

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 71

October 1985

In this Issue:

Page 1. Editorial	Harvey and Evelyn Linggood
Page 2. Commentary on "A More Perfect Way"	Brother Phil Parry
Page 8. Further Comments	
Page 11. Alabaster Boxes of Human Sympathy	
Page 11. Rendering Thanks to God	Brother Leo Dreifuss

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters in Christ Jesus, Greetings

And thanks to all who have corresponded with us during the past month and also those who have contributed to the work of the Truth in any capacity.

We have had further news from Bro. W. Hold of Queensland Australia, he tells us that his father Bro. A.W.Hold has had a stroke which has left him practically helpless so he is now living with his parents and has undertaken the care of them, we pray for them all in their hour of trial and that the light of the Truth which our brother has done so much to keep burning will not be extinguished but shine upon many more in Australia.

Our Bro. Phil Parry has added to Bro. Brady's comments on the book 'A More perfect Way' in this issue, we trust that the two articles will throw light on the true explanation of the Atonement and be found to be The perfect Way.

In this issue also we have an exhortation by our Bro. Leo Dreifuss entitled "Rendering thanks to God."

We have had news that our Sister Audrey Bundy was able to visit on Sunday September 22nd Bro. Leo Dreifuss of Wigan and Bro. and Sis. Albert and Ruth Woodhouse of Warrington where they remembered Our Lord's death in the Memorial Service. We pray for the Welfare of brethren and sisters everywhere.

With Sincere love in The Master's Service. Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

O Thou, Whose Compassionate Care.

O Thou, whose compassionate care
Forbids my sad heart to complain,
Now graciously teach me to bear
The weight of affliction and pain.

Though cheerless my days seem to flow,
Though weary and wakeful my nights,
What comfort it gives me to know
'Tis the hand of the Father that smites.

A tender physician Thou art,
Who woundest in order to heal,
And comfort divine dost impart
To soften the anguish we feel.

Oh, let this correction be blest,
And answer Thy gracious design;
Then grant that my soul may find rest
In comforts so healing as Thine.

A reply to

“A More Perfect Way”

a book “by P. Brady of Queensland, Australia

Having been loaned this book by one of our Australian members we were greatly encouraged by the introduction on page 1 and a small part of page 2 which concluded his remarks on the well-meaning Christadelphian Brethren of 1958 in Australia. Unfortunately his remarks under the heading FELLOWSHIP, if put into practice would be on a par with Infant Sprinkling and Confirmation, which was instituted by the very Apostate Church to which he once belonged and which he now rightly condemns. He says, “I do not believe anybody should be disfellowshipped or excluded from fellowship because of their views on the nature of man and the ‘atonement’, as I believe the full ramifications of these issues constitute ‘the meat of the word.’ I am happy to fellowship with people who differ from my views on the atonement, but I refuse to allow them to dictate to me that I must accept a statement of faith that I believe contains error. Much of the pedantic detail about the nature of man and the atonement could be safely excluded from our Statement of Faith.”

This is an astonishing statement to make, and one might ask on what basis of belief P. Brady was accepted into the Christadelphian Body if it need not contain views on the nature of man and the atoning work of Christ?

If these issues constitute “the meat of the word”, then it was the “meat of the word”, Paul first received as a convert to Christ, as he states in I Cor. 15.5, “For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures:” “This is the gospel I preached unto you which you have received, and wherein ye stand, and by which also ye are saved if ye keep it in memory, unless its importance is of no consequence to you and ye have believed in vain”.

This probably explains why P. Brady and many more were accepted into Christadelphian Fellowship - the doctrine of, and prime importance of the Sacrifice of Christ not being preached as an important element of salvation, as not many people would be prepared to accept their blasphemous definition of its necessity. This definition I agree, should be excluded from any statement of faith of people purporting to profess Christianity, but are we to accept P. Brady’s view that introduction into the Body of Christ can exclude a knowledge and understanding of the Atonement with a promise that after immersion in water and a continued study of the subject we can on enlightenment and true understanding of Christ’s death, have it confirmed and the immersion validated as introduction into Christ’s death and resurrection? He has set out to condemn the Christadelphian acceptance of the original-sin doctrine of the Apostate Church yet he advocates a similar position in that fellowship, of entry by water, and responsible knowledge at a later date.

This will not do. Neither will God accept such a position. The priority He demands is respect for His Love and Gift of His Son. Jesus confirms it, “The son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many.” He did it according as the scriptures teach and not by some trumped up theory and invention so defined that it is impossible to explain or to understand. As Ernest Brady said in his comments, “We give P. Brady credit for pointing out the errors of the Unity Basis which the Nazarenes have been contending against for the past 100 yrs, so we should be thankful for small mercies.” However, I must rebuke him strongly for discrediting E. Turney and the Nazarenes by his ignorance of what we really believe and teach, in misrepresenting and focussing attention on it, and then proceeding to demolish what is his fictitious obstacles, in failing to read properly what we teach. There is no necessity of another chapter to expose, as he suggests, the errors of the Nazarenes lest he be accused of being one of them. He has made it clear in his introduction Page 2 ‘FELLOWSHIP’, that we would not accept him for the reasons I have stated already, but a continuation of the reading of the book should convince anyone who has a fair knowledge of our teaching that he could never be mistaken for a Nazarene, nevertheless this is not to say that if he qualified we would not be overjoyed to receive him, it rests with God not us. But as our brother Ernest Brady has said, “Pat Brady is not yet 40

yrs old, so he is still younger than many of us when we learned the truth, so we need not give up hope of him.”

On page 5 P. Brady exposes the B.A.S.F. and the Carter-Cooper Addendum as equally wrong and dishonouring to God, though they claim the opposite, and what he says at the bottom of the page echoes what the Nazarenes have been saying since 1873 and what I myself stated quite recently in one of our Circular Letters and quoting the very scripture he uses Ezekiel 18:19 and 20,

On page 6, he is not far off the mark in his view of Romans chapter 8 when he says it is impossible for the condemnation spoken of by Paul to be physically inherited because those who had been introduced into Christ had been made free from it yet they still had their corruptible nature (and its subjection to natural death) after baptism. The words in brackets I added, but it is exactly what we believe and teach, and it is a pity P. Brady misinterprets the condemnation Paul speaks of with the condemnation JESUS alludes to at the judgment of actual sinners. Romans 5:18 and John 5:24 are not descriptive of the same condemnation. The condemnation Paul speaks of came by one man Adam, and the words of Jesus in John 5:18 bear witness to this, but in John 5:24 Jesus is speaking in the future tense in reference to those who have passed from death to life by the obedience of faith after enlightenment, (and not by a physical transaction or prospective redemption as some believe) and of those who after enlightenment believeth not the Son but on whom the wrath of God abides as a consequence. John ch. 5 v 36. If a person has passed from death to life, then we have to determine in what way this has come about, if that person has not died physically then it must be some other death from which he has passed. The answer is found in Paul’s epistle to Romans 5:15 “...For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.” The apostle has shown how God has chosen to regard all men as involved in the sin of Adam. “By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.” We were not made sinners in the sense of being created evil or obliged by nature to become sinful. The meaning is that we are legally classified as under the reign of sin in a similar way to that in which we are by law citizens of the country in which we are born. Paul says death “passed upon” all men, implying that the sentence of death incurred by Adam hangs over all his descendants, since all who share his life would have perished in him if he had been put to death on the day of his sin. We would never have existed. So that Adam is not only the one from whom we are all physically descended, but he is also nominated the federal head of all who are under the reign of sin.

This is the relationship of being in Adam, or alienated from God, and its vital importance is because if we remain in it, that is, unredeemed, we are inescapably destined to perish. Let it be understood, in “passing from death to life”, Jesus is not speaking of the death which some mistakenly refer to as our temporary or limited natural existence, He is speaking, as Paul understood him, of those who were regarded legally dead on the federal principle by the offence of one; yet, not being physically dead, through a condition and acknowledgment of the Atoning Work of God in Christ, could through the obedience of faith pass from the one state to the other. There is no physical change involved yet people who believe that natural death passed on Adam because of his sin, are continually at a loss to understand Romans chapters 5 and 6, where Paul expounds this important matter. It is association by “symbolic death” in water into the “inflicted death of Christ by which we pass from the legally-dead-position to the justification-of-life-position in Christ, that when Christ who is our life shall appear we may also appear with him in glory.

The Christadelphian theory is a one-sided one, of entrance into Christ without an exit from Adam, the latter being impossible because of their physical condemnation concept, and of course a person is either in one or the other. Is P. Brady prepared to accept this situation? He may not be happy with it, and probably try his best to draw attention to this absurdity, and if he does remain for very long, it will be because his particular ecclesia is more tolerant than ours was when we tried the same thing.

Concerning Pat Brady’s reference as to why babies die, I cannot add much to what E. Brady has already said, I cannot accept P. Brady’s view that “babies die condemned for what God knows they would have done, nor for what Adam did.” In my view babies die in like manner as adults die because they are corruptible creatures like Adam from Adam from his creation, and their natural existence, short

or long, is due to the sacrifice of Christ, they would not otherwise have existed, so that apart from those whose future is governed “by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God and predestinated according to his Will and Purpose, time and chance happeneth to all, and not necessarily because of Adam’s sin.

If babies die for what God knows they would have done, surely more babies should have died than has been the case from the time of Adam; did the babies slaughtered by King Herod die as a result and punishment for something they would have done in the future? I rather think it was because they had no part in God’s Purpose and Herod was allowed to exercise his free-will as a responsible person and in accordance with Ezekiel chapter 18 probably merit the judgment of God, when the books are opened, Revelation 20:12.

I certainly agree with P. Brady that personal condemnation is in our hands if we have been enlightened to the message of the Gospel, and that being of the same nature as Adam does not mean we inherit condemnation; this is a legal matter not a physical. But “alienation from God” and “being dead” by the offence of One, was never in our own hands, it is the legal state into which we are born and is termed “The Constitution of Sin,” and in this way we are “constituted sinners” but not actual sinners, for sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, says Paul, “Death reigned from Adam to Moses.” What death? Why, the death which came by Adam’s sin and which hung over him and his posterity, deferred in the mercy of God through the slain lamb, the typical sacrifice of Christ, who suffered it instead of Adam, and all in his loins on the federal principal. “Even over them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.”

What does Paul mean here by sinning after the similitude of Adam? The answer is clear. There was no Garden of Eden, there was no forbidden tree, consequently they could not sin in this way. Were they under any other law? There is nothing in the record which says so until Moses, and Paul says “Where no law is there is no transgression,” and John says “Sin is transgression of Law,” so what constituted the sin which was in the world when there was no law until Moses? Surely it must be the “sin constitution” which entered the world by Adam’s disobedience whereby all are dead, sold under sin and which is reckoned to be “The Sin of the world,” which Jesus as the Lamb of God came to take away by giving the equivalent life Adam had forfeited.

The difficulty P. Brady poses with other Christadelphians is in regard to our claim that Jesus was a substitute. We say His life was the substitute because it was not forfeited or sold under sin as was Adam’s and his posterity. Jesus was not in the loins of Adam when he sinned and therefore Jesus was not a continuation of Adamic life though related to that flesh, being made of the seed of David, the Virgin Mary according thereto. Jesus Himself said “It is the spirit that giveth life, the flesh profiteth nothing.” It was the Spirit overshadowing Mary that operated upon her seed, which produced Jesus the Son of God and brother of the original Adam who was also son of God. P. Brady’s idea of a substitute is that he must “be a sinner as Adam was, and therefore he could not rise from the dead after partaking of the death due to the sinner. Jesus did in fact suffer the death due to the sinner but it was not the death due to Himself, for sin had no claim on Him by reason of being the Son of God by begettal and also “by reason of remaining sinless even up to His willing and voluntary death upon the Cross. Eternal Life therefore was his by birth and retention of his sonship, He was not asked to sacrifice this right, He was asked to sacrifice the natural life of flesh and blood as the equivalent of that which Adam should have lost when he sinned, instead of which Adam gained an extension which ended after 930 yrs, and a man does not have to be cursed with many adverse diseases or opposition to live that long. Jesus did indeed sacrifice His own natural existence, and the death He knew to be in prospect affected Him more adversely than the prospect of death through natural causes, you cannot make the former identical with the latter and agree with John Carter “He merely suffered death.” We must accept the scriptural evidence that sacrifice was introduced, because of Adam’s sin, and was by shedding of blood, but natural death common to all was a result of Adam being created in that condition even before a law of prohibition was enjoined upon him as a condition and continuation of his natural life.

On page 70 of P. Brady’s book we have the heading “Where the Nazarenes went wrong,” but he is proving where he himself has gone wrong by misrepresenting what Edward Turney stated and what

Nazarenes have continued to state ever since, namely, that the death that passed upon all men was by imputation and not by physical inheritance, that by His divine begettal Jesus was free from this alienation and bondage having derived His life direct from God, hence the expression 'Free Life' which means unforfeited to sin. P. Brady continues, "The big error in this theory is that they make Jesus 'different' from those he came to save, and Hebrews 2:14 stresses that this was not the case." Edward Turney may have used the word 'inherited' in the wrong sense, but he did not deny that Jesus had the same nature as other men; neither do any Nazarenes, in fact Turney and we believe emphatically Hebrews 2:14 and that the strength of Jesus to destroy him that had the power of death was in His freedom to give a life not already forfeited in Adam, but this fact did not make the quality of Christ's flesh any different.

P. Brady accuses E. Turney of putting forward the theory of inherited guilt, which is one of the two foundation pillars of the doctrine of Original Sin, the other being the concept of the physical change to "prone to sin" at Adam's transgression. He says that Christadelphians, although they hate to admit it, largely believe both pillars of the doctrine of Original Sin.

Well it is quite easy to misconstrue what people are trying to explain in writing and I believe this to be the case with Edward Turney's book "The Sacrifice of Christ," and we must appreciate also that he was only just on the verge of discovering the truth on this important subject from which others have derived spiritual benefit and more specifically and scripturally enlarged upon. Howbeit, Edward Turney never taught the doctrine of physically inherited condemnation neither do the Nazarenes, nor do we believe, as P. Brady appears to, that the penalty for Adam's sin was natural death, in fact he uses the expression "eternal death," which is not a scriptural term. He accuses Turney of saying that Jesus paid the debt. This is not true. Turney says that Jesus offered himself willingly to God as the ransom price whereby God could pay the debt incurred by Adam (remember Adam has not paid it; the penalty or debt incurred was natural life and Adam had this for 930 yrs.). Jesus was God's own Son produced for this very reason, therefore we are as obliged to God as we are to Jesus because, in the words of Andrew Wilson, God was not paying the Devil with his own coinage for this would be a fraudulent purchase. As Turney rightly said, "Herein lay the strength of Jesus in that while we were yet without strength to obtain our own release from sin's bondage Christ died for the ungodly." To say therefore, as P. Brady does, that the really big error Edward Turney made was the same one made by Robert Roberts in believing in the concept of condemnation as something inherited by all men from Adam, is entirely incorrect as his quoting from the booklet "The Sacrifice of Christ" shows, and is an entirely different concept to that of Robert Roberts who made the same mistake as P. Brady has made and showed, by his quoting Hebrews 4:14, a fact of scripture Turney was establishing in the quotation P. Brady uses from his booklet "The Sacrifice of Christ," that only in Jesus was the strength to destroy through death him that had the power of death that is the devil. Turney has shown as the Nazarenes have in their literature, that as soon as the Devil or Master of the kingdom and Constitution of Sin, accepted or took the Life of Jesus over which he (the Devil) had no claim, as a substitute for those whom he held in bondage, through being sold under sin (the Sin of Adam), he (the Devil) could have no more legal power over those who chose to take the redemption or deliverance available to them by transferring from the enlightened state of "Being sold in Adam," to the state of "Being in Christ," also by enlightenment and faith. To understand Hebrews 2:14 and 15, P. Brady and everyone else must acknowledge that the death which came by sin and passed upon all men, was not by natural decay, neither was the condemnation an indwelling inbred propensity causing men to do more evil than good and styled sin-in-the-flesh or the Devil. Until Christadelphians cast this Apostate doctrine to the moles and to the bats they will continue to peddle the false theory that Jesus destroyed the devil in Himself but could not have done so for others because they still continued to die. This false theory obviously is bound to lead them to a false interpretation of Hebrews 2:14 and 15, they conveniently leave out verse 15 because they have no scriptural and logical answer to a condition Jesus brought about there and then for both Jews and Gentiles through His voluntary sacrifice for the world. "God so loved the world that He gave His Only Begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish."

The recent correspondence from a Christadelphian still teaches their old theory that God produced His Son in human nature synonymous with the Devil in order to condemn it by the ignominious exhibition of Christ's death upon the cross. I fail to see how this can harmonise with the statement of the Apostle, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto

them.” Yet the Apostle in Galatians 5:22 shows despite this latter statement of non-imputed trespasses, that God in His Love, Goodness and purpose, has concluded all men under the one sin of Adam so that the promises and blessings in Abraham by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. It is not therefore a question of being blamed for Adam’s sin, but by being members of his body and in his loins when he sinned, we also by enlightenment can accept God’s offer of justification of life and righteousness through the obedience of one Jesus Christ, If condemnation came about by our own acts of disobedience as P. Brady suggests, in what way have we achieved the position of being answerable to God when Paul declares emphatically in Romans ch. 6 that prior to baptism and induction into Christ, all were under the law of Sin as a master, and were his servants and received his wages, whereas eternal life was not wages but a gift of God, not of works but through Jesus Christ on the federal principal and by faith, as Paul sets it forth in all his epistles especially in Romans chapter 5. If God had not concluded all under the one sin of Adam we would all need a Jesus Christ for our own particular guilt, to redeem us, this would involve the necessity of multitudes of Jesus Christs, an unacceptable situation, so Paul gives the answer to the difficulty. Romans 5:15-21. Paul further declares that if while we were enemies or alienated from God, we were reconciled by the death of His Son, much more, “being reconciled we shall be saved by His life. God is gracious toward our predicament through Adamic sin, He does not condemn us personally for it but provides the “Atonement” or the Way back to Himself even through Jesus who declared “I am the Way the Truth and the Life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me.” Therefore “The Way Back to God,” or “The Atonement” must be achieved through faith in the Sacrifice of Christ and this requires a correct knowledge and understanding of its meaning. Paul has shown this fact in Romans chapters 5 and 6 and P. Brady has done little credit to Paul by misrepresenting and misinterpreting his unparalleled reasoning from the scriptures of truth. On page 71 of his book P. Brady says, “I would like somebody to prove that there is any difference “between the Unity Basis of physical condemnation and the Nazarene one of legal condemnation; for the people under both those condemnations the result is the same - death; so it is ridiculous to argue that there is any difference between them.” If the reader of this reply and that also of E. Brady, is not already convinced that there is a vast difference, then the remarks of our Bro. Hold who sent us the book should make it absolutely clear.

“Physical condemnation applies to the nature of man in the Christadelphian concept and baptism cannot remove it; the nature or flesh and blood rises from the water exactly as it entered and is still subject to the natural death which is believed by the candidate to be the condemnation inherited from Adam’s sin.”

This death Jesus did not suffer on the cross, He did not die a natural death, so it is obvious that the aforementioned candidate was not immersed into the death of Christ, and therefore cannot rise to newness of life in Him - the old man not having been crucified with Him that the body of sin, or in sin’s possession, might be put to death or destroyed - the physical condemnation still being in the flesh of the candidate, its penalty still has to be met in the experience of natural death. The Nazarene concept is that Adam on the day he sinned incurred the sentence of death by the shedding of blood, having forfeited the life which was in the blood. He was therefore legally dead, and all in his loins who would be the recipients of his forfeited life. But the sentence of death inflicted upon Adam was deferred in that God foresaw in His own begotten Son, exempt from the Adamic condemnation, the means by which Adam could be spared and continue his already corruptible and, limited life in reconciliation to God till he returned to the ground, not without hope. Of the lamb slain for the substitution of Adam’s death, Jesus was the antitype and voluntary sacrifice, in shedding His blood to take away the Sin (singular) of the world, Adam’s. Jesus suffered willingly the death due to Adam. It is into that inflicted death Nazarenes have been baptised. The death Jesus suffered was physical and real. Theirs is symbolic in acknowledgement that they have died unto Sin as a master, and have risen to newness of life, in the likeness of His resurrection, natural death being “but a falling asleep, a resting from their labours until becoming in reality subjects of the resurrection of eternal life.

Natural death therefore is not a penalty but a result of being descendants of a man who was corruptible and capable of death from his creation if left to himself without any further modification. The fact and prospect of resurrection did not make the physical suffering any the less for Jesus, nevertheless He did endure the cross for the joy set before Him. We are merely asked to die in symbol

and there is nothing physical involved apart from the act of immersion, the rest pertains to conscience, natural death has no place in Romans chapter 5. To the physical-condemnation believers, there remains condemnation, the old man is not crucified with Christ, theirs dies a natural death. To the inflicted-death believers, they have associated themselves in that mode of death symbolically with Christ and have transferred from Adam to Christ. There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, but there is to those who are still in Adam now, on the principal of hereditary physical condemnation from which immersion has failed to release them. I hope P. Brady can see now that there is a difference between the two deaths - the one by creation and the other by man - that there is only one escape from the former and this by a change - that there is escape from the latter legal one by man "and that is by Baptism into Christ and the "likeness" of His resurrection. If any man be in Christ he is a new creature if he is not, then he is in Adamic alienation and sin.

P. Brady seems to imply that we can earn eternal life by our works, and be equal almost to the love of God to be worthy of salvation, and much of what he says on page 74 is acceptable, but his alternative suggestion for the necessity of the virgin birth as a replacement for the Nazarene concept and that of the Unity Basis, is not an alternative in the fullest sense and is only half true, because the extent of the "Love of God in giving His Son is also involved in the Nazarene concept and appreciated highly, but if there was no more to be achieved than God showing His Self-sacrificing Love For a Son He held dear and wished to shew in the death of Jesus a love that would forgive us and save us, as P. Brady's alternative implies, then Jesus need not have died. Perhaps he has forgotten Hebrews 2:14 and 15 that the necessity of Christ being born of the Virgin Mary gave him the direct power of an un- forfeited life by which He was able to "render powerless him that had the power of death and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage." As I have proved, they could not have been in fear of natural death all their life time, and not even the prospect of resurrection could lessen that experience. I hope therefore that all Christadelphians will read Hebrews 2:14 and 15 with more understanding and a different motive than what they have used it for hitherto. Certainly the Love of God was beyond comprehension in allowing Jesus to die, yet it must be said that Jesus made it more bearable in His voluntary submission to the only means His Father could uphold justice and at the same time His abundant mercy Love and compassion toward His Creation.

I hope I have shown that the Nazarenes do not believe in "inherited guilt," and that "alienation" is a different thing from personal guilt, that if we sin wilfully after we have received a knowledge of the Truth there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins but a certain fearful looking for of judgment. Hebrews 10:26. Also to this agrees Hebrew 6:4 - 6, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift (Jesus Christ) and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come. If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." For the offering of the body of Jesus Christ for sanctification was once for all. Every high priest stood daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God. For "by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Why? "Because it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin. They were offered year by year as a remembrance not only for personal sin under the law, but of the Offence or Sin of Adam in which all were held in bondage and constituted sinners, that by the obedience of one man Jesus Christ, many could be constituted righteous. Moreover says Paul, the law entered, that the offence might abound. What offence? The offence of Adam. But where this abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, that is, the death of Christ, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord. This is what Paul means when he says "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." Yes, it could bring us to Christ, but there was something it could not do because it was weak, and that weakness lay in the fact that men could not be justified or constituted righteous in the sight of God, for by it was the knowledge of sin; What sin? Again we must point to Adam for the answer because there were people who kept the law blameless - the parents of John the Baptist and Paul among probably many more. Yet Paul says, "The commandment which was ordained to life I found to be unto death," "For I was alive without the law once but when the commandment came sin revived and I died." How did Paul die? It was through enlightenment to the fact that by the offence of one Adam, many were dead and the law could not give life. As he further says, "If there had been a

law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe, but after that faith is come we are no longer under a schoolmaster - but we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” Paul showed they were not sinners by the inability to keep the law, but that despite the keeping of it, they were still un-released from the “constitution of sin” through faith in the redemptive power of Christs’ death to which the law was continually pointing and on account of which it was said to be weak - for Paul does not say the flesh was weak and unable to keep it, which Christadelphians continue to teach and affirm in wresting scripture out of context. everything almost that Paul writes in Romans chapters 1 to 8 concerns the sin of Adam, the federal principal, and the law of Moses, which served to make manifest the alienation, so that men might avail themselves of the redemption in Christ through his death and resurrection, and this is showing where the mercy of God commenced in Eden even after Adam had sinned. God commenced to save, not to infuse into flesh of Adam and his seed a “bias and inclination to sin as part of the sentence, and which Christadelphians” believe and teach as part of the Original-Sin theory of the Apostate church. P. Brady realises this to “be an error but he endeavours to put an error of his own invention in its place and calls it “A More Perfect Way.” If he has not yet learned that the term “Sinful Flesh was never used by Paul and that the correct Greek translation is “Sins Flesh” or flesh belonging to Sin or in Sin’s possession or ownership, then he will not understand what Paul declared in 1 Corinthians 15:17 “And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your Sins.” Paul is here signifying something that has been removed by the death and resurrection of Jesus, and that if sin had been a physical fixation of evil in his flesh which Christadelphians term “condemned flesh,” then he could not have risen and they who had been baptised into His death would still be in Sin’s bondage or possession. But, says Paul “Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the firstfruits of them that Slept.” He also infers that by the Romans being symbolically crucified and risen with Christ, they had died unto Sin as a Master and by resurrection become servants to another master Jesus Christ. In other words, “If Christ be not risen they were still bondservants to Master Sin unto whom Adam had sold them.” “Condemnation” for personal and unforgivable sins would come as a result of responsibility to this new master and result in the second death, this also being an “inflicted-death” by sin, as was also the first death, demonstrated in the slain lamb in Eden, Paul has endeavoured to show that the Law in itself could not give life, yet says it was holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good in the sense of “being a code of good conduct, yet in his Pharisaical tradition he had ruled out the fact that redemption in Christ was vital before a code of good conduct could count for anything in the sight of God. Hence, a reading of Romans chapter 5 will show the truth of this as will most of Paul’s epistles, though as the apostle Peter said, “our beloved brother Paul wrote some things hard to be understood and in consequence some who are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures to their own destruction.” II Peter 5:15 and 16.

Pat Brady in his book has shown this to be true of the Apostate Roman Catholic Church’s doctrine of original-sin theory and if anything a similar and worse theory of the Christadelphians. I thank God we of the Nazarenes have been shown a “better way,” and if the more perfect way is yet to be shown then I am sure we shall all “be humble enough and ready to receive it. After reading Bro. E. Brady’s reply to P. Brady in which he has a way of condensing so much into forthright and logical scriptural reasoning, I feel my effort to “be rather inadequate with perhaps too much repetition, “but one has to do this sometimes to get it into some people’s biased minds, and so I have come to the conclusion of naming Hebrews 2:14, the Christadelphian ‘Jack in the Box’ because despite telling them we believe it, they keep springing it on us. “Clean Flesh” libellous accusation being the cause. Let it be noted, Edward Turney believed in the two sons of God as of identical nature. I. Adam at Creation. II. Jesus at his birth of Mary. The Nazarene Fellowship endorse this fact of Scripture.

P. Parry (5-9-85).

As outside Australia few will have heard of P. Brady’s book entitled “A More Perfect Way,” for this reason our Bro. P. Parry has briefly summarised the respective headings in the book with a few comments.

BIBLE TRUTH. Page 4. This gives fifteen separate statements purporting to be in harmony with the heading. P. Brady says that his book will only make sense if the reader has discovered the following Bible Truths numbered one to fifteen. This statement is rather bold seeing many readers will discover they are not all Bible Truths in the order presented.

Number 7. This is not in harmony with I Corinthians 15:51 and 52; I Thessalonians 4:14 and 18; John 6:58-58; Luke 14:14; Luke 20:55 and 58.

Number 8. This still has a suspicion of the Christadelphian view that the Devil is synonymous of human nature, instead of a mind un-renewed by the enlightenment and knowledge the word of God can produce, and therefore cannot be a quality of physical flesh but of character undeveloped or developed by the word of the Spirit, as the case may be. "Be not conformed to this world or 'constitution of sin' but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds," says Paul.

Number 12. I would rather think this was more of a request than a command as in taking heed to the significance of the Passover and symbolic Bread and Wine in reference to Christ. John 6:47-58, it is in our own spiritual and eternal interest.

Number 14. This again is a refutation of I Corinthians 15:51 and 52; I Thessalonians 4:14-18 etc. as in comments of No. 7.

Page 5. WHY FEDERAL OR ADAMIC CONDEMNATION in The Christadelphian is wrong.

In his comments on this he destroys the Christadelphian theory but when he gets to nearly half way of page 6, his own views become rather debatable regarding what he says of Romans 5:18, nevertheless he is correct in opposing physical condemnation.

Page 7. WHY BABIES DIE.

This obviously is something of a subject that comes under the non-responsibility category and has been answered by Ernest Brady and myself but whether the answers satisfy the readers is another matter, but I feel sure P. Brady's view is unsatisfactory.

Page 12. WAS THE DEATH OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST JUST?

According to R. Roberts, John Carter and many others of that body it was. But P. Brady has proved this theory wrong and blasphemous, in most of what he establishes from scriptural Truth. The Nazarenes have also demonstrated from the scriptures of Truth in harmony with the Apostle Peter that the death of Jesus was unjust and that God only allowed it because of the willingness of Christ to submit to it for the confirmation of the promises from Eden to Gethsemane which would have failed if they had been un-ratified in and by his shed blood. "For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." I Peter 5:18. We have shown this to be for the purpose of redemption from Adamic alienation; if not, then why the sacrifices offered from Abel to the Patriarchs?

Page 16. DID JESUS MERIT REDEMPTION BEFORE HIS DEATH?

In view of Dr. Thomas' definition of Redemption this question regarding Jesus should never arise or be asked. P. Brady should ask himself, "Was Jesus, the direct Son of God, ever under a former lord? Did God purchase Him in some way before He could be said to be God's Servant? Of course not. Even John Carter declares that Jesus always addressed God as "My Father" implying that at no time was He alienated from Divine Sonship as Adam was by sin. P. Brady uses the term mortal-body in relation to that of Jesus. This is incorrect. Mortal means subject to death through breach of law; Jesus was therefore capable of natural death if left to Himself without a change, but this condition was not by breach of law but as a result of being the seed of the woman corruptible like all creation from the beginning. Certainly Jesus needed an incorruptible body to inherit eternity and He rose in that state of incorruption, a body of flesh and bone energised by Spirit instead of the blood wherein was the life he

sacrificed for all. He was rich by virtue of an unforfeited life to sin, both by birth and by conduct. His poverty lay in the fact that He gave up His right to natural life that we might have life and have it more abundantly; even the riches He had as Heir of God could be shared as a result of not forfeiting His life by personal sin, and God raised Him incorruptible. We accept most of the other things P. Brady says under this heading especially where he flattens the unscriptural views of Christadelphianism because we have attested this for years and it is nothing new to us.

Page 21. SUBSTITUTION or REPRESENTATION.

P. Brady's difficulty in accepting substitution lies in the false belief that natural death is the penalty for sin. If the death of Jesus was unjust as it certainly was, why cannot he see that natural death is also unjust as a penalty, if as he says, God forgives and still exacts the full penalty? On page 19 he appears to contradict himself by stating that the death of Jesus was not unjust, but for different reasons. But his reasons do not make the death of Jesus by wicked hands a just one. How could God be said to be the justifier of them that believe in Jesus if His death was just? How can His slayers hands be clean if His death was termed that of the Just One? God allowed it, not because it was just, but because it was the only way, and because Jesus willingly accepted God's way.

Page 25. WHY WAS A VIOLENT DEATH NECESSARY?

This has been answered adequately and scripturally by E. Brady and other Nazarenes before Pat Brady was born and has been directly answered as a result of his book. He says, "Why then did God request such a death of Jesus when He obviously derived no personal satisfaction from it and when it was not required as a penalty to uphold any principles of Divine justice? He answers this question as though he had made a statement of scriptural fact, which is not the case, and then he continues, "I feel the answer to that question is that it was necessary for our sakes. God was well pleased with Jesus long before he died." We have already proved that this inflicted violent death was required as a penalty for sin, that of Adam, because this was the penalty he incurred and whereby those in his loins would have perished unborn. And in his undeserved death Jesus willingly upheld the Divine principles of justice for Adam's sake and ours. This should also answer Pat Brady's query why it pleased the Lord to bruise him. - Isaiah chapter 53.

Page 28. MORTALITY AND OBEDIENCE.

Much of what P. Brady states under this heading incorporates much of our teaching. But to say that Jesus earned life for Himself before He died on the cross is not the way I would put it. He did not earn eternal life He was born with that right and by His righteous conduct and integrity He retained it. Eternal life is the gift of God. The time a person remains in the dust of the earth does not add to the penalty or take from it. There is no consciousness in the death state. Jesus suffered all that was involved in Adam's penalty, and dust thou art and unto dust shall thou return was no part of it. God raised Him from the dead because He was not a sinner,

Page 36. THE PHYSICAL CHANGE.

Here P. Brady gives a list of 7 observations and statements and I can agree with most of what he says until reaching the seventh where he says, and, I believe contradicts himself, "Adam did have some proneness to sin" before the transgression, or else he would not have sinned." This I believe to be an absurd statement. The propensities of free-will are God-given and governed by His law and cannot be styled "sin" "nor a proneness to sin," since the person under the law is as equally capable of its observance as of breaking it. How can there be Divine Justice and equality otherwise?

Page 41. What about 2 Corinthians 5:21? What about Romans 8:3?

Page 42. What about Hebrews 2:14?

Page 43. What about the Serpent on the Pole?

All the above have been answered and if P. Brady and others have not read our matter on these subjects it may be because they have either been warned, threatened or told to burn them. We can supply plenty of blank paper for this purpose, but we do not write for the sake of writing but to enlighten people to the Truth; answers to these subjects would, therefore be available if required. And please remember also Hebrews 2:12,

Page 44. P. Brady's reference to Romans 6:12, and his explanation seems to be an admission of the "sin-in-the-flesh" and "sinful-flesh" theory as a physical element. Whereas Paul has already explained how the power of King Sin's reign over them had been taken away in Christ's death and their association by baptism with it. King Sin was never said by Paul to be in their mortal body, and it was no longer a matter of evicting nor de-throning Sin as their king, but of not allowing him to reign through disloyalty to the newly accepted King and Master Jesus Christ.

Page 80. MY STATEMENT OF FAITH.,

P. Brady's alternative Statement of Faith is almost as inadequate and misleading as the B.A.S.F. Clause 5 being unscriptural and little changed in words and meaning. Adam was never adjudged unworthy of immortality but of natural life through sin. I myself believe he had a second probation through the merits of Christ's death and I have no reason to believe he will not be a subject of the Kingdom of God. Much can be learned by reading P. Brady's book and comparing it with our replies and comments but I am sure nothing will be gained by what he calls his A.A.A.S.F. as a replacement for the B.A.S.F. If the intelligence he has shown can take him to the extent of exposing the Unity Basis as false and untenable to the lovers of justice, mercy and Truth, then he deserves to go on to a better realisation than what he has shown in, "A More Perfect Way."

P. Parry.

Alabaster Boxes Of Human Sympathy

Do not keep the alabaster boxes of your love and tenderness sealed up until your friends are dead. Fill their lives with sweetness. Speak approving, cheering words, while their ears can hear them and - while their hearts can be thrilled and made happier by them. The kind things you mean to say, say before they go. The flowers you mean to send to brighten and sweeten their homes, send before they go. If my friends have alabaster boxes laid away full of fragrant perfumes of sympathy and affection, which they intend to break over my dead body, I would rather they would bring them out in my weary and troubled hours, and open them, that I may be refreshed and cheered by them while I need them. I would rather have a plain coffin without a flower, a funeral without a eulogy, than a life without the sweetness of love and sympathy. Let us learn to anoint our friends beforehand for their burial. Post-mortem kindness does not cheer the burdened spirit. Flowers on the coffin cast no fragrance backward over the weary way.

Selected from among our late brother Fred Pearce's papers.

An Exhortation

Rendering Thanks To God.

By. Bro. Leo. Dreifuss.

I wish to consider briefly the life of Hezekiah, one of the kings of Judah. Let us first read a few verses from the second Book of Kings and the second Book of Chronicles:-

“In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amos came to him, and said unto him, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die and not live. Then he turned his face to the wall, and prayed unto the Lord saying, I beseech thee, O Lord, remember now how I have walked before thee in truth and with a perfect heart, and have done that which is good in thy sight. And Hezekiah wept sore. And it came to pass, afore Isaiah was gone out into the middle court, that the word of the Lord came to him, saying, Turn again, and tell Hezekiah the captain of my people, Thus saith the Lord, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: behold I will heal thee: on the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of the Lord. And I will add unto thy days fifteen years; and I will deliver thee and this city out of the hand of the king of Assyria; and I will defend this city for mine own sake, and for my servant David’s sake. And Isaiah said, Take a lump of figs. And they took and laid it on the boil and he recovered.” II Kings 20:1-7.

“In those days Hezekiah was sick unto death, and prayed unto the Lord: and he spake unto him, and he gave him a sign. But Hezekiah rendered not again according to the benefit done unto him; for his heart was lifted up: therefore there was wrath upon him, and upon Judah and Jerusalem. Notwithstanding, Hezekiah humbled himself for the pride of his heart, both he and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that the wrath of the Lord came not upon them in the days of Hezekiah.” II Chronicles 32: 24-26

The life of Hezekiah is typical of the life of many people in our day. He made a good start in the Lord. When he took over the government, the children of Judah had practically forsaken the Lord altogether. Idol worship was the fashion of the day. The Temple which should have been dedicated to God became defiled with idols. The Law of Moses had fallen into neglect.

Hezekiah cleansed the Temple, and restored the worship of God. He put the priests and the Levites back into their office. Having done that, he and his people kept the Passover, the feast at which the Jews went up to Jerusalem to worship and to remember their liberation from Egyptian bondage, the feast of unleavened bread. Things had gone from bad to worse ever since the days of David and Solomon, and we are told that such a Passover as Hezekiah’s had not been observed since the days of Solomon, who lived nearly three hundred years earlier. So Hezekiah revived a Divine commandment which had been neglected all that time, some 250-500 years.

Afterwards some misfortune befell the Jewish nation. Jerusalem was besieged by the powerful Assyrian army. They had just overthrown all the neighbouring countries, and also the ten tribes of Israel who had fallen away from the house of David. That calamity was God’s punishment for the sins of the ten tribes. But the house of Judah in the days of Hezekiah had returned to God. Hezekiah prayed to God. And God heard his prayer and on two occasions turned the invading armies out of Judah and saved His people.

After that, a personal calamity befell Hezekiah. He fell sick and the Lord said to him through the prophet Isaiah that he must die. But Hezekiah prayed unto the Lord, and God heard him and healed him and added unto his life another fifteen years.

But some time later, Hezekiah’s heart became lifted up. He ceased to thank God. He neglected God. We read that the king of Babylon sent messengers to Hezekiah, and that he showed the messengers all that he had. We read that “God left him, to try him that he might know all that was in his heart”. (II Chronicles 32:31). It appears that Hezekiah has neglected God to such an extent that he never mentioned him to those messengers. He glorified himself rather than God, and as the ruler, so the people, they also neglected again the things of the Lord, and so we read (II Chronicles 32:25) “Therefore there was wrath upon him, and upon Judah and Jerusalem.” But when things began to go wrong again, Hezekiah and the people turned to the Lord afresh, and so “the wrath of the Lord came not upon them in the days of Hezekiah.”

Now what can we learn from that? Hezekiah’s life is typical of that of so many people, to our day. Like many who learn to know the Lord and turn to him, he made a good start. He was zealous for the

Lord and the whole aim of his life was to turn the nation of Judah back to the Lord whom they had forsaken. Then things went wrong. First the invasion by the Assyrian armies, then his illness. Hezekiah took his troubles to the Lord who heard him and delivered him. Hezekiah's prayer of thanksgiving after the recovery from his illness is recorded for us (Isaiah 38:9-20).

Now all people, even many among those who have never a thought for the Lord, pray when things go wrong. Many people of the world say nearly out of habit: "Lord deliver us;" But I wonder how many thank the Lord afterwards, when He has delivered them. I hope that all of us make it a habit not only to pray when a calamity or an illness threatens, or before some unusual ordeal, many people of the world do the same, but let us also give thanks to God after He has delivered out of a calamity. Hezekiah did so after his recovery from his illness. And when we pray in face of some calamity, do we always put God's will before ours? Do we always make our requests subject to His supreme will? And are we always concerned that God should be glorified, not ourselves? Listen to Hezekiah's prayer as a pattern, the one he prayed in face of the threatening Assyrian army. They had just overthrown all the surrounding countries, and as the custom in those days was, destroyed their idols. They thought it in their power to destroy the Temple in Jerusalem as they destroyed all the idol temples in other places. But God intervened. This is Hezekiah's prayer. Isaiah 57:16-20. "O Lord of Hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubim, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth: thou hast made heaven and earth. Incline thine ear, O Lord, and see: and hear all the words of Sennacherib, which hath sent to reproach the living God. Of a truth, Lord, the kings of Assyria have laid waste all the nations, and their countries, and have cast their gods into the fire: for they were no gods, but the work of men's hands, wood and stone: therefore they have destroyed them. Now therefore, O Lord our God, save us from his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art the Lord, even thou only."

Mark the motive behind this prayer:

1. That God should reprove the leader of the Assyrian armies for his blasphemies,
2. That all the kingdoms of the earth may through this incident learn of God and of His power.

Do we always realise that any crisis in our life may be sent for a special purpose which we may understand only much later? Do we always put complete trust in God, that whatever the outcome, it is according to His will?

You see we with our limited knowledge only see and know partially. But God sees and knows so much more, and in the light of that knowledge, what we want may not be at all for our own good, quite apart from the fact that it may not be for the good of God's purpose with any of us being furthered.

Let us take to heart the warning of Hezekiah's actions some time later after he was delivered. "He rendered not again according to the benefit done unto him." So many people, when they are doing well, forget to thank God, many don't pray at all when things go well. As for their blessings of wealth and position, they talk as if by their own ability they got it all, they never bring God into it. Let us then try to learn three things from the life of Hezekiah:-

1. In our prayers, let us put God's will before ours, even in face of some calamity, when our own worries may overcast everything else.
2. When our troubles are over, let us not forget to give God thanks immediately.
3. When things go well, let us not forget to attribute our blessings to the love and mercies of God.

The Power Of Prayer

“Lord, what a change within us one short hour
Spent in Thy presence will prevail to make;
What heavy burdens from our bosoms take;
What parched ground’s refresh as with a shower;
We kneel, and all about us seems to lower;
We rise, and all the distant and the near,
Stands forth in sunny outline, brave and clear.
We kneel, how weak we rise, how full of power
Why, therefore, should we do ourselves wrong,
Or others, that we are not always strong;
That we are ever overborne with care,
Anxious and troubled, when with us is prayer,
And joy and strength and courage are with Thee?”

Selected.
