifting their guilt is sinful thinking and the only remedy then and ever since is to confess one's own guilt in humility and seek God's infinite mercy through the righteousness of Christ.

Two further points of change in Eve, as she receives her condemnation, her sorrows in the flesh of sin were like Adam's but in addition hers were multiplied in child-bearing. Why does the woman suffer so much more than the female of every other species? There is no natural reason for this! Further, her desire was to her husband and "he shall reign over thee." This divinely imposed subjection to her husband was not operative before her condemnation obviously or it would have had no meaning when imposed. God's displeasure is finally seen in their expulsion from the Garden. They were driven out!

The serpent is cursed and is forever the emblem of sin and its effects. The woman condemned to pain, sorrow and subjection. The man, made lord of the world at creation, is doomed to ceaseless labour and toil and the earth itself is cursed with crops reduced by weeds and plant diseases. The Garden of happiness remains closed until the true Seed of the woman returns to confer the right He has obtained through perfect obedience that the redeemed may eat of the Tree of Life in a restored Paradise.

Jesus knew that in man dwells no good thing - "Why callest thou me good?" He asked. And in another garden He made that meaningful statement, "The flesh is weak." This could not refer to the strong and robust physiques of His fishermen friends but to the mind of the flesh with its weakness of will. He knew what was in man and the thought of his heart which is "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked."

In his degraded state man is referred to as unclean, as in Job 14:4 "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." This defilement must be inbred and constitutional and not as a result of personal transgressions. An infant of a few days, innocent of all committed sin, will die of some malady, and such a death can only be explained by the sentence of death in its members inherited from Adam. Let us listen to Eliphaz's voice on the state of man; "What is man, that he should be clean...yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight. How much more abominable and filthy is man?" - Job 15:14-16. When David speaks of his "loins being filled with a loathsome disease," twice repeating, "there is no soundness in my flesh," in Psalm 38, he is groaning and suffering the burden of his weakness and failure. The context shows he is not talking of actual physical sickness. In saying he is sorry for his sin he speaks of himself alone, but Christ is foreshown when he says, "My lovers and friends stand aloof from my plague (or stroke, in Hebrew)! Such Psalms do not impute sinful acts to Christ, or He would have been like the rest of men (and no Saviour) but they do confirm that He was subject to the propensities of the flesh of sin with all its weaknesses. If we should ask how He could overcome the flesh or *diabolos* the answer is also in the Psalms, at 80:17, where David says, "Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right-hand, upon the son of man whom thou madest strong for thyself."

Why did Paul use the expression "in the body of his flesh through death," if there was nothing the matter with flesh and blood constitutionally, as Turney and his followers maintain? Why this continuous mention of "His flesh" and "the flesh," in Scripture, if it was not a body and mind subject to weakness and corruption? Unless the Father had produced a Son "Made strong" enough to overcome it, all mankind would be without the salvation our condemned state so sorely needs.

To say, as they do, that "there is nothing constitutionally wrong with flesh and blood," is a subtlety which denies the truth of Scripture. Unbridled flesh and blood thinks evil and does evil. There is nothing constitutionally wrong with a serpent but it bites and its venom kills, and that is an evil. The serpent is a perfect specimen biologically, but only when Eden is restored will it be so changed that a child will play

unharmd near its hole. By thinking clearly and deeply upon this fact we can now see the devious shift by which the followers of Turney are deceived.

The serpent or power of sin wounded Jesus in the “heel” but He fatally bruised its head by His own self-control: His unblemished character providing the perfect sacrifice, releasing Him from death to save all those who discern the Lord’s body. Jesus Himself confirms this by a most remarkable analogy - “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up” - John 3:14. Thus Christ Himself draws this significant parallel, in likening His own body, lifted up on the accursed tree, to the brazen serpent lifted up by Moses on the pole at the borders of the Land – Numbers 21:5-9. Those bitten by the serpents died unless they looked upon the brazen serpent, which healed them of the deadly venom. The serpent is the symbol of sin and evil in the Scripture, yet the Divine wisdom, chose to typify Christ by this brazen replica! The serpent of brass is therefore a threefold type of the body of Jesus:-

1. Brass represents the flesh of sin.
2. The serpent represents sin in the flesh.
3. Lifted up on a tree.

That Christ should be so represented baffles and confounds all that deny the true nature of Christ, “Not discerning the Lord’s body.” In verse 6 of John 3 Jesus had clearly stated “That which is born of the flesh is flesh” - and in styling Himself “the Son of man,” in this profoundly moving analogy with the serpent of brass, He confirms beyond all question how “He was made sin for us,” though absolutely free from it in His sinless character. This is also the perfect illustration of what Paul meant when he wrote “God sendeth His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh.” With the Apostle we look upon Jesus nailed to the tree and believe in Him, that we who know we have the “venom” of the serpent in us, might not perish but have eternal life.” We “rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.”

It is not without significance that Paul uses the subtle deception of Eve by the serpent to warn us how we can be beguiled and our minds corrupted from the pure and simple truth of Christ. Read carefully and take note how all “clean-flesh” literature elevates the flesh and indeed shows much confidence in the flesh. This single fact alone should alert all to its unscriptural and subversive character without attempting to unravel its devious arguments, which claim to explain Scripture, but in fact explain it away!

Name of writer unknown.

* * *

The following is by no means a complete commentary on the above article but indicates a few errors:-

We will commence our response by making an observation between two types of death referred to in Scripture. To take our example we see that Jesus makes a clear distinction between perishing in death and death as a sleep. The one is being put to death as a penalty for ones sins which is to perish for ever, and the other is a falling asleep in death which is a rest from ones labours till raised immortal. The one is dead for evermore, the other is alive for evermore. They could not be more different! The death which Adam was warned of was losing his present life as a penalty for transgression of God’s law, and it was to have been an untimely death on the very day of transgression. There is no reason for saying Adam’s natural death at the age of 930 years was his punishment for eating of the forbidden tree. This is not what Scripture tells us. (A consideration of Ezekiel 18 will show this).

The writer says, “The whole argument turns on the change that occurred as a punishment for Adam’s transgression” and we agree this is what the argument is about. But the belief that any physical change should have occurred is quite needless apart from never having been proven and the arguments put forward by this writer are seen to be unfounded assumptions when context of each argument is considered. God cursed the ground for man’s sake but never his flesh. For Adam to die for his transgression is the punishment of which he had been warned but he was not foretold of any change of his physical nature and making any such change is adding to Scripture. He was not warned of a changed nature from very good to

something inferior; he was warned of being put to death in the very day of his transgression. “Dying thou shalt die” or as we would express the Hebrew idiom in our modern language we would say “You will be put to death.” When? “On the very day you transgress.” But the writer says, “As a result (of their transgression) their whole bodily constitution was then made subject to death.” As proof of this the writer starts by quoting Romans 6:12, “By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin. So death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.”

This gives no support for changed flesh but it is confirmation of judicial death for sin in contrast to resting from one’s labours. Neither is it a good translation for the last phrase is better rendered as in the margin, “So death passed upon all men *in whom all have sinned*” and is reference to the fact that God has concluded all under the one sin of Adam for the purpose of salvation of the faithful. But the writer who opposes us does not see the crucifixion of Jesus as a sacrifice and the only value he sees in the crucifixion is that Jesus had to die because He had sin in His flesh from which He needed cleansing.

The writer then quotes Edward Turney: “But the return to the ground is not strictly speaking perhaps any part of the penalty” and says this statement is devious and unscriptural, and is said to be “The key to the understanding of the Atonement (Preface to “The Two Sons of God”).

This is not a devious statement but a genuine observation of a sincere man beginning to question the Christadelphian belief in natural death being the penalty for transgression, something which, as a Christadelphian, Edward Turney had always accepted. It can be seen by his later writings that Edward Turney was coming to the full realization that natural death was not the penalty.

The quotes from James and Paul are accepted for what they say - that sin brings death - but again, which death is here referred to? Scripture speaks of five “deaths” and we confuse them at our peril but we will not deal with them here due to the space required.

The writer next quotes from Genesis 3:17-19 claiming it to be the penalty for Adam’s transgression, “Because thou hast eaten of the tree... dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.”

This again is not the penalty of which Adam was forewarned. The penalty for transgression was that he should be put to death on the day of his transgression - and this was not fulfilled. Genesis 3:17-19 was a condition of his extended life after he had been forgiven, indicating that, although he had been forgiven this one trespass, he was not yet immortal.

The writer says, “All we need to keep in mind is that basic truth that death and dissolution into dust is the penalty of sin.”

But what death? And what dissolution? These claims need qualifying as in this simplistic form they can only mislead. Our sins were laid upon Jesus our Saviour, and He died for our sins, and indeed, Jesus was put to death because Adam wasn’t, but there was no dissolution into dust in His case for His body saw no corruption. Neither is death and dissolution into dust any part of the penalty for the faithful for there will be those who remain till the coming of the Lord and will be changed in the twinkling of an eye to immortality. The only reason why any of the faithful have died in the past two thousand years is because the Lord is not here in His Kingdom.

The writer then protests that Edward Turney should write, “We do not think Isaac typical of Christ as an offering.”

It would seem the writer is having to struggle very hard to find faults and wishes only to express his views rather than consider others. So here we reproduce the portion from page 11 where Turney is dealing with his view regarding Abraham and Isaac. Edward Turney writes: -

“Abraham is the only instance of a resemblance to the Father of Jesus Christ, each offering up his only son whom he loved. “And they came to the place which God had told him of; and Abraham built an altar there, and bound Isaac his son, and laid him upon the altar upon the wood.”

This implicit obedience of Isaac was equal to the firm faith of his father and cast a well-defined shadow of the meekness and obedience of the true Lamb.

“And Abraham stretched forth his hand and took the knife to slay his son.” There can be no doubt he would have struck the blow had not the angel of the Lord called to him to stay his hand, and to do the lad no harm. “Now I know,” said the angel, “that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me.”

That moment a heavy load fell from Abraham’s heart and at the same instant he realised the pleasant reward of unbounded trust in God.

It is usual to regard Isaac as a type of Christ; but in the apostle’s notice of this circumstance in Hebrews he neither affirms nor denies it. His comment shows that the offering was a means employed by the Almighty to prove the faith of Abraham; and this agrees with a portion of the passage already quoted from Genesis. We do not think Isaac typical of Christ as an offering. Isaac, though bound and laid on the altar, was not offered in reality; he was only offered in the obedient purpose of his father’s heart.

This thought is suggested by the fact that there is not a single example of an offering being ordained by Jehovah of any individual already under sentence of death as Isaac was, being a son of Adam; and also by the fact that he was not really slain. Isaac may have foreshadowed the intention of God to make a human being the means of atonement, but, if so, this was done without slaying him as a typical sacrifice.”

The writer says this is “Turney’s method of mishandling Scripture.” Is this denunciation fair? We leave our readers to decide for themselves who is guilty of this charge of mishandling Scripture.

The writer then accuses Edward Turney of bemusing his readers, so we continue Edward Turney’s quote as follows: -

“It is an easy matter to find, or rather, to make, allegories and correspondences; but the safest plan is to keep close to those already made by the New Testament writers. Departure from this rule has produced a well-known volume largely filled with human fancies. While perhaps few of our readers would assent to any of these correspondences, it is not out of place to intimate the need for caution, lest from another point of view we also fall into the same extreme.

The firmness of the patriarch was founded in the belief that God was able to raise up Isaac, even from the dead; “from whence also,” Paul adds, “he received him in a figure.” It is true that to Abraham’s mind his son was as good as dead; but this has been suggested by some writers that Paul’s allusion was not to this, but that it was to the extraordinary conditions of his birth. - Romans 4:19.”

So who is being bemused? His readers? Or those who write volumes largely filled with human fancies? But the writer goes on - “What is Turney trying to prove? These slanted comments, such as that above on Isaac, are attempts to support such previous assertions as it was not physical but legal defilement for which man needed to atone;’ ‘The breach of law did not make man constitutionally worse;’ The Almighty is not like man; He does not require to improve His work: all He makes is perfect of its kind.’ - (Pages 7 and 8).”

So according to this unknown writer, man had to atone for his physical defilement; his sinful flesh; his sin in the flesh, sinful nature, however one wishes to style it, while he sees Edward Turney is wrong to be contending that Christ died for our sins, the Just for the unjust!

Our response is that Scripture supports Turney and not the writer. Is not the breaking of law a legal matter? Is not the penalty for breaking law also a legal matter? Is not the atonement a legal matter? Is not

our choice of doing God's will or our own will not a legal and moral choice? Is not our relationship (or lack of it) to God a legal matter?

Breach of law is certainly a legal matter but in what way does the writer believe it to be a physical defilement? How can one atone for a physical defilement?

Edward Turney wrote, "All the Almighty made is perfect of its kind." Why should the writer doubt this? He quotes Hebrews 11 "that they, without us should not be made perfect," in order to show that Adam was not yet made perfect. Then later agrees with Edward Turney by qualifying "perfect."

It should be obvious that all God made was very good for its purpose. Our natural bodies are perfect for serving their present purpose and the spiritual bodies of the faithful will by God's grace be perfect for the future. When we see a fruit, say a peach, on the tree ready for eating we might say "It's just perfect" and that means it's just perfect for eating, the purpose for which it was grown. But as a fruit was it any less perfect when it was only half ripe? Of course not. So why this silly strife about words? To show that the word "perfect" is used in different senses we have only to read of Jesus, when healing the sick - Matthew 14:35,6, "they sent out into all that country round about, and brought unto him all that were diseased; and besought him that they might only touch the hem of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole." Being "made perfectly whole" means they were healed of any disease they previously had, not that they were made immortal beings, or that they had been "perfected" in the way Jesus was perfected at His resurrection; see Luke 13:32, "and the third day I shall be perfected." Again in Acts 3:15,16, regarding the man lame from his mother's womb, to whom Peter said, "Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk..." then in verse 36 we read, "the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all." This "perfect soundness" was his healing from lameness, not eternal glorification.

According to the writer of this article, Romans 7 tells us that God made two laws;

"One is God's law of ordinances, which was holy, just and good. The other was another law, a totally different law, which was an imposed law of congenital evil, or ill, i.e. "in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." This law was a moral and physical degeneracy in his members making him cry out to be delivered from "this body of death" (margin). In Romans 8:2 it is styled more fully the law of sin and death. Note! God is not of course the author of sin as transgression but He is the creator of evil as disciplinary punishment - "I create evil."

Is the writer correct in his setting out of these two laws which he says God made? Certainly we have "the law of sin and death" as he quotes from Romans 8:2 but the other law is also in this same verse; it is "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus." This second law makes us free from the first so that the faithful are no longer under the law of sin and death, but the writer ignores this and invents another law saying we are under "an imposed law of congenital evil"! How wonderfully far has the Mother of Harlots spread her offensive disease of congenital evil or Original Sin throughout all of Christendom!

Romans 7 is perhaps the most misunderstood chapter in Scripture but it is willingly misunderstood by so many. It seems that ignorance is no obstacle to advancement in certain circles, indeed it would seem to be an advantage. How we weary ourselves to put the record straight. I will here transpose part of Brother Eric Cave's letter in reply to Brother X, reported on page 6 of this C.L. :-

Next Romans 7 and what you term 'Nazarene theology.' It is true that in all English Bibles there is a change of tense in the middle of verse 14 which continues to the end of the chapter. But this arose because all Christendom, including King James translators and the Christadelphian 'establishment' remain believers in "Original Sin." Whereas the verb tense in English is completely "time orientated" (unlike Hebrew and Greek). In English the verb tense clearly confirms all action as either past, present or future. This does not apply in Greek where except for the future tense the tense is not concerned with 'time' but with the nature and state of the action as any Greek grammar will confirm. The context normally decides whether a translator renders the passage as past, present or

future. Ask yourself the question, Could the man who writes in Romans 7:5, “For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.” Could such a man follow that glorious contention with the statement that “I am carnal sold under sin”? Could such a man have exhorted the Corinthians “Be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ”? Impossible! The whole of chapter 7 from verse 14 should have been in the past tense when translated, and I believe would have been had Christendom not been deceived by “Original Sin” or “Sin in the flesh” as Christadelphians term it. Why does the very next verse (chapter 8) declare “There is therefore NOW no condemnation (Greek *katakrima* = down judgment) to them which are in Christ Jesus who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit”? Was Paul “in the Spirit”? Of course he was, he was “in Christ” from the moment of that baptism following his experience on the Damascus road.

The writer makes the claim that “Many great truths of Scripture are poised between two apparently irreconcilable opposites.” He doesn’t enlarge or support this claim in any way and I am at a loss to know what great truths he has in mind. Can any reader suggest any such great truths so poised?

The writer says that “The clean flesh error first arose in the ecclesias around 66 AD and John warns against false teachers who ‘confessed not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.’” He says, “The whole turns on what is meant by the flesh in which Jesus was born. The whole Apostasy holds that His flesh was immaculate, without that infirmity which the Scripture associates with man and his sentence to mortality... Having invented the immaculate Jesus their logic invented another deceit to account for this, so they declared Mary the mother of Jesus to be immaculate also... Logically they all needed to be immaculate from Eve onwards. This is the nonsense to which one is led by the Antichrist... How tragic and disastrous therefore that the modern clean-flesh theorists have indulged in a comparable error... The Trinity developed from this but it began with a “duality”. Christ and the Father were equal in substance and power said they... Thus the Monotheistic doctrine of the supremacy of the Father over the Son was eroded and finally lost; all stemming from this basic error that human nature is not a defiled thing. We can see this same development in the closing sentence of the type-script, “The Work of God in Christ” by O.E.H.Gregory - “May the love of Christ constrain us to honour the Son even as we honour the Father and worship them both in the beauty of holiness.” There you have it - equal honour and equal worship!”

I wonder if the writer ever learnt of his mistake?

O.E.H.Gregory would never have used such an expression without good reason and authority and what better authority than that of Jesus Himself? Let us read from John’s Gospel chapter 5 starting at verse 18:- “Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son of man can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father...” And there you have it for real! If Jesus said this of Himself then by what authority does the writer say that to worship the Son as we worship the Father is the result of being “led by the Antichrist”?

The writer then goes on to tell us about “a speaking serpent” becoming “the instigator of the temptation.” A creature “endowed with perception, sagacity, cunning, and the gift of reasoning but with no moral qualities.” If all this were so, then this creature also had knowledge and understanding of the law of God given to Adam and Eve as well as knowledge and understanding of the language they spoke, and even more – it also must have had human vocal chords in order to speak their language. Some serpent! No doubt then that God made this wonderful creature specially for the purpose of tempting Eve to do evil in His sight, and having succeeded, God turned this creature into a snake? Surely not. If this creature has all the qualities necessary for reasoning with Eve then it was indeed Eve reasoning within herself. Once we realise that law gives choice and the purpose of the law is to build character well pleasing to God in order for Him to reward those who are rightly exercised thereby, then there is no need to attach any mystery to the matter.

The writer continues, "The serpent thus became the symbol and figure for SIN being the prompter of the lie that caused the transgression." Revelation 20:2 tells us "And he (the angel) laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent which is the devil and *satan*, and bound him a thousand years." The best definition I have yet seen for the devil is that it is 'a personification of man's will when opposed to God's will.' The same definition then applies to the serpent, and this fits well with the case of Eve's temptation. The definition used by this writer that "the *diabolos* which is sin personified" is insufficient to meet the facts.

Next the writer quotes the phrases "Sin in the flesh," "Sin that dwelleth in me," and "the law of sin which is in my members" which, he says, "describe the condemned nature of man whose thoughts and desires incline to evil." The first of these (Romans 8:3) is misunderstood, for it refers to the fact that Jesus condemned sin while He was in the flesh, by overcoming every temptation to go against His Father's will all His lifetime showing that temptation to sin can be overcome in the same nature as ourselves. "Sin that dwelleth in me" and "The law of sin which is in my members" (Romans 7:17 and 23) - here, Paul refers to the time before his conversion when he was yet in bondage to sin, i.e. before he was "in Christ." The extract from Eric Cave's letter quoted above should be sufficient answer.

The writer goes on; "Had not Jesus been born of a woman He would not have inherited man's sickness or infirmity. His nature would not have generated thoughts that tempted Him to act contrary to God's will... He would not have been tempted in all points like His brethren... He would not have destroyed 'him that had the power of death'..." So the writer believes that Jesus being born of a woman would result in all the common ailments which afflict mankind yet we have no record of any such affliction. He also says that His nature would have generated thoughts that tempted Him to act contrary to His Father's will! Does this mean that Adam and Eve didn't have thoughts that tempted them to go against God's will because neither of them was born of a woman? Does not the writer know that we cannot be tempted without law and that is why God gave them the commandment as a test of faithfulness?

I quote again from the writings of Ernest Brady:- It is "a biological fact that there is no connection between the blood circulatory systems of mother and child, but that when a new life commences, its blood is newly created in the embryo, from the nourishment of the parent. Thus, Jesus being begotten by a miracle, neither His blood nor His life which it sustained, can be the life of Adam. This does not mean that either Jesus flesh or His blood, or the nature and quality of His life were different from Adam's or any other man's, but that He was a man newly created from the Source." Having "a new life from the source" gave Jesus a life free of condemnation; while all the descendants of Adam are concluded under the sin of Adam, Jesus was not and this fact is very important in understanding the gospel as we shall see.

Again the writer accuses O.E.H.Gregory of reversing the teaching of Scripture when he said "Abraham saw God as the Redeemer and Christ as the Lamb of God whom He offered to "sin" to buy us back..." "Please note," says the writer, "that he is saying that God offered Christ to "sin"! One error begets more errors! The Scriptures are not only repudiated here - they are reversed!"

But are they? Does not Scripture teach that we are bought with a price? The Apostle Paul explains that Adam sold himself to Sin as a Master, so from that time on Adam was sin's possession; and Jesus tells us God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son - for the purpose of buying us back from Sin. Jesus presented Himself to His Father as the perfect offering and His Father offered Him up as our sacrifice as He foreshadowed in Eden when He slew the animal to provide covering for Adam and Eve. No, God did not slay Jesus as Clause 12 of the BASF claims, but God foreknew what would be the outcome of Jesus' life of perfect obedience and accepted His Son's offering of Himself in order that He, Jesus, make Atonement for us, to buy us back, not from a literal person but from Sin personified as a King.

If this writer knew and understood a little more about the sentence threatened and the sentence passed, if only he understood more about what the serpent in Eden was, and if he knew more about the meaning of our purchase by Jesus Christ, about the meaning of sacrifice and about the beginnings of the doctrine of Original Sin, he would not have made such an unsavoury meal of sinful flesh.

Brother Russell Gregory.

I Remember Ewe, Thought the Sheep

Report by Roger Highfield. Science Editor of "Daily Telegraph (Nov.8th 2001)

Sheep, far from being woolly-brained, have memories that would do credit to an elephant, says a new study. Scientists have been under-estimating ovine intelligence, says the Babraham Institute in Cambridge. "Sheep are much more sophisticated than we thought, even similar to us in some abilities," said Dr. Keith Kendrick, who has spent more than a decade trying to fathom their minds.

The study by this team suggests that, while apparently mindlessly ruminating, sheep could be thinking about long-absent flock-mates - victims of foot and mouth culls, perhaps - or even shepherds.

Sheep can remember up to 50 sheep faces, even in profile, when most humans would be pushed to tell any two sheep apart. They can also remember a familiar human face: Sid the stockman, in the case of the Babraham study. It takes more than two years before their memory starts to fade.

Sheep may also possess "emotions," the study says. The Journal Nature describes today how Dr. Kendrick's team presented sheep with images of 25 pairs of sheep faces. Ear tags were removed to rule out the unlikely possibility that the sheep "were reading them." The sheep were trained to associate one of each pair of faces with food and walk towards them.

Dr Kendrick said: "The implication of our work is that sheep have a rich and important facial environment, "Farmers should avoid changing it all the time and keep their company as stable as possible."

Nov. 9th 2001 - Comment from a reader-

Sir - Well done Dr. Kendrick and his team of scientists who have spent years discovering that sheep know their shepherd (report Nov. 8)

They are only 2000 years or so behind with this find. Should they turn to John's Gospel, they would discover that sheep can also recognise voices, and their own names. "And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers." Dr. Kendrick may like to take up the hint in his next research grant application.

Clarence Barwick, Hayton, Cumbria.

A Pearl of Great Price

I understood it to be a biological fact that there is no connection between the blood circulatory systems of mother and child, but that when a new life commences, its blood is newly created in the embryo, from the nourishment of the parent. Thus, Jesus being begotten by a miracle, neither His blood nor His life which it sustained, can be the life of Adam.

This does not mean that either Jesus flesh or His blood or the nature and quality of His life were different from Adam's or any other man's, but that He was a man newly created, from the Source.

Ernest Brady in a letter to Viner Hall.