

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No 221

September/October 2006

In This Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2 Food for Thought and Bible Helps	Dr Angus' Bible Handbook
Page 2 Letter to Brother Jim Granter	Brother Phil Parry
Page 4 Reply to above	Brother Jim Granter
Page 6 The Day of Atonement	Dr Edersheim
Page 11 From a recent Conference of Terrorism	Brigitte Gabriel
Page 12 Changes For The Better?	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 14 A New Holocaust Extract from the Spectator Magazine	Lucy Mandelstram
Page 15 Some 'posts' placed on a Christadelphian Forum	Brother Russell Gregory

Editorial

Dear Brothers, Sisters and Friends,

Loving greetings. Perhaps you will recall that earlier in the summer I was writing about the six centurions that are mentioned in the Bible. The two that are mentioned in Acts come into close contact with the apostle Paul. They appear briefly and are not named, but they are not unimportant because they have a profound effect upon the way the authorities treat Paul with whom he finds himself in conflict.

When Paul came to Jerusalem after his third journey, James warned him that his loyalty to the Jewish Law was being questioned. James recommended that Paul associate himself publicly in the Temple with four other men under a vow of purification, which he did. But Paul was soon recognized by some Jews from Asia who accused him of "teaching men everywhere against the people and the law and this place." The mob dragged Paul out of the Temple to kill him. The Tribune and commander of the Antonia Fortress had to turn out the guard to rescue Paul. They put him under protective custody and attempted to take him up the stairway into the fortress. The Bible tells us that Paul "was borne of the soldiers for the violence of the people" while they were shouting "away with him."

Despite the violence the chief captain gave Paul permission to speak to the people. He stood on the stairs and as the people fell silent Paul began his brilliant and mercurial speech, in which he outlined his personal history as a Jew, as a Pharisee at the feet of Gamaliel, his own ardent persecution of the followers of Christ, his remarkable conversion on the road to Damascus, and finally his own vocation to the Gentiles.

At this point the mob went berserk, and the commander ordered Paul to be taken into the fortress for examination under the lash.

When he was already strapped up, Paul turned to the centurion on duty and asked, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man who is a Roman citizen, and uncondemned?" When the centurion heard this he went at once to his chief captain and said, "Take heed what thou doest: for this man is a Roman." When the captain was thus alerted he went to question Paul himself. "Are you a Roman?" he asked and Paul said yes. The chief captain then interestingly confided that he had obtained his freedom with a great sum. Paul responded that he had been born free.

The captain was afraid when he realized he had bound a Roman citizen, so he arranged for a confrontation between Paul and the Jewish Sanhedrin the following day.

These centurions obviously were men of quality and intelligence and were on good terms with their superior officers. They were encouraged to use their brains and their initiative and did not blindly do as they were told. They did not, or at least this centurion did not want to see the chief captain get into difficulties. I doubt if the army these days have many men of such quality in any of its ranks.

Love to all. Helen Brady

Food for Thought and Bible helps.

Brief history of the English Bible from Dr. Angus's Bible Handbook.

“The English version of the scriptures now in use is itself the result of repeated revisions. In the preface to the Bishops' Bible (A D 1568), a distinct reference is made to early Saxon versions; and there are still extant, parts of the Bible in Saxon, translated by Bede, by Alfred the Great, and by Alfric of Canterbury. Early Saxon MSS of the Gospels are still preserved in the libraries of the British Museum, and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

The first complete translation of the Bible was made by Wycliffe, about A.D.1380. It existed only in MS for many years, but the whole is now in print (N.T. 1731; O.T, 1848), the work was regarded with grave suspicion; and a bill was introduced into the House of Lords for suppressing it, but through the influence of John O'Gaunt, this was rejected. In 1408 however in a convocation held at Oxford it was resolved that no one should translate any text of scripture into English as a book or tract, and that no book of this kind should be read.

The first printed edition of the Bible in English was published by Tyndale, the N.T. in 1526 and the Bible in 1532. Tonsall, Bishop of London and Sir Thomas More took great pains to buy up and burn the impressions, but with the effect thereby of enabling the translator to publish a larger and improved edition. On the death of Tyndale, Miles Coverdale revised the whole and dedicated it to King Henry VIII, A.D. 1535, and in 1537 John Rogers who had assisted Tyndale, and was then residing at Antwerp, reprinted an edition taken from Tyndale and Coverdale. This edition was published under an assumed name. A revision of this edition was again published in A.D. 1539 by Richard Taverner. The Great Bible appeared in 1539; it was Coverdale's revised by the translator, under the sanction of Crammer.

During the reign of Mary was published the Geneva Bible A.D. 1557-1560. Archbishop Parker obtained permission from Queen Elizabeth to revise existing translations and in 1568 there appeared the Bishops Bible. In 1572 this was reprinted and was then in general use in the churches for 40 years. The Rheinish New Testament (printed at Rheims A.D.1582) and the Douay Old Testament (Printed at Douay 1609-10) formed the English versions as used by the Romanists. In 1603 King James resolved on a revision of the translations. He appointed 64 men of learning, and in 4 years it was completed, the result being our present day Authorised Version.

Although in almost every home in this country; how few ever think of the 'price' that has been paid by some in preserving The Word of God, under His hand, that we in our day for a 'handful of coppers' can purchase a priceless book wherein is revealed the Way of Life, through Redemption by Jesus Christ.

From a Circular Letter dated April 1957

Following on from the correspondence reported in our last Circular Letter between Brother Jim Granter and Brother Phil Parry we now publish a letter sent by our Brother Phil Parry:-

Dear Brother Jim Granter, Greetings in the Name of our Lord the Son of God.

I am rather dismayed by your comments, i.e. “The Spirit of Life in Jesus Anointed” – you ignore the term St Paul uses: LAW which makes void another LAW, - the Law of Sin and Death; neither of these are

physical. But the law in God's creation in all animal and human life was and is. It is impossible that Paul is saying he had been made free from a physical process of dying or of death. His flesh remained the same after his baptism, as that of Christadelphians - with the exception that Paul did not teach condemned flesh as they do, but condemnation of transgression of Law.

Your 'slow death sentence' upon Adam lasting 930 years does not harmonise with the 'Day' Adam knew as 'evening and morning' or the "surely die" which threatened Abimelech and Shimei. The 'slow death' sentence you say was upon Adam was also upon Abimelech and Shimei, so infliction of death is the scriptural meaning, as was so under Moses.

Levi is said to have paid tithes to Melchisedec but he never even met him nor was he alive at the time of Abraham, but in his loins. The same applies to us in the case of Adam when he transgressed; we were not guilty, but members of his body when he sinned. So being constituted or imputed as sinners, God was just in imputing Righteousness to us by faith in Righteousness of His Son.

Your Adamic 'slow death' theory leaves Abimelech and Shimei unaffected. But more serious still, the slow death you say was the penalty God passed upon all men is still upon you as an imputed or constituted sinner up to the time your physical decay consigns you to the dust. It reminds me of the Christadelphian hymn we have sung in ignorance but not now – "What though our inbred sins require our flesh to see the dust." How then can Jesus say we can pass from death to life unless it is a legal death by sin which passed upon all men – who had not sinned personally?

In the paragraph where you mention Nazarene jargon, your theory is that in passing a slow death on Adam's posterity who had committed no sin it gave them opportunity to REPENT and come back to Him (God) who desires not the death of any man.

This is the most paradoxical and unjust statement against the Creator I have ever read. To condemn persons to death not guilty and say 'it was not His desire that they should die' – is this justice?

Dear Brother Granter, unless you confine to the dust-bin your theory of 'natural death process' penalty, you have not passed from death to life; the physical penalty you believe in is still upon you. How then can you profess to be in Christ while you are still in Adam and you believe that in Adam all die by a slow process of decay and physical death?

In quoting Paul in Romans 3:23 you are charging God incorrectly and ignoring the Federal Principle which Paul is teaching and in verse 24 showing why though all sinned by imputation, God through Jesus has justified those all by His Grace, freely.

Because of their ignorance of Paul's teaching I heard members of the Christadelphian community state as you have that God knew all would sin, so He passed the death sentence on them in advance. Is there anything more ungrateful in making void the Love and Justice of God?

I think, Brother, you have tried your best to renounce that Jesus sacrifice was not in the place of Adam's penalty of inflicted death, and that when you were baptised you were not dying symbolically into the death Jesus suffered, but the baptism of John by water only which was for repentant Jews under the Law of Moses.

You say, "God has put me where I am." Well there may be a good reason for that as I think there was in the case of Robert Roberts – i.e. to cause people to prove by Scripture the errors of some of his teaching which has caused all the confusion.

We pray that you will eventually come to the light.

Brother Phil and Sister Rene Parry.
30th August 2006

In response Brother Jim Granter sent the following e-mail:

From: James Granter Sr. **Sent:** 02 September 2006 14:38 **To:** Russell Gregory

Subject: Re: Response from Phil Parry

Dear brother Russell. Greetings in the Lord. Thanks for your email. I reply to bro. Phil and sister Rene as follows. Please pass on to them.

para. 1: #1 No need to be dismayed - just reason scripturally and all things become clear. The apostle Paul uses "law" (*nomos*) in four ways:

- (i) law in general as legislation for human conduct;
- (ii) The Law of God thru Moses;
- (iii) self-will, which we often call 'legalism' - that spirit which treats God's laws as external to oneself which must be obeyed by might and by main, called "the oldness of the letter," v.6.; - but without the help of God;
- (iv) law as a principle of operation.

All these senses are used in Romans 7: (i) - v.1 (1); (ii) - v.1 (2); v. 12; v. 14; (iii) - v.8 no definite article in the Greek; (iv) - vv. 21, 23.

So we have:

(i) "those who know law," i.e. how law operates - it applies only to the living, not the dead; and only to those in the condition or situation of whom it speaks, e.g. the marriage law applies only to the married whilst married - cp Rom 3.19;

(ii) "the law (of Moses) which said, 'You shall not covet'." It applied to all responsible Jews under it having covenanted with God to obey it; and to no other; also v. 25, "the law of God;"

(iii) "Without law (no definite article), sin is dead" - when people do not use law as an external that must be obeyed, but rather have faith, or 'no law,' but use God's law as an internal "delight;" as "the shadow of good things to come;" and as torah = 'what points the way' to pleasing God; then sin is absent - for obedience has replaced disobedience; faith has replaced law; grace has replaced legalism;

(iv) in the law-educated but yet unregenerate or unfaithful man, Saul has God's law in his mind, i.e., in his knowledge and intellect, but still the law of sin or sinful habits take him captive to his habitual thinking and acting; legalism is unable to control his will or actions;

(iv) "I find then this law," v.21 - or principle that operates in my experience - I would and will to do good; but I actually do the evil (that I really want to do). Illustrating the philosophical saying that, 'fleshly affections are stronger than the human will'.

Whilst we might, and do, use the term 'natural law' referring to 'the laws of Nature,' I don't think The Word anywhere use 'law' that way, though it does speak of "the common death of all men."

para. 1: #2: "*the law of sin and death*" of Rom 8.1 refer back to ch. 7 to "the law of sin in my members" (i.e. his habitual thinking that led to constant transgression under the philosophical principle that 'the habit of sin begins with the first indulgence'). It becomes also "and death" because death is the outcome decreed by God for sin, or habitually broken law w/o repentance - which is possible only by true faith.

para. 1: #3: It is from THAT "law of sin and death" that faith in God thru Jesus Christ and the Gospel has freed or delivered Saul to become Paul and all who have his kind of converted/delivered faith. We are freed from self-will that leads to sin that leads to death, the wages of sin. We must reason contextually. Of course we still die as per Rom 5.14. But we are freed from the certainty and the habit of sin (though we may still sin). When we do sin we repent and because we have become a child of God in Christ God forgives us upon repentance "for Christ's sake;" and because of our renewed walk of holiness.

para. 1: #4: Christadelphians are a mixed bag - but because they share the denominational name doesn't mean we can lump them as all believing the same things. They don't: there are at least 35 different fellowships. I belong to the major fellowship but that doesn't mean that I have to believe what men, or

human documents by men tell me I must (law) believe. Paul commended the Thessalonians because their “faith was founded not upon the words of men but upon the word of God which effectually works in those who believe it.” We stand or fall individually upon our individual faith or lack of it. There is no group salvation. Jesus will judge, “the Word that I have spoken that shall judge a man in the Last day.”

para. 1: #5: “*Condemnation*” is a moral term, the sentence of The Great Judge applying to the immorality of sin or disobedience to His laws - esp. when He has provided that we may do otherwise. SO WE DO AGREE ON THAT. The scripture knows nothing about ‘condemned flesh,’ i.e. that men are condemned because they are born human beings. Does *anyone* believe that?

para. 2: #1: “*Dying you shall die*” teaches: (i) “dying” - the normal outworking of corruptibility unto death which has been the whole human experience, the reality, from Adam to now. (ii) “you shall die” also testifies its certainty - which also is the reality. “Day” doesn’t have to have the restricted meaning of a 24 hour period that you give it. “In the day of our Lord Jesus” doesn’t mean one day - but **the time or era** of his appearing, judgment, kingdom which will encompass many literal days in fact many years. You make it mean ‘summary death - right here and now’ to fit in with your other (erroneous) view of substitution. The lambs slain, the skins of which Adam and eve were covered by were not that but prophetic of Gen 3.16; John 3.16, 17. It was Adam & Eve’s opportunity to practically accept God’s terms for forgiveness and reconciliation - which they did!

para. 3: #1: Though the Bible does say Levi was in Abraham’s loins it does not say that ‘we were in Adam’s loins when he sinned so we are sinners by constitution or imputation.’ That is going beyond scripture to teach Original Sin - the bane of the churches’ atonement - and I fear has largely infected Christadelphia - and perhaps Nazarenia. Our constitution of human nature or flesh and blood does not make us sinners. We are born with possibilities and capacities - not with inevitabilities! What we become is what we have been taught, what environment we have had, what friends we make, what parents we had. The world is a sinful environment (Rom. 5.12) so we picked it up early, because it pleases the flesh just like sugar is better than salt. Nor does a just God impute people sinners who have not sinned e.g., babies and idiots. If people sin, he imputes (*logizomai*) accounts or reckons them sinners, not saints - because it is wrong to disbelieve and disobey God. If they believe and obey Him, He reckons that they are saints because it is right to believe and obey God! “I will not justify the wicked,” He says. We are not imputed righteous because Jesus was righteous no more than we are imputed sinners because Adam sinned. Believing the Gospel and being baptized into God’s Son, the Righteous, God reckons such faith-in-action as righteousness, just like the righteousness of His Sin who also believed and was baptized. True, we are covered by the righteousness of Christ - but that is a real righteousness not a notional one. R.Roberts put it well somewhere: ‘If a man is not righteous Jesus Christ will refuse to be righteousness for him.’

para. 4: #1 Not a theory - an explanation of a scriptural term as per para. 2. #1 above. Though I am privileged to be a brother in Christ and therefore a child of God’s grace I will still die “the common death of all men.” My constitution, like yours, is a dying one - from the cradle to the grave. But I have passed out of the death unto life - for to God’s children death becomes a “falling asleep in Jesus.” If Death is the wages that sin gives then if I have my sins forgiven and walk in righteousness then because God is just, and gracious, and for Jesus’ sake, I am now related to life - not death - even though this old body will die.

para. 4: #2: Never heard of, never sung the offending hymn you refer to. Like all hymn books the Christadelphian one is somewhat of a mixed bag too. The poetic licence sometimes (not often) taken is sometimes just a bit too much.

para. 5 #1 What’s this? ‘a slow death on Adam’s posterity who had committed no sin’ etc. All (apart from the non-responsible) have sinned and fallen short of God’s glory. Methinks you put into my mouth what I haven’t said, or you have completely misread what I did say. The facts are that normally all do suffer a slow death by corruption, sickness, disease, old age. That slowness rather than insanities death upon sins being first committed DOES show the love and kindness of God Who is not willing that any should perish but would have all men to be saved and to come to the acknowledgement of the truth. It DOES give most men and women considerable opportunity to turn to God. Few, as we know, avail themselves of the opportunity before it become too late to do so. E.g. my older bro. in the flesh after my 30 years of talking to him at age 75 has been immersed - he is very aware he may not have long to go.

para. 6. You misread me - Read Rom. 5. 14 again.

The remainder: almost as if you just HAVE to find something you can fulminate against. It would not do, would it, to have to agree with a Christadelphian! Are we Nazarenes not in the mode of criticizing and condemning all and any who don't agree with us - who are not with us! They are not "in Christ" like we are. They do not understand scripture like we do! They need to repent and come to the light - like we have! Ah well, we will pray for them to eventually come to our light.

Sorry, but your 7 last paras. are offensive being abusive and 'downputting.' So as lies don't require refutation I desist.

Sincerely in Christ by faith - a faith that I **do** "prove by Scripture" - and have done so!

Jim Granter

Please note: There can be no meeting of minds here. We see only muddle and confusion in what Brother Jim Granter considers explanation though we do not doubt his earnest sincerity. No reply has yet been sent to him. – Editor.

Extract from

“The Temple at the Time of Jesus Christ”

CHAPTER XVI

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

“But into the second (tabernacle) went the high-priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people... But Christ being come an high-priest of good things to come... by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Hebrews 9:7,11,12.

Weakness of the Law

It may sound strange, and yet it is true, that the clearest testimony to 'the weakness and unprofitableness' 'of the commandment' is that given by 'the commandment itself.' The Levitical arrangements for the removal of sin bear on their forefront, as it were, this inscription: 'The law made nothing perfect' - having neither a perfect mediatorship in the priesthood, nor a perfect 'atonement' in the sacrifices, nor yet a perfect forgiveness as the result of both. 'For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect' Hebrews 10:1. And this appears, first, from the continual recurrence and the multiplicity of these sacrifices, which are intended the one to supplement the other, and yet always leave something to be still supplemented; and, secondly, from the broad fact that, in general, 'it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.' (Hebrews 10:4). It is therefore evident that the Levitical dispensation, being stamped with imperfectness alike in the means which it employed for the 'taking away' of sin, and in the results which it obtained by these means, declared itself, like John the Baptist, only a 'forerunner,' the breaker up and preparer of the way - not the satisfying, but, on the contrary, the calling forth and 'the bringing in of a better hope.' (Hebrews 7:19; see marginal rendering).

The Day of Atonement.

As might have been expected, this 'weakness and unprofitableness of the commandment' became most apparent in the services of the day in which the Old Testament provision for pardon and acceptance attained,

so to speak, its climax. On the Day of Atonement, not ordinary priests but the high-priest alone officiated, and that not in his ordinary dress, nor yet in that of the ordinary priesthood, but in one peculiar to the day, and peculiarly expressive of purity. The worshippers also appeared in circumstances different from those on any other occasion, since they were to fast and to ‘afflict their souls;’ the day itself was to be ‘a Sabbath of Sabbatism’ *(1) while its central services consisted of a series of grand expiatory sacrifices, unique in their character, purpose, and results, as described in these words: ‘He shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar, and he shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation.’ (Leviticus 16:33). But even the need of such a Day of Atonement, after the daily offerings, the various festive sacrifices, and the private and public sin-offerings all the year round, showed the insufficiency of all such sacrifices, while the very offerings of the Day of Atonement proclaimed themselves to be only temporary and provisional, ‘imposed until the time of reformation.’ We specially allude here to the mysterious appearance of the so-called ‘scape-goat,’ of which we shall, in the sequel, have to give an account differing from that of previous writers.

* (1) *Rendered ‘Sabbath of rest’ in the Authorised Version.*

Its names.

The names ‘Day of Atonement,’ or in the Talmud, which devotes to it a special tractate, simply ‘the day’ (perhaps also in Hebrews 7:27) *(2) and in the Book of Acts ‘the fast,’ (Acts 27:9) sufficiently designate its general object. It took place on the tenth day of the seventh month (Tishri), that is, symbolically, when the sacred or Sabbath of months had just attained its completeness. Nor must we overlook the position of that day relatively to the other festivals. The seventh or sabbatical month closed the festive cycle, the Feast of Tabernacles on the 15th of that month being the last in the year. But, as already stated, before that grand festival of harvesting and thanksgiving Israel must, as a nation, be reconciled unto God, for only a people at peace with God might rejoice before Him in the blessing with which He had crowned the year*(3). And the import of the Day of Atonement, as preceding the Feast of Tabernacles, becomes only more striking, when we remember how that feast of harvesting pre- figured the final ingathering of all nations. In connection with this point it may also be well to remember that the Jubilee Year was always proclaimed on the Day of Atonement.*(4)

* (2) *In that case we should translate Hebrews 7:27, ‘Who needeth not on each day [viz. Of atonement], as those high-priests, to offer up his sacrifices,’ etc),*

* (3) *See chapter 14. So also Keil, Oehler, Kurtz, Hupfeld, and almost all writers upon the subject.*

* (4) *Leviticus 25:9. According to the Jewish view, it was also the day on which Adam had both sinned and repented; that on which Abraham was circumcised; and that on which Moses returned from the mount and made atonement for the sin of the Golden Calf.*

The Teaching of Scripture about the Day.

In briefly reviewing the Divine ordinances about this day (Leviticus 16; 23:26-32; Numbers 29:11), we find that only on that one day in every year the high-priest was allowed to go into the Most Holy Place, and then arrayed in a peculiar white dress, which differed from that of the ordinary priests, in that its girdle also was white, and not of the Temple colours, while ‘the bonnet’ was of the same shape, though not the same material as ‘the mitre,’ which the high-priest ordinarily wore.*(5) The simple white of his array, in distinction to the ‘golden garments’ which he otherwise wore, pointed to the fact that on that day the high-priest appeared, not ‘as the bridegroom of Jehovah’ but as bearing in his official capacity the emblem of that perfect purity which was sought by the expiations of that day.*(6) Thus in the prophecies of Zechariah the removal of Joshua’s ‘filthy garments’ and the clothing him with ‘change of raiment,’ symbolically denoted – ‘I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee.’ (Zechariah 3:3, 4). Similarly those who stand nearest to God are always described as arrayed ‘in white.’ (See Ezekiel 9:2, etc; Daniel 10:5; 12:6).

And because these were emphatically ‘the holy garments,’ ‘therefore’ the high-priest had to ‘wash his flesh in water, and so put them on’ (Leviticus 16:4), that is, he was not merely to wash his hands and feet, as before ordinary ministrations, but to bathe his whole body.

* (5) *This appears from the Hebrew terms.*

* (6) *According to Yoma, iii. 7, the High Priest wore in the morning white raiments of Pelusian, and ‘between the evenings’ of Indian stuff - respectively valued [no doubt, extravagantly] at about £118 and £79.*

Numbers 29:7-11.

From Numbers 29:7-11 it appears that the offerings on the Day of Atonement were really of a three-fold kind – ‘the continual burnt-offering,’ that is, the daily morning and evening sacrifices, with their meat- and drink-offerings; the festive sacrifices of the day, consisting for the high-priest and the priesthood, of ‘a ram for a burnt-offering,’ (Leviticus 16:3) and for the people of one young bullock, one ram, and seven lambs of the first year (with their meat-offerings) for a burnt-sacrifice, and one kid of the goats for a sin-offering; and, thirdly, and chiefly, the peculiar expiatory sacrifices of the day, which were a young bullock as a sin-offering for the high-priest, his house, and the sons of Aaron, and another sin-offering for the people, consisting of two goats, one of which was to be killed and its blood sprinkled, as directed, while the other was to be sent away into the wilderness, bearing ‘all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins’ which had been confessed ‘over him,’ and laid upon him by the high-priest.

Before proceeding further, we note the following as the order of these sacrifices - first, the ordinary morning sacrifice; next the expiatory sacrifices for the high-priest, the priesthood, and the people (one bullock, and one of the two goats, the other being the so-called scape-goat); then the festive burnt-offerings of the priests and the people (Numbers 29:7-11), and with them another sin-offering; and, lastly, the ordinary evening sacrifice, being, as Maimonides observes, in all fifteen sacrificial animals. According to Jewish tradition*(7), the whole of the services of that day were performed by the high-priest himself, of course with the assistance of others, for which purpose more than 500 priests were said to have been employed. (Comp. Jost. Gesch. d. Judenth. vol. i. p. 164). Of course, if the Day of Atonement fell on a Sabbath, besides all these, the ordinary Sabbath sacrifices were also offered. On a principle previously explained, the high-priest purchased from his own funds the sacrifices brought for himself and his house, the priesthood, however, contributing, in order to make them sharers in the offering, while the public sacrifices for the whole people were paid for from the Temple treasury. Only while officiating in the distinctly expiatory services of the day did the high-priest wear his ‘linen garments;’ in all the others he was arrayed in his ‘golden vestments.’ This necessitated a frequent change of dress, and before each he bathed his whole body. All this will be best understood by a more detailed account of the order of service, as given in the Scriptures and by tradition.*(8)

** (7) Special references would here be too numerous, and we must in general refer to Mish. Yoma, and to the tractates of Maimonides on the order of that service, which latter we follow very closely.*

** (8) The reader will readily distinguish what is derived from Scripture and what merely from tradition).*

The Duties of The High Priest.

Seven days before the Day of Atonement the high-priest left his own house in Jerusalem, and took up his abode in his chambers in the Temple. A substitute was appointed for him, in case he should die or become Levitically unfit for his duties. Rabbinical punctiliousness went so far as to have him twice sprinkled with the ashes of the red heifer - on the 3rd and the 7th day of his week of separation - in case he had, unwittingly to himself, been defiled by a dead body. (Numbers 19:13 May not the ‘sprinkling of the ashes of an heifer’ in Hebrews 9:13 refer to this? The whole section bears on the Day of Atonement). During the whole of that week, also, he had to practise the various priestly rites, such as sprinkling the blood, burning the incense, lighting the lamp, offering the daily sacrifice, etc. For, as already stated, every part of that day’s services devolved on the high-priest, and he must not commit any mistake. Some of the elders of the Sanhedrim were appointed to see to it, that the high-priest fully understood, and knew the meaning of the service, otherwise they were to instruct him in it. On the eve of the Day of Atonement the various sacrifices were brought before him, that there might be nothing strange about the services of the morrow. Finally, they bound him by a solemn oath not to change anything in the rites of the day. This was chiefly for fear of the Sadducean notion, that the incense should be lighted before the high-priest actually entered into the Most Holy Place; while the Pharisees held that this was to be done only within the Most Holy Place itself. (The only interesting point here is the Scriptural argument on which the Sadducees based their view. They appealed to Lev. 16:2, and explained the expression, ‘I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat,’ in a rationalistic sense as applying to the cloud of incense, not to that of the Divine Presence, while the Pharisees appealed to verse 13). The evening meal of the high-priest before the great day was to be scanty. All night long he was to be hearing and expounding the Holy Scriptures, or otherwise kept employed, so that he might not fall asleep. (For special Levitical reasons). At midnight the lot was cast for removing the ashes and preparing the altar; and to distinguish the Day of Atonement from all others, four, instead of the usual three, fires were arranged on the great altar of burnt-offering.

The Morning Service.

The services of the day began with the first streak of morning light. Already the people had been admitted into the sanctuary. So Jealous were they of any innovation or alteration, that only a linen cloth excluded the high-priest from public view, when, each time before changing his garments, he bathed - not in the ordinary place of the priests, but in one specially set apart for his use.

Altogether he changed his raiments and washed his whole body five times on that day (In case of age or infirmity, the bath was allowed to be heated, either by adding warm water, or by putting hot irons into it), and his hands and feet ten times. (The high-priest did not on that day wash in the ordinary laver, but in a golden vessel specially provided for the purpose). When the first dawn of morning was announced in the usual manner, the high-priest put off his ordinary (layman's) dress, bathed, put on his golden vestments, washed his hands and feet, and proceeded to perform all the principal parts of the ordinary morning service. Tradition has it, that immediately after that, he offered certain parts of the burnt-sacrifices for the day, viz. the bullock and the seven lambs, reserving his own ram and that of the people, as well as the sin-offering of a kid of the goats (Numbers 28:8-11), till after the special expiatory sacrifices of the day had been brought. But the text of Leviticus 16:24 is entirely against this view, and shows that the whole of the burnt-offerings and the festive sin-offering were brought after the expiatory services. Considering the relation between these services and sacrifices, this might, at any rate, have been expected, since a burnt-offering could only be acceptable after, not before, expiation.

The Sin-offering.

The morning service finished, the high-priest washed his hands and feet, put off his golden vestments, bathed, put on his 'linen garments,' again washed his hands and feet, and proceeded to the peculiar part of the day's services. The bullock for his sin-offering stood between the Temple-porch and the altar. It was placed towards the south, but the high-priest, who stood facing the east (that is, the worshippers), turned the head of the sacrifice towards the west (that is, to face the sanctuary). He then laid both his hands upon the head of the bullock, and confessed as follows: - 'Ah, JEHOVAH! I have committed iniquity; I have transgressed; I have sinned - I and my house. Oh, then, JEHOVAH, I entreat Thee, cover over (atone for, let there be atonement for) the iniquities, the transgressions, and the sins which I have committed, transgressed, and sinned before Thee, I and my house - even as it is written in the law of Moses, Thy servant: "For, on that day will He cover over (atone) for you to make you clean; from all your transgressions before JEHOVAH ye shall be cleansed." It will be noticed that in this solemn confession the name JEHOVAH occurred three times. Other three times was it pronounced in the confession which the high-priest made over the same bullock for the priesthood; a seventh time was it uttered when he cast the lot as to which of the two goats was to be 'for JEHOVAH;' and once again he spoke it three times in the confession over the so-called 'scape-goat' which bore the sins of the people. All these ten times the high-priest pronounced the very name of JEHOVAH, and, as he spoke it, those who stood near cast themselves with their faces on the ground, while the multitude responded: 'Blessed be the Name; the glory of His kingdom is for ever and ever.' (In support of this benediction, reference is made to Deut. 32:3). Formerly it had been the practice to pronounce the so-called 'Ineffable Name' distinctly, but afterwards, when some attempted to make use of it for magical purposes, it was spoken with bated breath, and, as one relates (Rabbi Tryphon in the Jerus. Talm. Possibly some readers may not know that the Jews never pronounce the word Jehovah, but always substitute for it 'Lord' [printed in capitals in the Authorised Version]. Indeed, the right pronunciation of the word has been lost, and is matter of dispute, all that we have in the Hebrew being the letters I. H. V. H. - forming the so-called tetragrammaton, or 'four-lettered word') who had stood among the priests in the Temple and listened with rapt attention to catch the mysterious name, it was lost amidst the sound of the priests' instruments, as they accompanied the benediction of the people.

Choosing the Scape-goat.

The first part of the expiatory service - that for the priesthood - had taken place close to the Holy Place, between the porch and the altar. The next was performed close to the worshipping people. In the eastern part of the Court of Priests, that is, close to the worshippers, and on the north side of it, stood an urn, called Calpi, in which were two lots of the same shape, size, and material - in the second Temple they were of gold; the one bearing the inscription 'Ia-JEHOVAH,' for Jehovah, the other 'Ia-Azazel,' for Azazel, leaving the expression (Leviticus 16:8, 10, 26) (rendered 'scape-goat' in the Authorised Version) for the present

untranslated. These two goats had been placed with their backs to the people and their faces towards the sanctuary (westwards).

The Mercy-seat.

The high-priest now faced the people, as, standing between his substitute (at his right hand) and the head of the course on ministry (on his left hand), he shook the urn, thrust his two hands into it, and at the same time drew the two lots, laying one on the head of each goat. Popularly it was deemed of good augury if the right-hand lot had fallen 'for Jehovah.' The two goats, however, must be altogether alike in look, size, and value; indeed, so earnestly was it sought to carry out the idea that these two formed parts of one and the same sacrifice, that it was arranged they should, if possible, even be purchased at the same time. The importance of this view will afterwards be explained.

The Goat shown to the people.

The lot having designated each of the two goats, the high-priest tied a tongue-shaped piece of scarlet cloth to the horn of the goat for Azazel - the so-called 'scape-goat' - and another round the throat of the goat for Jehovah, which was to be slain. The goat that was to be sent forth was now turned round towards the people, and stood facing them, waiting, as it were, till their sins should be laid on him, and he would carry them forth into 'a land not inhabited.' Assuredly a more marked type of Christ could not be conceived, as He was brought forth by Pilate and stood before the people, just as He was about to be led forth, bearing the iniquity of the people. And, as if to add to the significance of the rite, tradition has it that when the sacrifice was fully accepted the scarlet mark which the scape-goat had borne became white, to symbolise the gracious promise in Isaiah 1:18; but it adds that this miracle did not take place for forty years before the destruction of the Temple!

The Confession of Sin and the Sacrifice.

With this presentation of the scape-goat before the people commenced the third and most solemn part of the expiatory services of the day. The high-priest now once more returned towards the sanctuary, and a second time laid two hands on the bullock, which still stood between the porch and the altar, to confess over him, not only as before, his own and his household's sins, but also those of the priesthood. The formula used was precisely the same as before, with the addition of the words, 'the seed of Aaron, Thy holy people,' both in the confession and in the petition for atonement. Then the high-priest killed the bullock, caught up his blood in a vessel, and gave it to an attendant to keep it stirring, lest it should coagulate. Advancing to the altar of burnt-offering, he next filled the censer with burning coals, and then ranged a handful of frankincense in the dish destined to hold it. Ordinarily, everything brought in actual ministry unto God must be carried in the right hand - hence the incense in the right and the censer in the left. But on this occasion, as the censer for the Day of Atonement was larger and heavier than usual, the high-priest was allowed to reverse the common order. Every eye was strained towards the sanctuary as, slowly bearing the censer and the incense, the figure of the white-robed high-priest was seen to disappear within the Holy Place. After that nothing further could be seen of his movements.

The Mercy-seat.

The curtain of the Most Holy Place was folded back, and the high-priest stood alone and separated from all the people in the awful gloom of the Holiest of All, only lit up by the red glow of the coals in the priest's censer. In the first Temple the ark of God had stood there with the 'mercy-seat' over-shadowing it; above it, the visible presence of Jehovah in the cloud of the Shechinah, and on either side the outspread wings of the cherubim; and high-priest had placed the censer between the staves of the ark. But in the Temple of Herod there was neither Shechinah nor ark - all was empty; and the high-priest rested his censer on a large stone, called the 'foundation-stone.' (There is no need for here entering on the legends connected with this so-called 'foundation-stone'). He now most carefully emptied the incense into his hand, and threw it on the coals of the censer, as far from himself as possible, and so waited till the smoke had filled the Most Holy Place. Then, retreating back-wards, he prayed outside the veil as follows (We give the prayer in its simplest form from the Talmud. But we cannot help feeling that its form savours of later than Temple-times. Probably only its substance dates from those days, and each high-priest may have been at liberty to formulate it according to his own views): 'May it please Thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that neither this day nor during this year any captivity come upon us. Yet, if captivity befall us this day or this year, let it be to a place where the law is cultivated. May it please Thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that want come not upon either this day or this year. But if want visit us this day or this year, let it be due to

the liberality of our charitable deeds. May it please Thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that this year may be a year of cheapness, of fullness, of intercourse and trade; a year with abundance of rain, of sunshine, and of dew; one in which Thy people Israel shall not require assistance one from another. And listen not to the prayers of those who are about to set out on a journey. (Who might pray against the fall of rain. It must be remembered that the autumn rains, on which the fruitfulness of the land depended, were just due). And as to Thy people Israel, may no enemy exalt himself against them. May it please Thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that the houses of the men of Saron may not become their graves.’ (This on account of the situation of that valley, which was threatened either by sudden floods or by dangerous landslips). The high-priest was not to prolong this prayer, lest his protracted absence might fill the people with fears for his safety.

To be continued...

From a recent Conference on Terrorism

Remarks of Brigitte Gabriel,

Delivered at the Duke University Counter Terrorism Speak-Out

“I’m proud and honoured to stand here today, as a Lebanese speaking for Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East. As someone who was raised in an Arabic country, I want to give you a glimpse into the heart of the Arabic world.

I was raised in Lebanon, where I was taught that the Jews were evil, Israel was the devil, and the only time we will have peace in the Middle East is when we kill all the Jews and drive them into the sea.

When the Moslems and Palestinians declared Jihad on the Christians in 1975, they started massacring the Christians, city after city. I ended up living in a bomb shelter underground from age 10 to 17, without electricity, eating grass to live, and crawling under sniper bullets to a spring to get water.

It was Israel who came to help the Christians in Lebanon. My mother was wounded by a Moslem’s shell, and was taken into an Israeli hospital for treatment. When we entered the emergency room, I was shocked at what I saw. There were hundreds of people wounded, Moslems, Palestinians, Christians, Lebanese, and Israeli soldiers lying on the floor. The doctors treated everyone according to their injury. They treated my mother before they treated the Israeli soldier lying next to her. They didn’t see religion, they didn’t see political affiliation, they saw people in need and they helped.

For the first time in my life I experienced a human quality that I know my culture would not have shown to their enemy. I experienced the values of the Israelis, who were able to love their enemy in their most trying moments. I spent 22 days at that hospital. Those days changed my life and the way I believe information, the way I listen to the radio or to television. I realized I was sold a fabricated lie by my government, about the Jews and Israel that was so far from reality. I knew for fact that, if I was a Jew standing in an Arab hospital, I would be lynched and thrown over to the grounds, as shouts of joy of Allah Akbar, God is great, would echo through the hospital and the surrounding streets.

I became friends with the families of the Israeli wounded soldiers: one in particular Rina, her only child was wounded in his eyes.

One day I was visiting with her, and the Israeli army band came to play national songs to lift the spirits of the wounded soldiers. As they surrounded his bed playing a song about Jerusalem, Rina and I started crying. I felt out of place and started walking out of the room, and this mother holds my hand and pulls me back in without even looking at me.

She holds me crying and says: "it is not your fault." We just stood there crying, holding each other's hands. What a contrast between her, a mother looking at her deformed 19 year old only child, and still able to love me the enemy, and between a Moslem mother who sends her son to blow himself up to smithereens just to kill a few Jews or Christians.

The difference between the Arabic world and Israel is a difference in values and character. It's barbarism versus civilization. It's democracy versus dictatorship. It's goodness versus evil.

Once upon a time, there was a special place in the lowest depths of hell for anyone who would intentionally murder a child. Now, the intentional murder of Israeli children is legitimized as Palestinian "armed struggle."

However, once such behaviour is legitimized against Israel, it is legitimized every where in the world, constrained by nothing more than the subjective belief of people who would wrap themselves in dynamite and nails for the purpose of killing children in the name of God.

Because the Palestinians have been encouraged to believe that murdering innocent Israeli civilians is a legitimate tactic for advancing their cause, the whole world now suffers from a plague of terrorism, from Nairobi to New York, from Moscow to Madrid, from Bali to Beslan.

They blame suicide bombing on "desperation of occupation." Let me tell you the truth. The first major terror bombing committed by Arabs against the Jewish state occurred ten weeks before Israel even became independent.

On Sunday morning, February 22, 1948, in anticipation of Israel's independence, a triple truck bomb was detonated by Arab terrorists on Ben Yehuda Street, in what was then the Jewish section of Jerusalem.

Fifty-four people were killed, and hundreds were wounded. Thus, it is obvious that Arab terrorism is caused not by the "desperation of occupation," but by the very thought of a Jewish state.

So many times in history in the last 100 years, citizens have stood by and done nothing, allowing evil to prevail. As America stood up against and defeated communism, now it is time to stand up against the terror of religious bigotry and intolerance. It's time to all stand up, and support and defend the state of Israel, which is the front line of the war against terrorism."

Brigitte Gabriel

Changes For The Better?

The Year 1873 saw the confrontation between Robert Roberts and Edward Turney which caused the greatest of upsets within the Christadelphian community and has never been resolved. History has shown that successive Editors of the Christadelphian Magazine have been content with their endeavours to uphold the deceitful misrepresentations of Edward Turney's teaching promulgated by Robert Roberts. For well over one hundred years it has been the aim of the Nazarene Fellowship to present the Biblical teaching of the Atonement to Christadelphians during which time tens of thousands of booklets have been distributed amongst them which, with few exceptions, seemed to go unheeded. Anyone espousing 'Clean Flesh' views were disfellowshipped without a hearing.

It is not my wish here to dwell at length on the reprehensible behaviour of those people but to remark more happily on some possible changes which have taken place in recent years and are still progressing favourably in many places within Christadelphia today.

No longer is the teaching of sinful flesh acceptable to perhaps most Christadelphians; no longer is the blasphemous teaching of Jesus having to die for Himself because of His sinful flesh widely accepted and I think I can safely say that there is now only a minority of Christadelphians who would attempt to uphold such a false doctrine.

Fewer Christadelphians believe natural death to be the penalty for sin and as one Christadelphian writer puts it: "I think it is reasonably well accepted that when Adam and Eve sinned the penalty for sin was summary execution."

The number of Christadelphians being disfellowshipped for holding 'Clean Flesh' views has diminished in the last decade due, I believe to more open discussion and the acceptance of a better understanding.

One Christadelphian recently wrote regarding a disfellowshipping (though in this case not for 'Clean Flesh' beliefs): "Withdrawal is without doubt the biggest curse on our community. We have in our midst the most unkind, uncaring and unloving people one could meet."

Thankfully these unkind, uncaring and unloving people are no longer getting their own way so easily and I believe this is due to the fact that so many now have access to the Internet where they can easily find the beliefs of other denominations and are able to see why they believe as they do, and more especially there are many Christadelphian discussion forums available to choose from. Some of these are still very narrow in their outlook and try to maintain the old traditions and will not allow anyone to join them who does not share their beliefs! There are others where wider discussion of views is allowed to take place and even one or two where open discussion of the Scriptures is actively encouraged – as it ought to be.

While we see the most appalling traditions being thrown out – of Jesus being under both the 'Adamic Curse' and the 'Abrahamic Curse' and that He had to destroy His sinful flesh by accepting crucifixion, thereby destroying the devil in Himself and He would have been a sinner without hope if He hadn't – we now find the only reason given for the sacrifice of Christ is that it is an example of obedience He set us of doing His father's will, an example we should try to follow.

Well, yes, Jesus is our example of obedience, but the Sacrifice of His life was not part of that example. While Jesus asks us to be perfect even as His Father in heaven is perfect, it was Jesus alone who could take away the sin of the world.

Throwing out sinful flesh, and Jesus having to die for Himself because of it, leaves Christadelphians with an 'empty house.' Bearing in mind the lesson of Matthew 12:3, to sweep out one 'devil' and leave the house empty is an invitation to other 'devils' to enter. We will see in time if this will happen, but it is our concern by the grace of God to make available the true reason for the crucifixion as explained in Scripture.

Happily, the truth of the matter is that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, Jesus, and Jesus so loved us that He laid down His life voluntarily for us. How can one lay down his life for another unless he takes his place? The crucifixion was a true voluntary substitutionary sacrifice of Jesus who gave Himself, the Just for the unjust, and we know that this view has been expressed from the Christadelphian platform and accepted without the furore of past generations, but it still needs to be repeatedly reinforced for the benefit of those who will accept it.

Again, the teaching of the reason for baptism is sadly lacking in regard to the Federal principle and is seen by nearly all Christadelphians as nothing more than the forgiveness of past sins. To them the idea of being 'in Adam' means only that we are weak human beings subject to incessant failure who have to do unremitting battle till death, fighting against our constant hourly temptations yet continually failing, so that one is still 'in Adam' till Jesus returns!

Baptism and the Federal Principle is perhaps the least understood matter within Christadelphia and needs explaining again and again in a variety of ways till the principle is grasped. While the view is quite simple in itself there does seem to be a mental block in the minds of many due perhaps to some old ideas which need first of all to be cleared away.

Another teaching that continues to be prevalent is that after baptism one is no longer under law but under Grace and legal aspects of the Atonement are considered as mere metaphors. Just as there is a dread of the word 'substitution' there is a dread of the word 'legalism.' But there seems to be no clear explanation of just what is.

But continual obedience to God is required in order to continue under grace. So it is not a matter of being under law or being under Grace, but of being under grace through being under Law.

Whilst we rejoice that many Christadelphians are rejecting the worst of their ill-founded doctrines, they have still to concentrate upon the above three matters, viz., the reason for Christ's crucifixion; the reason for baptism; and how grace operates within Law.

May many more take heed before Jesus returns. Russell Gregory.

A New Holocaust

Response to a piece in the Spectator magazine:

"Sir: Melanie Phillips's mention of the 'annual hate-fest' on the streets of London filled me with despair ('Hezbollah cells await Iran's orders,' 5th August). Last month I celebrated my 80th birthday. Never in my wildest dreams did I expect to live so long. I survived four years in Vienna under Nazi rule, and three years in concentration camps. After the end of the war I was a refugee for three years, spending those years mostly in displaced persons' camps in Europe and Cyprus, finally coming to Israel. I had hoped to live out the rest of my life in relative peace. It was not to be.

I have been in Israel now for 58 years and I have lived through another few wars, but a great part of the world still debates whether to recognise us or not. No other country's right to exist is ever questioned: why ours?"

I know there are many reasons that I could name, but I am sure that Melanie Phillips is right: hatred is the driving force. Anti-Semitism is stronger than ever, even if it is called by another name, such as anti-Zionism. Our history has been so twisted out of shape that people have forgotten that the Jews in British-occupied Palestine were called Palestinians.

When I was a child in Vienna, people used to shout at us, 'Jews to Palestine.' Now that I have lived the greater part of my life here, it seems I still have no right to my own country. Where can I go? When I was liberated in Germany I never thought of revenge, I didn't hate anybody, all I wanted was to start a new life in my own country. It never entered my mind to go among Germans and blow them up or avenge myself in any other way; I only wanted to get away from them and start a new life.

I am very sad these days; it seems as if there will never be peace for us. I am not worried about myself, I even find it comforting that I am at the end of my life, but I am thinking of my children and grandchildren and the kind of future they are facing. I wish I had an answer."

Lucy Mandelstam
Natanya, Israel

Some 'posts' placed on a Christadelphian forum:

Several weeks ago I placed our booklet by Ernest Brady, "Too True To Be New." on the forum for consideration of readers.

One of the first readers posted this extract from Brother Ernest Brady's booklet after which he adds his comments:

"The blame for the perpetuation of such an incredible error amongst Christadelphians lies with those who lacked the humility and teachableness to admit their mistake when the matter was reasoned out before them from the Scriptures. One does not need what R. Roberts termed "a prolonged spiritual education" in order to perceive that it is impossible to harmonise the belief that human nature is full of sin with the fact that although Jesus was also human nature, He did not sin and He was holy, harmless and undefiled from His birth to His death."

And his comments - 'Yes, it is sad that this error came to be, and that even today, though it is generally NOT believed by the majority of CDs, still hangs around like a blot on the landscape of the truth.

Thanks for sharing this, I know you get support from Christadelphians who will not have their names published due to a fear of reprisals within their Ecclesia, and that is understandable. There ARE many who have realised the error, but still many more who are not even AWARE that this error lurks about within the body of the BASF.

May God bless our community with the courage to eradicate any trace of a doctrine that supports a defiled Christ, in any way shape or form.

Love in Jesus, X.' "

However, not all readers felt the same of course and 'Mike' did his best to find faults. Publishing only one side of the discussion makes it disjointed but I ask you to please 'read between the lines' in order to 'perceive' the full story:

I wrote, 'Dear Mike, May I bring you back to post 8 please?

Ernest Brady wrote "It is impossible to harmonise the belief that human nature is full of sin with the fact that although Jesus was also human nature, He did not sin and He was holy, harmless and undefiled from His birth to His death."

You wrote "And if the premise, or understanding that 'human nature was created sinful, that is, subject (slave) to sin' were found to be incorrect, what then?"

I am not sure whether you are agreeing or disagreeing with what Ernest Brady wrote in the first paragraph of section four of "Too True To Be New", but of course the premise is not incorrect! God did not create human nature sinful and neither did He create human nature a slave to sin. (I don't see how they can mean the same as each other).

But it is Christadelphians who talk of sinful flesh and I think it was Robert Roberts who wrote "What else can sinful flesh mean but flesh full of sin?" And again it is Christadelphians who teach that human nature was condemned as a result of Adam's transgression, and that it is therefore impossible for anyone to live a sinless life, and that is why Jesus had to receive extra strength from His Father to overcome temptation.

It is these claims that the Nazarene Fellowship is set so strongly against, not only because we do not see them taught in Scripture, but also because we see them as dishonouring God and Jesus, and destroying the reason for baptism.

Re your post 15: I had always thought that when the Pharisees said to Jesus “Thou wast altogether born in sins” they meant that He was conceived out of wedlock. I had imagined they knew this from when He was born and Mary and Joseph went to Jerusalem to offer for Mary’s purifying. I think they would have known that Mary and Joseph were not husband and wife when Jesus was conceived and the stigma of ‘illegitimate’ would have stayed with the family ever since.

When God said to Cain “Sin lieth at the door” this could just as well mean that ‘a sin-offering lieth at the door.’ It is implied that Cain and Abel had been instructed to offer sacrifice though we are told so little about those early days.

The point I think needs enlarging upon is our understanding of what Paul meant when he said “But the scripture hath concluded all under sin...” linked with what John The Baptist said - “Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.” Paul explained this fully in his epistle to the Romans but I need more time to write up my thoughts on it.

When Paul said “there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” I take him at his word and see nothing which suggests once saved always saved. It is those “in Christ Jesus” who are spared the condemnation, not those who have forsaken Him and therefore no longer “in Him.” “Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed.” (John 8:31).

It is up to each one of us to see that we stay “in Christ Jesus.”

With Love in His name. Russell.

Dear Mike,

There is much in your posts with which I agree, but you seem to suppose we believe things which we do not. There are so many stories being circulated in Christadelphia regarding what is called “The Clean Flesh Heresy” it seems everyone wants to think the worst they can of us without taking on board what we write. Ernest Brady’s booklet “Too True To Be New” answers all your points and I do not want to go into much detail to show these matters again here.

However, Jesus tells us He is different to us in as much as that He is the Good Shepherd and we are the sheep. Obviously the shepherd is not a sheep. I am not aware that anyone has said Jesus “was exactly like us.” I think you are adding words to what we write. The fact that Jesus was tempted in all points as we are I think proves that He was as human as we are and any help He had from His Father is also available to others. I think I said in another thread that I look upon Adam and Jesus as ‘twin’ brothers. Both Sons of God.

I agree too with what you say about human sacrifices. They were/are an utter abomination in the sight of God. He condemned the practice. If you think they have any bearing on the sacrifice of Jesus will you please explain what you have in mind. I see them as poles apart and cannot see why you want to write so much about the evil practice of human sacrifice.

You say that: - “in the Book of Leviticus, only distinct species of animals are permitted for use in blood sacrifices.” True, but why limit this to the Book of Leviticus? The same applies to the whole of the Old Testament. Furthermore, these species are declared legally clean for the purpose of sacrifice. Others were declared as legally unclean and so were not to be offered. Again, not only were the sacrifices to be of legally clean species but they also had to be without spot or blemish.

Regarding human sacrifice, you wrote – “This message was carefully communicated at Mount Moriah where Abraham was prepared to offer up his beloved son Isaac as a sacrifice. At that crucial juncture in history when Abraham was ready to sacrifice Isaac, the Almighty admonished him that He did not want the human sacrifice, and directed Abraham to sacrifice the ram caught in the thicket instead.”

Precisely! All this and more was said in the first part of this thread where Ernest Brady wrote:-

“When we picture Jesus at twelve years old in the Temple, “both hearing them and asking them questions,” He was not, as some people suppose, imparting to the doctors knowledge which He had received supernaturally; He was himself commencing to learn, how His nation’s history and economy proves mankind alienated from its Creator. He would learn of its deliverance from Egypt by blood-shedding at the Passover; of the laws of sacrifice and sin offering; of the law which stipulated that every first-born had to be redeemed for an equivalent price or put to death; He knew that every soul in Israel had to be ransomed by the literal payment of a piece of money; in the history of His great ancestor Abraham He would learn how Isaac was offered up and how God saved Isaac by the substitution of a ram; in the synagogue He was accustomed to hearing the words of Isaiah which speak so eloquently of One Who was led as a lamb to the slaughter and who bare the sin of many...”

At the request of God, Isaac was delivered from imminent death when Abraham was about to kill him, and so Abraham offered a substitute.

Adam also was delivered from imminent death in Eden by the offering of a substitute. I believe this throws a flood of light on the whole matter for in it we see that mercy and salvation commenced with Adam and Eve.

The first death that came by the sin of Adam was the death of the animal/s with whose skin/s Adam and Eve were clothed. It is thereby inferred that the animals were sacrificial - i.e. inflicted death by blood-shedding and were in fact substitutionary – like the animal slain instead of Isaac.

Dr Thomas wrote in *Elpis Israel* page 257:- “The angel of the Lord called to him out of heaven, and commanded him to do the lad no harm. The ram was appointed as a substitute for Isaac, which was, therefore, substitutionally slain for Isaac.” - Genesis 22:8-13:- “And Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son.”

In another booklet, Ernest Brady wrote:-

“The trial of Abraham is the sublime dual object-lesson of the ages by which this literal truth is driven home. When in faith he offered up Isaac and received him in a figure from the dead, we are shown a picture of God giving His beloved Son for the life of the world. When in actual fact Isaac was saved and a ram caught in a thicket killed instead we have defined for us the principle upon which the Lamb of God would literally die as a sacrifice.”

You quote from Hosea. I am in complete agreement with all he says - and with you when you write:- “The scripture never tells us that an innocent man can die as an atonement for the sins of all the wicked. Such a message is utterly antithetical to the teachings of the Tanakh.”

Never have I said that Jesus died as an atonement for the sins of all the wicked. If this is what you think the Nazarene Fellowship believe or teach then please believe me – it is not! Nor has it ever been since 1873. How can one person be the substitute for millions? It makes no sense. In love and mercy we are forgiven our sins through Jesus who is our Mercy-Seat. What we say is that Jesus laid down His life in place of the life Adam forfeited. A life for a life. This is redemption because a price was paid. After Jesus rose again he has been in the position to forgive all others. In the Old Testament sinners were reconciled to God by animal sacrifice but these sacrifices could not take away sin. Jesus chose of His own free-will to offer Himself as the sacrifice to redeem mankind from the law of sin and death. Therefore for the faithful there is now no condemnation.

You write “that Mashlach (Messiah) would be from amongst his brethren, making him one of us.” Agreed, - just as God said to Moses:- “I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee” (Deuteronomy 18:18). And in what way was Jesus like unto Moses? The most striking likeness is that just as Moses was brought up free of the bondage in which his family were held captive, Jesus, too had a free life – free of the bondage which holds all the descendants of Adam captive – in bondage to ‘Master Sin’ as explained by Paul in his letter to the Romans.

Again this brings us to the Federal Principle of Adam being the Head of all his descendants (the life they have is the forfeited life he passed down to them), and Jesus being the Head of all the faithful. (Like Adam's life, Jesus' life too came direct from God). In this present dispensation we have to come out of Adam to be in Christ through baptism into His death; by this we are born again and start a new life in Jesus.

Of course Jesus life and His death "are two totally different things." Jesus had an inheritance to keep; an inheritance which He would have lost had He committed sin. His total obedience to the law ensured that He would receive His inheritance. It also ensured He had a life He could call His own, to offer of His own free-will to take away the sin of the world – the price of redemption - the ransom price to purchase us unto Himself. This He did by taking Adam's place in death for had Adam died in the day of his transgression (as God said he would) there would have been no descendants of his to populate the earth and we would never have lived. Because Adam was spared, God provided Jesus, "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" and God-fearing people have the opportunity of life eternal (*zoe*) through Him. This makes our present natural life our redeemed life. It was one life lost - one life given in place.

Adam's life was spared provisionally when the animal was slain to provide a covering; and Jesus gave His natural life (*psuche*) in the place of the life Adam forfeited. In the words of another – "the promissory note was laid down in Eden; the gold sovereign was laid down at Calvary." We see Jesus gave His life (*psuche*) (slain from the foundation of the world) so that Adam's life (*psuche*) was spared.

The animal sacrifices for sin were all substitutional types, and they looked forward to the one great Antitype of the sacrifice of the Lamb of God on Calvary - to the moment when Jesus fulfilled the law of which He said: "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do" (John 17).

Only the One Great Sacrifice for sin was ever going to be effective in taking away "The Sin of the World" - which sin was the one sin of Adam in the beginning. All other sins can be/are forgiven through Jesus Christ.

While it is perfectly true that justice could not sanction the heathen practice of punishing the innocent instead of the guilty, and Deuteronomy 24:16 refers to this and forbids it; this is not an argument against self-sacrifice, which inevitably involves substitution. No one person can do anything for another without being in some sense a substitute. And the principle is not dishonouring God.

I see substitution as the sole principle behind the law of sacrifice. Can any person read the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement and deny such a principle? I think in all honesty they cannot.

With Love in Jesus. Russell.

Dear Mike, When I said Jesus had a life free of bondage to Master Sin like Moses had a life free of bondage to the Egyptians, your objection was that Jesus must therefore have had an advantage and was not from amongst his brethren. But being free from the bondage of Master Sin was the essential purpose of the Virgin Birth. There is no other reason given in Scripture for the Virgin Birth and without that 'advantage' as you call it, there could have been no salvation in Jesus sacrifice; it would have been a martyrdom.

The wages of sin is death – inflicted death. Natural death is not the wages of sin nor can it be. This is illustrated time and again in all the sacrifices for sin – each time an animal was put to death for the sinner.

Jesus didn't earn the wages of inflicted death and God tells us the reason He was brought into the world - it was because "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life."

To the Jews, Peter says, "The God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorified His Son Jesus, whom ye delivered up and denied him in the presence of Pilate when he was

determined to let him go; but ye denied the holy one and the just and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the prince of life.”

But Jesus sacrificed His life freely for us. His life was not taken from Him. He gave His life as a ransom – as a purchase – the redemption price for us. Why so? For the joy set before Him. What joy? The joy of bringing many sons to glory. What you see as Jesus ‘advantage,’ He used as His ‘opportunity’ to show His Love for us. That is why Jesus suffered an inflicted death. It was the death due as the wages of sin. Not being “concluded under sin” Jesus could receive these wages without perishing. Jesus sacrificed His natural life (*psuche*), which He never received back again. Any descendant of Adam who receives the wages of sin will perish and not see life (*zoe*).

Adam once had the same status as Jesus. He too, was Son of God, but he lost that status through transgression of God’s law. He forfeited that status and we, as descendants of Adam, never received it at birth.

Being “concluded under sin” is our legal position before God. It is the legal position which is changed at baptism so that “there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.” Being “concluded under sin” is an inherited position in which God has placed us all for the purpose of blessing those who will accept Jesus as their Saviour.

Robert Roberts was quite wrong when he wrote in “The Slain Lamb,” “if there had been a Jew who had kept the law in all things, having done the will of the Father from the very beginning of life to the end of his life, he would have been in the very position of the Lord Jesus himself...” but it seems to me that you are agreeing with R.Roberts when you say we forfeit our life only by sin – when we do as Adam did. This denies Paul’s teaching in the early chapters of Romans where we learn of the federal principle – of the need to come out of Adam to be in Christ. We cannot be ‘In Adam’ and ‘In Christ’ at the same time. When we are ‘In Christ’ we can be forgiven. No one ‘In Adam’ can be forgiven to the saving of their lives.

Another point you make in response to my view that whereas Adam lost one life; Jesus gave one life in place, you respond with: “This is the first law of Alchemy (law of equality, if something is taken, something must be lost of equal value), but I still don’t see that it is a concept of the Scriptures.”

But it is. Ezekiel 18:25 – “Yet ye say, the way of the Lord is not equal... Is not my way equal? Are not your ways unequal? (repeated in verse 29). Also 33:17 – “yet the children of the people say, The way of the Lord is not equal: but as for them, their way is not equal.” (repeated in verse 20). How can the Judge be unequal?

Are you yet of the opinion that if Jesus sacrifice was substitutionary, then He would have remained dead, just as the animals did? Well, Jesus natural life did remain dead, just as the animals did.

“Therefore doth my Father love me because I lay down my *psuche*.” “I lay down my *psuche* for the sheep” “The good shepherd giveth His *psuche* for the sheep.”

Jesus also said “I am come that they may have *zoe*.” “I give unto them *zoe*; and they shall not perish.” “I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of *zoe*.” “These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is *zao*.”

Is it clear now that the notion of Jesus not rising to eternal life because He laid down His natural life as a Substitute for our natural life is mythical? I hope so.

With Love in Jesus to all. Russell.

Dear Mike,

On looking back through these posts I find a few things I wish to comment on. For example, in post 10 you ask “Then there was no sin before there was ‘the law’?”

The Apostle Paul tells us that sin is not imputed where there is no law (Romans 5:13). It follows that Cain and Abel were under law and had been instructed regarding acceptable offerings. Cain’s offering was not acceptable; he had not done well in offering the fruit of the land and God “had not respect” to his offering. Then to add to his sin, Cain “was very wroth.” It is surely evident that Cain knew what was right and wrong when God said “If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?” But Cain refused instruction and went from bad to worse in killing Abel. So, yes, there was knowledge of God and of what was His will right from the first. Whether or not it was a formulated law does not matter.

Post 12 – (towards the end): You say - “The law is there to train one’s self, but if used extensively for this purpose, brings about a person that feels ‘justified’ in having made themselves ‘perfect’.”

This is not the case at all. Consider Jesus! He ‘used the law extensively’ and kept it ‘perfectly’ – and then more! Jesus did far more than what the law required when He went the extra mile, turned the other cheek and gave His cloak also.

Post 17 – You say, “Of course, if Jesus did not sin, and He Himself knew “why he had to” (yes had to, not deserved to, as it says elsewhere) “die”, then it is up to us to determine what he knew.”

But Jesus did not have to die! It was His choosing – to die for us – the Just for the unjust. Even during the last hours of His life He could have called upon twelve legions of angels to save Him from crucifixion had His courage failed Him.

Post 19 – You say, “That is only a problem if we forget or do not understand what Paul meant by “I die daily” and why? ...he dies daily to the sin he commits.”

No! This is not Paul’s meaning. You cannot show me one instance where Paul sinned after his conversion. Rather, as he said “Be ye followers of me as I am of Jesus Christ,” thereby giving us an example of living a sinless life.

Post 22 – You wrote, “Now I agree that Jesus had nothing to repent of, but he also makes sure we know he understands he has equal potential to fail and commit sin as anyone else: “Do not call me good” speaks, not of what he has done, but of his potential to sin and fall short.”

Jesus did not say “Do not call me good”! He never said at anytime that He was not good. It should be obvious that Jesus would not boast that He was good but in all things He indicated that He was. Your reference to Matthew 19:17 it translated in the “Concordant Literal N.T.” as “Why are you asking me concerning good?” with which the Emphatic Diaglott agrees. “Do not call me good” seems to me like a very biased transliteration!

Post 24 – Concerning Paul’s words “The scripture hath concluded (in a common subjection) all under sin.” Galatians 3:22. Your response was: “which causes me no problem because it is finished, either here or elsewhere with ‘in that all have sinned’.”

But when we read that “scripture hath concluded all under sin that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe,” we have to ask what Sin it is Paul is referring to? It is not the “all have sinned” as you suppose but the Sin (singular) under which all mankind is placed by God as a legal position. This Sin does not make anyone a sinner, but it places us under a legal condemnation from which we can free ourselves by baptism into Christ’s death. Once “in Christ” by baptism “there is therefore now no condemnation.” (Romans 8:1). This has to come before we can be forgiven our individual sins we commit from time to time. This condemnation of being concluded under Sin is the legal position of all “in Adam” and the purpose of baptism is to free us from it. Though we are forgiven our past sins at baptism, this is only

an incidental part of baptism. The main purpose is to bring us into covenant relationship with God through our Federal Head, Jesus Christ.

Again in this post the quote was made: “Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world” to which you responded “So, if sin is only a potential, so is salvation from sin.”

But the Sin of the world which Jesus took away has nothing whatsoever to do with potential sin. As explained above the Sin of the world is the Sin (singular) for which Jesus died; for which He gave His life in the blood as the purchase price for mankind – the ransom price of our redemption.

In post 34 you say in bold type “The ‘empowering’ of Jesus with a special ability to not sin, makes him unlike us.”

From this I am unable to tell if this is what you believe, or perhaps it is what you think I believe. All I know in this regard is that it is the official teaching of Christadelphia and I think it must be an offence to God.

Also in this post you said: “If it is considered suddenly OK to have a ‘sacrifice forced’ as sheep were, to accomplish something, and if we consider that Jesus was the ‘human sacrifice God demanded’ to satisfy His... what? Thirst for blood...”?

It is utter nonsense to suppose Jesus was the human sacrifice God demanded! Why do you not understand what we say? God is not a monster demanding the death of His only well-beloved Son. He is a Loving Father, not only of Jesus but also of the faithful. Read BASF Clause 12 again and see who says God demanded Jesus death!

A little later you wrote: “To say Jesus died “instead of” us would require that we do not die.”

Have you not understood the significance of the two Greek words used for life – *psuche* = natural life, and *zoe* = spirit life which is eternal life. Jesus gave up His natural life when He was crucified, never to receive it again. All He asks of us is that we ‘give up’ our natural life in the symbol of baptism, followed by a life in which we endeavour to do what is right in His Father’s sight as He did. Regarding the point that we should not die, is not this what Jesus said - “And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die”? He also said: “I give unto them eternal life and they shall never perish.”

You wrote “Contrary to the Catholic/Protestant claim that blood sacrifice is the only method of atonement in the Bible, there are three methods of atonement clearly defined in the Tanakh:- 1) the sin sacrifice. 2) repentance. 3) charity.

But No’s 2 and 3 are relative to No. 1 and all are necessary and interdependent. “This is my blood of the new covenant” – “We have redemption through his blood” – “Without the shedding of blood is no forgiveness.” Without the shedding of Jesus’ blood as the one Sin Offering the whole of the Old Testament would have been in vain! World history has been dependant on the one great fact of Jesus’ offering of Himself on Calvary! Repentance unto salvation can only come after one is “in Jesus” and is of no worth when still “in Adam.” The same is also true of charity.

Then you go on to say “Moreover, the sin sacrifice... did not atone for all types of sin, but rather, only for man’s most insignificant iniquity: unintentional sins.”

I am surprised that you dismiss this so lightly! What you say may possibly be true of the Trespass-offering but the Sin-offering is the most important of all sacrifices. (Though I suppose in all strictness one cannot make one sort of ‘obedience’ more important than another). Not only did they make atonement for the person, Sin-offerings were brought on festive occasions for the whole people. The most important of which was the Day of Atonement. It was the climax of the year. On the Day of Atonement, not ordinary priests but the high-priest alone officiated, and not in his ordinary dress, nor in the dress of the ordinary priesthood but in one particularly for that day; attire especially expressive of purity.

You then go on at length about human sacrifices and say “Those who espouse the Bible were strictly prohibited from offering human sacrifices.”

Yes, of course they were, but who offered Jesus in sacrifice? Or are you saying that Jesus crucifixion was not a sacrifice? And are you denying that Jesus blood was shed in sacrifice?

You say, “The scripture never tells us that an innocent man can die as an atonement for the sins of all the wicked... Rather it is the prayers of the sinner that would become as bulls of the sin-offerings.”

But these prayers of the sinner are offered through Jesus who sacrificed Himself on our behalf. He has the power to forgive sins. This was never the case with sin-offerings under the law.

You say, “Only the contrite and repentant prayer of the remorseful sinner can bring about a complete atonement.”

Firstly, there can be no such thing as incomplete atonement. Secondly, this is the wrong way round. Atonement and forgiveness are two very different things and though they are connected, Atonement has to be accepted before a sinner can be forgiven.

Post 35. You wrote, “The problem is, we see God not asking for sacrifices until the people started to move to be “like the nations around them.”

Not so, Sacrifices have been a requirement since Adam, Cain and Abel. It is also evident that Noah was instructed in sacrifice for he knew to offer legally clean animals, long before the Law of Moses, and even longer before the people wanted to be “like the nations around them.”

Now for something which I find a joy and pleasure to read! You say: “We can sacrifice ourselves for ourselves - the only way it is instead of another is when I would die rather than make you die. This is the lesson taught, will we learn it?”

Oh! I do hope so! Is not this exactly what Jesus did – for the joy set before Him? He died rather than see us die! He knew there was no other way. This is the lesson I have been trying to put across since I joined this forum (and long before). I would that everyone should understand it! This is the Gospel of salvation! Thank God!

With Love in Jesus to all our readers. Russell.

Dear Mike, I wrote in post 45:- ‘Now for something which I find a joy and pleasure to read! You say: “We can sacrifice ourselves for ourselves - the only way it is instead of another is when I would die rather than make you die. This is the lesson taught, will we learn it?” Oh! I do hope so! Is not this exactly what Jesus did – for the joy set before Him? He died rather than see us die! He knew there was no other way. This is the lesson I have been trying to put across since I joined this forum (and long before). I would that everyone should understand it! This is the Gospel of salvation! Thank God!’

In post 46 you responded by writing:-

“Even more so, he died instead of having to kill that generation (and thereby all forthcoming) in order to save his own life. He “demonstrated” God’s love.”

Oh dear, Mike, you saw and found a gem! Please treasure it for all its worth! Jesus died rather than make us die. That’s what you found. And you said it was “the lesson taught, will we learn it?”

Please do not spoil it by saying Jesus had to die to save His own life. Jesus said of Himself “Except a

corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone” - so it was for us and not for Himself that He died a violent death in sacrifice.

You agreed that Jesus died rather than see us die. This is the ‘gem’ I said was worth treasuring for all its worth. Now, you say “Let’s polish this gem then” - but how do you propose to do this? By saying Jesus “must die, not to save his own life but that His own life had to be changed in such a way He was no longer tempted for all eternity.”

Well, I do not call that polishing this ‘gem.’ “Tempted for all eternity”! Although we are on the edge of hypothetical argument here, you make an awful assumption when you suppose Jesus, had He not died, would have gone on living a corruptible *psuche*/life, being tempted “for all eternity.” Jesus did not have to die in order for His change to come. And neither does anyone else!

Neither do you polish this gem when you say of Jesus, “the violence of His death only had to do with ‘to whom much is given, much is required’.” This quote from Luke 12:48 just will not do. If you apply it to Jesus, see what happens: Verses 41 to 48 have to do with rewarding slaves for their faithfulness. The slave who knew his Lord’s will but failed in his duties was dealt with accordingly. Is this why Jesus had to endure such a terrible death? Is this where you want to place Jesus? Is this what Jesus deserved in your sight? Please, please think again.

Jesus condemned sin by showing it is possible to do right all the time; that we could do as He did.

He allowed Himself to be sacrificed so that He could forgive sins; yours and mine. He went willingly to His crucifixion so that we could have life, *zoe* life here and now, (as well as *psuche*/life with which we were born of our parents) and have it (*zoe*) more abundantly in the Kingdom.

And neither do you polish this gem in your illustration regarding the difference between “giving one’s life” and “dying for,” but this fails to distinguish between Jesus relationship to God in contrast to the rest of us. As the only begotten Son of God, Jesus derived His life direct from His Father and He was therefore never “in Adam.” Of all the people who have lived Jesus was the only One who could therefore give His life (*psuche*) in sacrifice without loosing His inheritance.

Mike, our differences do not lie in semantics as you suppose. Our differences lie in very different understanding of what we read in Scripture. Time and time again I have been at a loss to see from where you get your understanding.

On looking back to when I was a Christadelphian – up to the age of 58 – I see that I was ‘paddling about in muddy waters,’ so to speak; while now I see a ‘vast, clear ocean of truth’ to which I was blind before. I do hope you do not mind my saying this, but I feel you are where I used to be. And my exhortation to you and others is to keep searching and praying for a better understanding. You have thrown out a lot of Christadelphian baggage but there is still more to do.

Love to all in Jesus. Russell.

Dear Mike, In post 50 you wrote:

“Russell, further back, in an earlier post you quoted something, have you forgotten the words of Jesus you quoted? John 12:24 – “Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit.” Whether we die a physical death or die “by means of a direct change because we are alive at the coming” that portion of us that we develop during our lives that tempts us, must “die away”. This is our job in this life, to cut away as much of this method of thinking (your thoughts are not my thoughts, and your ways are not my ways, saith the LORD) that we learn from little on up. That must die and is never removed, according to Paul’s understanding of Tanakh, until the seed dies and is reborn (resurrection). I called this polishing the gem, because there is so much ambiguity in just saying what was said, that it could easily be mistaken for a once saved always saved doctrine, and also

for a “Maschiach that was above his brethren” rather than one “from amongst his brethren”. We must be careful not to slip into lashon hera, any form of evil speech, that adds to God’s word, or accuses one of being over or less than another.”

No. Mike I haven’t forgotten the words of Jesus I quoted - but Jesus, in John 12:24, was explaining to His disciples that the hour was come in which He would be glorified by offering Himself as the willing sacrifice to take away the Sin of the world. (“Therefore doth my Father love me”).

Of course Jesus was different to anyone else - He was the Son of God by begettal and that placed Him in a relationship to His Father which we do not have. We are “in Adam; until we are “in Jesus”. Jesus was never “in Adam.” We, being “in Adam” are born into an alienated relationship away from God; Jesus was never alienated from His father. We must come “out of Adam” and be born anew “in Christ” by baptism into His death. This, once again, is the Federal Principle of the two Heads - Adam and Jesus. We must be in one or the other. We cannot be in both.

This has nothing to do with “once saved, always saved” which is a rubbish idea - The fact of the second death for the unfaithful proves it’s rubbish!

Neither is Jesus here talking about the development of our characters - He is here talking about His own death by crucifixion (which was to take place within a few hours of this discourse with His disciples), and the bringing forth of much fruit - the giving of eternal life to as many as He chooses - which would not have been possible had He not given Himself as the sacrifice.

To talk of “dying by means of a direct change because we are alive at the coming” is just confusing jargon which flies in the face of Paul’s plain words “We shall not all sleep (in death).”

I know Paul wrote some things hard to be understood but I think 1 Corinthians 15:51 is clear enough.

With Love in Jesus. Russell.

Dear all, Here is my contribution I promised in post 23:-

In Eden Adam lost his life through transgression of God’s law (“for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die”). In His love and mercy God instructed the sacrifice of an animal as a covering and allowed Adam to live on, and though his life was not ended there and then, he now had a forfeited life. Paul explains that this forfeited life is the life Adam sold to sin as a master and is now the possession of ‘Master Sin.’ (Romans chapters 3 to 7). So we see Adam no longer had a free life, but a life sold to sin. It was this forfeited life which Adam passed on to all his offspring which is to say that all the human race have a forfeited life – Adamic life – a life sold to sin – concluded under sin.

In order to save Adam and the human race from this bondage to sin, it was necessary for him to be redeemed. The life which had been lost by sin could only be redeemed by a human life; a life for a life. No descendant of Adam could give his life as a ransom because his life was already forfeited and would be of no value as a ransom. “None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him.” (Psalm 49:7). It is surely obvious that the human race could only be saved from extinction if a ransom could be found – a human life that was not in bondage; not sold to ‘Sin;’ not concluded under sin and whose life was not forfeited.

Jesus was the One. A new life direct from God and not via Adam. Yes, He was descended from Adam through Mary and this ensured He was related to the human race, but His Father gave Him life other than Adamic life – a life not in bondage; not sold to Sin; not concluded under sin – in other words a free life. This was the reason for the Virgin Birth. “Unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given.”

“For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.”

Let us consider for a moment what Paul is saying here. If one dies for another how can this be meant apart from taking their place? Of course the (dreaded) word 'substitution' is not used but there could be no clearer meaning. "For scarcely for a righteous man will one die" – "peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die"- these expressions can only mean that one takes the place of the other – if indeed he has the courage.

To continue in Romans 5:- "Much more then being justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him, for if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life (*zoe*). And not only so, but we joy in God through Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the reconciliation (atonement)." And Paul 'recaps' - "as by the offence of one (Adam) judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one (Jesus) the free gift of God came upon all to justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners (not sinful), so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

In years gone by most Christadelphians have taught that the human race in Adam can be represented as being in one big circle and those in Jesus Christ as being in a smaller circle within the larger one thus while we are in Christ we are still in Adam. This is false and makes utter nonsense of Paul's teaching. We have to leave our Adamic life and be born anew into Christ by baptism. It is impossible to be in both at the same time. We are either under the federal condemnation in Adam or we are under the federal redemption in Christ. We cannot be under both together.

I feel this covers the essential points I wish to make but being condensed it may need 'bulking out' in many places and this I am very happy to do.

With Love in Jesus to all. Russell.