

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 276

4th Quarter 2016

Contents

Page	1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page	4	“SOON”	Poem
Page	4	Pearls of Wisdom	Brother Ernest Brady
Page	5	You Have Been Warned	Sister J.A.French
Page	9	Behold What Manner of Love	Brother Phil Parry
Page	10	The Church of The Living God	Brother J. Cameron
Page	13	You Can Burn This in Ten Seconds	Brother Ernest Brady
Page	17	Some say Jesus body was unclean...	Brother Russell Gregory
Page	17	From Adam Clarkes Bible Commentary	
Page	18	Difficulties With Character	from Golden Hour
Page	19	Free Life in The Bible	
Page	19	The Father and Son	Brother William Ellis

Editorial

PROMISES

Dear Friends, Brethren, Sisters,

There was a time when the Israelites were God’s chosen people to whom He gave laws and commandments which they must keep if they were to remain His and in return He promised to dwell with them and reign over them in peace and prosperity. The Old Testament tells the story of what happened; how they prospered while obedient to all the good moral rules God gave them, and of their sufferings for their dire failures.

All started very well; “Moses came and told the people all the words of the LORD and all the judgments. And all the people answered with one voice and said, ‘All the words which the LORD has said we will do’.” (Exodus 24:2 & 3). This included the righteous laws as well as ordinances regarding how they should form a priesthood and worship God acceptably also they must keep certain festivals as a frequent and continual reminder of His greatness and goodness as their Ruler.

The nation of Israel had a great leader in Moses for “the LORD spoke to Moses face to face, as a man speaks to his friend” (Exodus 34:11) and Moses was their go-between, so whenever problems had to be put right or important decisions had to be made, Moses would seek God’s guidance and tell the people.

In these early days God gave them important promises through Moses to encourage their faithfulness such as we read in Deuteronomy 28:1 to 8, - “Now it shall come to pass, if you diligently obey the voice of the LORD your God, to observe carefully all His commandments which I command you today, that the LORD your God will set you high above all nations of the earth. And all these blessings shall come upon you and overtake you, because you obey the voice of the LORD your God: Blessed shall you be in the city, and blessed shall you be in the country. Blessed shall be the fruit of your body, the produce of your ground and the increase of your herds, the increase of your cattle and the offspring of your flocks. Blessed shall be your basket and your kneading bowl. Blessed shall you be when you come in, and blessed shall you be

when you go out. The LORD will cause your enemies who rise against you to be defeated before your face; they shall come out against you one way and flee before you seven ways. The LORD will command the blessing on you in your storehouses and in all to which you set your hand, and He will bless you in the land which the LORD your God is giving you.”

The extraordinary list of blessing goes on and such promises as these were repeated again and again so there could be no doubt as to their meaning and importance with such reassurance.

Conversely, God counselled them of grave consequence should they fail to do all they had promised. The same chapter from Deuteronomy goes on to list His warnings - “But it shall come to pass, if you do not obey the voice of the LORD your God, to observe carefully all His commandments and His statutes which I command you today, that all these curses will come upon you and overtake you: cursed shall you be in the city, and cursed shall you be in the country. Cursed shall be your basket and your kneading bowl. Cursed shall be the fruit of your body and the produce of your land, the increase of your cattle and the offspring of your flocks. Cursed shall you be when you come in, and cursed shall you be when you go out. The LORD will send on you cursing, confusion, and rebuke in all that you set your hand to do, until you are destroyed and until you perish quickly, because of the wickedness of your doings in which you have forsaken Me. The LORD will make the plague cling to you until He has consumed you from the land which you are going to possess. The LORD will strike you with consumption, with fever, with inflammation, with severe burning fever, with the sword, with scorching, and with mildew; they shall pursue you until you perish. And your heavens which are over your head shall be bronze, and the earth which is under you shall be iron...” and so these warnings go on and on for about 20 more verses to the end of the chapter.

Sure enough it was not long before a few people thought they knew better and did not want to do as they were told. We will not go to any great lengths here nor mention any particular events but to give a broad outline only. Punishments followed disobedience and though early on the majority of the nation sought God, as time went by more and more rebelled and more and more suffered for their rebellion until God called them a “rebellious nation.”

After nearly a 1,000 years the prophet Ezekiel was sent to them and in chapter 2, of his book, verses 3 to 5, we read, “And He (The Lord) said to me: Son of man, I am sending you to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation that has rebelled against Me; they and their fathers have transgressed against Me to this very day. For they are impudent and stubborn children. I am sending you to them, and you shall say to them, ‘Thus says the Lord GOD.’ As for them, whether they hear or whether they refuse - for they are a rebellious house—yet they will know that a prophet has been among them.” Israel, as God’s special people were trying His patience to the extreme and now we read of Him giving them over to be ruled by the nations around them; first by the Babylonians, and so we read God’s message to their last king, again through Ezekiel in chapter 21, verses 25 to 27, “Now to you, O profane, wicked prince of Israel, whose day has come, whose iniquity shall end, thus says the Lord GOD: Remove the turban, and take off the crown; Nothing shall remain the same. Exalt the humble, and humble the exalted. Overthrown, overthrown, I will make it overthrown! It shall be no longer, until He comes whose right it is, and I will give it to Him.”

It had been a sad story of failure after nearly a century during which time God made so many appeals to them through the prophets but to little avail; yet He still made promises of hope for those few who would listen. For the next 600 years the land was occupied by conquering nations though the Israelites, whether remaining in their land or taken as slaves into surrounding nations were able, for the most part to keep their identity intact.

And now the greatest promise of all time was fulfilled - Jesus came to Israel! At this time they were ruled over by the Romans and although they had a king he was not of their nation but an Edomite chosen by Rome. Jesus was born in Bethlehem as foretold in the Old Testament; He was taken into Egypt as Mary and Joseph were warned by an angel; they returned to Nazareth and Jesus became known as a Nazarene – as foretold in the Old Testament; it is said there are about 100 prophecies in the Old Testament relating to Jesus’ birth, and there are lots more relating to His life, His preaching and His death and resurrection. Again there many yet more foretelling of His return as King over the whole earth. And all God’s prophecies are promises and many hundreds of them have been fulfilled.

One of the best known quotations of Jesus regarding Himself is to be found in John's gospel record where we read at verse 16 of chapter 3, "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." But the following five verses are interesting for they tell of Jesus work in preaching – "For God did not send His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He who believes in Him is not condemned; but he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For everyone practicing evil hates the light and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be exposed. But he who does the truth comes to the light, that his deeds may be clearly seen, that they have been done in God."

Since the re-establishment of the nation of Israel in 1948 they have not trusted in God but in their own capacity to defend themselves and have an extraordinary confidence in their own abilities to face any attack from their surrounding enemies who wish to wipe them off the face of the earth. There is also an increasing hostility from most of the nations of the world, yet they continue to trust in themselves. All this was foretold through the prophet Ezekiel in chapter 38 verse 8, "In the latter years thou (the enemy, which will be a confederacy of nations) shalt come into the land that is brought back from the sword, and is gathered out of many people, against the mountains of Israel, which have been always waste: but it is brought forth out of the nations, and they shall dwell safely (or, confidently) all of them. Thou shalt ascend and come like a storm, thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land, thou, and all thy bands, and many people with thee. Thus saith the Lord GOD; It shall also come to pass, that at the same time shall things come into thy mind, and thou shalt think an evil thought: and thou shalt say, I will go up to the land of unwalled villages; I will go to them that are at rest, that dwell safely (or confidently), all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates, to take a spoil, and to take a prey; to turn thine hand upon the desolate places that are now inhabited, and upon the people that are gathered out of the nations, which have gotten cattle and goods, that dwell in the midst of the land. Sheba, and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? Hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey, to carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil?"

The question is not, will it happen, but, when will it happen? We have the answer if we look at Jesus' words recorded in Matthew 24:4 - 14, "And Jesus answered and said to them: Take heed that no one deceives you. For many will come in My name, saying, I am the Christ, and will deceive many. And you will hear of wars and rumours of wars. See that you are not troubled; for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. And there will be famines, pestilences, and earthquakes in various places. All these are the beginning of sorrows. Then they will deliver you up to tribulation and kill you, and you will be hated by all nations for My name's sake. And then many will be offended, will betray one another, and will hate one another. Then many false prophets will rise up and deceive many. And because lawlessness will abound, the love of many will grow cold. But he who endures to the end shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in all the world as a witness to all the nations, and then the end will come." Again, the Apostles were preaching the same message and in Acts 2:17 to 21, we read the words of Peter, - "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy: and I will shew wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke: The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and notable day of the Lord come: and it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Let Jesus have the last word - Mark 13:19 to 23, "For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be. And except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days. And then if any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ; or, lo, he is there; believe him not: for false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect. But take ye heed: behold, I have foretold you all things.

With love in Jesus to all our readers. Russell Gregory

SOON.

I know not if He comes at eve,
Or night, or morn, or noon;
I know the breeze of twilight grey
That fans the cheek of dying day,
Doth ever whisper - soon:

I know not why our souls should doubt
His promise to appear,
When every flower's opening eye
Looks up into the changing sky.
And seems to murmur - near''

I know not round his blessed feet
What peerless glories throng;
I only know from rending tomb
The good shall burst, in beauty's bloom;
And faith assures - not long!

I know not if his chariot wheels
Yet near or distant are;
I only know each thunder-roll
Doth wake an echo in my soul,
That saith - not very far!

I know not if we long must wait
The summer of his smile;
I only know that hope doth sweep
With thrilling touch my heart-strings deep,
And sings - a little while!

I know not on this glorious theme
Why lips so oft are dumb;
I only know the saddened earth
Will flush with beauty and with mirth
At sound of "Lo, I come."

Prophetic Times.

*And the angel said unto them,
"Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."*

Luke 2:10.

Pearls of wisdom

"As I live, saith the Lord GOD, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die?" Ezekiel 33:11.

God is not particularly concerned about inflicting punishment on sinners – His purpose is to turn them from their evil ways in order that they may live, and this is why He has chosen to regard them as debtors. They owe that which they cannot pay without perishing, and indeed if God dealt with us as the sinners we are, He might justly blot us out of existence. But in His forbearance, choosing not to mark iniquity but to

exercise mercy, we are required to recognise that our life is something to which we are not properly entitled and that it is only because that God Himself has provided One who had in His own possession the wherewithal, and because that One determined of His own freewill to use His wealth to pay the debt we owe, that we can be delivered from the bondage into which we are born.

This is, of course, an abstract concept and its purpose is to develop in the minds of those to whom it is made known, that faith which can appreciate that while God is pleased to show mercy, He chooses at the same time to uphold the supreme principles of justice and law. This is what the offer of salvation through the atoning sacrifice of Christ is able to accomplish.

Brother Ernest Brady.

YOU HAVE BEEN WARNED!

**Three Letters from a Sister to John Carter,
Editor of The Christadelphian magazine - and His Reply**

Abertillery. June 1st 1945

Dear Brother Carter,

Greetings. I have read your article in the June Christadelphian entitled "Blind Leaders" and I wonder why you do not apply the same to your leaders, both living and dead, as you must know as well as I do that your literature and the Statement of Faith contains errors. It is only in the last few months that this has been brought to my notice and it has caused me mental agony to think that what I have loved and defended for 30 years was shattered; my resignation has been sent in and no doubt, you have been acquainted of the fact.

Now, Brother Carter, in all sincerity and humility, I ask you, are you out to teach pure doctrine, or defend the literature that has been put into your trust? I told you long ago that it needed revising, but then I did not know to what extent it was wrong or the seriousness of the errors. It would be a costly matter, no doubt, but if it was done the funds would be forthcoming and the many divisions that are taking place would be avoided. There has been plenty of literature sent round to open the eyes of honest brethren, though many like the Recording brother here, do not want the Truth and boast that they burn it unread. Another Recording brother I know put it out of sight, fearing trouble in the ecclesia; I myself have been warned against it by many, but after reading some of it I was soon convinced that I have been following errors. We who are Bible readers and love Truth have more understanding than our teachers because they will not humble themselves and be taught.

In my final letter of resignation I said that I had much to thank the Christadelphian's for "on the material side of the Kingdom," but they are astray on the nature of Christ and His sacrifice and resurrection; I received no reply - only withdrawal.

What a responsibility lies at the door of the leaders of Christadelphians who defend errors and make no effort to correct them; they are the "Blind leaders of the blind," and there can be no hope for them if they persist in false doctrine and teaching of lies.

Please excuse my plainness of speech but I feel very anxious for the "Blind Followers;" I have been one myself for 30 years, but I thank God that my eyes have been opened and I pray that others may be also. How I wish that you would read some of these booklets that deal with the real errors in the Christadelphian works and then you might be able to lead the divided body to unity in the Truth, even in Christ who is The Truth.

Believe me, yours faithfully, Mrs J.A.French.

* * * * *

Dear Brother Carter,

Abertillery. July 2nd 1945

Greetings; you did not reply to my letter of June 1st - and yet I think it has influenced the writers of some of the articles in the July "Christadelphian."

First, may I state that the pamphlets you so object to are sent out in love and sympathy to enlighten the sincere followers of Christ and help them to see that in Christadelphian writings they are embracing many errors. But instead of studying what they say - or answering them, you and the other leaders pronounce them heresy and the writers heretics. Even Nicodemus was wiser than you: "Doth our law judge any man before it hear him?" (John 7:51). You judge and condemn publicly in your magazine, yet you neither quote what they say nor try to refute it. Even Brother Islip Collyer speaks of the question as strife about words, but he does not name the pamphlet or the writer, nor does he quote the words which he says cause the strife. It would be more honourable to quote the words and explain, or if possible, refute them, before he condemns. Let us hear both sides of the argument. I have now studied it for myself and instead of it being strife about words, it is an earnest contention for pure doctrine; there is faith and faith.

You have preached to others that their doctrines are wrong and expect to be heard, but you will not listen when the errors in Christadelphian works are pointed out. Many will say of Islip Collyer's letter No. 31, "Good, it will silence those who differ." A year ago I should have agreed to all he said, but I am wiser now; the majority of Christadelphians are so biased by their upbringing and associations that they cannot see the simple truth.

At the end of last year a Yorkshire brother sent me "The Resurrection and Judgement of The Saints," by Wm. Richmond and said in his letter, "Truth sees no lion in the path, and many up North believe in the incorruptible resurrection that Wm. Richmond taught, but will not confess it, fearing excommunication;" so I read the booklet and sent for more. I received a selection of pamphlets from Birmingham, and to my surprise they were from those we call "the clean flesh people." I fought for months until I had to give in; they were right; Christadelphians were wrong. I sent some to Sister Houlston, of Ludlow, and she, being more intelligent and with her experience in writing in the Testimony and for the Isolation League, decided in four weeks, while I had been four months, and we were both baptized the same day last May.

Oh that we had known before; but we have always been warned not to read these pamphlets and have trusted too much in our leaders, who we now realize hold "the unclean flesh heresy." If you do away with that it will remove many errors and give you a clean and spotless Christ "who needeth not daily, as other high priests, to offer up sacrifice for himself" (Hebrews 7:27) for He was "holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners" (verse 26) and "in him is no sin" (1 John 3:5); "he did no sin" (1 Peter 2:22).

It is only Christadelphians who say He benefited from His own sacrifice, but in that case it would be no sacrifice. "He was cut off, but not for himself" (Daniel 9:26). He was cut off for "the sin of the world;" "the scripture hath concluded all under sin" (Galatians 3:22).

With all the education, literary talents and many books to help them, it is amazing to me that the eminent writers for the Christadelphian magazines cannot perceive the truth. "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes" (Matthew 11:25); and the babes, the despised ones, are trying to teach the wise and prudent and are preaching the Truth, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear.

I notice that F.W.T. has awakened to some truth - even the forgiveness of sins now; that we can be "presented faultless;" then how about the Christadelphian judgment?

On page 78 you print an extract from Robert Roberts on "God will be sanctified," and at the end of the first paragraph he speaks of Christ "who shared their sin-nature." You must know that there is no such term as sin-nature in the whole Bible. It is an invention of R.Roberts. Paul speaks of "first the natural, then the spiritual" (1 Corinthians 15:46,47). Perhaps Robert Roberts meant condemned nature; but even so he would have been wrong, for how could one condemned man ransom other condemned men? We are often given a lesson in simple Greek terms in the magazine, and I am wondering why those who profess to

understand the Greek do not deal with some of the disputed texts like the “sinful flesh” of Romans 8:3. Is it because they know that the doctrine of defiled nature based upon it is unjustifiable?

Kindly read the lecture by Edward Turney on “The Sacrifice of Christ” and then Robert Roberts’ reply “The Slain Lamb.” If you are then in any doubt read “A review of The Slain Lamb” by F.J.Pearce and you will have a better understanding of the situation. Your magazine is a powerful organ to lead and sway the people who are being called out and the Truth will come out, so please do not misrepresent those who in the fear and love of God are showing you and yours a better way. Until recently I had complete confidence in the Christadelphian magazine and I can truly say I would have died for my faith; I thought if Christadelphians are wrong, then who can be right? It was with sorrow and pain that I learned differently, but now it is a joy to me to have a fuller and better understanding and having found a good thing, I only wish to share it with others.

Believe me, yours faithfully, Mrs J.A.French.

* * * * *

Abertillery. July 9th 1945

Dear Brother Carter,

Greetings. The July Christadelphian in the intelligence from Ludlow says that Sister Houlston was “baptized into another fellowship.” This may be a misunderstanding on the part of the Recording brother and we should be glad if you will correct it in the next issue. Sister Houlston was baptized on the same day as myself, into the Name of Jesus and was received into the fellowship of those who believe that He was not under condemnation but that His sacrifice was made voluntarily to redeem us, not Himself.

Thanking you, yours in the service of Christ, Mrs J.A.French.

* * * * *

Dear Sister French,

Birmingham, 19th July 1945

I have received your three letters but have not had time to answer them before. Your last shall be answered first.

You say Sister Houlston was baptized into the name of Jesus and you question the intelligence from Ludlow. But that is the very point where we join issue. I would contend that both you and Sister Houlston have most unwisely been baptized, to use Paul’s phrase, “into another gospel which is not another.” In fact, it is no gospel at all. With this conviction, how could either Ludlow ecclesia or myself publish the statement you suggest?

When I got your first letter and the leaflet you sent and had read them, the words of Paul came to my mind; “Who hath beguiled you that ye should not obey the truth before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth?”

It would be difficult to crowd more scriptural errors within the space of four pages than is done in the leaflet you send. Unfortunately, to combat error and state truth very often takes longer time and more space than the declaration of error. I have noticed errors in nearly every paragraph- I am surprised to find that you are beguiled by statements such as these.

Sincerely your brother, John Carter.

* * * * *

Abertillery.
Dear Brother Carter,

August 3rd 1945

Greetings. Your letter of the 19th July to hand in reply to my three letters; I must say I think it very weak and you are very evasive and assuming. You do not even mention my second letter and you see so many errors in that leaflet - and give proof of none! This seems to be the spirit of the Christadelphian leaders, for you print an amazing letter from our dear Brother Islip Collyer (August, page 86) in which he mentions "undesirable literature," which he does not review but only misrepresents.

He says "It is suggested that a violent death was inflicted on Christ as a substitute for Adam." This is untrue; we contend that in His love God gave Jesus as a sin-offering and that Christ willingly offered Himself to release Adam and his family from Sin's captivity. We are "bought by the precious blood of Christ" and are no longer in Adam but in Christ, after baptism into His death.

It is easy for you to prejudice your readers and prevent them reading these pamphlets for your magazine is a powerful organ, but it is not always used for the good of its readers (and yet it is "to make ready a people prepared for the Lord"!). I am amazed that you should have passed the last paragraph but one on page 87, where you allow Brother Islip Collyer to condemn himself three times in print. It just proves that neither you nor he understand Paul's letter to the Romans. Allow a sister to explain it for your benefit.

Paul writes to converted Jews (Romans 2:17). They are called saints (Romans 1:7). Then he describes the state of wickedness natural man falls into when left to himself (chapters 1 and 3). Then righteousness by faith (chapter 4). The federal principle is shown in chapter 5, whether in or belong to Adam or Christ. Chapter 6 tells our position and how we should live after rising from baptism. But in chapter 7 he writes to the brethren that know the law (converted Jews) and in verse 5 he says, "When we were in the flesh" and relates the experience of a Jew under the Law, in the flesh or before conversion and without the Gospel. Paul (Saul) thought he was doing God service when he persecuted the Saints - against conscience, for he was "kicking against the pricks."

See what Dr Adam Clarke says about chapter 7 (*) - I guess you have his books. In chapter 8 Paul says, "There is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." Verse 9, "Ye are not in the flesh." So that saints may (and should) apply chapters 6 and 8 to themselves, but not chapter 7. I often heard from the platform "When I would do good evil is present with me." This is self-condemnation! We can be judged by our own words - see Matthew 12:35-7.

I feel towards you and your followers as Paul did in Romans 9:1-3, and 10:1,2, and as Moses in Exodus 32:32, and it is with this in mind and with this spirit that these matters are being published. Those who have eyes to see and ears to hear are leaving you behind. I have heard it said, and I think it is true, that Christadelphians are latter-day Jews and their eyes are holden; but there are a few latter-day Jeremiahs and Ezekiels, with the word of God burning within and they are speaking the word to their brethren, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, so that in the Day of Judgement none shall be able to say "We were never told."

With kind wishes, I remain your sister in Christ's service, Mrs J.A.French.

* Here is a small portion of what Dr Adam Clarke wrote about Romans chapter 7: - "It is difficult to conceive how the opinion could have crept into the Church, or prevailed there, that "the apostle speaks here of his regenerate state; and that what was, in such a state, true of himself, must be true of all others in the same state." This opinion has, most pitifully and most shamefully, not only lowered the standard of Christianity, but destroyed its influence and disgraced its character. It requires but little knowledge of the spirit of the Gospel, and of the scope of this epistle, to see that the apostle is, here, either personating a Jew under the law and without the Gospel, or showing what his own state was when he was deeply convinced that by the deeds of the law no man could be justified, and had not as yet heard those blessed words: Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way, hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost, Acts ix. 17.

In this and the following verses he states the contrariety between himself, or any Jew while without Christ, and the law of God. Of the latter he says, it is spiritual; of the former, I am carnal, sold under sin. Of the carnal man, in opposition to the spiritual, never was a more complete or accurate description given. The expressions, in the flesh, and after the flesh, in ver. 5, and in chap. viii. 5, 8, 9, &c., are of the same import with the word carnal in this verse. To be in the flesh, or to be carnally minded, solely respects the unregenerate. While unregenerate, a man is in a state of death and enmity against God, chap. viii. 6-9. This is St. Paul's own account of a carnal man."

From Dr Adam Clarke's Bible Commentary

Behold What Manner of Love

1 John 3:1

**"Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us,
that we should be called the sons of God..."**

There is a religious sect whose Magazine Editor has affirmed in their teaching that the righteous conduct of Jesus Christ is the basis upon which they receive from God redemption and forgiveness of sins.

This of course means that this "Righteousness of Christ" is "substitutional" for their own inability to obey the commandments of God due to a tendency in their flesh which causes a bias to commit sin.

This theory and teaching is obviously a belief that Jesus is to them a "Substitute," but the Scriptures do not teach in that order – that we have forgiveness, or redemption on the basis of Christ's righteousness being a substitute for our unrighteousness.

The Editor and his members are willing to accept their form of substitution but when it comes to accepting Christ's sacrificial death as substitution for Adam's death and all in him, they reject it and make Christ a "Representative," which He was not. The focus of Scripture is on Christ's death in relation to Redemption and forgiveness, but we do accept that the sinlessness of Christ in a nature like Adam's and ours justified God in condemning sin originally in Eden and now.

It is God's Righteousness we have to accept, "being justified freely by His Grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood" (Romans 3:24-26). "Much more then being now justified by his blood" (Romans 5:9). "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace" (Ephesians 1:7), "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins... And having made peace through the blood of his cross..." (Colossians 1:14,20).

If the righteous conduct of Jesus was all that was required, and God's forgiveness on that basis, then the death of Christ by bloodshedding was unnecessary, for when His false accusers took Him from Gethsemane, His own righteousness as a sinless Son of God authorised that He could ask His Father to release Him and in fact God could have justifiably given Him there and then eternal life, but how then could it be said that we have redemption through His blood in which was His natural life?

It was the right to natural life and continued existence which was lost in Eden by sin, and it was natural life not lost by sin which was given willingly by His shedding of blood on Calvary, by One who was always free from the law of sin and death; life in the blood being the same but the ownership different. Jesus was ever God's Son from birth and never in need of adoption, therefore free to give His life (not His character) a ransom for many.

It is a pity there are those who cannot see it; but it is deplorable to find there are some who refuse to see it.

Brother Phil Parry.

THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD;

In the widest sense, the Church may be said to embrace all who shall be found approved by the Lord when He comes. In the narrowest sense, the two or three met together in the name of Christ in that place is the Church. In both of these communities, Christ is the head: for in a sense, as the Apostle says, "The head of every man is Christ." The truth involved in this proposition is by no means realized as it ought to be; for it implies the absolute submission of every disciple to the will of him they call Master and Lord. This relationship, with the privileges and duties it brings with it, may well engage our thoughts for a little, if peradventure we may learn a little more of the responsibility it lays upon us, and drink a little deeper into the spirit it naturally breathes. It is by correct knowledge of the true nature of things that we can expect to sustain our own relation to them, and reap the full benefit such relationship is fitted to impart.

WHAT IS THE CHURCH?

Every human society is founded on some characteristic which is common to the whole membership, in which none is defective, whatever else may be possessed over and above. Whether it be an Anti-Slavery Society, a Free-mason fraternity, or a simple village Co-operative Store, the same rule applies. Membership, with its duties and privileges, is based upon some qualification which all possess in common. This, and this alone, makes the whole each other's Fellows or equals so far at least as corporate status is concerned. Want of this deprives of fellowship and its privileges, no matter what other qualifications may be possessed.

Divine wisdom has seen fit to incorporate that community called the Church upon the same simple principle, the members of that body may be the merest babes in Christ, or they may understand all mysteries, and have all knowledge; but if they have complied with the terms which God has been pleased to prescribe, they are, in virtue of this, and of this alone, entitled to rank as fellows of the very chief of the Apostles, because they are the brethren of the Lord Jesus the Anointed, the Son of God; and consequently the "sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty." This principle finds a beautiful illustration in the designation by which the community of Christ's brethren are most commonly known in the New Testament, namely, "THE CHURCH."

Modern nomenclature has obscured the light which the original word sheds on the simplicity of the constitution of the Christian community. The Greek is *ekklesia*, which is compounded of *kaleo*, 'I call', with the prefixed preposition *ek*, 'out', and signifies "the called out;" that is, the Ecclesia, or Church, consisted of the aggregate of those who had been called out from among the world at large, embracing both Jews and Gentiles. This aggregate was divisible into groups of smaller dimensions, according to the different localities in which it had pleased the Lord to cast the lot of his called ones. But there is no indication that any other principle than that of "local habitation" was ever allowed to subdivide the members of the body of Christ. Pity it is that what God has thus joined together, any man should presume to put asunder. Pity it is that human wisdom has invented terms and conditions of Church fellowship which Christ and His Apostles never dreamt of, and have substituted these for the Divine invitation in the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God. And pity it is that the professed disciples of Christ have in so many instances suffered such interference with "Heaven's easy, artless, unencumbered plan."

HOW IS THE CHURCH CALLED OUT?

In the calling out of God's Ecclesia, "the simplicity which is in Christ" is abundantly manifest. The Gospel is the only means by which "God has visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name." A few quotations will shew this to be the case: - "But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God has from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth: whereunto He called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Thessalonians 2:13, 14, "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel, according to the power of God; who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world

began; but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." 2 Timothy 1:8-10.

Paul's gospel is the gospel Paul preached, a specimen of which we have in what he preached for two whole years in his own hired house at Rome. This is described in these terms: "Preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ." The Kingdom of God is that Kingdom to be established on the earth in the land of promise, over restored Israel and the nations. "The things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ" are summarized by Paul himself in these words: "That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first to rise from the dead." Upon an intelligent apprehension of the things scripturally involved in such a summary as this, confessing Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, believers of the Gospel were immersed into the name of Jesus, and were thus called out from a world lying in wickedness. But "the Gospel of the Kingdom" is not only the means by which God is inviting sinners to become His sons and daughters, the Kingdom is also that to which they are invited when it shall be set up according to Divine prediction. A few extracts will demonstrate this without a word of comment: - "As ye know how we exhorted and comforted, and charged every one of you, (as a father doth his children,) that ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory." 1 Thessalonians 2:11, 12, "But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you." 1 Peter 5:10. "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold of eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses." 1 Timothy 6:12. "I press toward the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Philippians 3:14.

Those thus called to God's Kingdom and glory by the Gospel, constitute God's Church or Ecclesia, irrespective of all other human requirements. These are mere inventions which the foolishness of men seek to impose on the wisdom of God.

THE "FELLOWSHIP IN THE GOSPEL."

When Paul wrote to the Church at Philippi, whom he styles "all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons," he had no other idea in his mind regarding the fellowship than that of those called out by the Gospel. He says: "I thank my God upon every remembrance of you, always in every prayer of mine for you all making request with joy." For what? "For your Fellowship in The Gospel from the first day until now." But the Philippian Church seems to have been highly favoured in respect of their fellowship being in the Gospel. For we read of this simple basis of fellowship being interfered with at other places by men who would have "God's easy, unencumbered plan" eked out with human wisdom, which but too often proves to be folly. Thus, at Antioch, certain men came down from Judea and taught the brethren, "except ye be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, ye cannot be saved." This was happily quashed by a decree of the Apostles at Jerusalem, based on the simple fact stated by Peter: "How God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name." This form of human attempt at improvement on Divine wisdom was fruitful of evil in Rome, Galatia, and probably at other places. Paul's letters to the Romans and Galatians are specially directed against this form of sectarianism. In the former epistle (16:17, 18) he seems to have this evil fully before his mind: - "Now, I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

This "causing (or *making*, ποιεω) divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which they had learned" cannot be applied to such divisions as existed at Corinth, which shewed itself in a preference for certain teachers, none of whose doctrines are called in question. But the Judaizers come under Paul's description most fittingly: for the divisions they made were contrary to the doctrine they had learned. And be it remembered that the main design of the letter to the Romans was to vindicate the simplicity of the faith against the very class who taught the necessity of keeping the law of Moses in order to justification.

THE ONE FOUNDATION.

The figure of a building is often employed by the apostles to illustrate the simplicity of the Christian fellowship. To the Corinthians Paul wrote: - "For we are labourers together with God: ye are God's

husbandry; ye are God's building. According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which, is Jesus Christ." And to the Ephesians: - "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

This is in exact agreement with what our Lord taught his disciples. He asked them, "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter replied "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus answered and said "Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee but my Father who is in heaven. And I say unto thee that thou art Peter (Petros, a stone) and upon this rock (Petra, a rock) I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This rock is none other than Jesus himself in his character as the Messiah of Israel, and the Son of the living God. This is the foundation of the apostles and prophets, for it was predicted by the prophets and preached by the apostles, namely, Jesus Christ, the chief corner-stone laid in Zion.

Thus the prophet: - "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste." - Isaiah 28:16. Peter, quoting this, says, "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house"

DIVERSITY IN UNITY.

The one foundation having been laid in Jesus the Christ, and the living stones built thereon, on the simple principles of gospel faith and obedience, there could not fail to be many diverse elements outlying the cementing medium by which each unit was united to the foundation. This connecting link was the faith of the gospel. There were Jews and Gentiles, bond and free, Greeks and Barbarians, the wise and the unwise. They differed about meats and days, but the apostles expressly forbade such diversity to interfere with the unity which existed alongside of it in the one faith, of the gospel. Paul was thoroughly cognisant of this diversity in unity from the very first. He even accommodated himself, at the express request of a fellow apostle, to the prejudices of his Jewish kinsmen, by observing a certain ceremony in the temple. The oneness was in Christ Jesus, not in the manifold units of the body. "There is neither Jew nor Greek ... for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." A Jew remained a Jew, and a Greek a Greek. But each was a child of God, and an heir of the Kingdom. In 1 Corinthians 12 Paul at great length treats of this diversity in unity. "The body is not one member but many. But the eye never becomes an organ of hearing, nor the ear an organ of vision." As the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ."

THE NECESSITY OF FORBEARANCE.

It must be evident that in a society composed of such materials as the Church of Christ, there must be the greatest need for forbearing with each other. There would always be a danger of those things in which they differed exalting themselves over those in which they were one, thus marring the unity of the body. In beautiful adaptation to this liability we have a perfect body of injunctions and exhortations by the apostles. Those men never dreamt of classifying the disciples into groups or sections, in accordance with their various peculiarities and prejudices. As a specimen we might select one from Paul, which is thoroughly characteristic: - "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you, that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Ephesians 4:1-7.

Here are surely elements of unity sufficient to constitute the most stable bulwark against division, if only allowed to have their due influence. This is nothing less than paramount. All opinions or theories apart from the one faith of the gospel are the private property of their possessors, and must be subordinated to the unity of the church. If such are deemed important, and worthy of being taught, and others willing to

hear, well and good. But it is purely a matter of courtesy that any member of the Christian brotherhood is allowed to teach his brethren anything that is outside "the common faith" and that for the simple reason that everyone is as much entitled as he is to express an opposite opinion if so disposed.

BAPTISED BELIEVERS OF THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM.

The application of these principles to the present day among ourselves should not be very difficult to the sincere respecter of God's will in preference to man's. If God has called my fellow-creature to His Kingdom and glory by the gospel of His Son, what am I that I should not hail him as a fellow-worshipper in the assembly of the saints? Shall I presume to say "Stand back, for I am holier than thou;" I understand all mysteries and have all knowledge, while you know little beyond the simple elements of the gospel preached by Christ and his apostles for the obedience of faith? Nay: for has not my Master said "Whoso shall offend (cause to stumble) one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depths of the sea." "Take heed that ye despise not one of the little ones, for I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." - Matthew 18: 6-10. And has not his servant Paul left us a charge in his letter to the Philippians, we do well to ponder? - "Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the Faith of the Gospel."

This is truly an object worthy of our strife, not among ourselves, however, but with those around us; earnestly contending for The Faith once delivered to the saints."

Brother J. Cameron.

You Can Burn This in Ten Seconds...

**By way of Introduction we here reproduce an extract
from a correspondent's letter...**

"I should like you to send me the following pamphlets. I wish to be fully acquainted with your interpretation so that I able to state my differences to my own ecclesia. I am amazed - not at anyone else - but amazed at myself at the tame acceptance of some of the tenets of the Christadelphian belief. Regarding your booklet, "You Can Burn This In Ten Seconds," I must say I started reading that first and thought well here goes, I can at least burn it as suggested, but of all your papers I find that one most convincing - firstly to get a clearer impression of what I'm supposed to accept, but what is more important, what saith the Scriptures - I am still reading them all and I repeat with all humility that your papers have made a profound impression on my life-long association of Christadelphians.

I shall be grateful, therefore dear brother, if you will send the enclosed list of papers I haven't got and now the evenings are longer I can give them my undivided attention.

Time is short and the news of the world points to the beginning of that long looked for day of Promise - His return.

I shall look forward to hearing from you. With all good wishes and love in the Hope of Israel,

Your brother in the same Hope."

* * *

You Can Burn This in Ten Seconds... **Eternity Will Not Efface the Facts**

DO YOU REALISE....

...that as a Christadelphian you are supposed to believe that Jesus died for Himself? And have you ever found any place in the Bible where it says so? Yet the Birmingham Statement of Faith speaks of Him as “abrogating the law of condemnation for himself” and as “a representative of Adam's disobedient race.”

Do you realise that you are supposed to believe that there is a physical principle of evil in human flesh which makes it impossible for people to keep the Commandments and that it was because Jesus had sin in His flesh that God required Him to die upon the Cross? Has it never occurred to you how utterly foolish and unscriptural this is and what a monster of evil God would be if it were true?

We have never seen it stated anywhere except in Christadelphian literature that Jesus was under condemnation, or that His death was for Himself, or that sin can be literally in the flesh and blood of man. When we learned that these beliefs had been challenged more than 70 years ago and that the courageous souls who scripturally refuted them had been vilified and misrepresented ever since, we realised that Christadelphians were just one of many sects of apostate Christendom and that truth was really of less importance than their organisation.

It is quite true that many who may read this message object as strongly as we do to the doctrine that Jesus was in any sense sinful, defiled, or condemned and that His death upon the Cross was necessary for His own salvation and we are glad that one ecclesia has made a start by adopting a Statement of Faith from which all that rubbish is left out. It is still a fact however that as a Community they believe and teach that people are born with sin literally in their flesh and if you regard yourself as a Christadelphian these evil apparitions are on your doorstep and you must either disown them or take them in and live with them.

CRY ALOUD AND SPARE NOT

If there was any real scriptural defence against our reproaches Christadelphians would hardly resort to physical violence and hooliganism to prevent us distributing literature, as they did at Smethwick on September 37th 1949. They would rather hold us up to the ridicule of the public and prove the superiority of their own teaching. We are not much concerned whether our testimony is welcomed or spurned by such people; fortunately speech is still free and although they would like to take from us the liberty to proclaim what we believe to be the truth, we shall continue as opportunity offers to intrude upon the attention of those who make a great song about reading the Bible and preaching against error, but who become remarkably and uncontrollably angry when anyone ventures to draw attention to a few of the inconsistencies in their own teaching.

Since many people cannot understand how a sincere believer who has once had what Christadelphians regard as “the Truth” can ever have forsaken it, and because those who could and ought to explain the matter prefer suppression and misrepresentation, we offer the following explanation.

The Nazarene Fellowship believe the Bible to be the word of God, wholly inspired and infallible, and when it proves to be in opposition to the writings of Christadelphians, the Statement of Faith, or any other Creed, they follow the Bible.

They believe in the literal return of Jesus to the earth to establish the Kingdom of God and reign in righteousness and peace; they believe in the resurrection of the body and the reward of the righteous and all other things which can be scripturally proved.

Amongst these they believe that Jesus voluntarily suffered on Calvary a death which He neither incurred nor deserved, in order to redeem the life of the race forfeited by disobedience. He paid His brother's debt by

the sacrifice of His own life, meeting the claim against Him of a just law and Justifying the mercy of God in allowing a condemned sinner to live.

This is briefly the awful doctrine hated by Christadelphians and nicknamed by them “the Clean Flesh Heresy,” “The Free Life Theory,” “Renunciationism” and “Substitution.” Can you see anything very terrible in it? Does it strike you as a soul-destroying heresy? Is it not rather exactly what the Bible tells us?

DON'T BELIEVE ALL YOU HEAR

We are constantly being told that we teach that the flesh and nature of Jesus was different from that of all other men. If we had ever believed or taught so, then we should deserve some of the epithets we are given, but it is a complete untruth. We believe that Jesus was the same in nature and experience as us, but different in character and origin. We believe that flesh as such is neither clean nor unclean but simply the living material of which human beings are formed. The thing that matters in the sight of God is their relationship and the character which human beings display. The same kind of flesh can manifest good character or bad, according to the behaviour and thinking of the man concerned.

We have renounced nothing but the unscriptural teaching that sin (an abstract word meaning transgression of law) is literally in the flesh of human beings and that this was the defilement from which Jesus could only be cleansed by death.

It sometimes seems that Christadelphian leaders are themselves more than half ashamed of the doctrine, for it is rarely mentioned and then usually glossed over, but it hangs like a skeleton in the cupboard and is only revealed when anyone persistently asks why it was that God made the death of His own beloved and innocent Son the sole means of redemption. Then they produce the astounding explanation that although He was the Son of God, although He was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners, His flesh was unclean, His nature defiled by sin and fit only for destruction! They say His sacrifice upon the Cross was “a ritual exhibition of what was due to sinful human nature.”

But when giving this explanation which explains nothing, they conveniently forget that the body which was put into the tomb was the selfsame body which came forth on the third day! Was it still unclean and defiled? Why did not Jesus say, at the last supper, “This is my unclean body which is to be ceremonially condemned” and “this is my sin-defiled blood which is shed for myself”? How horrible it sounds; yet these would be appropriate words at the memorial table for “Filthy dreamers who defile the flesh.”

When the writer, then a member of the Suffolk Street fellowship, learned from former members of the Temperance hall section the implications of Christadelphian doctrine concerning Christ, all the petty squabbling which rends that body became meaningless, it was realised that membership of any section of the community was impossible to one who intelligently believes that Jesus, the only begotten of God, was given as a sacrifice to save sinners. We know that many deplore much of what has been written by their editors and fellow brethren on the subject, but the fact remains, that the accepted teaching of Christadelphians is that it was right and just for Jesus to be put to death, because He was personally of a sinful nature. That view seems to us so near to blasphemy that we do not see how one who knowingly tolerates it by sharing the name or fellowship of those who hold it can hope for acceptance.

WHAT WE REALLY TEACH

We once asked the simple question, “If human beings are born sinful and incapable of obedience, how can a just God hold them guilty?” We also asked, “If Jesus was the same as us, how did He succeed in living a sinless life?” These seem very simple and reasonable questions, but John Carter immediately wrote of us as “a renegade brother.” So long as he and the rest of Christadelphian expositors can do no better than the shameless assertion that Jesus had to be specially strengthened in order to overcome His innate sinfulness we shall be content for him to call us names.

Is it not the merest common sense to conclude that the attested fact that Jesus was made like us and tempted in all points as we are, yet lived a perfect life, proves that the reason we do wrong is because we do not try hard enough to do right? That being so God is Just in regarding us as sinners and holding Christ

before us as an example. His life proves beyond any question that it is not human nature or flesh and blood that is at fault but the relationship and behaviour of men and women. Honest people know perfectly well that they are not compelled to do wrong and when they go astray they must blame themselves, not God, and confess their faults and ask for forgiveness. No one who believes he is born sinful or inherits sin or has a physical principle of sin in his flesh can possibly be truly and sincerely repentant.

It is not however primarily our own transgressions which put us in the need of salvation, though they are involved and are wiped out in the process. If God had called us all to account individually, every individual sinner would have required an individual saviour or would perish without hope. Christadelphians have never understood this aspect of the atonement and yet it is one of the vital factors which make the subject so enthralling. One sacrifice could only redeem one sinner, one debt paid could only release one creditor; one righteous act could only atone for one act of sin (Romans 5:12-19). This is the reason why God regards all the offspring of Adam as involved in the act of rebellion which alienated him; his life was forfeited (but was not taken) and therefore the life which was transmitted to all his descendants was a condemned life. This is not in any sense a physical matter or a change of nature but purely of legal status and relationship and its purpose and object was not to make it difficult or impossible for men and women to obey God but to make it possible for Him to show them mercy and forgiveness. This is proved by the fact that the condemnation which came by Adam is removed as soon as a believer puts on Christ (Romans 8:1).

Now how was it possible for Jesus alone by the one great sacrifice of Himself, to redeem a multitude? It was because Jesus did not derive His life from Adam but direct from God and when He chose to carry out His Father's plan to save mankind, there was only one possible way to do it and that was by paying the ransom price, a life; His life instead of Adam's, to that other master, sin. He thus purchased back to God all those who were sold into bondage in Adam.

This explanation brings upon our head the sneers of "legalism," "the pawnshop," "taking metaphor too literally," and so on. We are not dismayed but simply ask our opponents to point out where it fails to agree with Scripture and to show if they can, that there is either truth, reason, justice, love, or mercy in, or scriptural proof for their own teaching.

We certainly believe that Jesus was free and had life in a sense that we have not (Matthew 17:26; John 6:38; 7:29) because His life came from God and not, as the Statement of Faith says (Clauses 8 and 9) from the condemned line of Abraham. Jesus was related to the line of Adam, Abraham and David "according to the flesh" as the Son of Mary, but His title to the promises was on infinitely higher grounds, being the child of promise raised up unto David's house and out of Abraham's line when it was dry and dead, by the only One capable of imparting life to the dead, even God Himself.

It was precisely because He was free and His life unforfeited that He had in His possession the price of our redemption. This is the true and the only adequate explanation of the virgin birth; if Jesus' life had come from Adam via Joseph He would have been in the same poor, lost and helpless position as we. Receiving His life direct from the Source and retaining His right to that life by perfect obedience, He alone of the human race had the wherewithal to redeem his brethren. Compare this with the Christadelphian teaching that His divine origin endowed Him with superior strength to overcome temptation and you may perceive how wide the gulf that separates us. It would debar Him completely from the common experience of humanity, rob Him of all honour and make the record of His bitter suffering a hollow deception.

We confess without shame and with a deep sense of thankfulness that we believe that Jesus was our substitute and that He bore in our stead the wages of sin. All that is required of us is that we pass through that death in the figure of baptism, thus acknowledging that by sin we were alienated from God and that in strict justice death would be our due reward. Then, when we think of Jesus nailed to the Cross, forsaken and stricken, suffering death in its most dreadful form for our sakes' alone, as our Redeemer, we can truly and thankfully acknowledge His loving self-sacrifice.

It should make you think; to see that Christadelphians to-day like some in Jesus' own day, can hardly find words harsh enough to describe us and our doctrine, but we appeal to you, as you stand before God, to ask yourself if it is not truly the teaching of Scripture and that other the invention of devils.

Any stick will serve to beat a dog, and because he could find no other, W.F.Barling said in "The Christadelphian" that our teaching implied a belief in a personal devil. He has admitted publicly that we deny such a belief and that he had never found it in our writing, but ignorant oafs who have not the sense to read and think independently now state it as if it were a fact proved against us. Sincere people will not believe without evidence all the nonsense that gets about and before you drop this in the fire you should read and think for yourself, if you have the truth it will stand up to criticism and investigation. It is only when there is something to be feared or concealed that people are advised not to read anything outside Christadelphian works.

In conclusion, if you have read this and are satisfied that what you now hold is complete and perfect truth, we are satisfied too and thank you for your patience in reading so far. If, however, your conscience tells you that there is something wrong somewhere, but you prefer the friendship and associations of a prosperous community to a search for truth wherever it leads, no one will compel you. If you choose to continue to support those who teach that Jesus was condemned by His own Father because of His nature, and if you choose to live in daily dread of the uncertain result of a Judgment which only concerns the unfaithful and unbelieving, the loss is yours.

On the other hand you may decide it is better to be a renegade, if thereby you can put your trust in a Saviour who in the days of His flesh was holy, harmless, undefiled and gave Himself freely for you in order that you might not come into Judgment. In such a case, your rightful place is with the outcasts, who rejoice in the assurance that whether they live or sleep, when He returns they will be accepted - not for what they have done but because He gave His life to save them and they have believed and obeyed Him.

Ernest Brady

Some say Jesus body was as unclean as those He came to save! We disagree...

Regarding Jesus you say "His body was subject to all the temptations of the flesh (which he had overcome) and was unclean in that respect."

I say this cannot hold true, for being tempted is the most excellent thing we can encounter in this life for it gives us the only opportunity we have of showing just how much we love God. How else can we build characters well pleasing to God except by overcoming temptation as Jesus did?

Every law which God has given to man for him to obey and thereby live, is a moral law. If we were to keep these laws perfectly we would be well pleasing to God and emulating Jesus. Finding them difficult to keep perfectly is to be expected; the way to eternal life was never meant to be easy and we need temptations in order to show how earnest we are in our desire for the gift of eternal life. Jesus was tempted in all points as we are and we can appreciate to some extent how hard it was for Him, but He overcame all temptation and sought God's help in prayer continually. Can we not do the same? I haven't, and I don't know anyone who has, but I dare not say it is impossible for I know that when I fail it is always my fault and so I need forgiveness. Thankfully this forgiveness is freely available to us through Jesus Christ even though He asks us to be "perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

But the fact that we are tempted does not make anyone unclean and certainly it cannot mean we have sin dwelling in our flesh. That would really be nonsense.

From Dr Adam Clarkes Commentary

Regarding Jesus he wrote, "As, therefore, your life depends on the bread which God's bounty has provided for your bodies, so your eternal life depends on the sacrifice of my body on the cross for your souls." Besides, there is here an allusion to the offering of sacrifice - an innocent creature was brought to

the altar of God, and its blood (the life of the beast) was poured out for, or in behalf of, the person who brought it. Thus Christ says, alluding to the sacrifice of the paschal lamb, "This is my body, *to uper umwn didomenon*, which IS GIVEN in your stead, or in your behalf; a free GIFT, from God's endless mercy, for the salvation of your souls. This is my body, *to uper umwn klwmenon*, (1 Corinthians xi. 24,) which is broken - sacrificed in your stead; as without the breaking (piercing) of the body, and spilling of the blood, there was no remission."

Difficulties Of Character.

Boys at Rugby in Arnold's time used to feel that they could not tell him a lie, he was himself so frank and fearless and he never doubted them. They knew that he not only required truth from his pupils, but that his own life had no concealments from them in it nor were his words mere formal phrases, meant only to agree with the role of the schoolmaster. A child will soon be ashamed of his own habit of duplicity, in association with a teacher who treats him with confidence, placing his own life openly before him, and never deluding him with exaggerated statements, or appeals to false motives. It is necessary to be careful in dealing with a character in which the habit of untruthfulness has been acquired, not to attempt its cure by starting with strong denunciations against falsehood, and severe punishment for the first transgressions against veracity. This line of conduct may have the effect of only leading to a deeper cunning, in order to conceal the hold which deceit has over the character. It is not easy at once to break off a habit of false speaking, and we must guard against leading into the temptation to hide one lie by telling many more in its support. At the same time constant watchfulness will be required over the words of an untruthful child, and if these show appearance of equivocation they must be taken up boldly at once. Where a habit of secrecy and concealment has sprung up from a system of repression, it will be important to encourage the natural expression of feeling and thought by sympathy and interest; but if the reserve be that mere natural closing of the character and conduct, which has been adopted in self-defence against the injudicious attempts of older persons to pry into recesses of feeling and sacred reserves in a child, the better plan is to let the child feel at once that alibis rights will be delicately guarded, and no intrusion permitted into anything he does not prefer to unveil. It is difficult for some persons to understand the pain which it is to others to have to share their thoughts and feelings with those who may not perfectly understand them; and that rough kind of questioning which insists in knowing all the little innocent reserves of a child's nature, teaches deceit rather than frankness. Whilst it will be found in most cases that children have acquired a habit of untruthfulness from a want of care in their early training, yet there are some few characters in whom there seems to be a natural tendency to delight in practising deception on others. To find that they have the power of deluding those around them seems to afford a certain gratification to them, and they will set their invention to work for the mere purpose of mystifying or deceiving more truthful and therefore more credulous natures. The slightest indications of such a tendency should at once rouse the watchful concern of those who have the care of children, for it may soon be indulged to such an extent as to become a species of disease. The stories of notorious impostors who have for no purpose but a love of deluding others, carried on systems of fraud, the practices of very many, to say the least, of what are called "spiritualistic mediums," all show what a powerful passion this tendency to impose on others may become by frequent indulgence. Where this morbid impulse appears in any form in a child, it should be taken up at once with great decision, and thoroughly exposed; it will be necessary also to guard most carefully against being deluded at any time, even to the length of appearing distrustful and suspicious in such cases, for nothing so excites and strengthens the tendency to imposition as any success. In cases of this kind untruth should be severely punished, and the meanness and disgrace of such attempts to play on the trust and straightforward belief of persons of a higher integrity should be strongly shown in its true dishonour. In order to avoid in every way the practice of this most dangerous tendency, it is better to prevent among children the habit of playing practical jokes, because, though the deception itself may appear harmless and momentary, yet the enjoyment generally arises from the completeness of the delusion, and is thus founded on the same skilful play upon credulity.

- Golden Hours.

‘Free Life’ in the Bible

But, what is the “element of evil” on our side? Bro. Reid’s answer, so far as can be gathered from the letter before us, is this: “Your theory seeks to supplement the word by the use of unscriptural terms, such as free life.” But in what way free life is an unscriptural term Bro. Reid has not attempted to show. All will agree that our lives are either free or bond; that is, we ourselves are either slaves or free men; for when we speak of life we mean living men, not life in the abstract, if such a thing can be. Now the question is very simple and easy of decision. Instead of its being, as Bro Reid intimates, an untaught question, it is a question as distinctly and impressively taught as any question in the Word, and for the very reason that it is a question second to none in vitality... We repeat the question, then, Are we the professed disciples of the Christ - free or bond? FREE! will be, doubtless, the unanimous response. Being free from sin, and our life hid with Christ in God, is not our life a free life - free from the penalty to which we were obnoxious previous to our purchase by the blood of Christ? It must be so, otherwise redemption has availed us nothing. Now with respect to freedom and bondage, in this sense, we ask, was there ever a moment when our Redeemer was not free? Was there ever a time when death, the wages of sin, had a claim against the Christ himself? No more emphatic negative could be given to this query than what is apostolically given, namely, that “He did no sin,” and further that “IN Him is no sin” To his immediate brethren John wrote, saying, “ye know” this to be true, but now there are some who do not know it, and who affirm the opposite teaching that Christ died for Himself, and that He was a son of Adam!”

“But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is Spirit: and they that worship God must worship Him in Spirit and in truth.” - John 4:23 & 24.

THE FATHER AND SON. Response to Brother Jardine’s article

Dear Bro. Turney, - With your permission I make the following remarks upon Bro. Jardine’s reply to my former remarks.

I understand the terms Father and Son to stand related to each other as cause and effect. Jesus did not stand related to two Fathers as the cause of his existence, but to one only. The ground was not the cause of the first man’s existence; but simply the material upon which Almighty power exerted itself. The mother of Jesus was no more the cause of His existence than the ground in the case of the first Adam. That Jesus was a son of man or of Adam as to the substance of His body has never been denied by me, but that He was a son of Adam in the sense of being the effect of which Adam was the cause is what I deny as being contrary to evidence. Jesus was not therefore a son of Adam, because the Spirit of God caused a daughter of Adam to bring Him forth.

It is incorrect to say the first Adam was destined to return to the dust. He was sentenced to return to the dust for His crime, but none except fatalists hold that man was destined either to sin or be put to death for sin. Death is the wages of sin, not the result of destiny. ⁽¹⁾

The conception of Jesus did not preclude the possibility of Jesus being both son of Adam and son of God, says Bro. J. To me it appears the very opposite. If the conception or purpose to bring Jesus into the world originated in Adam or in Adam’s daughter, Mary, then it would be true that He was a son of Adam; but inasmuch as the conception originated in the bosom of the Almighty and nowhere else, Jesus was the Son of God and of no one else, excepting in the secondary sense of being born of a woman as the medium through whom the first came, gave effect to His conception.

Again he says, “Though He is called the second Adam, this secondary feature as a representative head of a family did not begin until after He rose from the dead.” This is a mistake, as is manifest from the fact that between the Lord from heaven and the first man there is no parallel. The parallel between the two men

ceases at the point where the first one failed. The Lord who is now in heaven is not coming to be put under trial; but is in the heavens because He overcame where the first Adam failed.

Besides the word Adam defines his relation to the earthly nature, and it would be as reasonable to say He was not a man, as to say He was not the second man. The word man defines His nature or the substance of which He was formed, and the word second defines the order of His coming. To be a son of God as to cause; and son of man as to flesh, defines the time when Jesus became the second Adam. The phrases first man and second man shew or imply that there are only these two men who stand equally related, not to each other, but to the same Father as the direct cause of their existence. To contend that Jesus Christ was not the second Adam until He was raised from the tomb is to ignore the direct operation of God by His Spirit in causing His existence. Jesus was the subject of two divine operations. The first brought Him into existence from a woman. The second brought Him into existence from the grave. The first man was also the subject of two divine operations. The first brought him forth from the dust of the ground, terminating in his being a living man, and here he and the second man were equal. The second divine operation was the sentence of a return to the dust for his crime, terminating in his expulsion from access to the tree of life.

It must be manifest that the first operations upon these men placed them in similar circumstances; both were the possessors of life; and both were in circumstances in which nothing but the individual actions of either could deprive him of that life. They both die. The first because of his own act of disobedience. The second by an act of voluntary obedience not defined in the law under which He was born, but in perfect harmony with its spirit.

To maintain that Jesus was not the second man until He arose from the dead is indirectly to assert that He was the first man up until He lay in the tomb, and that He lay in the tomb the first man, for certainly He was a man for thirty-three years, and as a man He died.

This is simply another form of saying that a son of the first man died because He was in some way or other criminally related to the first man and to establish a criminal necessity for the death of Jesus on account of His connection with the crime of disobedience, is simply to say that Jesus voluntarily obeyed His Father's will because He disobeyed it. And His father was so highly pleased with this criminal for voluntarily submitting to die for his crime, that He has given Him the honour of being the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. That Jesus was made of or out of the seed of David is not equal to saying He was the seed of David; to contend that they are is to deny the facts relating to the begetting of Jesus. But here is a most extraordinary statement, illustrative of the terrible straits a false position imposes upon its holder. "He is called the One Seed of Abraham." (Gal. iii. 16.) This surely proves Him to have been a son of Adam; and so, also (directly or indirectly), do the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. The fact that Jesus did not naturally descend from Adam does not, cannot, set aside the fact that Adam the first was one of Jesus Christ's parents. The argument based upon Jesus being the One Seed of Abraham ignores the facts as to the cause of Jesus Christ's existence, and assumes a position contrary to them.

The genealogies of Matthew and Luke agree in tracing the direct connection of Joseph, the husband of Mary, with Adam by descent through begetting; but the argument to prove that Jesus was the direct son of Adam by begetting is without foundation and contrary to these genealogies.

Adam was one of the parents of Jesus!!! What next? If Adam was the one who was the other? This would make Jesus the son of two fathers but without a mother!!! It is perfectly true that Jesus was born in the house of Joseph, and therefore in the house of David, house of Abraham, and house of Adam, but He was not there as the direct fruit of Joseph's loins, and therefore not as the direct fruit of either David, Abraham, or Adam. He was, however, born in lawful wedlock, though not the son of a wedded pair; but a son begotten by the kinsman - Redeemer of Joseph and Mary as neither the one nor the other had the power of redemption within them.

"The fact that David called the Christ his Lord, did not ignore the other fact, that this same Lord, while He was in the flesh, "was of the fruit of the body of David," "and so in as true a sense was Jesus the fruit of the body of Adam."

The fruit of a tree is that which grows upon it or comes from it spontaneously. If this be Bro. Jardine's meaning, then I deny that Jesus fulfilled these conditions.

If, however, he means that Jesus was a "righteous branch raised up to David from one of his descendants, and therefore one raised up from the fruit of David's loins," then I agree, and discussion on this matter should cease.

In that part marked 2nd, page 413, in the argument and in support of the idea "that under the law God required man's obedience, and because man could not obey, the law required man's life," Bro. Jardine says, "Had he driven his thoughts a little further in the same channel, he would have doubtless have arrived at the conclusion that the Almighty must have been foolish in requiring of men to "be holy as He is holy," or that Jesus must have been insane when He exhorted His disciples to be perfect even as their Heavenly Father is perfect." "For, who can be holy as God is holy? Who can reach the perfection of the Almighty?"

These two last questions seem to be put forth to shew that not only the precepts of the law but also those of Jesus Christ Himself are impracticable; but that it would be folly and insanity to have expected they could be kept.

Now, in addition to believing that the law of God could be kept I am satisfied that all that Jesus taught can be obeyed, and also that a pupil may become as wise as his master. There is one who says "through thy precepts I have become wiser than my teachers."

That men have not kept the law is no proof that they could not keep it.

Probably the next point may be that Adam could not keep the law which had only one negative clause in it. He did not keep it. And upon the principle that as Israel did not keep the law of God given to them, it is assumed they could not keep it, so it is but fair at once to conclude he could not have done otherwise than disobey. This is probably the reason why some people say that Jesus could not disobey, and thereby render the terms obedience and disobedience unmeaning terms as applied to either the first or second Adam.

On page 444 Bro. Jardine says, "But the fact is, puny man imagines he can measure God's justice by his own sense, or want of sense of what justice is." Now that I or any other puny man cannot measure what Bro. Jardine supposes to be the justice of God is perfectly possible, and if he includes himself in the term puny man, it is manifest that neither teacher nor taught can measure it, for the best of all reasons, it is contrary to fact. The Almighty's ways are equal. "A God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He." And His law is as perfect as Himself. "His law is perfect, converting the soul" that lies in sin; "His precepts are true and righteous altogether." Puny man may not believe what God says, yet he abides faithful. The law of God did not only teach the knowledge of sin, but it also pointed out the only way it could be forgiven, and every sinner not forgiven received a just recompense of reward under it; but while perfect for the purpose it was given for, it was not given for the purpose of giving eternal life to any already under condemnation to die.

(3). "Sin in the flesh." These words are introduced between quotation points, but whence they are quoted we are not told. The scope of this whole piece is to prove that human nature is another phrase for sin in the flesh. This we say is not true. Human nature lived in the world before sin, and therefore sin is not a thing inseparable from it. Jesus Christ was human nature; at least so the advocates of sin in the flesh profess to believe, yet "in Him was no sin." These two facts, viz., that human nature was created and lived for some time at least without sin before it was in the world. And that human nature lived in the world and did not know sin after it had reigned in the world 4,000 years, ought to cause some hesitation to men who wish their judgment respected, before they enter the lists as champions of what is not taught in the Scriptures.

With much that is written in this part I perfectly agree, as being the truth, but it simply proves that human nature has committed sin. It does not seem to dawn upon Bro. Jardine's mind that human nature is a divine creation, just as much as the holy and good law that was adapted to it first in its best estate, and now even in its worst estate. The power to acquire ideas, to weigh, separate, and reject the bad and approve the good surely are not inherently bad qualities, because men do not act according to what they know is right. The apostle teaches that no temptation happened to his brethren but such as is common to man, and that with the

temptation God will make a way of escape, that they may be able to bear it. This principle shews that however strong the temptation is, it is never stronger than the tempted is able to bear. If therefore any one is overcome, he makes a mistake if he pleads as an excuse that he had sin in the flesh, and could not help being overcome, or that the temptation was too strong for him, for God cannot be overcome of evil, neither does He cause anyone to be overcome by it. This is certainly a very different doctrine from that enunciated in the saying that God gave a law that man could not keep, and because he did not do the impossible He punished him for incapacity. If such be the judgment of the saints in the coming age, I will pray may that age never come. I have already expressed my mind on Heb. ii. 14 and 16, and simply repeat that I see no reason for construing the verbs took part, might destroy, and might deliver in any other way than active verbs, and as such the common subject must be the Father and not Jesus. The facts recorded by Matthew and Luke confirm this view, viz., that it was the Almighty visited and redeemed His people by raising up an horn of salvation in the house of His servant David, and performed the oath He swore to Abraham and to his seed for ever. Jesus, and to Him we give the honour of having vanquished sin, which had the power of death, in this He stood at the end of His career, a conqueror, and then humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, that He might obtain the power to deliver from death those held in its grasp, and from its fear those who all their life time were exposed to temptations and in danger of being overcome.

I am, your Brother in Christ, W. ELLIS.

He who sows seeds of kindness enjoys a perpetual harvest
