

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No 86

January 1987

In this Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Bro. and Sis. Harvey and Evelyn Linggood
Page 2 Letter from	Brother Ray Gregory
Page 3 "Sacrifice" – continued	Brother Ernest Brady
Page 5 David – A Man After God's Own Heart	Brother G.L.Dreifuss
Page 8 Was R.Roberts the First Apostate Christadelphian?	Brother Phil Parry

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Reader Friends, Warm Greetings in Jesus Name.

By the time many of you receive this Circular Letter the current year of 1986 will in the annals of men be past history.

In the purpose of God it has been another phase forward wherein we have seen many signs of the times spoken of in the Scriptures being fulfilled and the new year we pray will give us more cause to take heed realizing "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed" Romans 15:11, We have seen disasters at sea in merchant and naval ships. While men still learn war, early this year during the N.A.T.O. at sea exercises tragedy struck. How we long for the days spoken of in Micah 4:3. The past year has seen disasters in the Air; on Earth; under the Earth; at sea and under the sea; drought; famine; floods; typhoons; volcanic eruptions and the unusual Nios Volcanic Gas Disaster in Cameroon with undersea lava .

Early September a Locust plague threatened the only area in Sudan where crops were growing, all efforts to halt it failed; the fear was heightened as it was near their breeding time. The past few winters in Israel have seen a shortage of rain and in the minds of officials rationing of water during 1987 had to be thought about. But God's eyes are upon His land and the natural seed of Abraham. A few days ago we were informed that the early rains had come and 50% of its annual rainfall came, but still more was needed to build up stocks.

Anti-Semitic feeling continues with attacks upon Jewish business houses, shops and Synagogues, during Sept under the guise of photographers an attack made to kill Jews and destroy their recently renovated synagogue; as soon as inside auto pistols and grenades were used but the attackers were killed along with many worshippers. Lastly we site this terrible plague in this country which is spreading, A.I.D.S., could it even equal that of the disaster of 1665 - the plague of London?

In this month's issue we have the concluding article on "Sacrifice" by our late Bro. Brady. An exhortation entitled "David a man after God's own Heart" by Bro. Leo. Dreifuss. And an article by Bro. Phil Parry.

We are pleased to say that Bro. David Phillips is now out of hospital and until sometime during January he will be staying with his daughter. We warmly thank all those who have corresponded with us, and phone calls during the past month. The following letter may be of interest to all. We send love and best wishes to all for a happy and Peaceful New Year.

Your Bro. and Sis. in the Masters Service.

Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

To The Nazarene Fellowship.

Dear Bro. and Sister Linggood;

I was very sorry to hear of the falling asleep of Bro. Ernest; your loss must in some small measure be reflected by the loss we all feel, who had spoken with him and read his works. To many brethren and sisters in the Christadelphian community his writings have expressed their own convictions which had been hidden or locked away by their environment, kept under by an atmosphere of fear, fear of controversy, fear of contradiction, unable to speak out because of lack of common ground or interest and in some cases actual suppression of discussion. Bro. Ernest with his precise and incisive mind liberated us from our feelings of isolation and helped us to give at least to ourselves "A reason of the hope that is within us."

Our tragedy is our inability to converse in a helpful and constructive way, and bring what we treasure most to unwilling minds; opposition can stimulate, discussion can encourage but indifference can only cause pain. Bro. Ernest never turned his back on the brethren and sisters in the Christadelphian community, it was to us he sent his message of light and hope, very few of us responded but some knew him and appreciated what he did for us.

You may feel we are presumptions in expressing ourselves in this way but when we were baptised into Christ we were unaware of some of our leader writers understanding of the nature of man, the nature of Christ and the nature of his sacrifice, we had been taught the Bible only, by our parents and in the Sunday School, and have always believed as have others what you understand and teach but many more are only confused when the matter is brought to their attention.

The B.A.S.F. is not used when interviewing candidates for immersion, it is considered too difficult or obscure at that time, but it is expected that in due course it will be accepted and become the basis of membership!

Sincerely Your Brother Ray Gregory and Others.

In the secular world great emphasis is placed upon freedom of speech. Surely this freedom should be extended to religion.

ISAIAH ch. 8 v 20. 20. To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.

MALACHI ch. 3 v 16. 16. Then they that feared the LORD spake often one to another: and the LORD hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the LORD, and that thought upon his name.

Continued from last C.L.:-

“Sacrifice”

We shall now quote a portion of the same chapter construed as we believe it should be, in harmony with all Scripture, and to the best of our knowledge with the views advanced by the Nazarene Fellowship.

“Who hath believed our report? And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? ...surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we (not God) did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions (our transgressions, not His nature or ours). He was bruised for our iniquities (not for His flesh nor ours). The chastisement of our peace (ours-not His)

was upon Him, and with his stripes we (not Him) are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray (but not Jesus). We have turned everyone to his own way ("I do always those things that please my Father"). And the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity (He had already got our nature) of us all (not of Himself). For the transgression (not the flesh) of My people (not My Son) was He stricken. Because He had done no violence (His offering was acceptable) neither was deceit found in His mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him (Why? because he was displeasing in God's sight? Never. But because God so loved the world). He hath put him to grief (Why? Because his flesh had to be humbled? Never. But that He might bear our grief and our sorrow). When Thou shall make His soul (Life - not flesh) an offering for (not of) sin, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord (to save mankind) shall prosper in His hand. He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied; by the knowledge of Him shall My righteous ("born in sin," "fundamentally corrupt," "sin bitten"?) servant justify many; for He shall bear their (not His own) iniquities. Therefore will I divide Him a portion with the great, and He shall divide the spoil with the strong; because He hath poured out his soul unto death, and He was numbered with the transgressors (not because He was one of them but because He alone could bear their punishment and not perish) and He bare the sin (the sin, not the supposed sinful flesh) of many, and made intercession (not for Himself - He needed none) for the transgressors."

One would have thought it scarcely possible to expose the repulsiveness of Christadelphian doctrine more conclusively than A.D.Norris has already done by the confession that he can see no alternative to the belief that Jesus was Himself sin: by likening Him to the tempter in Eden; to "the vile forms which sin takes in all our human race" and his conviction that His death was required because of "the defects of His flesh... its fundamental corruptness." Nevertheless he achieves a new peak of pedantic folly in his explanations of why he thinks it was necessary for Jesus' death on the Cross to "display the deserts of 'sin exceeding sinful'."

It was in order, he says, "that the very fountain from which sin might spring should be sealed." Surely if there is one thing which Jesus established for all time by His life and example, it is that human nature is not necessarily a fountain of sin. Does not the fact that Jesus, made in all points like unto His brethren, lived a life free from sin, dispose for ever of the theory that all flesh is physically defiled and impregnated with "Sin" in such a way as to make it 'unpleasing in God's sight'? Must we be for ever repeating that the flesh is as God created it, and just as capable of bringing forth good treasures as evil. It is not the flesh which is displeasing but 'the works of the flesh,' which are manifest (Galatians 5:19). If Jesus did no sin then it is the worst example of muddled thinking to speak of the vile forms which sin takes in all our human race. Was not Jesus one of our human race? Then if His flesh demonstrably did not manifest 'fundamental corruptness' what becomes of Norris's assertion ?

Again, who can honestly and intelligently consider the record of Jesus' life from His temptation in the wilderness to His last hour at Calvary and speak of his physical self as 'the very fountain from which sin might spring'? Certainly we know, since He was tempted in all points like as we are, that it was always possible for Jesus to sin just as it is for us, but the purpose of the Gospel record is to show by the exercise of an enlightened mind and a determined will, temptation can be overcome and the lusts and appetites natural to man controlled. A.D.Norris's reasoning appears to be that Jesus' life was cut short because God judged it wise to extinguish His life while He was still without sin, for fear that the time might come when He would spoil everything by succumbing to temptation. It passes comprehension that anyone can entertain such a debased conception; we hope we are not doing him an injustice in attributing it to him but we can see no other meaning in his statement, "that is His 'emptying of Himself' the constant possibility of temptation might be done away." What a light this throws upon what he thinks of Jesus! It is our view, and we should have thought of all right thinking persons, that the temptations and experiences which Jesus endured in His short life were of such poignance and severity that nothing more could touch Him. "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." "I have glorified Thee on earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do." He has overcome every thought which might have come between Him and His Father and thereafter, even had He lived a normal span of years, it is as unthinkable that He could have sinned against Him because He was of flesh and blood as it is to think that He could do so now that He is of spirit. It did not need His death "to seal the fountain from which sin might spring" He sealed that fountain when He said: "It is written, man shall not live by bread alone."

Temptation is not a property of the flesh, any more than sin is, and to experience temptation is not sin. Temptation is a matter of the mind and can only be dealt with mentally.

Death will most certainly end the possibility of temptation, as it will of every other human experience or activity, but it can also be overcome - and this is how Jesus overcame - in a living man by the exercise of self-control and the determination to do well. "Resist the devil and he will flee from you." One stands aghast at the state of mind which sees as the purpose of Jesus' death, "that flesh must be thus ignominiously shamed... the essential ugliness of the spectacle in which flesh... its fundamental corruptness... was displayed... to show its nature and due destruction." Could such a death by any stretch of imagination be termed "a sacrifice;" "An offering of a sweet-smelling savour"? With what thankfulness and relief can we turn away from such evil perversions to the simplicity of wiser words which conveniently summarise our faith and, very largely, our case against Christadelphians and the new apostasy.

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him as He is. And every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as he is pure. Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is transgression of the law. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil. Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you. We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death. Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us. Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world."

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 realized that Christadelphians were just one of the many sects of apostate Christendom and that truth was really of less importance than their organization.

Ernest Brady.

David - The Man After God's Own Heart.

An Exhortation by G.L.Dreifuss

The Bible calls David "the man after God's own heart." So we do well to consider his life and character for a few moments. In all we read about his early life, we find a close similarity between David's personality and that of Christ. And it should be our ambition to follow as much as possible the example our Lord set us. I think it will be profitable for us to run quickly through David's experiences, and how he reacted in the various situations.

His predecessor was Saul who was rejected by God for disobedience. The first we read about David was how God sent His prophet Samuel to anoint David instead of Saul, and here, in the very few verses of his life history we are taught a lesson we do well to remember. We are told how God sent Samuel to David's home, but Samuel did not know beforehand which of Jesse's sons he was to anoint, he only knew it was one of them. And when he saw the tallest he thought this was he, but let us see what God said: "Look not on his countenance, nor on the height of his stature; because I have refused him: for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the Heart." (I Samuel 16:7). Yes, it is not the tallest, or the strongest, or the most handsome looking whom God chooses. God does not need any strong man anyway as He has so often shown. God has infinite

strength Himself and if He wills, He can destroy all life in a moment. It is a faithful heart God wants. David's family must have been as surprised as was Samuel at God's choice. They did not even think it worthwhile to call him. This is what they said of him: - "There remaineth yet the youngest, and behold, he keepeth the sheep." Yes, they thought of him as just the youngest, just a little shepherd, not worth bothering about. According to man's standards he would have been the last person considered for kingship. But God knows us more than we do ourselves, and in His foreknowledge He knows what we are going to do, and how we are going to turn out.

The next recorded incident is a very remarkable one. On account of Saul's disobedience, God's spirit departed from him, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him, and he asked for one who could play the harp when this evil spirit was on him. And out of all people, David, the very one who secretly was anointed his successor, was appointed. At about the same time, David's encounter with the Philistine giant Goliath took place. This was in itself a miracle and showed an unbelievable faith in God. Just think of it, an unarmed, inexperienced youth taking on a fight with an armoured, protected giant, experienced in combat. What a tremendous courage and faith; He knew that the encounter was decisive for had he lost it, it would not only have been a personal defeat, or even death, but defeat for all Israel. Just listen to David's challenge as Goliath meets him: "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of Hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied... and all this assembly shall know that the Lord saveth not with sword and spear: for the battle is the Lord's and He will give you into our hands." Yes, David, young as he was, got to the heart of the matter. "For the battle is the Lord's." He knew whom he served, and he was conscious of it all the time.

After that, David fought so many successful battles with the Philistines that Saul's jealousy was aroused and the evil spirit came upon him more and more often. And now there follows a long series of incidents in which Saul tried to kill David, and God delivered him every time. David was nevertheless forced to flee from Saul. Sometimes God directly intervened to save David. At other times He just allowed things to happen in such a way that David had his opportunity to escape. When David fled from home his wife made a dummy and put it in his bed and told Saul's messengers that he was sick.

After that Saul hunted David from pillar to post, and many times, just when by human standards it seemed that David was lost, God intervened; on the first such occasion the Philistines had invaded the land and forced Saul to abstain from pursuing David just as he was on the point of capturing him. But after the Philistines were driven back, Saul again pursued David. And now twice in close succession the Lord intervened. A deep sleep fell on Saul and his guard, and David actually got close enough to Saul to have had his chance to kill him. But each time we read of the great character of David - vengeance belongs to God. Man has no right to take life, unless God specially commands him to kill. Saul was still the Lord's anointed, and David dare not kill him. But to show his faithfulness he cut off the corner of Saul's robe, and on the other occasion took Saul's spear and water pot from the side of him. Then after having got away from Saul he shouted across to him, showed him how close he was, and how he spared his life. Saul repented for a short while, but soon after the evil spirit came back, and eventually David was forced to flee abroad, even to the Philistines. Time does not permit us to go into all the incidents. We know that eventually Saul came to his end at the hand of the Philistines in battle, and afterwards the kingdom gradually went to David. But one more incident we must mention. After Saul's death an Amalekite came to David thinking he would get a reward by telling him that he killed Saul. But far from it. David himself durst not do anything to the Lord's anointed, how much less this Amalekite? David far from rewarding him, actually killed him. Yes, David intended no evil. In spite of all that Saul had done to him, he remained faithful and loyal, even after Saul's death. He even mourned for Saul.

Although Christ lived about a thousand years later, there are so many close resemblances between his character and that of Jesus, that he might have been one of his disciples. Let us look at some.

1. As we have already seen he never took vengeance on Saul. Once, when God delivered Saul into his hand and one of his servants wanted to kill him, David stayed him with these words: "As the Lord liveth, the Lord shall smite him; or his day shall come to die; or he shall descend into battle and perish.

The Lord forbid that I should stretch forth mine hand against the Lord's anointed..." David, like Christ, realised that vengeance belongs to God.

2. He always trusted in God, and always was in contact with God through prayer, in all distress, in every calamity. But also on many joyful occasions of victory he never neglected to render thanks to God. He was always conscious of God's presence over him. His life, like that of Samuel, or Christ later, was a life of full, complete dedication to God. In this sense he serves as an example to us. How many of us can say this of our lives?

3. David was a man of war, but He was God's faithful servant none the less. From his youth, beginning with his encounter with Goliath, he was skilled at combat, and all the art and cunning of war strategy. But he never sought self-glorification. He never fought or killed for selfish ends, except in the matter of Uriah, but conducted all battles as God's servant, conscious of fighting for the Lord. It is often not realised that God chooses men of war as well as men of peace to fulfil his purpose with the nations of the earth. In God's plan there is a time for war as well as peace. There was a time of peace and prosperity during the reign of his son Solomon. But in David's day, God's purpose was to subdue all hostile nations, all nations around Palestine who were not completely subdued when Joshua entered the land, or during the time of the judges. One of the very good traits of David's character was that he did not enter into a single battle without asking God, which at the time was to be done at the tabernacle through a priest. And when he grew older and more experienced he did not let his greatness go to his head, but still enquired of God as at the first. He truly was a capable warrior to which his friends as well as his enemies amply testified. In fact he is among the best warriors and strategists history has produced. And, perhaps together with Joshua and a few other prophets of the Old Testament, he is the only one who in one person combined that of a warrior and a man of God. He truly put his abilities as a warrior at God's disposal.

4. It must be remembered that when Christ returns His chosen people are to fight God's enemies, and some of that might well fall to us. God is love, but a time comes when he punishes the rebels, and God's people are the instruments to carry it out, as was ancient Israel. At this present age we are not to fight or to avenge ourselves. But there are times, and have been throughout past history, when God destroys wicked and sinful nations, and Israel as the forerunner of the Kingdom of God to come, was His instrument to carry it out. In fact, the sin of Saul, yea, the very reason why God rejected him in favour of David, was that he spared Agag the king of the Amalekites when God commanded to kill him.

Of course everybody is gifted in a different way, not all are warriors. But David shows us a supreme example of how to put one's abilities, whatever they are, at the Lord's service. In this I am afraid we all fall short too often if we are honest with ourselves. Another point is his constant consciousness of the Lord's presence, that the Lord preserves those who seek Him. And do we always ask God before taking any decision, be it trivial or important? And do we always, without delay, render thanks to God, when things have gone well and our prayers have been heard?

Let us part with these searching thoughts hoping that when our Master returns we shall be among those found approved,

Was Robert Roberts the First Apostate Christadelphian?

Answer: Yes, if clause V of the B. A. S. F. is the result of his reasoning. For this clause does not express unadulterated Scriptural terms or show that it is the expression of a Scriptural idea - it is out of context.

The late H.H.James, a Christadelphian, made the following statement, "There is something wrong with a belief that cannot express itself in Scriptural terms, or show that it is the expression of a Scriptural

idea.” By his own statement clause V stands condemned, but if we examine further the other clauses, they will also prove there is something wrong; for hardly one clause expresses itself in clear Scriptural ideas or shows that it is the expression of a Scriptural idea, but rather the ideas of Robert Roberts, worded in phrases peculiar to himself and which none of his brethren can explain without being contradictory also. Yet H.H.James is critical of people who reach a belief of certain things by a process of logical and deductive reasoning. What is the B.A.S.F. but a process of unscriptural reasoning? Is clause V an expression of Scriptural terms? Certainly NOT. Where in Scripture terms does it say, “Surely Die” means a process by physical decay of the body, ending in the dust of the earth when life is extinct? Nowhere in Scripture.

Where in Scripture terms do we read, “Adam broke this law (for continuance of natural life) and was adjudged unworthy of immortality etc. Nowhere in Scripture. Where in Scripture terms do we read that after sinning, the Divine sentence defiled Adam and became a physical law of his being and was transmitted to all his posterity? Nowhere in Scripture. What did Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts have to say to the man who was advancing this very apostate theory and as a prospective candidate for immersion in accordance with their beliefs? They said in effect, “There are no Scripture terms, neither is it the expression of a Scriptural idea.” We will quote Robert Roberts from page 85 in the Ambassador, March 1869 to Mr. David Handley, the candidate mentioned: “Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no evidence of this whatever - there was a change in Adam’s relation to his Maker, but not in the nature of his organisation.” Dr. Thomas in connection with the same David Handley wrote: “Death and corruption, then, with reproduction, is the fundamental law of the physical system of the six days, from these premises it will be seen that we dissent from our correspondent’s notion that all creation became corrupt, by which we understand him to mean constitutionally impregnated with corruptibility at the fall. We believe the change was moral, not physical.” (Herald of the Kingdom page 159). This dissent from David Handley’s view, by both Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts was because there was no Scriptural evidence to support such presumption, the presumption and evidence being entirely contrary. Some ten years later Robert Roberts accepted this presumptive, unscriptural view. Consequently assent to this theory, defining a change in nature, is required to-day of every candidate for baptism and in support of the Christadelphian Statement of Faith with all its additional clauses as a basis for fellowship. While the premises of Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts in regard to creation and the corruptible nature of Adam were scripturally correct, their teaching on the Atonement involving the death of Christ was rather spasmodic and contradictory, but as we have asked the question, “Was Robert Roberts the first apostate Christadelphian? we must answer, that as the Apostasy consisted in a belief that Adam’s nature was changed after his disobedience, to that by which he and his posterity had a bias or tendency to sin in an increased and compulsive manner, and defined in the dictionary as “Original-sin,” we must be honest and say “Yes,” if clause V was his theory and accepted belief after stating there was no evidence for it in Scripture; he has rejected the truth he and Dr. Thomas held, thus making void a correct understanding of the atoning sacrifice of Christ. If further evidence were required against Robert Roberts it is found in his own writings; example: “Slain Lamb” and “Visible Hand of God.” In the latter book he supports the theory of the substitutionary death of Christ (in his views on Enoch and those of like faith who are living at the second coming of Christ) not through choice but because Scripture and logical deduction forced him to. But Scripture and logical deduction were both absent when he wrote in the same book in describing his view of the inflicted penalty for Adam’s sin, “it required what men call ‘a miracle’ to depress to the level of the beasts that perish the noble creature made in the image of the Elohim.” It is remarkable that Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts could find no Scriptural evidence for a change of Adam’s nature after his disobedience, and we find Dr. Thomas remains consistent in this view when writing Eureka for he says, “seeing that Adam had become a transgressor of Divine law there was no need of a ‘miracle’ for the infliction of death - left to himself as God had made him, all that was necessary was to prevent him from eating of the tree of life and to leave his flesh and blood nature to the operation of the laws peculiar to it. It was not a nature formed for interminable existence...” (Eureka Vol.1 p248).

It is to be regretted that beyond this point in Eureka Dr. Thomas also went off course in his theory of “The law of Sin and Death” and “The law of the Spirit of life in Christ,” being physical laws whereby the former could only be substituted for the latter by a physical change in its constitution thus making void the Spirits’ teaching by Paul in Romans chapter 8. It was at the foot of page 248 of Eureka Vol. 1,

that Dr. Thomas's return to the Apostate doctrine of Rome and Original Sin" and "Sin-in-the-flesh," became apparent. After describing Adam's body as being 'very good' at creation but immortality and incorruptibility being no part of that goodness, he goes on to say that because Adam sinned this perishing body is "Sin" and left to perish because of "Sin." The power of death is in its very constitution, so that the law of its nature is styled "The Law of Sin and Death." Thus as I have said, the Spirit's teaching in Paul is contradicted and misrepresented by two men Thomas and Roberts, and is set forth under the adopted name Christadelphian which means "Brother of Christ," but we are forced to the conclusion that brethren of Christ would teach in unity of the spirit of truth and show that it is the expression of a Scriptural idea and without contradiction. These two men and also those who have regarded them as inspired of God and continued their teaching without question, have failed to qualify for that standard. Sincere people under the aforesaid adopted name, refer to themselves quite glibly, and in many cases thoughtlessly, as "In the Truth," so if what has been demonstrated in just these few examples of the two Christadelphian pioneers is still regarded as "The truth to be received" as embodied in their "Statement of Faith" and therefore confusion worse confounded and unexplainable, then under this "Banner of Christadelphianism" they can believe anything apart from what is listed under the heading "doctrines to be rejected" numbering 35 on page 15, some of which need clarification to be understood. Can sincere people professing to be Bible students, be so gullible? Can they be in so much fear of man's authority? We have proved in very few words that Christadelphianism is built upon the very flimsy foundation of contradiction and the apostasy.

We need only say that had Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts held fast to the true evidence of Scripture contended for at the beginning, the correct meaning of the statement "Surely Die" would have revealed itself in the process of discriminate reading and rightly dividing of the word of truth. It has indeed revealed itself as inflicted death by blood-shedding in the very context contended for by Thomas and Roberts in reply to D.Handley i.e. that Adam was subject to decay and death (not by virtue of sin) but by creation. In this context the account of Genesis and the statement "Surely Die" in ch. 2 v 17 can be understood as judicial death as also confirmed in the same language in Genesis ch.20 vs. 5-7. Genesis 26 v 11. I Kings ch. 2 vs 57-44. Ezekiel chapter 18 where verse 28 speaks of "surely live" as the opposite of "surely die" depending on conduct. The exhortation of Moses to Israel who were natural bodies of life, was, "choose to live out your lives in service to God otherwise ye shall surely be put to death = "Surely Die." Deut. ch. 50 verses 19 and 20. There is also the record in Deut. ch. 19 vs 5-10 of the prohibition of the shedding of innocent blood. Robert Roberts and Dr. Thomas have gone too far astray from the Scriptures for anyone to discover that "innocent-blood" can be entertained in their writings or have any part in their Apostate doctrine, the former having said of Jesus "The sentence of death ran in the blood which He inherited from Adam through Mary etc." (The Ambassador March 1869). This a complete violation of God's word in Ezekiel chapter 18 "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father." The latter we have already quoted from foot of page 248 of Eureka in regard to the natural body of man, "This perishing body is sin" - the power of death is in its very constitution, so that the law of its nature is styled "The law of sin and death." In his usual ramblings the Dr. goes on to explain that this law of sin and death can only be removed by a change from corruptible nature to incorruptible, and, as we have said this violates the teaching of Paul in Romans 8:2 and Romans chapter 6, leaving the supporters of Christadelphianism with their physical condemnation in the flesh unremoved. Whether it can be proved that Robert Roberts was the first Apostate Christadelphian or not, we know that many have followed in his path, regretfully, Dr. Thomas among them. * See footnote Nothing can be done for them apart from God's love and judgement, but those who are able to read and discriminate, can correct their own position if they choose to. Jesus Christ's mission was of God's appointing, not to condemn - but to open and keep the way to the tree of life retrospectively and also prospectively under man's respective dispensations, and He said in effect on God's authority, "I am the way, the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the father but by me." This lesson was taught under the Mosaic law, not even the priest could approach unto God without the legal cleansing of appointed blood shedding for remission of sin. How then can people with physical sin as a continual element of their flesh, approach unto God when such physical defilement can only be removed by physical destruction? "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me" saith God. Christ put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself the sinless one, - sin was laid on him and taken away - even the sin of the world. Our legal or imputed condemnation can be removed now by association with His death (by blood shedding), for without it is no remission or approach to God - He is the one mediator, - we must accept that we have no direct

approach to God of ourselves, the blood of Christ is the only effective means and we must recognise this. The return of Christ will mean nothing if we have not prepared for it in the way appointed for our legal and moral cleansing. We should therefore be in the position of those who are looking for Him; unto whom he will appear the second time, not as a sin-offering, but unto salvation.

P. Parry.

- **Footnote:** Further evidence has come to light since Brother P.Parry wrote this which shows that Dr Thomas' final understanding and beliefs were very close to those which Edward Turney taught.

This short treatise is recommended as an introduction and preparation for the reader whom we feel sure would derive further spiritual enlightenment from the booklet "Too True to be New" by the late E. Brady which is an appeal to Scripture, history and reason, and to correct a far-reaching error in Christadelphian Doctrine.

The Word Of God

OH, wonderful, wonderful Word of the Lord;
True wisdom its pages unfold;
And though we may read them a thousand times o'er.
They never, no never, grow old;
Each line hath a pleasure, each promise a pearl,
That all if they will may secure;
And we know that when time and the world pass away
God's Word shall forever endure.

Oh, wonderful, wonderful Word of the Lord;
The lamp that our Father above
So kindly hath lighted to teach us the way
That leads to the arms of His love!
Its warnings, its counsels, are faithful and just;
Its judgments are perfect and pure;
And we know that when time and the world pass away,
God's Word shall forever endure.

Oh, wonderful, wonderful Word of the Lord;
Our only salvation is there;
It carries conviction down deep in the heart,
And shows us ourselves as we are.
It tells of a Saviour, and points to the cross,
Where pardon we now may secure;
And we know that when time and the world pass away
God' Word shall forever endure.

The Promise: The Gospel.

Gen.22:16-18. Gal.5:8,16,29.

From the Scriptures of truth this conclusion we draw;
Neither wisdom of men nor works of the Law
Have the power to cleanse, to forgive, or to save,
To restore from the curse, or redeem from the grave.
Men are saved by their faith in the Crucified One,
When His love and His goodness to them are made known.
Saving faith comes by hearing the life-giving Word,
And the mercy of God through the Saviour conferred.

II Tim. 5:16. John 17:17.
I Cor. 1:19. Isa.5:21. Rom. 5:20.
Acts 15:59. Rom. 10:4. Heb. 7:19.
Gal. 2:16,21. Gal. 5:21
Acts 16:51. Rom. 10:9. Heb. 11:6.
I Cor. 1:21. John 5:16-18. Tim.2:6
Romans 10:17. Phil. 2:16.
II Cor. 5:19. I Tim. 2:5-6.