

# The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 199

## January/February 2003

### In this issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2 Logically Correct Testimony of Holy Scripture	Brother Phil Parry
Page 4 Commentary on "The Legacy of Eden"	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 9 Brother Phil Parry and "The Remnant"	
Page 14 Commentary on "The Atonement"	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 19 Letter to Brian Bloomfield	Brother Phil Parry
Page 21 Extracts from "The Christadelphian Lamp"	Brother Edward Turney & others

---

## Editorial

Dear Friends, Brothers and Sisters, Loving Greetings.

The debt we owe to William Tyndale who translated the Bible into English is almost incalculable. Without him and his tireless work, work that cost him his life, we would not know the Gospel as we do today. Although his illustrious name is not mentioned in the introduction to the King James Bible, it is to him that that great work owes most of its elegant and careful translation. There are many unforgettable turns of phrase for which William Tyndale is responsible. Turns of phrase that have entered the language and which are used to this day by those who value and try to practice good writing and speaking. These phrases stick in the mind. They appear as titles of books and are often quoted in many and various contexts. It is obvious that Shakespeare was well acquainted with the Bible and its cultured language which gave its narrative such an enduring and attractive quality.

In the Gospels one particularly memorable phrase has always appealed to me with its surprising shortness conveying as it does an ominous portent. It comes in John 18 where we read the account of Jesus' betrayal and arrest. Of the four accounts of this most dastardly and melancholy event John's is thought to be the most detailed and exact, and was probably taken from the official records of the trial of Jesus. The last sentence of the chapter reads: "Now Barabbas was a robber."

A better translation for 'robber' would really be 'bandit.' A number of early manuscripts of Matthew's Gospel give Barabbas a forename. Possibly very early in the life of the original manuscript a copyist transcribed the Greek words 'to you' ('release to you Barabbas') as the abbreviation for the common name Jesus or Joshua.

So, in such manuscripts, the words of Pilate to the people appear as: 'Whom do you want me to release, Jesus Barabbas or Jesus who is called the Messiah?' The dramatic force of the choice thus offered to the people is heightened by the identical names of the prisoners. This was noted in the 3rd century by the biblical scholar Origen.

It is possible to perceive here the polemical purpose to blame not only the Jewish priests but the Jewish people for the death of Jesus. Yet the choice of Barabbas rather than of Jesus would have been absolutely consistent with the contemporary political situation.

Barabbas was almost certainly a Zealot and a member of the *Sicarii*, the guerrillas or commandos, literally, 'dagger-men', dedicated to the expulsion of the hated Roman occupation forces. Jesus, on the other hand, in teaching and in practice was an exponent of non-resistance, appearing even at His own trial to yield to the occupying power. Faced with such a choice, the crowd without, hesitation, even with enthusiasm, chose the violent nationalist rather than the patient idealist, so useless to the nationalist cause. To coin Jesus' own dictum, they took the sword and perished by the sword, in Roman hands.

The rabble outside the Antonia Fortress, named incidentally for Mark Antony, would have gathered in the courtyard of about 2,500 square metres, which served as a place of meeting between the city and the Antonia. This rabble would certainly have included the partisans and supporters of Barabbas and this may account for the crowds clamorous insistence for his release. Pilate was outmanoeuvred at every turn by Caiaphas the high priest's cunning and by the people whom he had not even begun to understand. His already precarious reputation in Rome was dangerously threatened. Pilate must have felt deafened by the yelling of the blood-lust of the crowd and his resistance collapsed so he signed the death warrant.

The crowd held sway and got what they thought they wanted. In a sense their choice was and is symbolical. The world still chooses violence and banditry.

Almighty, eternal just and merciful God, grant us the desire to do only what pleases you, and the strength to do only what you command.

Love to all from Helen Brady

---

## **Logically Correct Testimony of Holy Scripture**

### ***“How Readest Thou?” “Understandest Thou What Thou Readest?”***

If I told a Christadelphian I believed I have an immortal soul, I am sure the rejoinder would be to the contrary with a reference to Genesis 2:7, where the writer states of Adam being formed from the dust of the ground and through the breath of life becoming a living soul - a natural body of life. The same Christadelphian would attest to himself or herself as being of that same nature like the beasts that perish apart from a superior intellect and responsibility by law to the Creator.

It is accepted that the prophet Moses under inspiration from the Creator recorded the Genesis account. Jesus, the Prophet God raised up like unto Moses, when in conflict with the Pharisees in His testifying to righteous judgment, declared “And yet if I judge, my judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me. It is also written in your law, that the testimony of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me” (John 8:16,17).

There can be no greater testimony than that of Father and Son. But, Jesus also spoke from Numbers 35:30 which speaks of witnesses and their testimony under the law of Moses making two men's testimony as being true. Jesus was a man but His Father was not.

Where then do we find the testimony of two men which would convince us that man was created capable of death and subject to death but not by breach of a law he was not, morally under until it was introduced to him later by his Creator?

The two men are Moses and the Apostle Paul who both show the difference of being capable of death and under sentence of death by law.

You may argue that Paul is only reiterating what Moses recorded about Adam in Genesis, true and that is the testimony of Moses the Prophet inspired of God. Now we also have Paul's words expressing inspiration and testimony received from the Son of God who was the embodiment of the Spirit-Word of His Father. In writing to the Galatian believers Paul declares, “But I certify you brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” This is the same gospel which Paul preached to the Corinthians adding the declaration, “By which also ye are saved if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you... For I delivered

unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures. (1 Corinthians 15:1-3).

We may ask, what sins can Paul be referring to which Jesus is said to have died for, seeing that many including us of the present day were not alive neither able to sin at the time of Christ's death? We cannot avoid this question, for Paul has made a declaration in Romans 3:23, "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." How then have all sinned and come short of the glory of God? Paul's answer is found in Romans 5:12, "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned."

Paul is here teaching about the sentence of death Adam had incurred by disobedience to God, a sentence that could be removed while Adam was still alive which could not be said for his subjection to death by his created physical nature, and seeing that Adam's legal sentence was passed upon or imputed to all in his loins, we also are in the position of a dying nature which cannot be removed at the present time, but is as Paul says, 'removable through Jesus Christ.'

This is the whole teaching of Paul in Romans, as to the reason or Christ's mission and sacrificial death by the shedding of His blood. He is teaching redemption in Romans 5 and Ransom in Timothy 2:6, "Who gave himself a ransom for all, a testimony in due time" Galatians 4:4. More also in 2 Timothy 1:8, "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner:.. verse 9, Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel: whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles."

That Paul is not speaking here of the natural death by process and decay common from creation to Adam and all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, is obvious to the logical reader in that such a common death we know by experience in the everyday obituaries published in the Press, has not been abolished, but the legal sentence of death under which all are born with the exception of Jesus Christ, is a different matter and is understood to be as termed by Paul, the Law of Sin and Death from which he had been made free while still a physical man of flesh and blood nature and still capable of natural death.

Paul rejoices in the fact, in praise of Jesus' sacrifice, "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Romans 8:2). No physical law of decay and death in this case nor of condemnation of the physical nature, but freedom from a legal position. (Romans 8:1). It is all a matter of the legal position which governs the case of whether we remain servants of Sin or become the servants of Righteousness in Jesus Christ, in hope of incorruptible nature at His second coming.

Paul teaches also in 1 Corinthians 15 that there is no difference in our bodies of flesh and blood now than with Adam's at his creation, he says, "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written the first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth earthy (created): the second man is the Lord from heaven (begotten from a living soul) as prophesied by Isaiah, "For unto us a child is born unto us a son is given... The Prince of Peace (Isaiah 9:6). And as we have borne the image of the earthy (living soul capable of death), we shall also bear the image of the heavenly (the last Adam).

Why do people professing to know and understand the teaching of Jesus and of Paul quote their words indiscriminately and boastfully? How can a man pass from natural death to life while still in the nature of a living soul? Impossible. Then Jesus must, be referring to another kind of death in John 5:24 and confirmed in the present tense by His servant John in 1 John 3:14, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath eternal life and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." (1 John 3:14). What death is John speaking of here? Is it not the death that he and others had passed from while still able to die naturally as living souls of the earth, earthy with no condemnation attaching to it?

When Paul speaks of no condemnation in Romans 8:1 he is not speaking of the physical flesh, there never was any, and further to that those who were not in Christ Jesus were of the identical flesh as those who were in Him, so is he not teaching a legal and a moral position; the difference between being in Adam by law and being in Christ by grace and faith in God? (Galatians 3:16-29).

If you have read from the third chapter of Galatians I referred you to, you will have read verse 22, "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." In verse 24 Paul having before explained the position of being under the Mosaic law in contrast with the Abrahamic covenant declares to the Galatian converts, "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith."

So then as Jesus said, "The testimony of two men is true," we have Moses' testimony of events regarding the creation, and how sin entered the world by Adam a man subject to death by creation and physical law of decay but not subject to death by transgression of God's law of restraint in partaking of the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil. This I have explained and Paul has borne testimony to the record of Moses, how that the Mosaic law entered that the offence of Adam might abound and become a schoolmaster to point men to Christ through the rituals and sacrifices which could never take away sin a remembrance being made every year. (Hebrews 10:3,4, & 11,12)

So who then could be a fit sacrifice to perform that office but Jesus Christ, the unblemished Lamb of God free from the Sin of the World, that He might by the shedding of blood give His natural life as a Ransom for all whether men accept it or reject it?

In contrast therefore with the testimony of Moses and Paul, do not mention John Thomas or Robert Roberts to me as the true testimony to be received concerning Adam's creation and the sentence of death incurred by his sin, for their writings on this subject are contradictory and untrue and their efforts, though sincere they may be, are wasted. Perhaps I have also wasted my time, but I have not shirked my duty in warning those who read this treatise. I do not condemn Thomas or Roberts, their writings have compelled me to search for Truth by prayer and faith in God and His Son. Controversy is not always bad in finding Truth.

Brother Phil Parry.

---

A commentary on

## **The Legacy of Eden**

The Endeavour Group have recently published a booklet entitled "The Legacy of Eden." It is my impression that this is the first booklet by this writer and I hope what follows is accepted by him as an attempt at encouragement and I trust the criticisms will be found helpful. I have tried to find what good I can in this publication before commenting on the unscriptural and other unreasonable elements.

Oddly enough I will start at page 29 where we find some reasoning from a study of Paul's letters to the Romans and the Corinthians. Here the writer understands and describes the Federal Principle very well and refers to it as the "scriptural doctrine sometimes called 'corporate unity'." In the next two pages he writes such things as: "The best example is Abraham, whose faith was such that God made promises to him which applied through him to all his descendants... It was the idea of the one whom includes within himself the many, that Paul uses to convey the connection between Adam and his descendants... Something of Adam lives on in all his descendants..." etc., after which he observes that Adam "is a symbol of those who are not yet regenerated by Christ, still subject to sin and death. Adam is the man of the earth, the man who obeys his own selfish inclinations instead of the will of God... He represents the natural state of mankind." "To be 'in Adam' therefore means to participate in the defection of the whole race... its origin in Eden."

The writer next points to the alternative:

“Christ as the one who brought righteousness and life. Through union with Him we can attain a righteousness that we cannot attain in our own strength...” Christ “was sent to heal the scars of the past... the path to righteousness and obedience, freedom and hope, justification and eternal life.”

In referring to 1 Corinthians 15:45-49 the writer, on page 32, goes on to say:-

“Typically the Apostle balances pairs of opposites: the first and last Adam, spiritual and natural, earthly and heavenly. Thus he emphasises the total contrast between the respective status of the two Adams and their effects upon humanity... ‘For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive’.”

Again he writes:

“All men begin in Adam for that is the natural state of mankind. Those who repent and turn in faith to God are transferred to the community of Christ...” Jesus “life was not confined to Himself but overflows to others, to those who are united with Him.”

Much earlier in the booklet (page 4) the writer, in briefly referring to Romans, says;

“In what sense did we participate in it (Adam’s sin)? Romans 5:12 has the words ‘because all sinned’ which in the Latin Bible was translated “IN WHOM all sinned’. This translation was to have far-reaching implications. It was taken by many writers to mean we were all ‘seminally present’ in Adam... All humanity was present in Eden, just as the author of Hebrews describes Levi as existing seminally in Abraham (Hebrews 7:9). This is called the ‘realistic theory’.”

And on page 16 the author writes:-

“Man, suspended between the divine and the natural, the heavenly and the earthly must choose between the two, deriving his life from the material order alone, or looking up to the God in whose image he was made.”

For all practical purposes in understanding Scripture teaching I cannot see much difference between what Dr. Thomas called the Federal Principle and what the writer refers to above as the ‘realistic theory’ and the ‘corporate unity.’ All have to do with being either ‘in Adam’ or ‘in Christ.’ While the writer has a good knowledge of the Scriptures and so much of what he says on this subject of serving Christ instead of remaining in Adam and serving the lusts of the flesh, what he fails to see, or at least to say, is that transferring one’s self to be ‘in Christ’ is a legal matter. Once a believer realises he is in Adam and that in order to serve God he must come out of Adam and be in Christ, it is not enough just to ‘come forward’ at some Evangelical church gathering and consider himself ‘saved,’ as could be read into this writer’s work, he must be baptised into the death of Christ, dying with Him in symbol and then rising out of the water to a new life in Christ. Baptism then, is far more than a matter of forgiveness of sins. Certainly forgiveness of sins takes place at the same time so that the newly baptised person can start a new life with a clean slate as it were, but both the forgiveness of sins and transferring to a new Lord are legal matters. And when he refers to those “not yet regenerated by Christ, still subject to sin and death” he doesn’t appear to notice that it is the law of sin and death to which they are still subject and from which law the faithful are freed - freed from the law of sin and death means being transferred to the law of the spirit of life and freed from condemnation, and, being freed from condemnation means that the faithful do not come into judgment but are raised in spirit life - eternal life, evermore to be with their Lord. They have their part in the first resurrection on whom the second death hath no power. “If the Son therefore shall make you free, then ye shall be free indeed.” (John 8:36).

It is pleasing to read on page 11:-

“that if God Himself chose to make the heart of man depraved then that effectively makes God the Author of moral evil,”



and on page 17:-

“Yet nothing in the text of Genesis directly supports the notion that God caused such a psychological (referring to the bias toward sin) change in human nature to make it less virtuous than it had been before, or that the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge had this malign effect. Such an interpretation effectively makes God, at least indirectly, the instigator of human sin.”

And again on page 26:-

“When (Jesus) describes the evil that comes out of the heart He does not mean that the heart is inherently corrupt, in the sense that God made it that way, so that its owner had no choice but to do bad. His point is simply that His opponents have chosen to pollute their heart with an evil of their own doing. They are responsible for the contents of their hearts.”

And then on page 35:-

“If we say that God implanted them (bad impulses) in us as a punishment for what Adam did, that He willed that there should be an evil component or a moral defect within the human heart then the same problem arises. Such a theory effectively makes God rather than Satan, the instigator of man’s sin.” He also observes that “a personal devil or fallen angel who leads into temptation and incites them to sin... if such a being existed then... it would imply that God is not all-powerful. And... would imply at least a partial diluting of man’s responsibility for his own wickedness...”

Well done! If only Robert Roberts had had such good sense the Christadelphian body may not be the confused shambles we find today. But the writer should be true to his own argument and apply the same reasoning to the doctrine of Original Sin. If God implanted sin in the flesh then God is responsible, or at least partially so, for the sin we commit. But this writer makes the curious claim, “We sin inevitably, yet we are responsible for our sinning.” What does that say about the God whom we serve if He has made us so that we sin inevitably and then blames us for it?

What a pity the writer did not build on the beliefs expressed above of the legal position of the two Adams, that we must come out of first Adam and be in Christ, the second Adam, by baptism and faith; that we transfer our allegiance to another Lord in just the same way as one might choose to be legally a citizen of another country; and secondly that there is no bias towards sin in our flesh. I hope the writer is now able to apply the same reasoning to ‘sin in the flesh’ and see that if we really have it then it was implanted by God and thus makes God responsible for our sin.

So now we come to some other criticisms: the writer in the very first page, in the second paragraph, finding that people cannot live at peace with each other, he asks:-

“What is this defect in the nature of man which distorts even his highest achievements?”

Thus he embraces original sin with all its awful ramifications and on page 2 he says of the Original Sin doctrine that:-

“It derives from a long tradition which goes back through the reformation to Saint Augustine who derived it from the Apostle Paul who in turn read Genesis through Rabbinic eyes.”

While the writer proves himself to be well versed in theological teachings showing the development of the doctrine of Original Sin since about 400 AD., he cannot rightly claim that, St Augustine derived his views of original sin from the Apostle Paul for nowhere does Paul teach it and neither could Paul have derived it from reading Genesis through Rabbinic eyes. It isn’t there. On the contrary, it can be seen from historical records that St Augustine believed the basic principles of original sin before he converted to Christianity having obtained his beliefs from a Persian tradition that all matter is evil and all spirit is good - this he modified by saying that flesh, being matter, must be full of sin, wholly inclined to all evil. This teaching he batted on to mainstream Christianity for all time. Such nonsense does not derive from Scripture but is the teaching of men of corrupt minds and it is a shame the writer spends so much time considering what they have to say. Paul’s letter to the Romans teaches nothing of “Original Sin” but is used

by theologians to support their own man-made notions. There is nothing in the Bible which can prove that the nature of Adam and Eve was changed. Such teaching is based on supposition and it is only the mistranslation of Romans 8:3 which can be found to give it an appearance of support. Paul did not write that Jesus came in the likeness of sinful flesh but in the likeness of sin's flesh; and here are two points to consider. First, that the 'flesh' is here used by Paul as representing those people who lived after the lusts of the flesh who were the possession of 'sin,' and second, that Jesus was not the possession of sin, though in the likeness of those who were. Taking the next phrase; "condemned sin in the flesh," this can be taken as meaning either that Jesus condemned sin in those who were 'of the flesh' or that Jesus condemned sin while He was in the flesh, which latter understanding I believe to be correct; but never can it, mean that Jesus condemned sin-in-the-flesh as if sin dwelt in the flesh like some disease. If it did then the writer's argument above would equally apply in that it would show God was the cause of sin and we ought not to be blamed for it.

On page 13, regarding the commandment "Thou shalt not eat of it," the writer says:-

"Nor was there any moral dimension to the command, they were required to accept the Lord's prohibition on His authority."

Did not God's authority give the commandment a "moral dimension"? Do not all God's laws have a moral dimension? One could as justly say that none of the ten commandments have a moral dimension. But this is the point - whatever God tells us to do, because He is perfect and because He is Love, His commandments form our moral standard. Moral dimension is obedience to God, for He alone determines what is right and wrong. Not all the ten commandments could apply in the garden of Eden: Remember the seventh day to keep it holy. Honour thy father and thy mother. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not bear false witness. Thou shalt not covet. Thou shalt not commit adultery, etc... These did not apply at that time but whatever God commands people to do is for their own well-being and the well-being of the community in which they live. In Eden none of the ten commandments applied except to love God and put Him first in their lives, and in this they failed by putting themselves first. God saying "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not..." give the moral dimension.

Page 15:- "The most plausible way to understand the serpent is to see it as a representative or symbol of what lay around Adam and Eve, the natural order... Animals were created only to satisfy natural appetites, to act as their instincts dictate, to live devoid of any awareness of the Creator. That is how He made them and in that state pronounced them to be good. Man, by contrast, was made for something higher, to live in conscious dependence upon his Creator and according to His revealed will. Now as soon as the 'animal principle' as we might call it, confronted Eve in the person of the serpent, a representative of the natural order, then it inevitably became a source of temptation to her, because it invited her to view her situation from the perspective of the animals. And, from that perspective, her whole situation was turned upside down..."

Surely this cannot be true - "To view her situation from the perspective of the animals..." whom God had created "to live devoid of any awareness of their Creator"? No. Such an opinion is the opposite of what we are told in Genesis 3:6 where we read that Eve "saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise..." Animals live by their instincts and are incapable of seeking wisdom. They do not have reasoning powers; man does. This is the distinction which makes man able to understand God and to reason with Him. It is what was meant when God said "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."

Page 17:- "Temptation must come from within as well as from without. If Adam and Eve had been morally perfect to begin with then it is hard to see why they would have wanted to transgress in the first place. A morally perfect being would have no inclination to disobey."

Firstly, it matters not one jot where the temptation originates, either from within or from without. The temptation is settled one way or the other within the mind. The purpose of temptation is to test our resolve to serve God. Temptation is our opportunity to show we love God. We are reminded of what James said: "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into diverse temptations..." (James 1:2). The second point I would comment on is that the writer says, "a morally perfect being would have no inclination to disobey," so

are we too assume after all these years of the Christadelphians claiming that Jesus was of morally perfect character that He had no inclination to disobey? But Scripture tells us that He was tempted in all points like as we are. So if Jesus was tempted in all points like we are, does that mean He was not a morally perfect character after all? No one can have it both ways and the fact of the matter is that a morally perfect person can be tempted just as severely as any one who is not morally perfect.

Page 19:- “The whole drama of salvation would not have been possible if man had spent his entire life in Eden, protected from pain, responsibility and moral choice.”

More extraordinary assumptions. Because Robert Roberts said such things does not mean we have to be his parrot. There is no evidence in the Scriptures that Adam would feel no pain. On the contrary, if Adam was protected from pain why did God put him into a deep sleep before removing a rib? And was it not Adam’s God-given responsibility to tend the garden in which he was placed? And would not His Creator have been displeased had he neglected his duties in this matter. As for moral choice, this has been explained above that Adam and Eve were given moral choice in the simple law “Thou shall not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.”

Page 20:- “One thing that even God cannot create is a morally perfect being...” “There can be moral perfection only for a creature who has a choice between obedience and disobedience... so God created man... with a potential to grow into perfection...”

This statement is somewhat confusing. Moral perfection requires perfect obedience and one who is perfectly obedient is morally perfect! So does or does not the writer believe we can be perfectly obedient to God’s commands? Perfect obedience is positively denied by Christadelphians. Or are we to believe the writer is referring to the perfection attained in eternal life? Jesus showed that perfect obedience was possible for He came in flesh like ours and was tempted in all points like as we are - yet without sin. This is the way in which Jesus condemned sin when He was in the flesh. However, even when we have done all things well we are still unprofitable servants, and without faith it is impossible to please God. However, it is our understanding that perfect obedience, or moral perfection is possible here and now.

Pages 20 & 21:- “The real issue is the relationship between God and man. As long as man obeyed the will of God then he remained in the garden... When he broke that relationship... he was expelled and sentenced to death.”

The real issue is of course the relationship between God and man, but to remain obedient in the garden, and be protected from pain, responsibility and moral choice would not make good sense for such conditions would not allow for growth of character. And again this last statement is simply not true. The sentence of death was not carried out. Adam and Eve were expelled from the garden instead of being put to death. The booklet “The Meaning and Usage of Muth Temuth and B’Yom” proves this point conclusively and should any further proof be asked for then the Unamended Christadelphians have produced an article which goes into even more detail.

Page 21:- “Symbolism does not always conform to our notions of logic.”

If this were true then God is charged with misleading us with illogical representations. The purpose of using symbolism is to help explain to those who are prepared to search things which are not easily understood. We know that Jesus said, “Therefore speak I unto them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand” but I am sure the writer has not “waxed gross” like those to whom Jesus was referring in Matthew 13:13ff. But Jesus said “Ask and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.” (Matthew 7:7).

Page 23:- Under the heading of “What is Evil?” the writer says:-

“Yet there is no clear dividing line between good and evil.”

In this section the writer confines himself to the evil men do without reference to the evil God brings upon people, e.g. Amos 3:6 “shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?” But nowhere does he give support to the claim of “no clear dividing line.” Instead he spends the next few pages dealing



with all kinds of evil and its appearance in totalitarian regimes, religions and superstitions throughout the ages, referring to historical books, the Scriptures and the Apocrypha as well as Jewish tradition, giving differing views as to its cause and origin. After giving this list of evils the writer leaves us wondering what was the point in referring to a dividing line between good and evil. If we use the terms right and wrong instead of good and evil then perhaps a clear division can be seen. So while the writer gives much space to the wrongs of mankind, quoting such passages as Jeremiah 17:9 (page 25) "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it?" it was good to find he does not attach this in the usual way to 'prove' that the hearts of all men are wicked, for on page 27 he quotes the words of Jesus, "The good person out of the good treasure of his heart brings forth good..." (Matthew 12:35). The good man out of the good treasure of his heart knows for certain that there is a strict dividing line between good and evil.

There is much more that one could comment on such as on page 29 where the writer makes the strange claim that "The Apostle Paul is the only New Testament writer to make specific mention of Adam as the culprit who brought ruin upon mankind," and presenting an alternative view regarding the writer's observation, when referring to the parable of The Prodigal Son he considers the older brother to be wrong in saying "Look, these many years I have served you, and I never disobeyed your command" suggesting that this older brother was equally at fault but in a different way when, in fact, it is the reason Jesus could rightly have given for rejecting us His younger brothers, but Jesus did not us. He was the Brother who served His Father "all these years and never disobeyed His command." Instead of rejecting us as He could have done and rightly so, He worked with His Father to bring the faithful back, showing His marvellous love and compassion for us even as His Father has shown His love, mercy and grace.

So to conclude. In many places it is not at all clear whether the writer is expressing his own views or the views of others, or whether he agrees with the views being expressed. It would be easy to say that this is perhaps intentional in order to avoid criticism of his beliefs but I feel this is more in keeping with an inexperienced writer and one of the reasons for supposing this is a new author. This writer also spends a lot of time airing his knowledge of theology to little effect other than telling us what he knows, and if the booklet had been half its present length or less, leaving out pages and pages of other people's opinions it would have been more readable, more informative and more readily absorbed, and hopefully, the inconsistencies would have been avoided; then this could have been an excellent article based wholly on Scripture teaching and which would have led the writer, and reader, away from the main thrust of this booklet which is based on the doctrine of Original Sin. Sadly, it does not.

Russell Gregory

---

## **P. Parry AND "THE REMNANT"**

**In 1988, P. Parry sent the following letter to the Editor of The Remnant Magazine which they published in their March issue:-**

"Under the heading "Edward Turney 1873" you also misrepresent Turney's teaching by saying he undermined the truth and the work of the deceased doctor; he did nothing of the kind but exposed the errors of the doctor and exposed also the Truth taught by him and Robert Roberts which you have discarded for error. You state, "So the true teaching was passed over, namely," - and you go on to express a mixture of truth and error in the experiences of Jesus, and class this mixture as true teaching instead of what in fact really is true teaching. Jesus did not struggle against sin working in Himself - sin is abstract, transgression of Law, - if sin had been working in Him then He would have been a sinner, - fleshly temptations are not sin, - it is only when temptations lead to violation of Divine Law that sin is committed.

Turney was right and you are definitely wrong in saying or suggesting that Jesus had to obtain eternal Redemption for Himself - the letter to Hebrews does not teach this. You talk of Turney denying the truth concerning the Name of Jesus Christ - He upheld it more than Dr. Thomas, Robert Roberts or any of you who profess to follow them - and where the pioneers taught the truth he confirmed it, and where they

contradicted themselves and one another he exposed it - as we also do for the benefit of people who are continually put off the track by your phraseology. You will see in my article that your remarks about E. Turney are libellous. I came to the conclusions Turney taught having never read his works or ever heard of him, or any literature circulated by the Nazarenes. I was a Christadelphian for 17 years and read my Bible with discrimination, not following blind leaders.”

P. Parry

\* \* \*

**The above letter was accompanied by an article by P. Parry. The Remnant Magazine editors published only a small part of Brother Phil Parry’s article for the benefit of their readers and this we reproduce below, but the whole article is available on request:**

Brother Phil Parry wrote:- “...in appealing to his readers to get back to the writings of Thomas and Roberts one would think that they had explained the most important and profound subject of God’s dealing with mans’ salvation namely the “Atonement...” In view therefore of the appeal that has gone out for Unity in the Christadelphian divided communities of North America in the form of a Referendum it is very strange that I should have before me a pamphlet by six named members of its steering committee, where under the heading... “Appraisal of Current Situation” they make five important comments and admissions. Number 4: “There are some views that are indeed contrary to Scripture.” But the Number 1 is what I want to draw attention to in connection with what I said of the one version of the “Atonement” delivered by Paul to the Corinthians. It reads as follows:

1. “There are certainly doctrinal differences among Christadelphians. For example there is a considerable range of views on the “Atonement” within both fellowships...”

Is it not a fact that the pioneers of Christadelphia never reached a complete understanding of the Gospel as preached by Paul, as a result of misunderstanding and misinterpretation in many cases? ...the significance of immersion into the death of Christ... being left to all sorts of conjecture and versions of men. It should not be expected that there would be unity on such a basis, but in the true Ecclesia of Christ it is expected, and must be on the foundation laid, which is Jesus Christ... And who is this Jesus Christ? He is the Son of God who was of like nature as Adam and ourselves and gave His ‘life in the blood as the ransom price’ for all who by the offence of one were ‘legally dead’ and alienated from God. It was just prior to Edward Turney’s lecture on this matter that the Christadelphian community was in a state of Apostasy regarding Adam’s sin and its consequences... their attack on Adam’s conduct being directed against his flesh, instead of his ability to be obedient in character, and wilfully disobeying God... condemnation of the flesh was substituted for condemnation of sin... This... presented them with a dilemma because if the flesh was defiled and in the words of Roberts “unclean” as a physical quality, then the flesh of Jesus would be unclean also; so one error begets another and thus a true understanding of Paul’s doctrine of the Atonement was never preached by Dr. Thomas or Robert Roberts... it was not His character that was sacrificed as a Ransom Price, but His natural life in the blood, a life unforfeited to sin in exchange for a life forfeited by Adam... Where no law is there is no transgression, Adam realised this and his conscience was defiled in the knowledge that he had transgressed Divine Law while in the nature in which he was first created and it was in this very nature that Jesus was born and by perfect conduct showed it was possible for Adam to have been obedient and thereby He (Jesus) condemned sin while in the likeness of the very nature which transgressed. I think this answers Dr. Thomas’s bewilderment; “How could sin be condemned in the nature of Jesus if it did not exist there?” I think I have shown that it did not and could not exist in Jesus, or anyone else as a physical element... sin is abstract... This is the Jesus we believe in... one who needed not redemption as other men, but who by his life, acquired directly from the Father (yet in the veins) as the blood of all humans flows, He was free to pour out His life unto death for us... we do not teach a dual Christ by separating His flesh from His character, the former unclean, sinful, devilish and satanic in every respect... Robertsites including “the Remnant” wrest the scriptures from their context in every way they can to describe the false theory of human nature being changed to a sin-contaminated polluted flesh, incapable of obedience to God’s requirements.”

Phil Parry.

\* \* \*

## **THE REMNANT'S COMMENTS:-**

“First of all may we point out the error in the Nazarene’s statement that Jesus had “a life unforfeited to sin...” When Jesus was born He was already on a course (unlike Adam) that would inevitably lead to death. As Jesus grew up He was ageing, therefore He was dying. The only escape for Him was by His death upon the cross. The simple question therefore is presented that if His body was not sin stricken, condemned, why was He dying? The Nazarenes also ask, “How could sin be condemned in the nature of Jesus if it did not exist there?” In reply we ask the question that if the Diabolos was in Jesus, is the Diabolos not to be condemned in His nature because He did not give way to His temptations, which are described so that we might know the struggle which took place in Him, between the mind of the flesh and the mind of the Spirit? Jesus was specific. “Why callest thou me good?” (Matthew 19:17). When Jesus was exalted to the divine nature, only then were no evil thoughts present in Himself, as there will not be in the exalted redeemed in the last day. The promise in the beginning was that He would “bruise” the serpent, which of course meant a work of condemning and overcoming serpent thinking, and where does such thinking and reasoning take place if not in the flesh?

If Jesus had not died on the cross He would still have died. Therefore His thoughts are prophetically described, “He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever.” (Psalm 21:4). Where in this is there “a Ransom Price...” of a “life unforfeited to sin in exchange for a life forfeited by Adam” as asserted by the Nazarenes? The simple fact is that Eternal Life is the gift of God, even to His Son Jesus Christ. Life was forfeited by Adam, who though not dying did not have eternal life, but Jesus was already subject to death even from the day He was born, therefore when God exalted Him to Eternal Life it was of God’s goodness and mercy; for there was no injustice in God of Jesus being in the mortal condition in which He was found. Jesus therefore had to die, but it was His obedience in the manner of the death which God required of Him, that brought Him into the ultimate favour of God.”

### **What Robert Roberts said:-**

“...in what way the righteousness of God was declared in the crucifixion of a guileless and sinless and perfect man. We must first of all ask who he was. It is a ready and Scriptural answer, so far as it goes, to say, he was the Son of God. But he was more than this. His being this alone would not have qualified him for the work of declaring the righteousness of God in being sacrificed. He was likewise the son of man through birth of a woman. Although he is called the second or last Adam, he was not a new Adam: he was not made fresh from the ground as Adam was. He was not of angelic nature; he was not in any physical sense apart from us... partaker of the same flesh and blood, that through death he might annul, destroy, neutralize, that which is destroying us all... The word of God to Adam took effect, and made him a death-stricken man; he was not subject to death before, for sin was the door by which death came in, “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.” “By man came death”... could a mortal beget an immortal?... “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death hath passed upon all men for that all have sinned.” Now, how was this state of things to be remedied? There were three ways of mending it. One way was to exterminate the whole human species. But this would have been a poor remedy. It would have been to confess failure - that God had set going an arrangement on this planet for His glory and could not make it work. This was impossible... God has said that He has not made the earth in vain: that He formed it to be inhabited by the righteous; and that as truly as He lives, it will be wholly filled with His glory yet. The second way would have been what might be called the toleration-of-sin method - the universal and indiscriminating pity method, by which the wickedness of disobedience should have been ignored, and mankind allowed to occupy the earth immortally for their own pleasure. But this also was impossible. It would have meant God’s abdication, and the handing over of man to eternal misery. There was a third way - a middle way, and that is the way which has been adopted - namely, to enforce the law against sin, and at the same time leave the door open for mercy to repentant and obedient sinners. How such a method could be made consistent with itself has been exhibited to us in the birth, death and resurrection of Christ. He was born that He might die, as the first necessity in the case; for such was the righteousness of God to be declared, and sin condemned in its own flesh as the foundation of all the goodness to come afterwards. It may be asked, could not such a result have been achieved by the sacrificial immolation of any sinner? So far as the mere condemnation of sin was concerned, no doubt the lesson could have been thus enforced; but as

in all the works of God, there were more objects than one. Not only had sin to be condemned, but resurrection had to come in harmony with the law that made death the wages of sin; and this resurrection was not merely to be a restoration of life, but the providing of an Administrator of the glorious results to be achieved - the raising up of one who should be a mediator between God and man, the dispenser of the forgiveness and the salvation of God through Him and the Judge also of who should be fit to receive these great gifts. All these aims required that the sacrificial victim should be a perfectly righteous man, as well as the possessor of the nature to be sacrificially condemned - who should do no sin Himself, while "made sin" and treated as sin for us; who should be just and holy, obedient in all things, while yet "numbered with the transgressors, and making his grave with the wicked"... The crucifixion of Christ as a "declaration of the righteousness of God" and a "condemnation of sin in the flesh," exhibited to the world the righteous treatment of sin. It was as though it was proclaimed to all the world, when the body was nailed to the cross. "This is how condemned human nature should be treated according to the righteousness of God; it is fit only for destruction." The shedding of the blood was the ritual symbol of that truth; for the shedding of the blood was the taking away of the life. Such a declaration of the righteousness of God could only be made in the very nature concerned; a body under the dominion of death because of sin. It would not have been a declaration of the righteousness of God to have crucified an angel or a new man made fresh from the ground... It pleased God to require the ceremonial condemnation of this sin-nature in crucifixion in the person of a righteous possessor of it, as the basis of our forgiveness."

#### **What Dr. Thomas said:-**

"Man having been made subject to evil, and consigned to the bondage of a perishing state, the Lord God repudiated their fig-leaf invention, and "appointed coats of skins" for their covering. To appoint coats of skins implies a command for the sacrifice of animals whose skins were converted to this purpose... When the sacrifice was accepted, the offence was provisionally remitted: for the scripture saith that it is not possible for the blood of animals to take away sins. It was impossible because sin was to be condemned in sinful flesh. This required the death of a man; for the animals had not sinned: so that, if the whole animal world, save man, had been made an offering for sin, sin would still have been uncondemned in his nature. Besides the necessity of a human sacrifice, God deemed it equally necessary that the victim should be free from personal transgressions; and that when he had suffered, he should rise from the dead so as to be "a living sacrifice." If the death of a transgressor would have sufficed, then, Adam and Eve might have been put to death at once, and raised to life again. But this was not according to the divine wisdom. The great principle to be compassed was the condemnation of sin in sinful flesh, innocent of actual transgression. This principle necessitated the manifestation of one who should be born of a woman, but not of the will of man. Such a one would be the Seed of the woman, made of her substance with Him for His Father who by His overshadowing spirit should cause her to conceive. He would be the Son of God by origination; and the Son of Mary by descent, or birth of sinful flesh... Adam and his wife had faith, or God would not have accepted the sacrifices with whose skins they clothed; for it was as true then as it is now, that "without faith it is impossible to please God." Faith, then, in the Seed of the Woman, first as a sacrifice for sin, wounded to death by His enemies; and afterwards the destroyer of the sin-power; in connection with the sacrifice of animals as representative of the bruising of his heel - was the ground of their acceptance with the Lord God... When the saints are all gathered into the Kingdom they will not find themselves in an unexpected situation. They will all be there by virtue of believing the same things... Their sins will have been covered upon the same principle - by the raiment of righteousness derived from the sacrifice, by faith in whose blood they have been cleansed."

#### **Final Comment by The Remnant:**

"We leave our readers to the final decision of who was right, Turney or Roberts. For our part we have no doubt whose word and work has the convincing ring of truth."

#### **P. Parry sent the following letter to The Editors of The Remnant magazine in reply to the foregoing: -**

"I thank you for your July and August magazines. The March issue dealing with my correspondence on The Sacrifice of Christ where I pointed out your statement that you were leaving the final decision to your readers of who was right, Turney or Roberts. No final decision in this matter has been forthcoming



from your readers, at least not in your Magazine, and in any case could not have been addressed to me as my address was omitted from it, so that all correspondence would have to be addressed to you as Editors who would have the opportunity of scrutiny and censorship or worse still, manipulation, falsifying and misrepresentation, as you have done in my own case. This was the very reason I was reluctant to continue any more correspondence because your line of demarcation seems to be drawn up to where and what R.Roberts decided, not what the inspired word teaches. But to be brief, I have to correct you in your assertion that because I used Dr. Thomas's question it was also my question.

I am led to understand from this that if I quote a passage from Isaiah that I am in fact the prophet Isaiah because I have used it to teach some lesson. Would to God this were true every time I quoted any of the true Prophets! Dr. Thomas asked the question simply because he misconstrued Paul's teaching in the manner of the Greek terminology used as was also the case in Romans chapter 7 where many misunderstood Paul, but in this latter case Dr. Thomas was an exception, knowing that Paul was speaking of himself in the past tense as a Jew unconverted to Christ. Dr. Adam Clarke also realised this fact and does not speak very approvingly of the teaching of "sin-in-the-flesh" which crept into the early church and tenaciously taught by all sects of Christadelphia. No wonder Ernest Brady was led to make the statement: "The Remnant in the Rag Bag"! Under your reply you misquote the Apostle as saying "In my physical flesh dwelleth no good thing," yet Dr. Thomas and Dr. Adam Clarke knew that Paul was referring to his unregenerate state (in the flesh) and not (in the Spirit) converted to Christ.

You continue your corruption of the word and your denial of Christ raised incorruptible as the firstfruits by saying he was flesh and blood nature when He emerged from the tomb and when He was met by Mary Magdalene. You change the inspired recording of the words of Jesus in preference for those expressed by one of your pioneers in order to surmount an obstacle which was never there except of his own creating, namely that of flesh and blood resurrection of Jesus, and he makes it to read "Touch me not for I have not risen or ascended to my Father's Nature." You talk of the emotions of the flesh alive again in Jesus as previous to His death, which you said was the very reason for that death, that those emotions should be ended, was God, in your view giving Him another trial of temptation to prove Him worthy of a change to Spirit nature? Perish the thought! He always lived unto God, but died unto Sin, but not as a sinner. We die unto Sin through Him and then live unto God now.

I am not sure what you are trying to convey in regard to Mary's emotions and if she had embraced Jesus. Are you suggesting that what is now causing a storm of protest from many professing religious people, namely, the film "The Last Temptation of Christ" depicting sexual hallucinations involving Mary Magdalene in His thoughts, as He was hanging on the Cross, could have happened and gone too far, if He had not said to her "Touch me not"? This is something that has never entered my mind in all my years as a Bible student and believer, and I sincerely hope you and your readers have not, with all your addiction to serpent nature doctrine, stooped as low as this in carnal thinking, that such a thing could have happened between Jesus and Mary after His resurrection. Besides, this would have been impossible in Spirit Nature as I believe Jesus was when He emerged from the tomb, for if He were flesh and blood then He did not sacrifice natural life for anyone, but took it back, thus making it a loan, not a gift. What harm would have been done if Mary had touched or embraced Jesus whether He were flesh and blood or Spirit nature, her emotions would have been no different, and I was of the impression Jesus had cured her of most of the vices she had. There is nothing wrong with human nature or human propensities if they are governed and controlled by Divine Law. The sentence upon Adam of judicial death was not therefore as you imply, because of his nature and the propensities of that nature, but because he allowed his propensities of free will to violate Divine Law. Nevertheless, this did not affect his body or nature; it affected his relationship and status, his legal position in the sight of God, not his physical condition. Your statement on page 131 is therefore absurd and unscriptural where you say, "God in mercy gave Jesus the eternal life for which He asked because though His body was condemned His life (being perfect) was accepted and therefore was perpetuated." This is the usual vivisection of Christadelphianism - the confusing of Christ's character with His life in the body and blood for He was not as you say or imply "The fulfilment in His character of the Lamb without spot and blemish and whose blood (or life) poured out was the Atonement," for if as you maintain His body was condemned why was it brought back from the tomb, and why was the Antitype of the sacrificial lamb (Jesus) offered up by God in violation of His own Law - a condemned Body as you state? The Lamb under the law was to be legally clean in body to typify Jesus the Antitype but it had no developed character under law, so it must have typified the legal position and relationship of Jesus to His Father from birth to the time of God's offering Him up freely for us all as a Ransom and not as an exhibition of what was



due to human nature. It is time Christadelphians including The Remnant began to see Jesus as a human being - a Body of life - a whole - not one part good and the other part evil and condemned, a person God acknowledged as His Beloved Son in whom He was well pleased. Jesus quoted from Hebrew Scripture much that applied to Himself and one application reads: "A body hast thou prepared me." What was it for? Jesus said to His disciples, "This is my body which is given for you." If this body had been condemned and unclean would Jesus have given His disciples bread in symbol of His body and caused them to violate the law they were still under?

You falsify what I said concerning the corruptible nature of Jesus where you state on page 130 "The unsinning Jesus had to die because (as our correspondent says) He was human with human propensities." I did not say Jesus had to die because He was human with human propensities. I said He was capable of dying because He was of the same nature as Adam at creation (as affirmed by Dr. Thomas and R.Roberts), but He did not need to die a natural death nor the untimely inflicted death of the cross apart from God's reason for allowing it as a substitutionary and sacrificial death for us. My reasons are scriptural, yours are diabolical and contradictory for on page 130 you also say that in the resurrected Jesus there was need for a change of mind as well as a change of body, so if this were so we have not an High Priest who can any more be touched with the feelings of our infirmities or be any more conscious of the trials that beset him - He is a man with no character, in other words, Mindless," and we are exhorted "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus."

All you have achieved is to substantiate your belief that Adam's nature was changed to Serpent Nature full of sin, in direct opposition to what was taught in the beginning by your pioneers John Thomas and R.Roberts. If you are "The Remnant in the Rag Bag" what of those who are not yet in it? Please give your readers freedom to decide and reply. Or must they accept your statement at the foot of page 131: "Jesus on the cross showed His killed serpent nature. He bruised the serpent in His head causing this 'serpent thinking' to cease in a death of condemnation fore-ordained of God to declare His righteousness"? Thus in your statement is involved the serpent (Jesus) bruising Himself in the head, whereas Genesis records the seed of the woman (Jesus) bruising the head of the serpent, and Jesus being bruised in the heel by the serpent. Here again is your manipulation of the word of God taking you to the extent of blasphemy by doctrine and tradition received by the precepts of men."

Phil Parry.

**Footnote:** To help us understand what Paul meant by Jesus condemning sin by His righteous conduct we compare what the writer to the Hebrews (11:7) tells us about Noah condemning the world of the ungodly by his faith and righteous walk before God. P.P.

---

A short commentary on

## **The Atonement** (An article written by John Carter)

This article on "The Atonement" by John Carter has now been republished in The Christadelphian Magazine in two parts, the first part under the subheading "Sin That Dwelleth in Me." published in the November 2002 issue and the second part. "A Just God and A Saviour," in the December issue. The article is based on an address given in Malvern Town Hall, Melbourne, Australia in 1958.

Why this has been resurrected after 45 years is a question for the publishers to answer for themselves but it is noteworthy that John Carter, towards the end of his life, was beginning to lean towards some of the teachings of the Nazarene Fellowship, taking on board the fact that Jesus Christ died as our substitute, and his proof is set out perfectly on page 456 (December "Christadelphian") as we indicate below. Also John Carter hints at his belief that natural death is not the wages of sin. It may be noted too that not once does John Carter make use of the expression 'sin in the flesh' or 'sinful flesh,' and this may be because he did not

wish to offend his audience in Melbourne. However, he very quickly shows his belief in such, for in the second column of the first page (414), while still introducing his subject “Sin That Dwelleth in Me”, John Carter says:- “We are entering into a discussion and a consideration of God’s ways, which are higher than our ways and His thoughts are higher than our thoughts.”

How soon does John Carter misuse Scripture in order to build up his argument that sin dwells in man! Isaiah 55:7-8 reads “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord... For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord.”

Are we to assume from this confession that John Carter considered himself to be among the wicked who needed to forsake his ways and his thoughts and return unto the Lord? We mention this here because we find it typical of Christadelphian speakers and writers who so frequently misuse verses such as Isaiah 55:8, Jeremiah 17:9, Psalm 14:2,3 and Romans 3:10-19 etc. in their attempt to show how depraved all men are because they supposedly have sinful flesh. Christadelphians boast of reading the Bible effectively, but all too often is it a vain and fruitless boast for these Scriptures also by way of contrast, consider the opposite - the righteous who serve God.

Towards the end of page 415 John Carter refers to Romans 5:12 - “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered the world and death by sin; therefore death passed upon all men, for that (margin - “in whom”) all men have sinned,” as follows: -

“In this connection let us say quite firmly, that the marginal alternative, “in whom” (instead of “for that”) is not permissible as a translation. The Apostle is saying that Adam sinned; that death entered the world of mankind as a result of his sin; that all of us share in that death which has come into the world as his descendants; *with the added point that all of us*, as a consequence of that sin in the beginning, *are ourselves sinners.*”

John Carter may not like the marginal alternative translation because it does not accord with his unscriptural conviction but he has no grounds on which to oppose it, because, in fact, the rendering “in whom” can be seen to be Paul’s meaning in this argument. We do not all ‘share in the death which came by sin,’ for Paul tells us that those baptised into the death of Jesus Christ escape the death by sin, “knowing this that our old man is crucified with him... for he that is dead is freed from sin” (Romans 6:6-8), and again: “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus...” (Romans 8:1). So we are no longer under the law of sin and death, i.e. the death which came into the world by the sin of Adam, but we are under the law of Grace, i.e. the law of the Spirit of Life which is in Christ Jesus. Romans 5:12 should indeed read: “...so that death passed upon all men in whom all have sinned.” This rendering is in keeping with the teaching that we are all concluded under the one sin of Adam - and this was by the grace of God for the purpose of our salvation. Paul continues his argument in verse 18 (verses 13 to 17 are in brackets) where he says “Therefore as by the offence of one (Adam), Judgment came upon all men (in Adam) to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one (Christ), the free gift came upon all men (in Christ) unto justification of life.”

What the Scriptures teach is that we come into this world as descendants of Adam after he had sold himself to Sin as a Master; after he became estranged from God by his sin, and we have this sin imputed to us so that we too come into the world estranged from God, but this is not as a punishment, nor as a misfortune, and it is certainly not to make us sinful, but it is for our blessing - for the sake of our salvation. The clearest expression of this is to be found in Galatians 3:22 - “But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.”

On page 416 John Carter says:-

“But something else is evident: there is a bias in their nature inherited too.”

Here is the inevitable Christadelphian assumption. This blindness in part, which, even today, after 130 years of being repeatedly challenged to show where this inherited bias towards sin is taught or how it is deduced from Scripture has failed miserably to bring forth any semblance of a reason. We have consistently shown inherited sinful nature to be error and still the Christadelphian Establishment choose not to open their

eyes and see the facts of scripture which we present. However, we know that in the rank and file of Christadelphia there are many who do have eyes to see more clearly than their leaders. Suffice it to say here that there is no good reason for such a bias, and if it exists then God alone could have put it there - but to what good purpose would He want to make us sinful? And why is not the choice given us by His Law sufficient for Him to find out who will serve Him and who will not? John 4:23 - "the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him." Therefore we say that this doctrine of a bias in our nature blasphemes God who alone could have put it there.

On the next page John Carter says that sin can become part of the individual himself - that one's sin really can become part of one's flesh! He gives the example of an alcoholic who destroys his health with drink and seems to think he has made his point that the break-down of this man's body is because he has put alcohol/sin in his flesh. On page 417, first column, he then goes on to say:-

"So that when we come to the question of the forgiveness of sins we must face the problem: how can sin be forgiven when it has become a part of the individual himself, and is the expression of what the man has become?"

According to John Carter this man has become an alcoholic and therefore his sin has become part of him. If John Carter does not believe that this sin can be passed on to this man's offspring then what is the point of mentioning him at all? This man has become an alcoholic and is suffering for his excess. But if John Carter really believes that sin can be passed on in this way then it proves too much, for it would mean that every sinner passes on more and more sin to the next generation; so that if Adam was able to pass on sin in the flesh to his offspring then every generation ever since has been adding more and more sin to that flesh!

If this is what people want to believe it is up to them but it is not taught in Scripture for there is a better understanding to be found - those who live after the lusts of the flesh are said by Paul to be 'in the flesh' as opposed to those who seek the things of God, and of these Paul said "ye are not in the flesh but 'in the Spirit.' If they are not in the flesh, what has happened to their sin in the flesh?"

Page 417 second column John Carter refers to Romans 7:24:-

"O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

It is always good advice to read the context, even if it means going into the next chapter to see if the argument is continued there, and in this case we find that there should be no break between chapters 7 and 8, for three verses later on Paul gives the answer - that he was indeed delivered "from the body of this death" before he wrote this letter to the Romans, as he tells us in verse 2 of chapter 8:- "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Paul was delivered and free, no longer the "wretched man" under the law of sin and death but delivered from that position and now under the law of the Spirit of life (i.e. under the law of Grace) in Christ Jesus. Paul was delivered at his conversion and baptism, perhaps about 25 years before writing this letter to the Romans, and ever since then he could say, "I can do all things through Jesus Christ which strengtheneth me." (Philippians 4:13). He was no longer the "wretched man" but the man for whom there was laid up a crown of righteousness. (2 Timothy 4:8).

Page 427, second column, John Carter says:-

"What is it within us, that the Apostle describes as sin? Clearly there are the impulses that lead to sin. There are impulses that are the result of sin at the beginning, which we have by inheritance. But in what way is sin used here? Sin is lawlessness. *Sin is the expression of ourselves in defiance of the will of God, either in thought or act.*"

These "impulses that lead to sin" are the lust of the eyes the lust of the flesh and the pride of life, otherwise known as temptation - and temptation is not sin, it is choice. These impulses to sin are not "the result of sin at the beginning, which we have by inheritance" Impulses to sin cannot be inherited. And "defiance of the will of God" can only come when one has knowledge and understanding of the law of God. There are no impulses apart from temptation, and temptation is there because of law, and temptation is choice.

Going back to page 416, we find the first hint of John Carter's belief in "Substitution," where he writes:-

"They hid themselves from God, and knew that they needed to cover themselves. We know how God repudiated the covering they fashioned, and substituted that which He Himself provided in the covering of skins."

Adam and Eve "knew they needed to cover themselves." This was an indication of their remorse or contrition which God accepted as repentance but He did not accept the type of covering they offered. The law required that they should be put to death in the day they sinned. Instead God accepted the life of an animal(s) - a covering which He Himself provided, and Adam and Eve were to wear the animal skins to show that their sins had been covered over. The animal(s) died instead of Adam and Eve but they were only the type of the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world, also provided by God - "Unto you a child is born, unto you a Son is given..." Jesus Christ was the great Antitype of all previous sacrifices for sin, all of which were substitutionary for the life of sinners.

In the second part of his address John Carter develops his thoughts further where on Page 456, he says:-

"We must go back again to the ritual type and ask, what does this mean? The blood of the animal was a token of life taken, and an identification of the man with the animal. By placing his hands upon its head he said in effect, This is what ought to happen to me; I am taking its life, but I am the sinner and death is due to me.' It becomes the ritual expression of the fact that the man recognised that death was due for sin."

What better way could one express the principle of substitution? The animal died in place of the sinner and Jesus died as the Antitype of the animal sacrifices. Who can argue against Jesus dying in our stead? He died to take away sin (John 1:29); He died as a ransom for all (1 Timothy 2:6); He redeemed us to God [Revelation 5:9]; We are purchased with the precious blood of Christ (1 Peter 1:19). All speak of substitution! The idea that Jesus died as a representative man is a concocted theory unworthy of anyone who loves the Word of God. There is no forgiveness of sin without the shedding of blood (Hebrews 9:22). And who dare follow this and say that our natural death is the wages of sin?

On page 455, second column, John Carter says of Jesus;

"He was there, one of us. God raised up one who was like us, and yet who, because he was the Son of God, was able to live a perfectly obedient life. Thus upon the very conditions that had brought death, through sin, He provided the way for resurrection from the dead and the bestowal of immortality upon the beloved Son of God."

John Carter says that 'Jesus was there, one of us.' That's an assumption! He was the only begotten Son of God; He was separate from sinners; He was without blemish and without spot; He was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death; He was that "holy thing" born of Mary; He said, My Father and I are one; He was the Great Shepherd of the sheep, but He was not one of the sheep. He was there because of us and He gave His life because of us and for us. But never can it be truly said that "He was there, one of us."

Again John Carter is wrong in saying that: "Because He was the Son of God, was able to live a perfectly obedient life." Adam was a son of God and he and Eve were able to live perfectly obedient lives, but they chose not to. Jesus lived a perfectly obedient life because He loved God and put God first in His life and He sought God's help - always - as we can - Jesus did not spare Himself but made unsurpassable effort to please His Father - and so can we. The reward is great and the effort is very worthwhile, but it is easier to make excuses - 'poor me, I have sin in my flesh, I can't possibly do what I ought, I am an inevitable sinner.' Nonsense!

Page 457, first column :-

“He was a mortal man. Was it right that he was related to death as a member of the race? Was God righteous in His decrees? The answer is found in Jesus’ voluntary submission: God was right and he upheld the law of God and vindicated His righteousness. He did it as one of us, as a representative man, and in that very fact, we have that which provides the nexus between himself and God...”

This is pretty horrible stuff and in my view it is blasphemous. It is only the phraseology that prevents one seeing just how ugly these claims are. “Related to death as a member of the race?” I take this to mean ‘was Jesus under condemnation?’ - He was not. And mortal means ‘subject to death through sin.’ - Jesus was not. Of course God’s decrees are righteous, that is axiomatic, but the notion that Jesus was under condemnation because of sin is unjustifiable and Jesus did not vindicate any such thing in His voluntary sacrifice. If Jesus had submitted as a representative man, then of a truth His death would have been a martyrdom and no sacrifice.

On page 456, John Carter refers to the baptism of Jesus by John in Jordan, that:

‘Jesus went down into that symbolic death, a symbol which was wrought out in fact three and half years later when He voluntarily went to the cross.’

I would like to add to this thought. John’s baptism was for the forgiveness of sins, but Jesus had no sins, so Jesus’ baptism could not have been for that reason. When Jesus came up out of the water, a voice from heaven said “Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.” (Luke 3:22). Why did the voice come at this time? We know that Jesus had come into the world to take upon Himself the sin of the world and to save us from our sins and I believe this voice at His baptism signified the moment when Jesus took the sin of the world upon Himself, at the commencement of His ministry and which sin He carried for three and a half years to His crucifixion when He died to take that sin away.

On the next page John Carter talks about our baptism:

“We come to baptism with the recognition that we are being baptized for the remission of our sins, and with a consciousness that we are sinners in God’s sight. We repent, acknowledging that we are willing to turn our backs on sin and turn our faces to righteousness. That is our contribution in the first instance to this problem of reconciliation. For such is the nature of sin that one cannot pass it by lightly.”

This is insufficient explanation for what should take place when we come to our baptism. Apollos was one who, having been baptised into John’s baptism for the forgiveness of sins was later baptised into Jesus Christ. (Acts 19:3-5). Why? John’s baptism was for the forgiveness of sins only and was for those who, as Jews, were already in covenant relationship to God but those baptised into Christ were baptised into His death having legally come out of Adam and put on Christ, they now belong to Christ and are adopted sons of God under the new covenant. This legal transfer could not happen with John’s baptism.

Though the writer does say later that we identify ourselves with Christ, he makes this almost coincidental rather than the crux of the matter, for on page 458 he says:

“If we sanctify him in our humble approach in identifying with Christ in baptism - the symbol of death, which is our due - we rise, not to ourselves, but to walk in newness of life as men and women reconciled to God.”

Amen to that.

What can we say by way of summing up this talk? John Carter produces a mixture of truth and error due chiefly to his lack of understanding Paul’s letter to the Romans, especially with reference to Romans 5:12 and 7:24. His novel idea of how sin can enter flesh in his example of the alcoholic, was given, I assume, to show how the sin of Adam and Eve entered their flesh; but is it really worth twisting reason in order to follow St Augustine? John Carter’s view of the reason for baptism is rather shallow, missing the true value of one’s legal relationship with Christ as His brethren and sons of God by adoption. The best part of John Carter’s presentation was his support for Jesus dying as our substitute, and while this was very



precise and clear, it was sadly contradicted when he said that Jesus died as the representative man. He can't have it both ways.

Russell Gregory

---

**In the last three Circular Letters we have published letters to B.Broomfield. We continue with another letter, this time from Brother Phil Parry:**

Dear Brian, Greetings in the cause of "Truth" and salvation through Christ Jesus. Your letter to hand dated 18th December 2002 re: "Raised To Life" - your reply.

I appreciate the time you have taken to reply to my booklet but I am very disappointed that you have misconstrued and therefore misrepresented some of the matters and views I have presented, but not only so, in many of the scriptures you have quoted, is support for pre-resurrection judgment for eternal life

I do not deny that those who are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, are as the angels of God and cannot die anymore, but stand before Christ to receive their rewards according to their merits in his service. These are two different aspects of a standing before His Judgment seat at the right-hand of God at the present time, and of His second coming to reward every man according to his works. Cannot you see that certain people are accounted worthy of the world to come before they are raised from the dead incorruptible? And do you reject the fact that Paul said a crown of righteousness was laid up for him by the righteous Judge from henceforth of his statement, and not to him only but to all them also that love His appearing? (2 Timothy 4:7,8). And what of this fact of appearing, is it not at the time of the resurrection of the just at Christ's coming? (1 Thessalonians 2:19), and are not these Thessalonians the people whom Paul assured, that, whether alive or asleep in Him, at Christ's coming would be in a state of being able to meet Him and ever be with Him? (1 Thessalonians 4:13-18).

You are incorrect in saying my idea that judgement takes place during the death state is peculiar to say the least. I have never said such a thing; my view is that judgment is in operation until death after which no judgment of conduct can take place. Indeed you have misread and construed my booklet in this case also. On page 15 of the booklet, I speak of two groups of people asleep in the dust of the earth, the one group awake as David describes his own hope of the resurrection or rising from the dead; Psalm 17:15: "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake with thy likeness." On the basis of Michael Ashton's views and those traditionally held by Christadelphians, David could not experience such a thing, he would have to stand before the judgment seat in corruptible nature (which is not a likeness of the resurrection of Christ) and be judged as to whether he was worthy to awake in the likeness of the glorified Christ!

Thus followed my reference to the words of Isaiah 26:19, God's dead servants live, they arise with Isaiah; having dwelt in dust they awake and sing, and have plenty to sing about for indeed they have everlasting life having part in the first resurrection (Blessed and Holy) on whom the "Second Death" hath no power (Revelation 20:5,6).

Paul's view of the dead in Christ rising from the earth incorruptible at the sound of the Trumpet is unacceptable to Christadelphian views on account that they do not accept pre-resurrectional judgment and approval at the end of the course. On this same matter Dr. Thomas wrote "Anastasis" making the resurrection of the saints in Christ a process, in violation of Paul and his authority through Christ. In fact he made a complete mess of the subject not realising that chastisement of God's sons is judgment, and also what he said in Eureka of a true believer passing from under a sentence of death, a legal position, to a sentence of Life, and consequently as Jesus said, "shall not come into condemnation" (John 5:24).

I draw your attention also to John 6:37-40 and what Jesus confirms as the predestination of those whom the Father has given Him, that being their present status of everlasting life, spirit resurrection and spirit change of the living at the last day – verses 40 to 47.

Re page 3. you say I seem to disregard “and we shall all be changed,” this is not true for it is my important point in that Paul only refers the change as operational upon “we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord;” he says nothing about the dead in Christ being changed. I think you should read Paul’s statement again more thoroughly. Yes, we are meant to believe that those alive at Christ’s coming will be changed whether they are standing on their feet, sitting or lying down, but the dead in Christ will have already come forth in spirit incorruptible bodies recreated, not changed. I have never said or believed that the dead are changed; you seem to be misrepresenting me on the subject.

2 Corinthians 5:10 speaks of rewards for the things done in the body while in the service of God. This has a bearing on 1 Corinthians 3:11-15, the fire trying every man’s work of what sort it is. It is not a matter of earning eternal life by works but by faith and appreciation of what God has done for us through His Son.

However, I regard myself as standing before the judgment seat of Christ at all times, this is the reason for His Priesthood in Heaven that He might make intercession on my behalf that the words of Jude may also apply, that in accordance with His judgment I might be presented faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy - not in fear of condemnation which is for those who say He was unclean and of condemned nature from birth needing redemption, when all He needed was a change from corruptible to incorruptible. You have not made any comments on my booklet “By Man Came Death - What Death?” Is it a stumbling block to you that you know only one death as the penalty upon Adam which John Carter, “Christadelphian” Editor in 1958 falsely believed to be contained in the Divine statement of Genesis 3:19, which is a result, not a penalty, of being spared to live out his natural life of 930 years, the limit of his appointed nature by the Creator? “Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return;” this is not “the death by sin” but by being created corruptible capable of death.

It is passing strange that people can believe the “very good” corruptible nature of Adam should become the penalty for his sin when in this nature he is the very object of something altogether the very opposite, i.e. “Surely Die” in the day (24 hours) thou eatest. Judicial Death, not natural as related and appointed to the human species by the Creator. Adam brought himself under sentence of judicial death before the Divine statement in Genesis 3:19 was made.

Have any of your members besides you three, had access to the correspondence and booklets you have received or is it the usual Christadelphian policy to withhold from them anything which does not comply with the traditional views handed down from the time of Dr. Thomas?

One important observation in conclusion. Jesus abolished death. What death did He abolish? Not His own, neither natural death. All experience natural death, righteous and unrighteous. So what death did Jesus abolish? He died the death that came by Adam’s sin, thus abolishing it for Adam and for all who associate with His sacrificial death in the symbol of Baptism. Life and immortality could not be possible while the legal sentence of death had dominion. Jesus allowed death to have dominion over Him in willingly laying down His life for all, not for Himself. He was not under condemnation at any time and need not have died when He did. Thus His words in Matthew 20:2. This was not martyrdom but an intentional premeditated act of Love and devotion to fulfil His Father’s purpose with mankind. “I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again, this authority have I received from my Father.” “I give unto them eternal life” John 10:27-29. Amen.

Regarding your reference to what I said of Dr. Thomas in “Anastasis,” I either sent my original copy to someone interested or lost it is some way, this was some years ago but I have quoted it from memory. Since that time a friend sent me the booklet made up from photocopies so that the page numbers are different from your copy, this one being a second edition published by his executors and dated July 29th 1871, Robert Roberts, Birmingham.

On page 35 of my copy there is confirmation of what I said of one class of people standing in bodies of sin and the other in bodies like Adam’s before he sinned - then a third body is mentioned. He says:-

“As far as body is concerned in the matter, the one character on record in the Lamb’s book of life when glorified, will have been related to three bodies, more or less intimately connected - the first, the body of sin; the second, a body like Adam’s before he sinned; and the third, this second new body changed, or transformed, by quickening into a glorious powerful and spiritual body. When this is manifested, the process is complete; and the spiritually embodied character, named Abraham, for example, is “clothed upon with his house from heaven.” He is then raised incorruptible.”

From this we gather that Dr. Thomas held the doctrine of changed flesh through sin, as taught by Apostate Rome and also expressed by Robert Roberts in Clause V of the B.A.S.F.

Another error stated on page 31 of my copy (of Anastasis) is his reference in Romans 14:10 and 2 Corinthians 5:10 to being the setting of the ‘Great White Throne’ in which Paul includes himself and also those who experience the Second Death, (Revelation 20:11). Paul cannot be present in this setting of a thousand years after Christ’s return; he is in the first resurrection having judged himself, “I have kept the faith.” It is God not Jesus on the Great White Throne, and those whose names are in the book of Life are not judged out of the books which John saw opened. On page 25 of my Anastasis copy, Dr. Thomas, on Paul’s statement “raised incorruptible” declares, “I taught this truth in “Elpis Israel;” if a Truth then, why did he challenge Paul and make his word a lie?

You want this correspondence to end? Very well, but please read the enclosed. I have replied more quickly than you have.

Kind Regards, Phil Parry.

---

## **Extracts from “The Christadelphian Lamp”**

Very recently I was given the first volume of The Christadelphian Lamp. The date of this first issue: November 1873. The Editor: Edward Turney. The first Editorial introduces us to the reasons for starting a new Christadelphian publication and I quote: -

“Had we listened to the suggestions of friends, a periodical advocating the truth, would long since have been taken in hand by us. The way, however, has never appeared quite clear until now. Not that the recently developed ideas concerning Jesus Christ are by any means the sole cause of our taking up the position of editor: they are not; yet the previous thought of doing so has no doubt been thereby matured into a decided resolution. Large numbers of the brethren in various parts of the country, who firmly and thankfully rejoice with us in the “new light,” feel themselves cut off by the action of the Christadelphian and, therefore, are desirous that their views should find a permanent and clear utterance. This is the reason of our consenting to become their public mouth-piece at the present time. It is hardly needful to remark that our faith in “the things concerning the kingdom of God” has not been shaken by the acquisition of the glorious truth that the Christ was not under sentence of death through Adam’s sin: on the contrary, we find it much strengthened; we discern more clearly the ratification of the Abrahamic covenant; “the sure mercies of David” are now to our minds sure indeed; the scheme of their confirmation now appears like a “morning without clouds;” having all the freshness of “tender grass by clear shining after rain.” It will be our earnest endeavour to bring forth from the rich store house of the Word “things new and old.” And while we endeavour to “increase in knowledge,” the right use of that knowledge will be regularly enforced. Practical as well as intellectual Christianity must be a distinguishing characteristic of the high vocation wherewith we are called; men must see our “good works” as well as hear our “good words,” that they may have a double motive to glorify our Father who is in heaven.” - Edward Turney.

“The recently developed ideas concerning Jesus Christ” were, of course, the natural and logical outcome of the earlier work of Dr. Thomas. In fact there was very little in the way of new ideas, but what Edward Turney did was to work his way through the contradictions in the writings of Dr. Thomas and then

piece together the true teachings and take steps forward in putting them together in their proper order, leaving out the nonsense.

It is clearly seen with hindsight just what had been going on in the world of Christadelphia and the different attitudes to Scripture of the various “players” on the scene. Dr. Thomas, a prayerful man, always searching; not satisfied to stick to one view if a better view could be seen, was prepared “to change every day if need be” until he got it right at last. Then there was Robert Roberts, an arrogant newspaper reporter, could sway his audience through his eloquence and puzzling phraseology, a know-all, of whom it was said by someone who knew him well: “he should be kept in a glass cage and only let out on Sundays;” fixed in his self-righteous views, who said “we have passed the investigation stage” and then batted onto Christadelphia his own version of ‘truth’ in a Statement of Things to be Believed, which he slowly modified into the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith. And today, this Statement of Faith, though well known to some is thankfully ignored by most, though sadly its influence is still seen in its stifling effect on the body as a whole who can put any interpretation on any passage of Scripture just so long as it does not conflict with it. And thirdly there was Edward Turney, who followed more after the steps of Dr. Thomas, prepared to learn and to change; one who could reason things through prayerfully and carefully, who could see through the folly of placing Jesus under Robert’s double curse and was prepared to fight for the truth in a surprisingly gentle manner.

A year ago, in the Jan/Feb issue of the Circular Letter, I reported on page 21 that according to the Christadelphians of the day there were only some 68 individuals and one large family who followed Edward Turney. But in the Editorial above, Edward Turney refers to “large numbers of the brethren in various parts of the country, who firmly and thankfully rejoice with us..-” at the end of this first issue of The Christadelphian Lamp, there is the “Intelligence” section which gives more of this same picture, and many items here are striking:

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

Glasgow: B.Gray writes:- “There are now ten of us who meet on the basis of an uncondemned Christ and greatly rejoice in that glorious Truth. We have been greatly strengthened by the reading of Turney’s published lecture, it clearly shows the fallacy of our opponents, especially in reference to the Types.

We think it well calculated to enlighten the minds of many on the points in dispute.”

London:- Watts writes “...I can reckon on ten or twelve who have thoroughly made up their minds about the subject and see with us an uncondemned Christ in the teaching of the Word.”

Liverpool:- Ellis says, “I am happy to say that I am still increasing in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, so that you may still rejoice with me in thanking our heavenly Father for blessing us with a more perfect knowledge of Himself. I have seen your lecture and read it once. You must not get vain when I tell you I consider it a masterpiece, and quite exhaustive...”

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

Maldon;- “In this town there are only six who have not as yet embraced the Truth as we now understand it.”

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

Deal;- “All in this Ecclesia have embraced the new views without exception.”

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

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

In following editions of The Christadelphian Lamp there are many reports of increasing support with several newcomers being immersed into Jesus Christ.

In the second issue of The Christadelphian Lamp a John Glover wrote:

“Dear Edward Turney, I greatly rejoice that you have commenced a monthly periodical. There is a pressing necessity for it. R.Roberts, in the October Christadelphian, seems to think that he has fought the battle, won the victory, and has nothing to do but to quietly retire with flying colours. I have no doubt, however, but that he will find that the battle has only just commenced. Judging from what is being advanced, it seems as if the shades of moral darkness are falling so fast around us, that it is high time the Christadelphian Lamp began to shed its light. I have no doubt, but it will tend to dissipate the darkness somewhat...”

“I have no doubt, however, but that he will find the battle has only just begun.” John Glover could hardly have known just how prophetic his words were to be - that was in November 1873 and the fight for Truth continues. There are now some 2 dozen or more divisions within the Christadelphian body and the one and only thing that binds them together is the commonly held fear of the idea that Jesus Christ died in Adam’s place, taking away the sin of the world.

Edward Turney submitted the following contradictory statements as proof that Robert Roberts lacked understanding on several subjects; all these extracts are taken from the March 1869 issue of the “Ambassador” magazine and can be found on pages 83, 84, 85 and 86:

“If Jesus came in the flesh, He was under condemnation, for the nature He inherited was a condemned one. The sentence of death ran in the blood which He inherited from Adam through Mary. He was therefore, “in the days of His flesh,” as much under its power as those He came to save. This conclusion follows from the testimony that He was a man; it would stand secure upon that foundation alone.”

“When, therefore, we realise the fact that Divine power (directly wielded by the Holy Spirit) was the energy which incepted His being, we are enabled to see that the type and texture of His being, though developed from the flesh of Mary, were something far above what falls to the lot of the mere children of men, and we shall find that this is one of the secrets of His sinlessness.”

“It is testified that He was “made sin for us.” As He was not of sinful character, this could only apply to His physical nature, which, drawn from the veins of Mary, was “made sin”.”

“The phrase, “sin in the flesh,” is metonymical. It is not expressive of a literal element or principle pervading the physical organisation.”

“Sin could not be “condemned in the flesh,” if the flesh under the dominion of sin was not the subject of operation. (This has reference to nature)

“There is no such thing as essential evil or sin.

“The idea “that He (Jesus) was of the same nature as Adam before his fall” is equally untenable, in the sense in which it is put forward. His nature was developed from Mary, and partook of the qualities of that nature. If therefore Christ was of the same nature as Adam before His fall, so must Mary’s have been. The fact is that both were of the flesh of sin.”



“Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no evidence of this whatsoever, and the presumption and evidence are entirely the contrary way. There was a change in Adam’s relationship to his Maker, but not in the nature of his organisation. What are the facts? He was formed from the dust a “living soul,” or natural body. His mental constitution gave him moral relation to God. He was given a law to observe: the law he disobeyed, and sentence was passed that he (the disobedient living soul) should return to mother earth. What was the difference between his position before disobedience and his position after? Simply this: that in the one case he was a living soul or natural body in probation for immortality; and in the other case he was a living soul or natural body under sentence of death. He was a living soul or natural body in both cases.”

“Jesus was clothed with the condemned nature of our sinful race.”

Brother Russell Gregory

---

“The Genesis account and Paul’s comments thereon in Romans explain how on the federal principle one sacrifice could cover a multitude, while the laws of sacrifice and sin-offering establish the true substitutionary nature of Jesus’ death. It is, of course, open to anyone to deny that Christ suffered death in their stead, just as it was open to any Israelite to deny that God would accept the life of an animal, offered in faith as a substitute for his life. But the alternative in either case is the same, “That soul shall bear his sin and shall be cut off.”

Ernest Brady