

# The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 98

## January 1988

In this Issue : -

Page 1 Editorial	Brother and Sister Linggood
Page 2 Promises	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 3 Commentary on "The Clean Flesh Heresy Again"	Brother Phil Parry.
Page 9 Life – By Law and by Grace	Brother F.C. Maycock

---

### Editorial

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

This issue of the Circular Letter is being sent out a little earlier because of the seasonal postal situation; God willing we hope to include with the February issue an updated list of addresses and phone numbers of brethren and sisters, if there is any change in these please let us know by mid January, if nothing is heard we shall repeat as before.

We learn from the news media that famine continues in Ethiopia due to drought and civil war. It is worse in Mozambique largely due to the terrorising rebel organization in the province.

Recently on the Radio we were again reminded of Israel's deep concern for her northern border with Lebanon due to a large build-up of P.L.O. and their unprovoked attacks upon Israeli civilians. Still later we have heard this morning that additional troops are being drafted into the Gaza strip to maintain order among the Arab inhabitants.

There still seems to be a certain amount of concern among the many branches of Christadelphia on the major doctrine of the Atonement.

We thank all who have contacted us during the past month with words of encouragement, we also wish to express our thanks to all those who have supported this work in any way during the past year your co-operation is much appreciated.

Bro. Harold Dawson sends "greetings to all readers of the Circular Letter and that the Angel of the Lord will encamp around us and dwell in our hearts and bring us to His Kingdom".

This month we have an exhortation by Bro. Leo. Dreifuss entitled "Promises." Bro. Phil Parry answers an article called "Clean Flesh Heresy again" taken from the Magazine "Bible Searcher and Witness" edited by Peter Reekie. Also the first of two articles which make up a booklet by F. C. Maycock entitled "Life by Law and by Grace".

Brother Bill Hold of Queensland Australia has suffered a nasty accident injuring his shoulder and arm. We wish him a speedy and full recovery.

We wish all our readers a happy and Peaceful New Year,

Sincerely yours in the Masters Service. Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

---

## Promises.

Today I want to consider two cases: That of Jephthah and that of Herod. Each made a promise. But then unforeseen circumstances arose which put them in a terrible quandary that made it either impossible to keep their promise, or to commit a terrible act of taking life.

Let us first take the case of Jephthah. He was at war with the Ammonites. He had fought and won God's battle against them. Before then he had vowed a vow. He said (Judges 11: 50 and 51) "If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon in to mine hands then it shall be, that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering."

It probably never crossed his mind that the first living being to meet him could be his daughter, his only child. When he made that vow he probably thought of an animal of his flock meeting him. Of course human sacrifices were strictly prohibited under the law of Moses. Whether Jephthah killed her, or whether he redeemed her remains a controversy among Bible scholars to this day. It is one of those things which we shall only find out in the Kingdom.

Now to the case of Herod. On the occasion of his birthday party, he swore to the daughter of Herodias who danced before him "Whatsoever thou shall ask of me I will give it thee, unto the half of my kingdom." He certainly never thought of the possibility that her request would turn out to be the head of John the Baptist. John had reproved Herod about his illegal marriage to his brother Philip's wife. So his wife had a quarrel against John. Herod imprisoned John on account of this, but he must have had some respect for him, he did not like the thought of putting him to death. But he lacked the courage to go back on his promise. Now both these cases have one thing in common. The promises were made in all sincerity, and with the avowed intention of keeping them. The circumstances which arose afterwards were entirely unforeseen.

There are other cases where promises were made rather more rashly, but could have been kept if they wanted to. The children of Israel promised Moses, and the next generation to Joshua, to serve the Lord to the best of their ability. They said when they stood in front of Mount Sinai (Exodus 19:8) "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." And their children said to Joshua (Joshua 24:16) "God forbid that we should forsake the Lord, to serve other gods, for the Lord our God, he it is that brought us up and our fathers out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage..." But neither generation had the will and strength of character to keep their promise.

They could have done had they wanted to, for there is nothing in God's commandments which it is impossible to keep.

Now what of our position? All of us have made one great promise on the day of our baptism when the name of Christ was pronounced on us. We promised solemnly to serve our new Master. God brought Israel from Egyptian bondage. "And He brought us, spiritual Israel from bondage to sin, personified in the Bible as Master Sin. And do we, the Israel after the spirit, take our promise made that day always seriously? There is no going back. Temptations do and will arise. And after we have fallen, and very likely shall fall again. But to be honest with ourselves, there is no Divine law which we cannot keep. We are assured in I Cor. 10:15, "There hath no temptation taken you such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." So we have not the excuse of unforeseen circumstances arising as in the cases of Jephthah and Herod.

We fail, we sin. But we have our faithful High Priest at God's side for whose sake our sins are forgiven, provided we sincerely repent. But let us also heed John's warning (I John 5:16) that there is a sin unto death. We are told that no murderer, no fornicator will have a place in the Kingdom of God. There is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, denying the power of God. And there is the sin of wilfully

not on the spur of the moment, but wilfully and deliberately forsaking the path of righteousness, once we have made that solemn promise on the day of our baptism.

Let us conclude with the solemn warning given in (Heb. 10:58) “Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition, but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.”

Yes, drawing back, this is promise breaking and a very serious one at that. Let us not be of them who do so.

Bro. Leo. Dreifuss.

---

## **Magazine - “Bible Searcher and Witness”** Edited by Peter Reekie

### **The “Clean Flesh” Heresy Again.**

The above subject has appeared in the magazine “Bible Searcher and Witness” and sent to us by a friend who has been reflecting on the false and unscriptural accusations levelled against the community unjustly labelled by Robert Roberts “Renunciationist” and “Clean Flesh” heretics, together with the lowest form of degradation of the nature of Jesus it could muster in various expressions applicable only to men of corrupt minds and destitute of the Faith. He (our friend) thought the writer of such anti-Christian irresponsible statements and misrepresentations, was not worth the repetition of the answers which have been made continually and in various letters and pamphlets during the past 40 years or more.

However, though agreeing with our friend, I thought about it and concluded that if the Almighty Creator of all things had condescended to my level and imparted unto me an unassailable knowledge and understanding of the doctrine of the “Atonement” essential to salvation, then I in turn, and on the teaching of Jesus to love my enemies, should do so in the form of an effort to enlighten the opposition to the true facts of the case. The writer, whose initials G.T., appear at the end of his discourse gives the impression that he knows all there is to know about the Suffolk Street division and also the “Clean Flesh” heresy so-called, but I am confident that most of what he says is based on hearsay, inability to read the scriptures with discrimination, and accepting without question or examination that what Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts wrote was the truth and in harmony with the inspired scriptures.

In appealing to his readers to get back to the writings of Thomas and Roberts one would think that they had explained the most important and profound subject of God’s dealing with man’s salvation namely the “Atonement”, which Paul says was the first thing he received by revelation from Jesus Christ and consequently delivered as a priority to the Corinthians, see I Corinthians chapter 15 verse 3. So it would be absolutely logical and right to say that the members of the Corinthian Ecclesia were all in unity of understanding the doctrine of the “Atonement”, and that Paul delivered only one version of its meaning.

In view therefore of the appeal that has gone out for Unity in the Christadelphian divided communities of North America in the form of a Referendum it is very strange that I should have before me a pamphlet by six named members of its steering committee, where under the heading, “Appraisal of Current Situation”, they make five important comments and admissions; number 4. “There are some views that are indeed contrary to Scripture”. But the Number 1, is what I want to draw attention to in connection with what I said of the one version of the “Atonement” delivered by Paul to the Corinthians.

It reads as follows; 1. “There are certainly doctrinal differences among Christadelphians. For example there is a considerable range of views on the “Atonement” within both fellowships. However, it

is unrealistic to expect that every person would have an identical understanding of this profound subject". Is it so unrealistic if you profess the very gospel that Paul preached to the Jews and Gentiles? Did not Paul remonstrate with the Galatian converts in removing themselves from him that called them into the grace of Christ unto a perverted gospel? Was Paul unrealistic in expecting them to remain faithful to the gospel which was the one and only power of God unto Salvation to everyone that believed it? Is it not a fact that the pioneers of Christadelphia never reached a complete understanding of the Gospel as preached by Paul, as a result of misunderstanding and misinterpretation in many cases? We find that the real kernel of the Gospel i.e. the "Atonement", has been set aside in preference for the promises to Abraham of the Land of Canaan, the teaching of the Kingship of Christ and establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth with Christ as King and immersion on belief of the promises to Abraham to become his seed which is Christ, the significance of immersion into the death of Christ by this immersion in water being left to all sorts of conjecture and versions of men.

It should not be expected that there would be unity on such a basis, but in the true Ecclesia of Christ it is expected, and must be on the foundation laid which is Jesus Christ. - And who is this Jesus Christ? He is the Son of God who was of like nature as Adam and ourselves and gave his "Life in the blood as the Ransom Price" for all who by the offence of one were "legally-dead" and alienated from God.

It was just prior to Edward Turney's lecture on this matter that the Christadelphian community was in a state of Apostasy regarding Adam's sin and its consequences. John Thomas and Robert Roberts contradicting one another in their written works but neither being clear in their understanding of the most important issues, their attacks on Adam's conduct being directed against his flesh, instead of his ability to be obedient in character and wilfully disobeying God. Thus was brought about in the Christadelphian community the Apostate Doctrine of Rome, called original-sin, whereby condemnation of the flesh was substituted for condemnation of sin - the "changed flesh" doctrine, which Thomas and Roberts originally rejected as having no Scriptural evidence.

This also presented them with a dilemma, because if the flesh was defiled and in the words of Roberts "unclean" as a physical as quality, then the flesh of Jesus would be unclean also; so one error begets another and thus a true understanding of Paul's doctrine of the "Atonement" was never preached by Dr. Thomas or Robert Roberts. Not all had been accepting however all that had been preached or written by Thomas and Roberts, with all due respect to both, God only accepts those who are reconciled to Him through the Blood of Christ and its Atoning Power, The Way, The Truth and The Life.

The Roberts version was not "the way", as was proved when Edward Turney came on the scene after much prayerful study while a member of this confused community. "Unclean Flesh" was never a scriptural term in the physical sense neither "Clean Flesh", these terms were inventions of Thomas and Roberts, and Edward Turney never believed in either terms as a physical quality, neither did he teach either in his lecture on "The Sacrifice of Christ", I can supply copies of this lecture to anyone so that they can read it and prove for themselves. One thing he did teach was, the meaning of "Clean" and "Unclean" as used in reference to sacrificial animals in legal terms of Divine Law from Adam to Moses and from Moses to the fulfillment in Jesus Christ, and that only the clean were acceptable though their flesh was identical, so that Christ could only be the antitype or true substance of the clean types and shadows. Under His Law God defined what was clean or unclean even of animals of the same species but it had nothing to do with their mental capacities. even so with Jesus the True Antitypical Lamb of God, it was not His character that was sacrificed as a Ransom Price, but His natural life in the blood, a life forfeited to sin in exchange for a life forfeited by Adam.

The latter is what E. Turney meant by the term "Free Life" and which Robert Roberts said was a myth but the myth is "Clean Flesh" a term Turney never used of the flesh of Jesus or of any other man. The accusation by Roberts against Turney was therefore libellous. Turney never taught "Clean Flesh" neither have any of his supporters who carried on his excellent expositions of the Atonement. I speak of course for those who are known today as the Nazarene Fellowship. It is no surprise to me that G.T. is continuing to use the same libellous statements as R.Roberts did and using the same quotations wrested out of their context from I John 2:22 and it is very apparent to me that when he reads the Bible it is with the indoctrinated and biased mind he has obtained through R. Roberts, because never when I was a

Christadelphian did I ever think or believe that John was speaking about the physical nature of Christ as being sinful and unclean, but that there were people probably Jews. who did not believe that the Messiah had come and their leaders had killed the Prince of Life - that what John and his fellow disciples were teaching was not a fiction of their imagination, that Jesus was only living to them in this way, but that Messiah had come in flesh and blood nature like themselves, and to teach or say that he had not come physically was anti-Christ, a spirit not of God. The Bishop of Durham has recently implied in his confusing reasoning that the resurrection of Jesus was not His physical body but that His teaching and personality was still alive in the hearts of His followers and this is what the resurrection of Jesus consisted of. Perhaps he could see that the necessity of a bodily resurrection would destroy the false but popular doctrine of the immortality of the soul. It is highly probable that Robert Roberts thought Edward Turney was about to steal his popularity and falsely accused him even to the extent of misquoting I John 2:22 out of context to this end, but this was far from Edward Turney's mind as the following quotation from page 55 of his lecture will prove; "Now then I put down a public challenge to discuss three or four nights before you all when I return. (I repeat it. Mr. Roberts did not accept it). I hope Mr. Roberts will be better informed on the scheme of redemption before I return, for instead of publicly debating the question it would be far more profitable to go round the country helping him set it forth. But so long as he is hostile, it will be war to the last. I never give in when I feel sure I am in the right."

The chairman's remarks after the confusion caused by the loud shouting of Robert Roberts, can be read on the rest of the page and his conclusions did not favour the case of Mr. Roberts by virtue of the fact of contradictions in his writings proving his theory to be false. And now I say, that anyone who says that the Nazarenes believe or teach that Jesus had a nature different from other men, has never read Turney's lecture or any of our literature, or on the other hand has been misinformed and consequently is promulgating this false, libellous charge to the detriment of those people who may be sincerely seeking Truth. It is a proven fact that evidence exists in the writings of present day Christadelphians that Jesus was not of the same, or exact nature as ourselves - but that He was a Hybrid, part human and part Divine in nature, or he could not have gained the victory that it is impossible for other men to do.

This is the result of Christadelphians following R.Roberts in accepting the Apostate doctrine of Rome - "original-Sin" "Defiled-flesh", "Condemned-nature" and of course the "Sinful-Flesh" term which is not in Paul's writing, but should be correctly rendered Sins Flesh denoting ownership not physical quality. This was Edward Turney's teaching and contention, that if Jesus had come in Sins Flesh, that is, with Sins claim upon Him, His mission would have been impossible in God's purpose of Redemption and Forgiveness, He would have been as much without strength as all mankind, hence Paul's use of the term "Likeness" It made all the difference especially if the unscriptural term "sinful flesh" is omitted from Paul's statement and the correct term "Sin's Flesh" used. Even Dr. Thomas and Mr. Roberts have been quoted as using the latter correct term but resorting to the incorrect one when trying to put over the condemned flesh theory.

G.T. continues his misrepresentation by resorting to lies and deceit, and I quote, "They affirm that no defiling element entered into Adam's flesh as a result of his sin and that we being the progeny of Adam, have the same flesh which is, they say Clean." The last three words is what they do not say, but that his very good nature in which he was created as a natural corruptible being remained unaltered, and this was also stated by both Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts before 1873 when G.T. is apparently convinced that even at that time Thomas and Roberts had the Truth. For the benefit of those people whom G.T. says, "could be deceived by what we affirm and that this places those in the right as dishonouring Christ; and leads the unwary into the worship of a false Christ, and those who believe in it to lose the whole Truth," I will quote both Thomas and Robert's statements made prior to 1873 and supporting Edward Turney's teaching as denied by Mr. Roberts. These statements were made as a result of a certain person seeking Baptism and fellowship with them on the basis of a doctrine which is now the very Basis of belief and fellowship with modern Christadelphia of Central and other divisional groups of which G.T. and Peter Reekie are members, this doctrine is that Adam's nature was changed by the introduction of a physical element which defiled and became a physical law of his being and transmissible to his progeny.

Now compare this with the following remarks of John Thomas and Robert Roberts; -

“We believe that the change was Moral not Physical” (Dr. Thomas, Herald of the Kingdom page 159), “Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he transgressed. There is no evidence of this whatever, and the presumption and evidence are entirely contrary. There was a change in Adam’s relation to his maker, but not in the nature of his organisation,” (Ambassador March 1869).

Obviously these statements contradict Clause 5 of the B.A.S.F., Edward Turney proved the statements true, we also do the same, how then can G.T. direct people to read the writings of the pioneers and yet describe those people who are in agreement with their true evidence of scripture, as Liars, deceivers, anti-Christ void of the Spirit of God? We have a greater authority on this subject than Thomas, Roberts or Turney, this authority is the man about whom G.T. is unwarrantably making all the fuss in his gross ignorance and inability to discriminate and keep to the context when reading the scriptures. It is no use talking on, or writing about the subject of Sin unless one keeps in mind the context which is Law, for where no law is there is no transgression; Adam realised this and his conscience was defiled in the knowledge that he had transgressed Divine Law while in the nature in which he was first created and it was in this very nature that Jesus was born and by perfect conduct showed it was possible for Adam to have been obedient and thereby He (Jesus) condemned sin while in likeness of the very nature which transgressed. I think this answers Dr. Thomas’s bewilderment. “How could sin be condemned in the nature of Jesus if it did not exist there?” I think I have shown that it did not and could not exist in Jesus, or anyone else as a physical element - sin is abstract as Jesus the authority I appeal to will show.

Like G.T. the Scribes and Pharisees regarded the importance of physical cleansing of the flesh more than the operation of the word of God upon the mind and Jesus reminded them that what proceeded from within their minds would cause defilement by their outward actions, and not what they ate. As he said unto them, “Even so ye outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.” Matthew ch. 23 verse 28. Also in regard to disrespect of Divine Law he says that from their hearts proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: These are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashed hands defileth not a man” Matthew ch. 15 vss. 18-20.

Men are indeed capable of these evils even as they are capable of refraining from them. so that they cannot be said to be a fixation of evil in the flesh as a result of Adam’s sin or of a change of his nature seeing he was created with the will and power of obedience as in equal measure, for disobedience.

This G.T. cannot or will not accept, not even from Jesus. He insists they already exist as elements of the flesh whereas they are impossible as we have said, without law. Adam could not have sinned if law had not been introduced. We have shown that G.T. and Robertsite followers of the present time do not accept the earlier writings of the pioneers substantiating the evidence of scripture that human nature has never been changed. They are not therefore justified in equating changed defiled nature with the first Adam and neither could a just God relate them in any way to the sin committed by the first Adam seeing he was different in nature. So the Robertsites have produced a second Adam because no evidence of a second Adam could be found by Thomas or Roberts prior to 1871. G.T. in most degrading phrases in application to the nature of Jesus one of which (“inordinate”,) his Editor Peter Reekie saw fit to modify to “Passion” from the R.V. equates Jesus with their second Adam with this changed flesh.

Paul on the other hand chooses, and rightly so, to equate Jesus and the first Adam in their relationship to the Creator as both being Sons of God so does all inspired scripture, - the one by creation of the dust and energised by the breath of life, and the other by begettal from the identical nature also energised and dependent on the breath of life.

Unfortunately Adam by disobedience forfeited his right to the term direct son of God and became dependent on God for redemption and forgiveness, this demanded the production of one who was not in this alienated position and he came in the person of another Son of God directly related and not in the alienated position - One with the Father.

This is not the Christadelphian view, though at times they support it without being aware of doing so. John Carter supported our view and was fully aware of doing so, but he could not accept the outcome. The Christadelphian view is that Jesus was the same in flesh and relationship as all other Jews who were the subjects of typical Redemption from Adamic alienation and bondage, yet in his own words he proved this to be untrue by stating the difference between his relationship to God and theirs while he was among them, and before his death had even taken place, see; Matthew ch. 12 verses 47-50, "Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him. Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said. Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother." What further proof do Christadelphians need than this? Proof from Jesus himself that he was never the son of Adam but ever Son of God from birth? That they which desired to call him 'Brother', must first become Sons of God in the prescribed way; this of course by covenant relationship and acknowledgement of the spirit of the Law in the types appointed and pointing to Christ who in the shedding of his blood would confirm the promises made to the fathers (before the Mosaic Law was instituted).

This is the Jesus we believe in - one who needed not redemption as other men, but who by his "life" acquired directly from the Father (yet in the veins) as the blood of all humans flows, he was free to pour out his "life" unto death for us. This certainly is a different Jesus Christ to the one G.T. describes and most Christadelphians who follow Mr. Roberts, and I am afraid theirs is of little strength for salvation. The Nazarenes are completely honest in their handling of scripture and in quoting accurately but I notice G.T. in quoting Hebrews ch. 7 v. 27 leaves out a very important word, "first" in order to mislead his readers in the event that might not notice that a person who has offered first for his own sins had nothing left to offer if he had in fact already offered himself by shedding his own blood. This is the very deceit of which he falsely accuses those he calls errorists. It is a fact that this chapter has been used continually by Christadelphians in an attempt to prove their false doctrine that Jesus died for himself, but it actually proves the opposite, - firstly that he was the victim and secondly that he was not a Priest, this is confirmed in the very Epistle to Hebrews ch. 8 v. 4. I think I have dwelt perhaps rather too long on the exposition of the truth in comparison with history and the errors and mistakes of the past inherited by the various divisions of Christadelphia, but I must refer to G.T.'s remarks about Suffolk Street. He states they believed in partial inspiration of the Bible, but I have it from a reliable source that this was an unjust accusation again, of which Mr. Roberts was responsible in 1885 not being content with his misrepresentation and false accusation of "Clean Flesh" against E. Turney. In attacking Suffolk Street it is difficult to conceive why Mr. Roberts and his followers should accept and teach a doctrine that is not in the inspired Scriptures of the prophets of the old covenant and it was to these Scriptures that Peter referred as inspired not the New Testament where for a simple example the term "Sinful Flesh" is incorrect as genuine Greek scholars are all agreed it should be "Sin's Flesh" which makes all the difference in understanding the teaching of Paul in Romans chapter 5.

G.T.'s reference to belief in "non pre-baptismal responsibility" is not as bad as he tries to make it, and the only difference we find in their view and ours is that the Nazarenes believe that responsibility comes upon true enlightenment, to the need for Redemption from Adamic alienation, through the Sacrifice of Christ, and not at and after Baptism; for it is possible that the enlightened might yet reject or decline to take the important step necessary in demonstration of faith in the Salvation offered. True we do not become servants of God until Baptised, nevertheless we are responsible when enlightened although Sin's servants, because the way to freedom in Christ has been shown and offered. Therefore we are responsible if we neglect so great salvation. Seeing then that I have shown "Clean Flesh" to be non-existent as a physical quality - "A myth of Mr. Roberts" - and that the Apostle Paul says God hath made of one blood all nations, it is impossible for G.T. to use the following derogatory remarks against us i.e., "The most God dishonouring, Truth denying, moral corrupting of them all "Clean Flesh". I say to G.T. again, Turney did not use the term in reference to the physical flesh of Christ neither the opposite term, he needed neither, nor do we in preaching the one true Gospel of Salvation. So it belongs to you and those other of our accusers and we therefore present you with it.

G.T. continues his accusations by saying that “We seek by our doctrine to place those in the right as dishonouring Christ.” I am afraid that you do that very well without us, and we know that no one who is in the right can or would dishonour Christ, but at least we do not teach a dual Christ by separating His flesh from His character, the former, unclean, sinful, devilish and satanic in every respect. Yet we are considered devilish for being the victims of R. Robert’s libellous accusations of teaching a “Myth” of his own invention. It is evident G.T. does not understand the error he is supposed to be combatting, but we agree with him when he says “our Lord overcame the impulses of the flesh (if he means unlawful) all his life through.” But his further statement, “If we hold on tightly to this truth we will never be taken in by the “Clean Flesh” errorists - whether we understand the error or no. However to understand it gives the necessary armament to destroy it, which it is our duty to do,” is the most puzzling and peculiar illogical statement he could make. There is now a sect calling themselves “The Remnant of Christ’s Ecclesia “influenced by W.G. Butterfield England, and J.A. Defries U.S.A. who in a booklet entitled “Are Christadelphians Astray? give their history and causes of the many divisions and in assuming that Dr. Thomas had the whole Truth (which he did not), closing their own eyes to his errors, maintain that all other but themselves are Apostate.

Their misrepresentation of Edward Turney is as false as G.T.’s and as misleading to people seeking the Truth, for their teaching embodies the same false theories that Jesus had sin in his flesh and had to die for himself. They say that Turney’s failure was in exalting his own opinion of the nature of Christ, but this is not true, for as I have shown, he supported the original scriptural views of Thomas and Roberts, and it was Roberts who rejected the scriptural views advanced in Herald of the Kingdom and the Ambassador 1869 and Christadelphia in general have accepted the Robertsite Apostasy and consequently the doctrine of Rome and in fact worse in regard to the nature of man.

Edward Turney never denied the Truth concerning the Name of Jesus Christ neither do we his supporters. Through the scriptures we honour him as he was honoured by his Father, the Robertsites including “he Remnant” wrest the scriptures from their context in every way they can to describe the false theory of human nature being changed to a sin-contaminated polluted flesh, incapable of obedience to God’s requirements.

Read Turney’s lecture read Nazarene literature, and you will not be able to charge Turney or the Nazarenes with error or undermining of the Truth. What “The Remnant” fear and what G.T. fears is the undermining of their own false conception and lies in the name of the Lord, as a result of not being able to read the Bible with discrimination and sincere desire for the Faith once delivered to the Saints. Turney and the Nazarenes are not an offshoot of Christadelphia; it is a distinct body of people found in isolation in all parts of the globe who are ready always to give to everyone that asketh a reason of the Hope within them with meekness and fear, difficult as this is when contending with these false accusers.

Robert Roberts found he could not misrepresent E.Turney when facing him in the Temperance Hall so he did it by libel in “Slain Lamb,” it is still being done by G.T. “The Remnant” and others. I am not afraid to sign my full name. In the true service of the Father.

Philip Parry (Nazarene)

-----

The Genesis account and Paul’s comments thereon in Romans explain how on the federal principle one sacrifice could cover a multitude, while the laws of sacrifice and sin-offering establish the true substitutionary nature of Jesus’ death. It is, of course, open to anyone to deny that Christ suffered death in their stead, just as it was open to any Israelite to deny that God would accept the life of an animal, offered in faith, as a substitute for his life. But the alternative in either case is the same, “That soul shall bear his sin, he shall be cut off.”

Ernest Brady.

-----



# **Life - By Law And By Grace,**

## **By. F.C.Maycock.**

A well-known Christadelphian writer of the 1940's Mr. W.F.Barling was the author of an article in The Christadelphian Magazine of December 1945 entitled "He asked life of Thee". In December 1946 by the same author another article appeared entitled "Made a curse for us".

Our late brother F. C. Maycock of the Nazarene Fellowship replied to the first article in the following terms: "Before commencing a detailed examination of this article it should be made clear that underlying the whole argument, and therefore damning it from the start, is the false theory of sinful flesh and defiled human nature."

Sufficient has already been written to expose the foolishness of this idea, and prominent Christadelphians in all sections of the community make no secret of the fact that they no longer defend it. But the writer has made a single colossal blunder which has led him into a morass of contradiction, misapplied scripture and erroneous conclusions. He has taken statements from the letters of the Apostle Paul, written after the Mosaic Law had been superseded and applying only to members of the Christian Church, and he has applied them to periods and to people to which they have no relation whatsoever and to which Paul certainly never intended them to apply. This is a foolish and blameworthy error in one who sets out to be a teacher and one might have expected an editor to be sharp enough to protect his readers from such nonsense; but it implies a violation of a fundamental principle of all justice, i.e., that a change of law cannot operate retrospectively. The purpose of Mr. Barling's article is to prove that the Law of Moses could not give eternal life and as "an unanswerable argument" he quotes Galatians ii.16, which says, "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." He says "this verdict should be an end of all strife." Far from it being the end of strife it is the renewing of it, for the statement he quotes was made by Paul after the Mosaic Law as a rule of righteousness had been superseded by the Law of Grace, Galatians ii. 21. After Christ had come, belief in and acceptance of Him was the means of obtaining eternal life. It was henceforth impossible to be justified by the Law, not because it had always been incapable of giving life, but because it had been done away with. The passage he quotes (Gal. ii. 16) proves that a Jew or Gentile who sought to be justified by keeping the Law after Christ had come, was going back to a means of justification which had been superseded. It does not prove, and Paul never intended it to prove, that when it was in force the Law of Moses was any less efficacious as an object of faith and a means of justification than the Law of Christ.

Of what use is a plausible edifice of argument raised on such a rotten foundation? Dr. John Thomas had both a better understanding of scripture and a better logic than those who profess to follow him. We quote from "The Revealed Mystery", page 27, the following passage, which not only exposes Mr. Barling's initial blunder mentioned before, but also, in the very first sentence directly contradicts the whole proposition he has set out to prove. He says the Law could not give life; Dr. Thomas says it could.

"The condition, then, to which men are required to conform if they would live forever is in general, to keep the Commandments. This I say, is general, and applies equally to the past, the present and the future. But the condition is resolvable into something more particular. Hence the sentence fails to be completed, keep the Commandments of the Divine Constitution under which you live. Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, had to keep the ordinances of the Patriarchal Constitution of things; Moses, Aaron and Israelites of the Siniatic Law; The Jews and Gentiles of the Roman world after Pentecost A.D.33, the Commandments of the new Institution; and the universal concourse of mankind will, from the Coming of Christ to His Kingdom, have to keep that Law of Love which is to proceed forth from Zion to every nation, tongue, kindred, tribe and people of the inhabited earth."

This seems to be sound scripture and sound common-sense. How are we to account for the Editor of The Christadelphian printing Mr. Barling's statement, "we look in vain in the Siniatic Covenant for any such promise(of life) explicit or implicit, in reward for perfect obedience? The Law was based upon

the Promises and was a national extension and development designed to educate and control Abraham's descendants during the period between the Patriarchal and the Christian Ages.

The very essence of the Promises was that Eternal Life was offered upon evidence of faith; in the nature of things it could not have been any the less so in the Law. "Is the Law against the Promises of God? God forbid." (Gal. iii. 19 and 21.) It seems not to have occurred to the writer that if he had succeeded in proving his absurd contention, he would have consigned to eternal oblivion every prophet and Godly Israelite of the Mosaic Age from Moses himself to Malachi.

This is a small thing no doubt, as compared with the urgent necessity to uphold the apostate doctrine that all flesh is sinful flesh and that the sole purpose of the Law was to prove that this sinful flesh is incapable of keeping it, but such a mockery of Divine justice and wisdom and such a flat contradiction of plain scripture teaching will destroy both itself and its author. We have the testimony however, of a better authority than any Christadelphian.

To the young man of Matthew xix. 17, Jesus said, "If thou wilt enter into life (*Zoe*) keep the Commandments." Are we to believe what Mr. Barling says and conclude that Jesus was intentionally misleading that young man? Or shall we conclude that he has been so carried away by his own misguided garrulity that he has lost all sense of proportion? R. Roberts, commenting on this text in "The Slain Lamb," says, "Does this mean Eternal Life? Yes. This is shown by x. 33: "This do and thou shall live". It is a curious commentary upon the Christadelphian position, that we discover that the lecture, 'The Slain Lamb' originally was given for the purpose of refuting the views we hold, and generally supposed to have done so, has needed to have several paragraphs omitted in subsequent reprints. It is still more strange that we have today a writer in The Christadelphian making direct contradictions of what R. Roberts (its first editor) says in a book which is regarded as a standard work on the subject of the Atonement, and which is always referred to as if it were the last word and beyond any criticism whatsoever.

We have this position then: both Dr. Thomas and R. Roberts emphatically declare that the Law of Moses could give life, while Mr. Barling equally emphatically declares it could not. He cites as his authority for thus giving the lie direct to his predecessors the text, "by the works of the Law shall no flesh be Justified". Now had this statement appeared in the Old Testament it would have been legitimate to use it so, and it would have supported his contention. Unfortunately for him, however it is taken from the New Testament, and to try to make it retrospective is to set scripture against itself. It is plainly stated that the Law "was holy, just and good, spiritual, and ordained unto life". (Romans vii. 10,12, and 14) It is also affirmed that "The man which doeth these things shall live". (Lev. xviii. 5; Ezekiel xx. 11. 13. and 21; Romans x. 5; Gal. iii. 12).

It is also to be remembered that the Law of Moses was for those who were under it (Rom. iii. 19) and obedience to its ordinances was the means whereby through faith and association with the Promises, salvation was offered to the children of Israel. But after Christ had come it was no longer the means of life and it is on that account alone that Paul wrote that no flesh could be justified by the works of the Law.

Mr. Barling has thus wrested his statement from its context, misapplied it as proof that the Law could not confer life, in direct contradiction of Paul himself not to speak of Dr. Thomas and R. Roberts, and says it is the end of all strife! We have quoted their actual words; we have quoted Jesus' own affirmation that the Law could give life and, finally, if more evidence of his confusion is needed we would recommend a reading of the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, where he will find a long list of those who actually established for themselves a title to life under the Law. Jesus was born a Jew and lived under the Law, living an obedient and sinless life; this single fact alone destroys Mr. Barling's whole case and makes his article so much waste paper. Tempted in all points like unto his brethren, Jesus proved that strict obedience to the Law was possible; both His words and His actions indicate that the spirit of the Law was more important than the letter, and it was in this direction that the majority of the Israelites failed to attain to righteousness; "Because they sought it not by (or through) faith, but as it were (merely) by the works of the Law. Romans ix. 31, 32; Heb. iv. 2. But Mr. Barling says that Jesus had

extra power to enable him to keep the law; he says we are sinful flesh and cannot do what we wish. We do not hesitate to say that there is not a greater falsehood in the whole systems of apostate Christianity than this, and no worse slander against the name of Jesus and the honour and justice of His Father has ever been uttered. Unhappily, there is evidence that many people have been misled by it, and lured into the slippery path of self-deception and unbelief ending in the abyss.

It was a profound shock to read in The Christadelphian for December 1947, the following incredible paragraph in an article signed, "P. Watkins":-

"Sin is a product of Adamic flesh, and sin after baptism indicates a revival of the Adamic nature which we purported to destroy at baptism. Yet if we are still members of the body of Christ we are still without sin, for in Him is no sin. If we are truly in Christ, it is not we that have sinned, but it is the irrepressible Adamic nature which we have been striving to mortify that has obtruded itself - and we heartily deplore the fact. As long as we deplore our transgressions - as long as they are committed despite ourselves - we remain in Christ and righteous."

This is the evil fruit of the tares sown by Mr. Barling in 1946; that there has not been an outcry against it is merely an evidence of how far the poison has spread and how utterly unconscious the Christadelphian community is of the direction and speed of its declension.

"It is not we that have sinned, it is the irrepressible Adamic nature. As long as our sins are committed despite ourselves, we are still righteous. Even though we commit sin, we remain in Christ, and in righteousness".

This is one hundred per cent. Roman Catholicism. These are the identical sophistries with which apostate Christianity has deluded itself for 18 centuries. These are the lies with which Popes and Priests have excused their hypocrisies and adulteries and every kind of bloody and unspeakable crime against God and His people. With these doctrines why make a pretence of following the Nazarene? The nearest Confessional box is the place for such - not the table of remembrance. Those who have the "boldness" (we quote, or effrontery) "in the day of judgment" to affirm that their sins have been committed despite themselves or that "even though we commit sin our spiritual state is the same as if we had resisted," will discover that shame shall be the promotion of fools. It is time we paid heed to the Apostles warning: "Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God". (I John iii. 7 and 8) Who is the liar: John the Apostle or Barling, Watkins and Co.? What is faith worth if it is not wrought unto works? Learned Christadelphians say it cannot be done. The Apostles and Jesus say it can be done (John v, 5; Rom. xii. 1; Luke xvii. 10), and they prove it in the best way possible, by their own example. Those who imagine that their pious professions and confessions will excuse their failure to behave themselves are self-deceived.

We agree that the Mosaic Law passed away and that in some respects it was weak; but it had a purpose as a stage in the development of man's relation to God. It expanded the Edenic Law and the Promises, and it embodied in a simple form the rudiments of the Gospel and the Christian revelation. The moral principles of the Law are incorporated in the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ. The revelation of God has opened out in stages and has grown parallel with the development of civilization and man's moral sense. Rules of human conduct and attributes of God which can be taught in parable and precept today would have been beyond the intellectual range of a man living four thousand years ago. But the same fundamental principles of justice, mercy and truth could be embodied in ceremonies and ordinances and would make similar demands upon the faith and behaviour of the one as the other. The purpose and intention of God in all the changing state of man's consciousness has been to select and reward the worthy with a better and fuller life - with eternal life, and no polemical attempt by Mr. Barling to prove that Jesus was condemned by the Law even though he was obedient to it in all points, can stand against the evidence of scripture and reason that the Law was ordained unto Life.