

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 254

March/April 2012

In This Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 2	Veritas and His Friends	
Page 4	Forgiveness	Brother Ernest Parry
Page 6	Who Jesus Is... continued	Cloudberry
Page 9	Baptism in the Name of The Lord	Brother A.H.Broughton
Page 15	The Clean Flesh Heresy Again	Brother Phil Parry

Editorial

Dear Friends, Brothers and Sisters, Greetings in Jesus Name,

In my last editorial we saw how God, having asked for perfect obedience, provided forgiveness for repentant sinners. Once Adam had sinned there was nothing he could do to help himself; his life was forfeit and without God's mercy and loving kindness he would have died that day. From that day on it was Adam's forfeited life that was passed down to his children and so on through all generations, and this is shown to us by the apostle Paul when he explained that we are all concluded under sin, i.e. the one sin of Adam. (Galatians 3:2).

From that very first transgression, we learn that there is no forgiveness without the shedding of blood (as confirmed in Hebrews 9:22) and for four thousand years the blood of animals was accepted as a covering for sins and the sinner allowed to go on living.

John the Baptist told his hearers that God sent His only begotten Son into the world to take away the sin of the world. No longer was it to be covered over; here was One who would take it away. Jesus came into the world born of a woman and subject to the law of sin and death like everyone else and His probation was like Adam's first probation but whereas Adam failed to yield perfect obedience to God, Jesus succeeded. Jesus did not breach the law of God and therefore He did not require redemption.

If Jesus had come into the world with a forfeited life, a life concluded under sin, what hope would there be for anyone? We read in Romans 5:12 that by one man's offence death passed upon all men, and if Jesus is included as some would have it, then death would have passed upon Jesus also and His life would have been lost; He would have no ransom to offer and Matthew 20:28, "the Son of man came ... to give his life a ransom for many", would not have been fulfilled. But Jesus did not receive a life passed down from Adam, but a life direct from His Father; a new life as was Adam's at first – unforfeited to sin. This shows the great importance of the virgin birth. Where Adam failed, Jesus succeeded and was now in the strong position of being able to bear Adam's burden, a burden which was impossible for Adam to bear without perishing.

However, Jesus could bear the burden in Adam's stead and live and we can see this is what happened if we compare such scriptures as John 10:11, "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep" and verse 28, "I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish..." The difference is found in the two Greek words used for "life". When Jesus said "the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep" He used the word 'psuche' for life' but when He said "I give unto them eternal life" He used the word 'zoe' for life. We find this consistent with all that Jesus said, for He always used 'psuche' when referring to our natural life, the life we have here and now, and He always used 'zoe' when referring to eternal life.

When Jesus died on the cross He laid down His 'psuche', for this life was in the blood He shed and He did not receive His blood back again as is suggested when He said, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have" (Luke 24:39) but there

is no mention of blood for He was energised by Spirit life or zoe. It was the exact price; the perfect life of Jesus freely given in the place of the perfect life forfeited by Adam.

Jesus, then, laid down His life in place of Adam's life which allowed Adam to pass his life down to us, and it is in this way that Jesus died for all, for our present life is our redeemed life.

Love to all, Russell.

VERITAS AND HIS FRIENDS.

"I believe, of course," said Pietas, in a surprised tone, "that Christianity has historical foundations. I can hardly understand how any one could deny this or overlook it who knew that Jesus had come in the flesh, and that his apostles preached the gospel in the world."

"But," said, Veritas, "that is only one point of contact between Christianity and history, whereas my remark was that the Bible throughout, as to the divine scheme which it unfolds, can be checked and proved by comparison with human affairs all along the line of the divine movement. Your school of speculation transfers the more serious part of God's dealings with mankind to 'another world' - 'a spirit world' - your eyes and thoughts are ever directed thither, and so you fail to see what God is doing beneath your very nose, and how the Scriptures and history tally in a thousand things."

"Well," rejoined Pietas, "I certainly believe - most firmly believe that God's great purpose with man is to prepare him for a better world; and all that relates to this world, of course, transcends history, though resting upon it."

Mentor for some time during this conversation had been indicating a desire to break into it, which uneasiness was a thing very unusual for him. At last he said, "Depend upon it you are getting off the lines, when you make so much of historical confirmation of the Scriptures. I think it far safer to proceed, by discriminating between the reliable and the incredible in the Bible. History may support some things, but it won't support all. I don't go so far as Dubitas in thinking there is no actual inspiration from God traceable in the Scriptures, but I certainly should stop short of your position."

"Perhaps so," replied Veritas, "but I have not told you yet what my position is, beyond saying in a general way that I believe the Scriptures to be trustworthy. You must wait till you have heard a little more, and then perhaps you will be inclined to put more confidence in the Book than you do at present."

This was said in a very kindly, modest manner, and then, turning to Pietas, Veritas went on, "You speak of God mainly contemplating a 'better world' for man, by which I suppose you mean a 'spirit world,' as it is often termed."

"Yes," responded his host.

"Well, that was the first thing that I began to doubt and to read the Scriptures upon, with the object of understanding what this 'better world' meant." "I can't understand," cried Dubitas, "what people want to bother themselves about 'another world' for, as long as this is one too many for them, as it generally is. If they want a 'better,' why don't they set about making this world better? Most people are like children who see nothing in the toy in their hands, but want the one in the closet upstairs."

"Speaking for myself," said Veritas, with a tone of dignity, "I tremble about another world - a phrase which, though you use it, you do not understand - because it has been made a matter of glorious promise to certain persons who will graduate for it, and then, I do not waste my time in trying to patch and mend up this world, because I believe it is a hopeless and - unnecessary business. New wine is best put in new bottles, as we have been told a good while ago. I was saying that I was led to doubt the popular teaching of the 'better' world. For analysed a little it is by no means a better but a much worse one, for although it supposes a heaven of endless enjoyment, it also affirms a hell of everlasting torment. And it was this latter feature of

the 'better world' which struck me, as it has struck thousands besides me, as being impossible. I admit that I was led to examine the Scriptures on the subject because of this previous revolt of my reason, which refused to be satisfied with that idea of the universe in which sin and evil would remain an eternal flaw upon it."

"Everlasting torment is absurd," broke in Mentor.

"I say the same," said Veritas, "but I affirm more; I can say it is false as well; I mean Scripturally false. You have probably rejected the dogma, because your reason could not assent to it: I reject it because the Scriptures do not teach it."

"Would you accept it if the Scriptures taught it?" asked Dubitas.

"As I can't imagine the Scriptures teaching any irrational doctrine, your question needs no answer," was the reply.

"Oh yes," said Dubitas, "surely you can imagine the Scriptures teaching it, for as a matter of fact, very many people believe that the Scriptures do teach it."

"Ah, I can imagine it written or printed, with the people you refer to, but I cannot conceive of Scriptures, which are the expression of divine wisdom and grace, teaching that God has made a world in which sin and evil would be permanent and eternally established facts, for ever set over against God's power, which that power could never dislodge or change or subdue. Joseph Cook, the Boston lecturer, talks about character tending to permanence whether of good or evil, as though that proved anything. It is true that character does tend to permanence while the character lasts, but suppose the man destroyed in whom the character is resident, where is the permanence then? But let me go back to the 'better world' question." "Yes," said Pietas, "let us know what notions of this 'better world' you entertain. I confess to considerable haziness on the subject myself. It is too much like the moon in a mist."

"I will try to do so, not only that you may perceive my position on this particular point, but that you may see how the historical argument for the Scriptures is augmented."

"I learn from the Scriptures," began Veritas, "that all that God is going to do for man he purposes to do in the EARTH, having 'created it,' as he says in Isaiah xlv. 18 (taking out his Bible) 'not in vain, but having formed it to be inhabited' and having 'established it.' It is not the earth that is the object of God's displeasure, but sin in the earth, and it is not the world, but the fashion of the world, that is to pass away. 1 Cor. vii. 31. When God created all things, he pronounced the works of his hands 'very good,' and though afterwards the earth was cursed, the curse will, at a certain time, be removed, as you may read in Rev. xxii. 3, and in Rom. viii. 19-23."

"I am afraid," said Dubitas, "that you will place the Bible in more formidable conflict with science than the orthodox folks, who have a notion that some time or other man's doings on this planet will be played out. How can you reconcile your view of an endless history for this planet with the fact that at some far distant period the sun's fires will die down, and this earth become a mass of ice?"

"I don't attempt to reconcile the Scriptures with scientific speculation," was the reply; "I wait for the speculation to burst, and the next bubble after that, and so on. Believers have something better to do than attempt to annual 'reconciliations' immediately after the British Association has sat. The history of science has been a history of blunders, and we need have no more anxiety about the refrigeration than of the combustion of our planet. It is sufficient that in a very credible account of things - an account that can be tested in many ways - it is written that 'the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.' Is. xi. 9."

"Do you believe," enquired Dubitas, "that the present continents were once beneath the ocean, and that the ocean now covers what was once the dry land?"

"Yes," replied Veritas; "I believe that such changes have taken place in ages prior to man's advent."

"And do you believe that the same causes that have produced such vast changes are at work still?"

“I do.”

“Then may not the same results happen again, given a sufficient lapse of time?”

“Not necessarily,” observed Veritas, “for the Creator, if he choose, may set absolute bounds to the sea. Indeed, not only may he, but we can discern reason why he will; for mutation and change are connected with, and necessitated by the presence of sin and death, and when these are removed many of the mutations of things may cease. We are told that ‘the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death;’ then what altered conditions may we not expect when creatures filled with perennial life have to be provided for?”

“Oh,” said Dubitas, “if you fall back upon possibilities in that way, I see how you can escape every difficulty alleged against your position.”

“I am not falling back on bare possibilities,” was the reply, “but on possibilities connected with certain statements as to what the Creator intends to do. This connection changes them into probabilities, does it not?”

Dubitas did not reply, but Mentor remarked - “I see no reason for demurring to your observation, if it could be satisfactorily shown that these intentions which seem to be expressed by the Creator, are really his expressions. But of that we must be sure before it can be granted that your possibility changes to a probability.”

(To be continued).

Forgiveness

It is a surprising fact that although there are so many denominations in the world to-day claiming to be Christian in their doctrine and belief and especially since it is an essential doctrine and belief of Scripture, and again essential if we are to obtain Salvation through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, that so many of these so-called Christians do not really believe in the forgiveness of sin. This may seem a strange statement to make in view of the fact that so many of these denominations have in their statements or creeds for belief included the belief in the forgiveness of sins, but whilst admitting that it is a doctrine of the Bible and essential to Salvation, in their practical outlook, together with the statements they make on the doctrine of Judgment at the last day, out-rules any faith they claim to have that they receive present-day forgiveness for their sins. This is true of Catholics, Church of England, Methodists, and in fact most we can think of. You cannot hold the popular beliefs in Judgment at the last day (though we do not say that there will be no judgment of any kind) and at the same time, when you pray, sincerely believe that you receive forgiveness for your sins. The popular belief in judgment is to the effect that these sins have to be answered for again and therefore could never have been forgiven in the first place. The doctrines of Scripture do not contradict themselves and when forgiveness of sins is asked for sincerely and in the manner described in the teachings of Scripture, forgiveness is received and is not answerable for again. This is also a great error in Christadelphian teaching, and a misconception of certain passages of Scripture where judgment is mentioned. Some of these references we will point out later in our consideration of this subject. But we must be assured of one fundamental fact of Scripture; God does not lie and cannot be the author of confusion.

We must understand the mind of the Lord and His Son, Jesus Christ, if we are to receive Salvation through the forgiveness of sins made possible by the supreme sacrifice of all time. On His own principle, God does not forgive sins unless He is approached in the manner shown through His teachings. We must, on asking forgiveness, believe that forgiveness will be received. Not that God intends at some future date to bring these sins to our mind again that we might answer for them and receive judgment accordingly. Yet we know that many people whilst asking God to forgive them through His Son, on the other hand freely make statements about the judgment to come, and show their attitude to present forgiveness for sin by God. Their

understanding of these matters, however, is so confused that they know not really what they believe. First they have an immortal soul which departs to heaven at death, then they have a body resurrected at the last day for judgment to find out by this process whether or not it is worthy of what it has already received. They are in fact confronted with two bodies, this being the dilemma in which popular doctrine has placed them.

We do not deny that there is to be a judgment at some future date, but we do say that the popular belief or idea of Judgment is not according to Scripture. In this respect let us examine the teachings of Paul in Romans 6:3 – “Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted in the likeness of his death we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” Verse 7 – “For he that is dead, is freed from sin.” Verse 11 “Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin but alive unto God through Christ our Lord.” Romans 8:1-6, “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect? it is God who justifieth.”

Should we, in view of these verses be looking forward with a measure of uncertainty and fear of Judgment to come? To have our good deeds balanced with our faults to find out if we are worthy of incorruptibility or death? Would this be in harmony with the words from the 14th Chapter of Revelation v.13 – “Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth. Yea saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.” Or would it be in harmony with these verses in 1 Corinthians 15:42 – “So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.”

Judgment, as the following words will show, is a word greatly misapplied. We are now as responsible people being judged, and our everyday life will show which verdict will be pronounced upon us, whether we are alive at the coming of Christ, or in the grave, the verdict will remain the same. For said Peter in his generation, “the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God. And if the righteous scarcely be saved where shall the ungodly and sinner appear? Therefore let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their souls to Him in well doing as unto a faithful Creator.

Judgment according to this statement in 1 Peter 4:17, was to run current with the age in which it was stated and three classes of people were referred to - the righteous, the ungodly and the sinner. The righteous scarcely saved, the ungodly and sinner where shall they appear? What hope have they? The sinner being a responsible person will receive judgment accordingly, the ungodly will receive judgment because they have the same attitude down through the ages; they could not care less. This class of people will not accept responsibility to the Divine Creator because it does not offer an easy way of life which is all they require. Those, however, who have known the way of Salvation through the gospel message and have not obeyed it will indeed come into judgment, that which is styled in 20th Chapter of Revelation, verse 12, the second death. It would appear to me that these are judged out of the books and that those who have been faithful in whatever age they lived, have their names written in another book which was opened, the book of life. It would seem to me, though this is open to Question, that these are not recorded in the books at all, that the books contain matters concerning those who partake of the second death and are cast into the lake of fire. 15 Verse – “And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.”

It is inconsistent to believe that faithful men and women come into judgment with sinners or ungodly men and women.

“Speak not evil one of another brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law and judgeth the law, but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge.” 1 Peter 1:3-5.

These are written in the other book which was opened, 20 Revelation, the book of life.

The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. “Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord, or who shall stand in his holy place ? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully, he shall receive the blessing from the Lord and righteousness from the God of his salvation.” Psalm 24:3-4.

Matthew 7:1, “Judge not that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.”

Hebrews 9:27-28 – “And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment. So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall be appear the second time without sin unto salvation.”

Ernest Parry.

Extracts from the Nazarene Fellowship forum continued from last C.L.

Who Jesus Is...

I would like to elaborate more on some of the verses that I’ve already posted, to give a more detailed reason for believing as I do.

One is: 1 Cor. 8:5, 6. In this chapter, I will start with verse 4... it is explaining that “...an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one.” We see here, what most believe, that God is one. Where some differ is how he is one. In 1 Cor 8:6, we are assured that there is one God, “But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.” Here in verse 6, we are assured that this one God, that is declared to be one in verse 4, is the Father as it says in verse 6 “...But to us there is but one God, the father...” What we do not see it saying is that Jesus is also this one God.

Verse 4 establishes that idols are not gods. Verse 5 says many are called gods, which are not Gods, only called gods, and verse 6 says that there is one God, the Father.

This is the one God...the Father, the father of the Son Jesus, as is said in John 20:17, “Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God,” and in John 17:3. “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.”

This Father is the only one that is God, as the above verses show. And most believers do not believe that the Son is the Father. And these verses show that God is the Father, and do not show that Jesus is this only God the Father, but His Son. These verses show that the Father is the only true God, and that Jesus is the Son.

And now for John 1 beginning at verse one... “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”

I would like to make the point that this isn’t the only way it is translated, that in centuries past, it was translated a little differently. Here is an example of John 1:1-3: Tyndale’s New Testament – 1530 –

“In the beginnyng was the worde, and the worde was with God: and the worde was God. The same was in the beginnyng with God. All thinges were made by it, and with out it, was made nothinge, that was made.”

Obviously, in the past, in this translation, the use of “it” was considered an accurate translation; and when

one considers the “in the beginning” of the verses in Genesis 1, we see there that God spoke when he created, that he created by his spoken word. And this in John 1:1-3 appears to be referring to Genesis 1 in which God spoke. We see in John 1:3 that it says “...All things were made by it, and with out it, was made nothinge, that was made, “ is likely about the creation of all things in Genesis. Therefore in John 1:1 the word is God’s spoken word which he used in his creation of all things in Genesis, being mentioned here in John 1. Also, verse 1 in John, being translated as it is in Tyndale’s New Testament, is more likely correct, as John here is saying that it is God’s spoken word that is with God in the beginning, and was with God and was God. In the beginning of what? In the beginning of the creation of Genesis. It seems to be more in context with this understanding.

And another example is: The Geneva Bible – 1560 AD –

“In the beginning was the Worde, and the Worde was with God and that Worde was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by it, & without it was made nothing that was made.”

Here again we see the use of the word “it.” It seems that it is in more modern translations that we see the word “it” being replaced with the word “him.”

The older translations show, that it may have been considered, in the past, that John 1:1-3 is speaking of the word of God, his spoken word, and only his spoken word. And that it is in more current translation that it is thought that this is speaking of Jesus. Yet it isn’t until verse 14, that we see the word becoming flesh.

Verse 14, “And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.”

For me what this is saying is that the word of God, his gospel, is to be given as a message to the people, by the Christ, his son, Jesus, in the flesh; that is born as a man. I do not see it saying that Jesus was the word in a pre-human existence, or that it is saying that Jesus is God. And no where in this verse do I see it saying that it is God that came in the flesh. Jesus was born, and brought man the gospel of God. This is all that it is saying, as I see it.

Verse 15, “John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he was before me.”

As we see, it is John baring witness of him, (Jesus) and saying that he (Jesus) who comes after him is preferred before him. While reading this I see John speaking of being preferred, and not about when Jesus came into existence. When John says “...for he was before me” he is still saying that the one he is baring witness of is preferred before himself. Also read verses 27 and 30 which supports this view.

Verses 16-18, “And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace. 17. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. 18. No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.”

In verse 18 it says that no man has seen God. I see no contradiction here, as if we read this verse carefully, we will see that it does not say Jesus saw God, only that the Son hath declared him, (God). I think that being in the bosom of the Father here means that Jesus is loved and preferred by God, not that he literally was God or part of God or saw God, or had a pre-human existence.

Verse 27, “He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe’s latchet I am not worthy to unloose.”

Verse 30, “This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me.”

Again these verses support that what John was saying is that Jesus is preferred before himself; and is not about when Jesus came into existence, or that Jesus is God, or that Jesus was the word before his birth as a man.

This is how I see it reading. I know most do not agree, but thought that it is important to consider the views of others who do not see it in the usual understanding.

1 John 4:9, "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him."

Here we see that it says God sent his Son. Not that God the Father sent his God the Son. No mention whatever that the Son is also God, but only that he is the son.

Verse 10, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

And again we see that he, God, sent his Son. And not that the son is also God.

Verse 11, "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another. 12 No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us. 13 Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit. 14 And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world."

Here we see it say that the Father sent the son, and we just saw verses that say God sent his son (see 1 John 4:10 above), which supports that Jesus is God's son, the Father's son (verse 14); and being that God can dwell in the son, (see John 14:10,11 below) and can dwell in us, and we in Him (see 1 John 4:12,13 above), and being that this does not make us God, there is no reason to think that it means that Jesus is God either when Jesus said he and the Father are one (see John 10:30 below), or that the Father dwells in him, or that he is in the Father and the Father is in him.

John 14:10 Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. 14:11 Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake.

John 10:30 "I and my Father are one."

Let's see what Nathanael says....and also Jesus as to who he is.

John 1:49 "Nathanael answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel."

And now Jesus...

John 10:36, "Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"

Jesus himself said that he is the son of God; Nathanael says the same. I have found no where that he says he is God, and no where that he is God the Son; but many verses that say he is the Son of God.

Ephesians 1:3 "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ:"

And this says it all...the God and Father of our Lord Jesus...it is obvious that Jesus is the Son, and not God.

This is how I see it, thanks for listening. Cloudberry.

Editor: Once again we wish to thank Cloudberry for her continued support.

BAPTISM IN THE NAME OF THE LORD

1. THE GRAND SECRET OF CHRISTIANITY IS CONTAINED IN THIS SYNOPSIS:

“Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, for the promise is unto... as many as the Lord our God shall call.” Acts 2:38.

Here is the Promise, preceded by two conditions;

2. GOD ALWAYS KEEPS HIS PROMISES.

Whenever the conditions are fulfilled. He fulfils the above Promise whenever the conditions are met, just as He did in the house of Cornelius and in the Ecclesia at Ephesus. (Acts 10:44-48 and 19:6). How important therefore that the conditions be fulfilled! So few receive the Spirit because so few fulfil the conditions.

3. THE OBJECT OF BAPTISM

Before proceeding further let it be acknowledged that there is only one Baptism (Ephesians 4:5) and it comprises baptism in water and spirit. Thus is a believer baptised “into the Lord Jesus Christ” (See Appendix F).

An interesting comparison between the “house” of Moses and that of Christ is made in Hebrews 3:5-6. Let us extend this comparison to 1 Corinthians 10:1-2, “Our fathers. . . were all baptised unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea,” and we shall see in baptism of water and spirit the entrance into Christ.

Read:-

Romans 6:3-4,	baptised into Jesus Christ
Galatians 3:26,	baptised into Christ
Corinthians 2:12,	Buried with him in baptism. . . risen with him.

Baptism in water is a baptism unto death (even as in the case of the pursuing Egyptians, in type) while baptism in spirit is a baptism into life (as in a figure the liberated Israelites ascended from the Red Sea).

The Ethiopian Eunuch went down into the water and came up in the Spirit. (See Appendix E.)

4. THE SUBJECT OF THIS ARTICLE is one phrase in the second of the conditions, viz: “Be baptised... in the name of Jesus Christ”

5 THE CUSTOMARY MANNER is to baptise “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.” This is on account of the Authorised Version of Matthew 28:29-30, “Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.”

6. THE DIFFICULTY

If this passage of Matthew 28:29-30 were the only direct or indirect reference to the matter in Scripture the difficulty would have been seen by very few. But as there are several passages which teach contrary to the Authorised Version of Matthew 28:29-30 the difficulty has been recognised by many, and every year in innumerable periodicals the same difficulty is set forth for elucidation.

7. THE APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

This is important. Why is there so wide a divergence of teachings on Biblical themes? Because Bible study alone is insufficient to lead one to the truths of God. A willingness to obey the teaching is a pre-requisite, as it is written, “If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.” John 7:16. Hence, it is necessary, in examining this or any other point of scriptural teaching to be fully persuaded that whatever is found to be the will of God the student of scripture is willing to be obedient no matter what the cost may be.

8. WHAT IS THE DIFFICULTY

Although according to Matthew 28 (Authorised Version) the disciples were commanded to baptise “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost” they in practice always baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus.

9. THE PRACTICE OF THE APOSTLES

“Be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ”	Acts 2:38
“Be baptised in the name of the Lord”	Acts 10:48
“baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus”	Acts 19:5
“baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus”	Acts 8:16

10. DOES IT MATTER?

The matter does appear to be important in the sight of God, and that is what really matters.

(a) It is written of Apollos that he knew “only the baptism of John and that he was shown the way of God more perfectly.” Acts 18:25.

(b) It is written of the disciples at Ephesus that although they had been baptised unto John’s Baptism they were baptised in the presence of Paul “in the name of the Lord Jesus.” Acts 19:3-5.

Now the baptism of John, like the baptism of Jesus (then and now) was a baptism of repentance and for the remission of sins. (Mark 1:4; Acts 2:38-39). And John preached also the coming of the Christ who should baptise with spirit. The difference between the Baptism of John and baptism after Pentecost is that the latter was in the name of the Lord. No other difference is shown in scripture.*^{see note} We may at first think that a second immersion in order to be baptised in the name of the Lord is unnecessary, but Paul, who was an apostle, thought it to be necessary, and it is here submitted that his teaching and practice on the matter was correct. On this point see Appendix G.

***Note:** It is worth noting that Brother A.H.Broughton had not, at the time of writing, appreciated that baptism into Jesus was baptism into His death. Not only was this not possible for John the Baptist to do for Jesus was not yet crucified, but also the Jews who came to John were already in covenant relationship with God. At the Last Supper Jesus introduced the New Covenant (New Testament) which replaced the Old once the veil of the Temple was rent from top to bottom the moment Jesus died on the cross. This opened the way for the Gentiles as well as Jews to come into the new covenant relationship with God through baptism into Jesus. – Russell.

11. EVIDENCE THAT BAPTISM SHOULD BE IN THE NAME OF THE LORD

(a) The practice of the Apostles.

This has been shown in 9.

(b) **The practice of the early ecclesias.** It is “almost generally admitted that the practice of the Churches in the first two centuries was to baptise person’s in the name of Jesus” (Haase, Eccles. History, 8th edition, p. 44).

This is an admission by those who do not follow the practice.

(c) **The other Ordinance of the Christian.** The Weekly Memorial is the Lord’s Supper, not that of a trinity. (“My body, my blood”).

(d) Prayer in the Name of Jesus.

The apostles were desired of the Lord to pray to the Father in the name of Jesus, “because I go unto the Father” (John 14:12-14, and 16:23). We have at present no authority to do anything in the name of the Father or of the spirit nor to ask anything in that manner. When Revelations 3:12 and Revelations 22:4 is fulfilled upon us, then we shall have authority to act in the name of the Father, having His name in our forehead. But not until then.

(e) All things, to be done in the name of the Lord. It is written, “whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus” (Colossians 3:17). Baptism is a matter of both word and deed, and hence baptism should be done in the name of the Lord.

(Of actions done in the name of another see Matthew 10:40-42; Luke 9:48. Of actions in the name of the Lord by those not having the authority - see e.g. Acts 19:13 and Matthew 7:22.)

(f) Baptism in spirit in the name of Jesus. We should baptise in water in the name of Jesus. It should be noticed that the Father baptises the believer in spirit in the name of Jesus. (John 14:26). There is a reason for this. The Holy Spirit was the Promise which Christ received on ascending to the Father - one of the promises made to Abraham and then fulfilled - and only those who are in the corporate body of Christ, the ecclesia which is His body - only those may receive the Gift, and only because they are IN that One Body.

(g) Baptism should be in the name of Jesus Christ because it was He Who was crucified for us.

This is the argument in 1 Corinthians 1:13,

“Is Christ divided?”

“Was Paul crucified for you?”

“Or were ye baptised in the name of Paul?”

From this it is to be understood that believers ought to be baptised in the name of that One who was crucified for them. The Father in His amazing love gave to us His Beloved Son, who by the Spirit was raised to incorruptibility, but it is the Lord Himself who was crucified, and in His name, therefore, must believers be baptised in water.

8. THE SOLUTION OF THE DIFFICULTY

The solution now submitted is of a drastic nature and is based on the suggestion that the end verses of Matthew were tampered with by an early copyist. Here are the reasons for the suggestion.

(a) The Lord Jesus never used a formula such as “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit”, either in His preaching or in His other commands. The phrase is quite in agreement with the liturgical custom of men in their forms of religion but altogether foreign to the elevated teaching of the Master.

(b) The sense of the passage in the A.V. is not clear, but interrupted. If, however, we read as under, the whole context hangs together and the tenor of the instruction is complete.

“All power is given unto ME ... Go “therefore... baptising in MY name, “teaching them... whatsoever I have “commanded and lo I am with you alway.”

(c) The phrase “in the name of the Holy Spirit” is found nowhere else in scripture. A prophet of old time spoke “in the name of God” and not of His spirit. Now we must do all things in the name of Jesus. The spirit is not a person but is the spirit of a Person and is never to be addressed in prayer or worshipped.

(d) The textual evidence (dealt with in Appendix B), shows that the original writing of Matthew was as stated in (b) above, viz., “ baptising . . . in My name”. (See also Appendix D.)

9. BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE POSITION

Reducing the argument to a brief statement, we must either receive the text approved by the forty-seven scholars in 1611, or that accepted by Eusebius, who lived in the third century, and had before him many ancient manuscripts, probably including some direct copies from the original manuscript of Matthew.

If we follow the former there will remain always the difficulties set forth in this treatise. If we accept the testimony of Eusebius all difficulties on the matter are cleared away and the scripture on this theme is in perfect harmony in its several parts.

10. ACTION TO BE TAKEN

Doctrine should result in action. The teaching of scripture is intended to be worked out in the life.

To those not baptised in water we quote the words of scripture:

“Repent and be baptised every one of you “in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins” (Acts 2:38). This was the Gospel according to Peter and according to Paul, and we cannot, dare not, preach any other (Galatians 1: 8-9).

“And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptised and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord” (Acts 22: 16).

Need we, could we, make it plainer?

To those who have been baptised according to the customary formula.

we have only one word to give, Pray about it, Pray for guidance. But first of all settle it in your mind that you will be obedient to whatever you find to be the will of God. Only in this mind can you be taught of God.

(The writer was baptised in the name of the Lord on 5th June, 1932, with three others, each of whom had in earlier years been baptised according to the Trinitarian formula. By this last baptism we rendered obedience to the Lord to the best of our understanding.)

(Of the case of those who, being baptised according to the Trinitarian formula have not been made aware of the position here outlined, we make no judgment, but point out the possible analogy with those who “did eat the Passover otherwise than it was written” and the prayer of Hezekiah for their forgiveness. 2 Chronicles 30:18-20.)

To those who have not been baptised in Holy Spirit we repeat that God always keeps His promise when the conditions are fulfilled. If you will obey Him, and will ask. He will give you His Holy Spirit as in the days of the Apostles. He is no respecter of persons. As it is written, “How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?” (Luke 11:13). “Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is unto... as many as the Lord our God shall call”. (Acts 2:38.) “In one Spirit are we all baptised into one Body”. (1 Corinthians 12:13 R.V.)

11. A WORD IN CONCLUSION

“Blessed are they that do His Commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the City”. (Revelations 22:14.)

APPENDIX A AN EXPLANATION CONCERNING TEXTUAL CRITICISM

The errors in the Authorised Version are seldom of consequence.

The most serious perhaps is the incorporation among genuine scripture of the following spurious passage:- “For there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one”. (1 John 5: 7.)

This was placed by Erasmus into his third edition of 1523, and Tyndale used this edition to revise his English version. From thence it found its way into the Authorised Version, but the Revisers rejected it. The passage does not appear in any Greek manuscript prior to the fifteenth century.

Another example is in 1 Corinthians 11:24, where the word “broken” ought to be deleted in favour of the word “given.” This can be seen by comparing the parallel account of Luke 22:19. Certain ancient Greek manuscripts leave a blank space where this word appears in other copies. The structure of the sentence in Greek necessitates some word to be inserted. Evidently, some scribe, seeing this space (honestly left blank

by other copyists who would not insert a word of their own to fill the gap) made a guess and slipped in “broken”. The Revised Version reads “which is for you”. It would have been more correct to have given “which is for you”, thus leaving the gap which appears in so many of the Greek MSS.

APPENDIX B THE EVIDENCE OF EUSEBIUS

1. This consideration deals with the actual text of Matthew 28:19 apart altogether from its teaching.
2. It must be remembered that the Authorised Version is not a direct translation into English from the writings of the inspired apostles and others, but is a revision and correction of the Bishops’ Bible.
3. Till the publication of the Authorised Version the English were using three Bibles - the Great, the Bishops’ and the Geneva. In its preparation the revisers compared many of the ancient and modern versions, but Tyndale’s and Coverdale’s Bibles were the real ancestors of the Authorised Version.
4. Questions of doubt among the 47 scholars were solved by a majority vote. In such an important work as the selection of words and phrases to be incorporated in the Bible as holy writ, and the rejection of spurious of the competitive readings, the majority vote is certainly a very faulty standard of measurement. But the nominees of King James knew of nothing better.

[“The Revised Version is based upon the Authorised but is more correct. At the time of the revision (1885) many more and older MSS. were available for comparison than were known in the time of the former revision (1611). Differences of judgment among the revisers were again settled by majority vote].

5. Now each of the four great codices have been discovered since their days, and these have brought to light numerous erroneous readings in the A.V. It must be remembered, however, that only very occasionally is there any serious error in it. In the majority of cases the variant readings are of little consequence. (See Appendix A.)

6. Now let us introduce Eusebius, who rejected the now common reading of Matthew 28:19 as spurious, and said that the phrase in question should read “in my name.”

6a. Eusebius, then, died A.D. 340 and was the greatest Greek teacher and the most learned theologian of his time. Let it be said emphatically that if the question under consideration were one of theology, his evidence would be of no value whatever, for our doctrine must be obtained from the pure word of God alone, and not from any other source. Eusebius, too, lived in the days of theological darkness, and when we have the light of scripture it is folly to search among the dim candle-lit darkness of the theologians.

7. We ask his testimony, then, not upon any point of doctrine, but upon a matter of fact as to what, according to the manuscripts in his possession at the time, and within his access, should be the correct reading of Matthew 28:19. He spent the major part of his life in one of the greatest libraries of the day, and worked untiringly for the acceptance of the pure word of God, as it came from the inspired writers.

8. The famous Codex Vaticanus (one of the ancient four) is probably a copy of his recension (Allzog : Handbook of Patrology, p. 224). This Codex, known as B and numbered 1209 in the Vatican Library, is probably the oldest of the MSS. available, made early in the fourth century, and would be preferred even to the Sinaiticus if it were completely preserved, less damaged, more easily legible, less corrected, and had not been altered by a later hand in more than 2,000 places.

9. Eusebius, whether or not the original of codex B be the work of his hand, wrote many commentaries, a synopsis, numerous copies of the Bible and in addition compiled a collection of those corrupt texts which he had seen in those manuscripts which he had had the opportunity of examining. (“Monashette. Aug. 1923)

10. It is only this last work of his with which we are now concerned. For he denounced the now common reading of Matthew 28:19 as spurious. (Remember that he was a Trinitarian!). According to Eusebius Matthew’s actual words were : “All power is given unto me in heaven and upon earth. Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptising them in my name.”

11. For collateral evidence on this point see Appendix C.

**APPENDIX C
SPECIMEN OF EUSEBIUS**

“But the rest of the apostles, who had been incessantly plotted against, with a view to their destruction, and had been driven out of the land of Judea, went unto all nations to preach the gospel, relying upon the power of Christ, who had said to them, “go ye and make disciples of all the nations in my name’.” (Int. Crit. Comm. (Matthew) p. 307). (Eusebius Church History, ch. 5, v. 2. [B’ham. Reference Lib. 108031]).

**APPENDIX D
EVIDENCE OF DOCTORS YOUNG AND PEAKE**

1. Dr. Robert Young in his Literal Translation of the Bible inserts in parentheses (to indicate doubtful origin) the following phrase “baptising them to the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all, whatever I did command you.” But he does not state his reasons for showing the phrase to be of doubtful origin.

2. Dr. Peake says “The command to baptise into the threefold name is a late doctrinal expansion. Instead of the words “baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost” we should probably read simply “into My Name.”

**APPENDIX E
THE BAPTISM OF THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH. Acts 8:39**

The Alexandrian MS. Reads, “And when they were come up out of the water the Holy Spirit fell on the eunuch, and an angel of the Lord caught away Philip that the eunuch saw him no more. And he went on his way rejoicing.”

It is submitted that the above is the correct reading because:

(a) Copyists fall into the error of missing out phrases through inadvertence. This is a recognised fact in textual criticism. Every typist of this age is well aware of this danger.

(b) If the Holy Spirit fell on the eunuch he would indeed go on his way rejoicing, but if not in view of all that had happened at Samaria, of which Philip would have spoken, having just left the place, the place where because none had received the Spirit Peter and John had travelled from Jerusalem in order to pray for them to receive the Spirit, then the eunuch would have been left in an unhappy state of mind.

APPENDIX F

The Revised Version reads: “baptising them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.”

(1) As, however, will be seen by the section “The Object of Baptism,” and by the rest of scripture, the utmost limit to which we can at present be conveyed is into the Lord Jesus Christ.

(2) The Lord said: “I am in My Father, and ye in Me,” John 14: 20. Not until the Thousand Years have passed, and the Lord, Jesus Christ returns His “Kingdom to God even the Father” (1 Corinthians 15:24-2, shall God be “all in all.” Till then we may not aspire to be “in the Father.”

(3) It appears to be quite beyond possibility to be baptised “into the name of the holy spirit.” Spirit is not a person, nor is holy spirit, and has no “proper” name. Holy spirit is given to a believer; he should be filled with it, and from him it should abundantly proceed as rivers of living water.

APPENDIX G
ON DETAILS IN SYMBOLIC ACTION

1. What we think is of no account when the Will of God has been stated. (Obedience to the will of God saved Noah; the use of their common sense destroyed the rest).
2. It is not to be expected that we should understand everything; for God's thoughts are much higher than ours (Isaiah 55:8, 9).
3. Obedience to the details of any symbolic action is important.
 - a) Caan's offering lacked blood and was rejected.
 - b) The Sabbath stick-gatherer forfeited his life.
 - c) Uzza, by touching the Ark, lost his life.

Maybe God was displeased because they marred the portrait in type of the Son of His Love; as to (a) His atonement by blood; (b) His millennial rest and (c) His chosen ones.

Anyhow, all the symbolic actions demanded by God are related to life: thus –

- (a) There was victory when Joshua pointed his spear (Joshua 8:18,19).
- (b) Only three victories were given to Joash when he struck the ground but 'thrice (2 Kings 13:19, 25).
- (c) The Passover Lamb must be without blemish (Exodus 12:5) even as was Christ* if the household were to be preserved from the Destroying Angel.

4. Now both the Lord's Supper and water Baptism are symbolic acts, and the principle here stated applies to those two ordinances. The principle is that any deviation from the divinely-appointed symbol arouses the displeasure of God.

[*Ponder, the use of unleavened bread at the Last Supper, the symbol of sincerity and truth]

A.H.Broughton

THE CLEAN FLESH HERESY AGAIN

MAGAZINE "BIBLE SEARCHER AND WITNESS"

Edited by Peter Reekie

The above subject has appeared in the magazine "Bible Searcher & Witness" and sent to us by a friend who when reflecting on the false and unscriptural accusations levelled against the community unjustly labelled by Robert Roberts "Renunciationists" and "Clean Flesh Heretics", together with the lowest form of denigration of the nature of Jesus it could muster in various expressions applicable only to men of corrupt minds and destitute of the Faith, he (our friend) thought the writer of such anti-Christian irresponsible statements and misrepresentations, was not worth the repetition of the answers which have been made continually and in various letters and pamphlets during the past forty years or more.

However, though agreeing with our friend, I thought about it and concluded that if the Almighty Creator of all things had condescended to my level and imparted to me an unassailable knowledge and understanding of the doctrine of the Atonement essential to salvation then I in turn, and on the teaching of Jesus to love my enemies, should do so in the form of an effort to enlighten the opposition to the true facts of the case.

The writer whose initials are G.T. appear at the end of his discourse gives the impression that he knows all there is to know about the Suffolk Street division and also the "Clean Flesh" heresy so-called, but I am confident that most of what he says is based on hearsay, inability to read the scriptures with discrimination,

and accepting without question or examination that which Dr Thomas and Robert Roberts wrote was the truth and in harmony with the inspired scriptures.

In appealing to his readers to get back to the writings of Dr Thomas and R.Roberts one would think that they had explained the most important and profound subject of God's dealing with man's salvation, namely the Atonement, which Paul says was the first thing he received by revelation from Jesus Christ and consequently delivered as a priority to the Corinthians. (See 1 Corinthians 15:3). So it would be absolutely logical and right to say that the members of the Corinthian ecclesia were all in unity of understanding the doctrine of the Atonement and that Paul delivered only one version of its meaning. In view therefore of the appeal that has gone out for unity in the Christadelphian divided communities of North America in the form of a referendum it is very strange that I should have before me a pamphlet by six named members of its steering committee, where under the heading "Appraisal of Current Situation" they make five important comments and admissions; Number 4, "There are some views that are indeed contrary to scripture."

But Number 1 is what I want to draw attention to in connection with what I said of the one version of the Atonement delivered by Paul to the Corinthians. It reads as follows: - "There are certainly doctrinal differences among Christadelphians. For example, there is a considerable range of views on the Atonement within both fellowships. However, it is unrealistic to expect that every person would have an identical understanding of this profound subject." (end of quote)

Is it so unrealistic if you profess the very gospel that Paul preached to the Jews and Gentiles? Did not Paul remonstrate with the Galatian converts in removing themselves from him that called them into the grace of Christ to a perverted gospel? Was Paul unrealistic in expecting them to remain faithful to the gospel which was the one and only power of God unto salvation to everyone that believed it?

Is it not a fact that the pioneers of Christadelphia never reached a complete understanding of the gospel as preached by Paul as a result of misunderstanding and misinterpretation in many places. We find do we not, that the real kernel of the gospel, i.e. the Atonement, has been set aside in preference for the promises to Abraham of the land of Canaan, the teaching of the Kingship of Christ and establishment of the kingdom of God on earth with Christ as King and immersion on belief of the promises to Abraham to become his seed, with the significance of immersions into the death of Christ by this immersion in water being left to all sorts of conjecture and versions of men.

It should not be expected that there would be unity on such a basis, but in the true ecclesia of Christ it is expected and must be on the foundation laid which is Jesus Christ. And who is this Jesus Christ? He is the Son of God who was of like nature as Adam and ourselves and gave His life in the blood as the ransom price for all who by the offence of one were legally dead and alienated from God. It was just prior to Edward Turney's lecture on this matter that the Christadelphian community was in a state of Apostasy regarding Adam's sin and its consequences, John Thomas and Robert Roberts contradicting one another in their written works but neither being clear in their understanding of the most important issues, their attacks on Adam's conduct being directed against his flesh, instead of his ability to be obedient in character and wilfully disobeying God. Thus was brought about in the Christadelphian community the apostate doctrine of Rome, called Original Sin, whereby condemnation of the flesh was substituted for condemnation of sin – the changed flesh doctrine, which Dr Thomas and R.Roberts originally rejected as having no scriptural evidence.

MM This also presented them with a dilemma because if the flesh was defiled and in the words of R.Roberts "unclean" as a physical quality, then the flesh of Jesus would be unclean also; so one error begets another and thus a true understanding of Paul's doctrine of the Atonement was never reached by Dr Thomas or Robert Roberts.

However, not all had been accepting all that had been preached or written by Dr Thomas and R. Roberts with all due respect to both. God only accepts those who are reconciled to Him through the blood of Christ and its atoning power – The Way, The Truth and The Life. The Roberts version was not The Way as was proved when Edward Turney came on the scene after much prayerful study while a member of this confused community.

“Unclean flesh” is not a scriptural term in the physical sense, neither “Clean flesh”, these two terms were inventions of Dr Thomas and R.Roberts; Edward Turney never believed in either terms as a physical quality, neither did he teach either in his lecture on “The Sacrifice of Christ”. Copies of this excellent lecture are available without charge to anyone who may be interested. One thing Edward Turney did teach was the meaning of “clean” and “unclean” as used in reference to sacrificial animals in legal terms of Divine Law from Adam to Moses and from Moses to the fulfilment in Jesus Christ, and that only the clean were acceptable though their flesh was identical, so that Christ could only be the Antitype or true substance of the clean types and shadows. Under His Law God defined what was clean and unclean even of animals of the same species but it had nothing to do with their mental capacities; even so with Jesus, the True Antitype Lamb of God, it was not His character that was sacrificed as a Ransom Price, but His natural life in the blood; a life unforfeited to sin in exchange for a life forfeited by Adam. The latter is what Edward Turney meant by the term “free life” and which Robert Roberts said was a myth, but the myth is “Clean Flesh”; a term never used of the flesh of Jesus or of any other man. The accusation by R.Roberts against E.Turney was therefore libellous. Turney never taught “clean flesh” neither have any of his supporters who carried on his excellent expositions of the Atonement. I speak of course for those who are today known as the Nazarene Fellowship.

It is no surprise to me that G.T. is continuing to use the same libellous statements as R. Roberts did and using the same quotations wrested out of their context from 1 John 2:22, and it is very apparent to me that when he reads the bible it is with the indoctrinated and biased mind he has obtained through Robert Roberts, because never when I was a Christadelphian did I ever think or believe that John was speaking about the physical nature of Christ as being sinful and unclean but that there were people, probably Jews who did not believe that the Messiah had come and their leaders had killed the Prince of Life – that what John and his fellow disciples were teaching was not a fiction of their imagination, that Jesus was only living to them in this way, but that Messiah had come in flesh and blood nature like themselves and to teach or say that He had not come physically was anti-Christ, a spirit and not of God.

The Bishop of Durham has recently implied in his confusing reasoning that the resurrection of Jesus was not of his physical body but that His teaching and personality was still alive in the hearts of His followers and this is what the resurrection of Jesus consisted of. Perhaps he could see that the necessity of a bodily resurrection would destroy the false but popular doctrine of the immortality of the soul. It is highly probable that Robert Roberts thought that Edward Turney was about to steal his popularity and falsely accused him even to the extent of misusing 1 John 2:22 out of context to this end, but this was far from Edward Turney’s mind as the following quotation from page 55 of his lecture will prove; “Now then I put down a public challenge to discuss three or four nights before you all when I return. (I repeat it. Mr Roberts did not accept it). I hope Mr Roberts will be better informed on the scheme of redemption before I return, for instead of publicly debating the question it would be far more profitable to go round the country helping him set it forth. But so long as he is hostile, it will be war to the last. I never give in when I feel sure I am the right.”

The Chairman’s remarks after the confusion caused by the loud shouting of Robert Roberts can be read on the next page and his conclusions did not favour the case of Mr Roberts by virtue of the fact of contradictions in his writings proving his theory to be false. And now I say that anyone who says that the Nazarene Fellowship believe or teach that Jesus had a nature different from other men, has never read Edward Turney’s lecture or any of our literature, or on the other hand has been misinformed and consequently is promulgating this false libellous charge to the detriment of those people who may be sincerely seeking truth.

It is a proven fact that evidence exists in the writings of present day Christadelphians that Jesus was not of the same or exact nature as ourselves – but that He was a Hybrid, part human and part Divine in nature, or he could not have gained the victory that it is impossible for other men to do. This is the result of Christadelphians following R.Roberts in accepting the apostate doctrine of Rome – “Original Sin,” “defiled flesh, “condemned nature” and of course the “Sinful flesh” term which is not in Paul’s writings, but should be correctly rendered “Sin’s flesh” denoting ownership not physical quality. This was Edward Turney’s teaching and contention, that if Jesus had come in “Sin’s flesh”, that is, with Sin’s claim upon Him, His mission would have been impossible in God’s purpose of redemption and forgiveness; He would have been as much without strength as all mankind, hence Paul’s use of the term “likeness” in Romans 8:3. It made all

the difference especially if the unscriptural term “sinful flesh” is omitted from Paul’s statement and the correct term “Sin’s flesh” used. Even Dr Thomas and Mr Roberts have been quoted as using the latter correct term but resorting to the incorrect one when trying to put over the condemned flesh theory.

G.T. continues his misrepresentation by resorting to lies and deceit and I quote, “They affirm that no defiling element entered into Adam’s flesh as a result of his sin and that we being the progeny of Adam, have the same flesh which is, they say clean.” The last three words is what they do not say, but that his very good nature in which he was created as a natural corruptible being remained unaltered, and this was also stated by both Dr Thomas and Robert Roberts before 1873 when G.T. is apparently convinced that even at that time Thomas and Roberts had the truth.

For the benefit of those people whom G.T. says could be deceived by what we affirm and that this places those in the right as dishonouring Christ; and leads the unwary into the worship of a false Christ, and those who believe in it to lose the whole Truth”, I will quote both Dr Thomas and R.Roberts statements made prior to 1873 and supporting Edward Turney’s teaching as denied by Mr Roberts. These statements were made as a result of a certain person seeking baptism and fellowship with them on the basis of a doctrine which is now the very basis of belief and fellowship with modern Christadelphia of which G.T. and Peter Reekie are members, this doctrine is that Adam’s nature was changed by the introduction of a physical element which defiled and became a physical law of his being and transmissible to his progeny. Now compare this with the following remarks of John Thomas and Robert Roberts:- “We believe that the change was moral not physical” (“Dr Thomas in Herald of the Kingdom page 159). “Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he transgressed. There is no evidence of this whatsoever, and the presumption and evidence are entirely contrary. There was a change in Adam’s relation to his Maker, but not in the nature of his organisation,” (Ambassador, March 1869). Obviously these statements contradict Clause 5 of the BASF. Edward Turney proved the statements true, we also do the same, how can G.T. direct people to read the writings of the pioneers and yet describe those people who are in agreement with their true evidence of scripture as liars, deceivers, anti-christ void of the Spirit of God? We have a greater authority on this subject than Thomas, Roberts, or Turney, this authority is the man about whom G.T. is unwarrantably making all the fuss in his gross ignorance and inability to discriminate and keep to the context when reading the scriptures. It is no use talking or writing about the subject of sin unless one keeps in mind the context which is law – for where no law is there is no transgression. Adam realised this and his conscience was defiled in the knowledge that he had transgressed Divine Law while in the nature in which he was first created and it was in this very nature that Jesus was born and by perfect conduct showed it was possible for Adam to have been obedient and thereby He (Jesus) condemned sin while in the likeness of the very same nature which transgressed.

I think this answers Dr Thomas’ bewilderment, “How could sin be condemned in the nature of Jesus if it did not exist there? I think I have shown that it did not and could not exist in Jesus or anyone else as a physical element – sin is abstract as Jesus the authority I appeal to will show.

Like G.T. the scribes and Pharisees regarded the importance of physical cleansing of the flesh more than the operation of the word of God upon the mind and Jesus reminded them that what proceeded from within their minds would cause defilement by their outward actions, and not what they ate. As he says of them, “Even so ye outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.” (Matthew 23:28).

Also in regard to disrespect of Divine Law he says that from their hearts proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornication, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.” (Matthew 15:18-20). Men are indeed capable of these evils even as they are capable of refraining from them, so that they cannot be said to be a fixation of evil in the flesh as a result of Adam’s sin or of a change of his nature seeing he was created with the will and power of obedience as in equal measure, for disobedience.

This G.T. cannot or will not accept, not even from Jesus. He insists they already exist as elements of the flesh whereas they are impossible, as we have said, without law. Adam could not have sinned if law had not been introduced. We have shown that G.T. and Robertsite followers of the present time do not accept the earlier writings of the pioneers, substantiating the evidence of scripture that human nature has never been

changed. They are not therefore justified in equating changed defiled nature with the nature of the first Adam and neither could a just God relate them in any way to the sin committed by the first Adam seeing he was different in nature. So the Robertsites have produced a second Adam, because no evidence of a second Adam could be found by Dr Thomas or R.Roberts prior to 1871.

G.T. in most degrading phrases in application to the nature of Jesus one of which, “inordinate affection”, the Editor, Peter Reekie saw fit to modify to “passion” from the Revised Version, equates Jesus with their second Adam with this changed flesh. Paul on the other hand chooses, and rightly so, to equate Jesus and the first Adam in their relationship to the Creator as both being Sons of God, so does all inspired scripture, Adam by creation of the dust and energised by the breath of life, and Jesus by begetting from the identical nature also energised and dependent on the breath of life. Unfortunately Adam by disobedience forfeited his right to the term direct son of God and became dependant on God for redemption and forgiveness, this demanded the production of one who was not in this alienated position and He came in the person of another Son of God directly related and not in the alienated position - One with the Father. This is not the Christadelphian view, though at times they support it without being aware of doing so. John Carter supported our view and was fully aware of doing so, but he could not accept the outcome. The Christadelphian view is that Jesus was the same in flesh and relationship as all other Jews who were the subjects of typical redemption from Adamic alienation and bondage, yet in his own words he proved this to be untrue by stating the difference between his relationship to God and theirs while He was among them and before His death had even taken place (see Matthew 12:47-50), “Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto them that told him, Who is my mother? And who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother.” What further proof do Christadelphians need than this? Proof from Jesus Himself that He was never the son of Adam but ever Son of God from birth? That they which desire to call Him Brother must first become Sons of God in the prescribed way; this of course by covenant relationship and acknowledgment of the Spirit of the Law in the types appointed and pointing to Christ who in shedding His blood would confirm the promises made to the fathers (before the Mosaic Law was constituted).

This is the Jesus we believe in – One who needed not redemption as other man but who by His life acquired directly from the Father, yet in His veins, as the blood of all humans flows, He was free to pour out His life unto death for us. This certainly is a different Jesus Christ to the one G.T. describes and most Christadelphians who follow Mr. Roberts, and I am afraid theirs is of little strength for salvation. The Nazarene Fellowship are completely honest in their handling of scripture and in quoting accurately but I notice G.T. in quoting Hebrews 7:27 leaves out a very important word, “first” in order to mislead his readers in the event that they might notice that a person who has offered first for his own sins had nothing left to offer in that he had in fact already offered himself by shedding his own blood. This is the very deceit of which he falsely accuses those he calls errorists. It is a fact that this chapter has been used continually by Christadelphians in an attempt to prove their false doctrine that Jesus died for Himself, but it actually proves the very opposite, firstly that He was the victim and secondly that He was not a Priest. This is confirmed in the very Epistle to Hebrews 8:4. I think I have dwelt perhaps rather too long on the exposition of the truth in comparison with history and the errors and mistakes of the past inherited by the various divisions of Christadelphia, but I must refer to G.T.’s remarks about Suffolk Street ecclesia He states they believe in partial inspiration of the Bible but I have it from a reliable source that this was an unjust accusation again of which Mr Roberts was responsible in 1885 not being content with his misrepresentation and false accusation of “Clean Flesh” against Edward Turney.

In attacking Suffolk Street fellowship it is difficult to conceive why Mr Roberts and his followers should accept and teach a doctrine that is not in the inspired scriptures of the prophets of the old covenant and it was to these scriptures that Peter referred as inspired not to the New Testament where for a simple example the term “Sinful Flesh” is incorrect as Greek scholars are all agreed it should be “sin’s flesh” which makes all the difference in understanding the teaching of Paul in Romans 8. G.T.’s reference to belief in “Non pre-baptismal Responsibility” is not as bad as he tries to make it and the only difference we find in their view and ours is that the Nazarene Fellowship believe that responsibility comes upon true enlightenment to the need for redemption from Adamic alienation, through the sacrifice of Christ and not at

and after baptism; for it is possible that the enlightened might reject or decline to take the important step necessary in demonstration of faith in the salvation offered.

True we do not become servants of God until baptised, nevertheless we are responsible when enlightened although Sin's servants, because the way to freedom in Christ has been shown and offered. Therefore we are responsible if we neglect so great salvation. Seeing then that I have shown "Clean Flesh" to be non-existent as a physical quality, a myth of Mr Roberts, and that the Apostle Paul says God hath made of one blood all nations, it is impossible for G.T. to use the following derogatory remarks against us, i.e. "The most God-dishonouring, truth denying, moral corrupting of them all "Clean Flesh"! I say to G.T. again, Mr Turney did not use the term in reference to the physical flesh of Christ neither the opposite term, he needed neither and neither do we in preaching the one true gospel of salvation. So it belongs to G.T. and those others of our accusers and we therefore present them with it.

G.T. continues his accusations by saying that we "seek by our doctrine to place those in the right as dishonouring Christ." I am afraid he does that very well without us, and we know that no one who is in the right can be or would dishonour Christ, but at least we do not teach a dual Christ by separating His flesh from His character; the former unclean, sinful, devilish and satanic nature in every respect. Yet we are considered devilish for being the victims of R.Roberts' libellous accusations of teaching a "myth" of his own invention. It is evident G.T. does not understand the 'error' he is supposed to be combating, but we agree with him where he says "our Lord overcame the impulses of the flesh (if he means unlawful) all His life through." But his further statement "If we hold on tightly to this truth we will never be taken in by the "Clean Flesh" errorists – whatever we understand the error or no. However to understand it gives the necessary armament to destroy it which it is our duty to do" is the most puzzling and peculiar illogical statement he could make.

There is now a sect calling themselves "The Remnant of Christ's Ecclesia" influence by W.G.Butterfield (England) and J.A.Defries (USA) who, in a booklet entitled "Are Christadelphians Astray?" give their history and causes of the many divisions and in assuming that Dr Thomas had the whole truth, which he did not, closing their eyes to his errors, maintain that all other but themselves are apostate. Their misrepresentation of Edward Turney is as false as G.T.'s and as misleading to people seeking the truth, for their teaching embodies the same false theories that Jesus had sin in His flesh and had to die for Himself. They say that Turney's failure was in exalting his own opinion of the nature of Christ, but this is not true, for as I have shown, he supported the original scriptural view of Dr Thomas and R.Roberts, and it was Robert Roberts who rejected the scriptural views advanced in the Herald of the Kingdom and in The Ambassador 1869 and Christadelphia in general have accepted the Robertsite apostasy and consequently the doctrine of Rome and in fact worse in regard to the nature of man. Edward Turney never denied the truth concerning the name of Jesus Christ neither do we his supporters. Through the scriptures we honour Him as He was honoured by His Father, the Robertsites including the Remnant" wrest the scriptures from their context in every way they can to describe the false theory of human nature being changed to a sin-contaminated polluted flesh incapable of obedience to God's requirements.

Read Edward Turney's Lecture, read Nazarene Fellowship literature and you will not be able to charge Edward Turney or the Nazarene Fellowship with error or undermining the truth of the Gospel. What the Remnant fear and what G.T. fears is the undermining of their own false conception and lies in the name of the Lord, as a result of not being able to read the Bible with discrimination and sincere desire for the faith once delivered to the saints. E. Turney and the Nazarene Fellowship are not an offshoot of Christadelphia; it is a distinct body of people found in isolation in all parts of the world who are ready always to give to everyone that asks a reason of the hope within them with meekness and fear, difficult as this is when contending with these false accusers. R.Roberts found he could not misrepresent E.Turney when facing him in the Temperance Hall so he did it by libel in his article "The Slain Lamb" and it is still being done by G.T., the Remnant and others.

I am not afraid to sign my full name. In the true service of the Father. Philip Parry. 2nd December 1987.