

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No 151

November 1994

In this Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 1	From Your Letters	
Page 3	Thoughts on the Daily Readings for November	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 5	Correspondence	
Page 10	Thoughts on the Daily Readings for December	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 11	“Art Thou a Teacher and Knowest Not These Things?”	Brother F.J.Pearce
Page 21	A Consideration of Hebrews 13:20	Brother A.H.Broughton and others
Page 24	Haman Hanged by his Own Rope	Brother F.J.Pearce
Page 25	W.F.Barling’s Five Basic Principles Answered	Brother F.J.Pearce

Editorial

Dear Brethren and Sisters and Friends, Greetings in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

During 1994 we published the Netherton Debate in the Circular Letters and this was followed by some articles which were written as a result of that Debate. In this Issue we will finish with those articles - not that we have published them all, but enough for the time being.

As world events sadly and inexorably move on from dilemma to tragedy it is difficult to see any particular Scriptural significance in them at present but we know the general pattern will continue to worsen, as Paul wrote to Timothy (2 Timothy 3). “In the last days perilous times shall come: men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false-accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God... Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.” What an awful catalogue of man’s selfishness and rejection of God’s loving kindness! Thankfully, we have the exhortation, “But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured, knowing of whom thou hast learned them... All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.” (See 2 Timothy chapter 3).

My Sincere Love to all, your brother in the Master’s service,

Russell Gregory

From Your Letters:

Brother Phil Parry writes:

“Rene and I thank you for the recent C/Letter and we appreciate the work you put into it and which made it so interesting and encouraging to know that others are taking notice of our efforts. I realise that some of our fellowship are living alone and lack conversation in the personal sense with others of like faith, this is the trial which isolation brings, but Jesus, the Son of God even had to say in the taking upon Himself the form of a servant, “The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests

but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.” Even we are not down to that level though we class ourselves as the poor of this world rich in faith whom God hath chosen. Paul said, “I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content.” When we observe through the TV the suffering experienced in other countries of the world our light affliction, as Paul termed it, “worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal - but the things which are not seen are eternal.”

Regarding Sister Evelyn’s comments about the Kingdom of God being the teaching before the Sacrifice was made, I cannot see that the teaching of the Kingdom of God could be separated from the teaching of the Atonement; Jesus Himself was preaching of His atoning work in conjunction with that of the Kingdom of God as can be seen from Genesis to His own day. The preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom was committed to Peter and to Paul, and what does Paul say on the matter in 1 Corinthians 15:1-3? “Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved... For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.” We know that our plural sins are involved firstly in the Federal Sin of the world and secondly in our personal sins which can be forgiven through the Priesthood of Christ in His Heavenly office providing they are not wilfully committed to the extent of despising the Spirit of Grace, and counting the blood wherewith we have been sanctified, an unholy thing. (Hebrews 10:29).

I am not sure who is regarded as being a bit hazy on the subject of the Kingdom of God, but Nebuchadnezzar had no hazy idea about it as can be seen from a reading of his words in Daniel 4:24-35. Yes, the Most High giveth the kingdoms of men to whosoever He will, even as in the case of Saul, whom He gave to Israel to be king over them, yet He was still over-ruling in their kingdom, therefore I cannot accept, as some have told me that the Kingdom of God is the kingdom of Israel restored. For this to be so would indeed involve the Old Covenant Temple worship and all it’s rituals - a return to that which has been abolished (Ephesians 2:14-22 and Hebrews 8:13, also Hebrews 12:26-29). In the reading of Zechariah 8 I find no evidence of a literal Temple, but I do read evidence speaking of joy and gladness and cheerful feasts, etc. See verses 19-23.

The measurements shown to Ezekiel of a Temple do not reveal any evidence that it would be built, this is mere assumption as far as I am concerned until I have scriptural evidence to prove otherwise. Neither do I find evidence in Zechariah 14 that the nations of the earth that are left of those that fought against Jerusalem, will send representatives. Verse 16 states “Everyone that is left of all the nations.” This need not be such a great number as to warrant representatives, and it does stipulate a feast of tabernacles (booths, or tents), feasts and sacrifices of praise to the Lord, not a returning to the memory of that which had been abolished, which was the ministration of death. Nevertheless, I respect other peoples views on the subject. I am hoping to be able to read what Gates and Willey have written and have no wish to pre-judge their theories beforehand.

Regarding your correspondence with Esleigh Feltham, there was one point I thought you omitted in writing to him and which Brother A. Wilson has quoted, I think from J.J.Hadley, i.e., “We are legally justified when we are baptised into the death of Christ, but we shall not be morally justified when the roll is called unless we have finished our course and kept the faith.” If Esleigh had finished his statement, “Subject to death” adding “by sin,” I think he would have been nearer the mark. For indeed Adam was subject to death by nature at creation.”

Sister Evelyn Linggood writes: “Many thanks for the C/Letter which is interesting as usual, we are pleased to think the articles we sent will be used. I can’t think why they had been overlooked until now as Bro. Gates must have given them to us a long time before his death.”

Sister Evelyn goes on to mention Brother Grant Pearce whom she has now written to... “Grant Pearce reminds me of how I was wanting every bit of information on the subject of our differences with the Christadelphians that I could get hold of and I kept going over the literature time and again.”

In the middle of October, Brother Phil telephoned Brother Hayden Price and not being able to contact him on the Sunday phoned again on the following Wednesday to find that Brother Hayden had been in hospital with prostate gland trouble. Brother Phil writes to say that he (Brother Hayden) has relatives and friends who keep an eye on him and one takes him as far as Newbridge at week-ends, otherwise he goes no further than across the street to some sort of friendly club where he can chat to people he knows, otherwise he says he is fairly well for his age of 86.

Also Brother Phil was in touch with the nursing home where Brother John Carter lives. The Matron says that he is quite well considering his age of 94, and most trouble was Meniere's disease and he cannot have much conversation, nor concentrate on things like he did.

There are many others of our number who are now well on in years and troubled by various ills and the limitations which age bring. Our thoughts and prayers go out to all as we wait and pray for the Kingdom to come.

I wish to thank all who have written and do please keep sending in items of interest for future C/Letters.

Russell.

THOUGHTS ON THE DAILY READINGS for NOVEMBER

Our daily readings at this season, take us through two chapters describing events which took place at very nearly the same time, the period of the partial return to Palestine at the end of the Babylonian captivity. They are in the Book of Ezra, chapter 6, and Esther, chapter 6.

In Ezra chapter 6 we read how Darius, the Persian ruler, made a decree to the effect that the nations surrounding the returning Jews were to support the building of the temple by diverting some of the king's tribute (taxes, we would call them nowadays) towards its building. These surrounding nations were hostile to the Jews and wanted to get this work. Of re-building the temple stopped.

About 15 years previous to this, they did succeed in stopping the work for a while. They wrote to Artaxerxes, the then Persian ruler, to say that if this temple were to be built it would inspire the Jews to insurrection, and Artaxerxes indeed wrote back to get the work stopped; but this success was not to last. At the encouragement of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah and the leadership of Zerubbabel, building was resumed.

Again, the surrounding enemies tried to stop it by the same means as before; they sent a letter to the Persian ruler, but by this time Artaxerxes was succeeded by Darius, and he, far from stopping the work, actually commanded the people to support it. What a blow this must have been to the enemies of the returning Jews! And how it goes to show that when God's time for a work to proceed has come, it is impossible for man to stop it. Previous to this, under Artaxerxes it appears the time was not yet quite come for the re-building of the temple.

Now let us look at the 6th chapter of Esther. "This is the chapter where we read how Haman went to the king to get Mordecai hung, and then to his greatest dismay and humiliation, had to bestow on him the highest royal honour.

The Book of Esther, whenever the season comes round to read it, strikes me as the supreme example of how God brings about circumstances, apparently unimportant at the times, to achieve His purpose.

Let us look at it a little more closely. First, the appointment of Esther, a Jewish girl, as the queen. Then comes the apparently trivial incident, dismissed in three verses at the end of the chapter, of how two of the king's chamberlains were plotting to assassinate the king and how Mordecai, the queen's cousin, reported the matter to the king. Nothing more was heard of the incident and it seemed to have been entirely forgotten; after all, so they thought, why all the fuss about that insignificant Jew, Mordecai? But, oh no! Just before Haman approached the king to get Mordecai hung there was brought about by God the coincidence of three, by themselves, unimportant events:

1. The king had a sleepless night.
2. The records were read.
3. They read the incident when Mordecai, by his alertness and loyalty, prevented the assassination of the king and they discovered that no reward had been given him; his deed, so far, had not even been recognised.

Then just at the decisive moment when the king was anxious that something must be done about this omission and negligence, there enters Haman to get this same man, Mordecai, hanged!

What a downfall for vain Haman! His wife and friends appreciated the situation all right. They said (chapter 6, verse 13), "If Mordecai be of the seed of the Jews, before whom thou hast begun to fall, thou shalt not prevail against him, but shalt surely fall before him" Remember, those who said this' were gentiles, but they evidently had enough knowledge to recognise God, to know that the Jews were His chosen people and that fighting against God and His people and His purpose was futile.

You know, this sixth chapter in Esther, I find one of the most touching ones in biblical history. Every year I read through it I am touched to tears of joy. Of course, the Book of Esther is not alone in showing how "the mills of God work slowly, his wonders to perform." But somehow, the way it is told, shows in such a dramatic way God's working, using trivial everyday matters to bring about His purpose.

Now, the two chapters considered, have one common underlying theme: in each case somebody wanted to harm the Jews, but circumstances forced them to do the very opposite; to help them, in one case, to honour one particular Jew in the other.

And what about our position as spiritual Jews? I think we all have had set-backs in our lives which seemed a terrible blow at the time, but turned out for our good later - but the 'later' may have been years. It comes back to what Paul says in Romans 8:28, "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God to them who are called according to His purpose." We all have, or had in the past, our cross to bear, and when our prayers seem unanswered let us take heart in what the Lord said to Paul (2 Corinthians 12:9), "My grace is sufficient for thee." Let us not forget to count our blessings; comfortable homes which so often we take for granted, and above all, the blessing of the knowledge of the truth concerning our redemption in Jesus and the great privilege of being among the called.

How often do we realise how little room we have of being high-minded. All of us came to the truth in different ways, but most of us, I think, through our parents, or others talked to friends, or perhaps attended Bible lectures, or through reading Bible literature. But whichever way we came to it, one thing we all have in common in this respect - it was entirely through God's mercy on us, and through absolutely no merit of our own. Let us not forget this. Let us walk humbly before our God, but at the same time rejoice in the hope of the resurrection which will certainly happen. Let us take comfort in the signs of the times, the immense increase in scientific knowledge, man's inability to create peace and justice on the earth; "when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh" (Luke 21:28).

Brother Leo Dreifuss.

Continuing the correspondence between Esleigh Feltham and myself published in the last C.L.

I have received another letter from Esleigh as follows:-

“I am surprised at the quotes you give re Muth Temuth - “dying, thou shalt die.” Scarcely one of them necessarily requires the immediate implementation of the penalty.

1 Kings 2:42 might be the exception, but I doubt whether Shimei could go to seek his servant in Gath and get back in one day; and there was no reason why the original warning could anticipate an absence of only a few hours.

If the phrase “dying, thou shalt die” involved the death of Adam and Eve the same day that they ate of the tree of knowledge a significant implication arises.

Only last Sunday I heard the familiar reference to “the Serpent’s Lie” - heard many times in the past, no doubt by you also. But do you realise that your understanding of “dying, thou shalt die” means there was no such thing as the “serpent’s lie”?

God Himself endorsed the second part of the serpent’s comment to Eve (Genesis 3:22) and if the day of eating was to be the day of death, then Adam outlived it by nearly a thousand years! The serpent was, in fact, speaking the simple truth!

Re my paragraph stating “I could not agree....” You do not seem to grasp the conclusion I drew.

I do not agree that animal sacrifices were substitutional. Were this so, surely any man could have obtained redemption by sacrificing himself (Hebrews 10:11). The animals simply pointed forward to God’s appointed Redeemer.

I have never heard an intelligent exposition of what occurred in the Garden of Eden.

The reason I find discussing differences so depressing is because the process is so fruitless; due largely to the way the Scriptures are written.

Sincerely your brother, Esleigh Feltham.

My reply to the above letter was as follows:-

Dear Brother Esleigh,

Thank you for your letter. I derive great pleasure in corresponding with others on all Bible topics but sometimes find it disappointing when others do not see the things that to me are so clear.

The quotes I gave re. Muth Temuth are very much to the point of countering your view that the words mean “Being of a dying nature thou shalt indeed become subject to death.”

Every use of the phrase Muth Temuth contradicts your view because they all refer to judicial death as opposed to natural death. The context of each passage shows that Muth Temuth can mean nothing less than inflicted death, and it cannot mean the gradual wearing out process such as Adam actually experienced.

Your argument re Shimei not being slain the day he crossed Kidron fails to make your point because Solomon slew him, or rather, had him slain, at the very first possible opportunity, and it was a judicial execution due solely to his transgression of the King’s command. Had Solomon been there as Shimei crossed the brook no doubt Solomon would have slain him that very day. But what was not possible for man does not mean it is impossible for God.

Nevertheless, Shimei's slaying was certain from the moment he crossed over the brook - an untimely death he brought upon himself unnecessarily; and the fact that he lived a few more days until Solomon could carry out the slaying in no way compares with your argument that Adam lived nearly a thousand years after receiving a similar threat from God.

God did not in any sense slay Adam at the first possible opportunity after he had taken of the fruit of the tree of knowledge; God slew the animal that day instead, in order to provide a covering for Adam. It was in fact, the first Atonement.

Regarding the "Serpent's Lie:" "Thou shall not surely die" do you really think the serpent was right just because Adam and Eve were not put to death that day? The statement of the serpent "Thou shalt not die" implied they would never die but would become like the angels with whom they conversed from time to time. Once Adam and Eve had transgressed God's commandment it meant that could not be - unless of course, God provided a way back to Him. Again, of course, the serpent had no knowledge of any such thing.

But let's take a sensibly look at the possibility of a serpent, usually thought of as a snake, ever having the ability to reason. It must have had hearing and both knowledge and understanding in order to do reason and to speak; it also must have had vocal chords in order to be heard. Was there a real serpent in the garden that had also these capabilities - to hear what God had said and to reason and to speak with human voice?

Throughout Scripture the serpent, or devil, is illustrative of man's will when opposed to God's will - no more, no less. The conversation between Eve and the serpent was the reasoning of her own thoughts and desires.

One might say Eve saw a snake eating of the fruit and on seeing no harm come to the snake she might suppose no harm would come to her either if she were to eat of it. Be that as it may, the final analysis is that the reasoning was in her own mind; and this is in keeping with all Scripture teaching regarding temptation.

If this view is conceded then it can be seen that Eve had no way of knowing that she would not die, only that she hoped she would not. In fact, her reasoning was that if they were to know good and evil as a result of eating the fruit, then they would necessarily have to remain alive in order to experience that good and evil, therefore God did not mean what He said. That God did not mean what He said was the lie, and Eve had no way of knowing that God, having anticipated their predicament, had already laid plans for their escape.

You say, "I do not agree that animal sacrifices were substitutional. Were this so, surely, any man could have obtained redemption by sacrificing himself."

No! No man can sacrifice himself for himself. If he needs redeeming it is because he is unclean, and if he is unclean he is not a fit offering. If he is clean then he does not need redeeming - and such was Jesus.

A sacrifice is the act of giving up something valued for the sake of something else of at least equal value. It is necessarily substitutional. This agrees with Bible teaching that the object of a sacrifice is its substitution for the offender; and we see that all the types point to Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ bore our sins, the Just for the unjust. The One for the other. That is substitution. The transferring of the sins from the sinner to the innocent bearer is substitution. Call it by any other name you will, the fact remains. We are purchased with the precious blood of Christ. Purchase is substitution. Jesus said He laid down His life as a ransom. Ransom involves payment of a price and necessitates substitution. You cannot take out the principle of purchase from buying, ransom or redemption.

Let's look again at Leviticus 16:21 - "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited."

What could be plainer? The innocent victim took away the sins of the people. And again at Isaiah 53, which speaks of Jesus - "The Lord laid upon him the iniquity of us all."

I am sorry you find discussion of differences depressing and fruitless. It is a view I cannot share; rather do I find the opposite to be the case, as “iron sharpeneth iron”. There are certainly things in the Scriptures which are “hard to be understood” but they are there “for our learning” and it is up to each one of us to search diligently. There is no fault in the way the Scriptures were written for they were inspired of God, but in the translation of them there has always been a bias towards the translator’s own beliefs. However, there can be no excuse for adding to or taking away from the Scriptures as the Christadelphians have done, for their doctrines have far-reaching effects leading to denials and contradictions of Bible teaching. Once we abandon these false Christadelphian beliefs we can quickly find a clear ocean of truth and realise we were before paddling about in muddy waters of confusion.

There is much more I would love to talk about but perhaps I have said enough for now.

Sincerely your brother in the hope of Life Eternal, Russell.

Some weeks later I received Esleigh’s reply’s—

“Dear Brother Russell,

In reply to yours I would say that your comments on Muth Temuth are an expression of opinion. I can find no support in Young’s concordance that the term necessitates immediate judicial death. The Hebrew “dying, thou shalt die” in no way contradicts our point of view. The penalty for sin was death, which, apart from remission, was final.

The fact that Christ was raised from the dead shows that He was not a substitute for man.

God could only remit the death penalty when His own righteousness was acceptably acknowledged. Hence Christ came in our nature and, being personally sinless, could justify His Father’s law of death for sin by laying down His life as He did.

Those who acknowledge Christ’s work in the appointed way obtain deliverance from death as forgiven sinners, not as debtors whose liability has been met by someone else.

The animals sacrificed under the Law were an acknowledgement of sin – not a substitute.

Your seventh paragraph is strange indeed. It means that Genesis 3:1-5 is untrue (to put it politely) Likewise 3:13. Likewise verses 14 & 15 - words of God to the serpent.

To assume that the “serpent” is a metaphor for another entity would not be unreasonable, but your assumption transfers the Lie from the serpent to God Himself - in triplicate! This makes the whole episode not only pointless (no useful purpose served at all) but creates a most deplorable foundation for the rest of the Scriptures of Truth.

Without wishing to be irrelevant, your seventh paragraph brings to mind Numbers 22:23-30; 1 Kings 17:6; 1 Kings 13:24-28.

These differences are painful to bear; we can only hope that one day real unity of mind will finally prevail.

Sincerely your brother, Esleigh Feltham.

My reply to the above:-

Thank you for your letter. It seems our correspondence is centred only upon our disagreements, which is very sad, because we both long and pray for the day when we shall know even as we are known. Surely there is much we should be able to reason out agreeably during this present life.

Your letter again raises many points, all of which I shall answer with Scripture and reason. I maintain still, that Muth Temuth does not and cannot refer to natural death - Adam was saved from judicial death and your reference to 1 Kings 13 goes a long way to proving this matter. Look at the facts and compare them with events in Eden; 1 Kings 13, verse 7, “and the king said unto the man of God, Come home with me, and refresh thyself, and I will give thee a reward. And the man of God said unto the king, If thou wilt give me half thine house, I will not go in with thee, neither will I eat bread nor drink water in this place; for so it was charged me by the word of the Lord, saying, Eat no bread nor drink water, nor return again by the same way that thou earnest....”

The man of God given a command to obey - then follows the temptation:- verse 15, “Then he (the prophet) said unto him (the man of God), Come home with me, and eat bread. And he said, I may not return with thee, nor go in with thee: neither will I eat bread nor drink water with thee in this place...”

Then follows the reasoning, the lie, and then the sin: verse 18; “...I am a prophet also as thou art; and an angel spoke unto me by the word of the Lord, saying, Bring him back with thee into thine house, that he may eat bread and drink water. But he lied unto him. So he went back with him and did eat bread in his house and drank water.”

The man of God was then made aware of his sin and, soon after, follows the penalty: Verse 21, “...thou hast disobeyed the mouth of the Lord, and hast not kept the commandment which the Lord thy God commanded thee...” verse 24, “and when he was gone a lion met him by the way and slew him.”

This story compares with events in the Garden of Eden except that Adam was spared the judicial death while the man of God was not. Adam’s life was spared and the animal died in his place. The man of God was not spared, but died in the day of his transgression. We should thank God that Adam was spared in this way because if he had not been, then you and I would not have received our lives from him and would never have had the opportunity of life Eternal through Jesus Christ who voluntarily took Adam’s place in death.

You write, “The fact that Christ was raised from the dead shows that He was not a substitute for man.” By this, do you mean that if Christ was put to death instead of Adam, then He should have stayed dead? (This is, I believe the usual argument here, but please correct me if you have something else in mind).

The point here is that Adam should have lost his natural life by judicial death on the day he sinned, as happened to the man of God in the story above, but this sentence of death was not carried out upon Adam; however, in due time Jesus Christ accepted this sentence of death in Adam’s’ stead, and so Jesus Christ lost His natural life, never to take it again. His natural life was in the blood shed on Calvary; that life was ended and gone forever. He did not rise again to natural life because His natural life stayed dead as it was the price He paid for Adam’s release from the penalty. In this way Jesus Christ was the Saviour of all men, for our life has come from Adam, through generation after generation, so our present life is therefore our redeemed life.

Jesus Christ’s natural life which He laid down was the corresponding price, the exact substitute, for Adam’s natural life. Jesus Christ could not receive again the price He paid, but He could and did rise to immortal life. For Jesus Christ not to have risen would have meant that He had paid more than the corresponding price. It would have meant He had lost His Eternal life in place of Adam’s natural life. That would have been a monstrous injustice.

You write, “Those who acknowledge Christ’s work in the appointed way obtain deliverance from death as forgiven sinners, not as debtors whose liability has been met by someone else.”

I agree with this. However, Adam’s case was different in that his sin in the Garden of Eden was not forgiven. There was no provision made at that time for the forgiveness of sins. It was necessary, therefore, that the penalty be met, and God so loved His creation that He provided the means of meeting it. Adam’s debt was paid for with the precious blood of Christ, foreshadowed in Eden by the slaying of the animal; and ever since that first typical slaying, people have been able to seek forgiveness in the appointed way.

Again you write that “the animals sacrificed under the law were an acknowledgement of sin - not a substitute.”

By what authority can you possibly say that they were not a substitute? It is surely a well enough known fact that the Jews have always understood the sacrifices to be substitutionary; and indeed, it is very difficult to read such Scriptures as Isaiah 53 without seeing in them the principle of substitution. Let me quote from the writings of Dr Edersheim on this point, from his book on the Ministry and Services of the Temple:-

“On one point the authorities of the old synagogue, previous to their controversy with Christianity, are agreed. As the Old Testament and Jewish tradition taught that the object of a sacrifice was its substitution for the offender, so Scripture and the Jewish fathers also teach that the substitute to whom all these types pointed was none other than the Messiah.”

You refer to my seventh paragraph regarding the serpent. First, let me ask, in what way were we made in the image of God? Was it not that we were given the ability to reason with Him and to respond to His will? So what of the serpent? It is incomprehensible to suppose that God made another creature also able to reason and to speak with human voice, put there by God in the Garden of Eden just to tempt Eve into sinning and having done that then this creature was doomed to crawl on its belly and eat dust all its life! This is superstition.

But what do the Scriptures say about the serpent? Revelation 12:9 and 20:2 tell us the serpent is the Devil and Satan, and further than this, Revelation 20:2 goes on to tell us that this Satan is to be bound for a thousand years during the reign of Christ. That is to say, that the serpent/Devil/Satan/man's will when opposed to God's will, is to be bound or restricted during the Kingdom Age. This is what Jesus Christ taught His disciples to pray for so that God's will should be done on the earth as it is now done in heaven

I maintain, therefore, that my argument is valid, that the serpent represents, or is a personification of, man's will when opposed to God's will. How wonderfully well all Scripture fits together with such great harmony on this point, as with all the other points I have expressed.

You refer also to Numbers 22:23 to 30 - the matter of Balaam and his ass. Did God give the ass the ability to reason and to speak with human voice? Was it not much more likely, that while it may have appeared that way to Balaam, it was in reality the angel who spoke the words as if coming from the ass?

Perhaps the most puzzling part of your letter is your paragraph, “To assume that the serpent is a metaphor for another entity would not be unreasonable, but your assumption transfers the “Lie” from the serpent to God Himself – in triplicate! This makes the whole episode not only pointless (no useful purpose served at all) but creates a most deplorable foundation for the rest of the Scriptures of truth.”

I have struggled with your reasoning here, but to no avail. I made the point in my last letter, and confirm it in this one, that the “serpent” was the reasoning in Eve's own mind where it was in opposition to the will of God. How you transfer this “Lie,” which was in the mind of Eve, to God is indeed baffling.

Other points: I don't see that Christ had need to justify His Father's law of sin and death, nor that God righteousness had to be acceptably acknowledged. Why not just accept the facts that God is righteous, and that He implemented the law of sin and death, instead of dressing them up in typical Christadelphian jargon, which may sound very good, but really has little meaning. Such language hides and avoids the real issues.

The difference between us is summed up in this: Was the purpose of the virgin birth to endow Jesus Christ with special strength to resist sin, or was it to produce a man who was legally in a position to give Himself as the sin offering? It was the latter, of course, and herein is to be found the one point which annihilates the view that Jesus Christ died for Himself. It is this, that He was not a Priest at the time of His death upon the Cross. He was of the tribe of Judah and could not therefore offer up sacrifices, which were the prerogative of the Levites. For Jesus Christ to offer up sacrifice for Himself would have been a grave sin indeed. No, Jesus Christ was not the Offerer, He was the Lamb of God, the Offering; His Father was the Offerer. “Unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given.” (Isaiah 9:6).

On the Day of Atonement, the High Priest, the Offerer under the law, had first of all to offer for himself in order to make himself legally clean so that he could then offer the sacrifice for the people. Not so with Jesus Christ. He was the Sacrifice, not the Priest, and this one fact alone destroys any argument that He made an offering for Himself.

When we consider the great love God had for His created son, Adam, we can imagine, to some extent, the distress He felt when Adam sinned. How often have we, as parents, wished we could take our child's place when we see that he or she has to face some ordeal? We can imagine, I think, that God Himself would have wished to take Adam's place, but this, of course, was not possible but God did have another Son, His only begotten Son, whom He also loved greatly and asked Him to take Adam's place in death and so spare Adam's natural life, giving him further opportunity of eternal life through faith and forgiveness while at the same time, making him the father of all living. Sincerely your brother,

Russell Gregory.

THOUGHTS ON THE DAILY READINGS for DECEMBER

Once more we come to the end of another year, and with it the end of another reading cycle. December takes us through the trials of Job, the minor prophets and various Epistles, followed by the Book of Revelation.

Today I want to pass on a remark on the short Book of Haggai. In this book God speaks through Haggai to the small remnant of the people who had returned from the Babylonian captivity under the leadership of Zerubbabel. God's complaint was that the people were more concerned about the building of their own houses than the re-building of the temple.

It is easy enough to understand. Had we been in the same situation, we might have done the same. We all like a good home. And when we come home from a long journey, or from an enforced stay at hospital, the first thought that comes into our minds is "Is it all right?" We are anxious to catch up with cleaning, washing, tidying up, straightening out in the garden, etc. Yet the prophet had to remind them that God must be put first. Of course, there is no temple in our day; yet do we always have God in our thoughts? Can we all say with a clear conscience that in whatever we do, or plan to undertake, we have God in our thoughts and that our actions are in accordance with God's will? Do we faithfully ask God for guidance in any major decisions we have to make, and when we have successfully come through some danger, thank God for protection?

The work of rebuilding the temple was held up once or twice by hostile nations around them. Yet thanks to the staunch characters of Ezra, Nehemiah and the preaching of Haggai and Zechariah, the work was completed.

There are no prophets in our time; we have the word of God as recorded in the Bible to guide us which, of course, contains the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, and many other prophets. They all contain such words as are necessary for comfort, encouragement, and also rebuke which applies to us all as well as to those to whom it was first spoken.

And then we have the Epistles of John. One important theme that runs through John's first Epistle is the love that God showed towards us, and our duty to love our fellows. We read, in 1 John 3:1, "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God." And a similar statement in John's gospel (3:16) "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Both these verses contain an essential part of the gospel. I want to take the last one mentioned first. And we notice that God loved and gave. God's love is giving, and what gift is more precious than His Son? Come to think of it, this sort of

love is difficult for us to fully appreciate. You see many people, when they give something, expect, at least subconsciously, to get something in return, not necessarily goods or money, but perhaps some special favour. Many people just can't understand the idea of giving just for the sheer love of it; the sheer love of giving somebody else a pleasure. Yet this was God's love when He gave His Son and Jesus' love when He allowed Himself to be subjected to that cruel death on the Cross.

How can people say that Christ benefited by His death, when He died as our representative, and not as the Scriptures teach, as our substitute, that is, instead of us? It discredits our Lord and pulls down His sacrifice to the level of people in the world who give in order to gain something for themselves. This talk of Christ having benefited by His death reduces His sacrifice to the sort of people who give something to a charity in order to pay less tax.

And then the verse in John's Epistle, "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, - that we should be called the sons of God." Just think of the privilege that we are regarded as God's sons by adoption; provided, of course, that we have taken the first step of dying to sin in the water of baptism and rising to a new life as Christ's servants.

I wonder if we are fully aware of this high calling? Can we conscientiously say that we always conduct ourselves worthy of that Name? To be honest, none of us live up to this high calling all the time. But we have this consolation that if we fail we have our Great High Priest for whose sake our sins and failings are forgiven. Again, we must do our part by availing ourselves of His pardon through prayer and really sincere repentance.

Let us then take to heart this unselfish Divine love, love in giving, for the joy of it; and endeavour to walk worthy of it in humility, but at the same time rejoicing in God's mercy for having made known to us His Gospel of better things to come.

Let us hold fast to the end of our probation.

Brother Leo Dreifuss.

“ART THOU A TEACHER AND KNOWEST NOT THESE THINGS?”

An Examination of a few of the Replies to Questions put to Mr W.F. Barling, a Christadelphian, at Netherton.

Many people have been puzzled at the non-appearance of the report of the debate between W.F.Barling and E.Brady on 7th May 1949. As one who was present, and felt it to be an historical event which amply confirmed the truths brought to light in 1873 by the late Edward Turney, and a demonstration of the lies and inconsistencies of the Christadelphians, I am determined that nothing shall prevent the publication of the facts.

The position at present appears to be as follows: reports were taken at the debate by two independent reporters of "Stenotype Limited," and by a Christadelphian. The Stenotype report was sent to E. Brady by that firm within a week or so of the event and after minor corrections was forwarded to the Secretary of Netherton Ecclesia for W.F.Barling to do the same in accordance with the conditions which had been agreed. Then nearly a year elapsed, and in correspondence which has been published, Netherton Ecclesia made various excuses for the delay, refusing either to let E. Brady examine the report taken by their own member or to have copies of the speeches, as had been agreed. Finally, they produced what they described as "A Compiled Report by W.F.Barling," and submitted it to E.Brady for his approval. I have myself read this Compilation and compared it both with the Stenotype report and with my own recollection of the debate, and

it is a subtle and calculated fraud, containing alterations and omissions designed by its author to improve his case.

Personally I am of the opinion that even so it would be better published than nothing, since even with the skilful touching up it has received, the Christadelphian position is exposed in all its nakedness, and Haman is indeed hung on his own gallows - but E. Brady, very properly, refused to have anything to do with it, and insists that the original condition, that a report taken by an independent reporter and subject only to minor corrections to be agreed by both parties, shall be adhered to.

As I see no prospect of the present deadlock being broken, and as Christadelphians are now circulating the story that it is the other side who are obstructing publication, I have decided to duplicate this short consideration of a few of the more important questions dealt with.

Question 1. E.Brady asked, "Do you accept the Christadelphian Statement of Faith?"

Answer: W.F.Barling replied, "Yes." But later, when he was asked, "Did Jesus rise with the same body?" he answered, "I don't know." This proves not only that his reply to the first question was a falsehood, but that he is false to the Constitution he professes to uphold.

C.C.Walker wrote in 1910, "Christ rose from the dead in mortal human nature," and to be true to his professed belief W.F. Barling should have said the same. But he knew that to confess to the belief that Jesus rose mortal, as Christadelphians are supposed to believe, would put him in a difficulty, and he dared not admit what many Christadelphians do now secretly believe, that Jesus rose "in the Spirit" incorruptible; so he took refuge in a cowardly "I don't know." Do you realise that honest and sincere brethren have been disfellowshipped for admitting a scriptural belief upon a point which W.F.Barling says publicly, he doesn't know? We are reminded of Dr Thomas's words, "Disturb not that which is quiet," which is a capital maxim for a rotten cause, especially where its subversion would break up all vested interests and pecuniary emoluments.

This one issue is sufficient to split the body to its foundation if all men were honest. W.F.Barling can play fast and loose by saying "It is my belief and teaching I am defending," not the Statement of Faith and other writings, and he can claim not to be committed to anything others say; but it is very evident that he should either uphold the accepted doctrines or get out.

We must thank W.F.Barling for his latest information "I don't know" and ask, would it not be better to put it so in the Constitution? Would he accept a new convert who was asked the question and replied "I don't know"?

Question 2. "Are you satisfied you understand the Nazarene Fellowship?"

Answer: "Yes."

This was the vain boast of W.F.Barling to the late J.B.Handley in a letter to me, August 25th 1945. R.Roberts told Edward Turney, "We know all you have to say on this subject before you begin." Anyone reading "My Life For The Sheep" will have no difficulty in seeing how foolish this little man with Goliath ideas must be. (See "Redemption in Christ Jesus" page 32, "That is, according to the Nazarene theory the forgiveness of sins was obtained without a ransom." We do not believe such a thing!) What W.F.Barling said in the following sentence is our answer to him. He glibly accuses us of misrepresentation. Physician, heal thyself! Much more could be said under this heading, but we smite W.F.Barling in accordance with the spirit of Proverbs 27:6 and Psalm 141:5. These two questions alone should be enough to any honest reader not to put trust in a broken reed.

Question 3. "Is it just to punish a man for a sin he did not commit?"

Answer: "No."

Obviously he dared not answer anything else; yet his own plain statements are directly contrary. Here is what he wrote in "Redemption in Christ Jesus" page 23,

“How did the crucifixion declare God’s righteousness? In that Christ possessed a nature under condemnation to death, so that there was no violation of justice in his death. It was not wrong for him to die. The death of Jesus was just. He was under Adamic condemnation and thereby God could lawfully require him to die.”

In the debate he made great play with asking for precise and explicit scriptures by way of proof of certain Nazarene reasoning, but where is there a precise and explicit scripture for such a monstrous statement?

In answer to other questions he agreed that Jesus was just; that He did no sin: yet he teaches that God required His death because He inherited Adamic condemnation, and in face of that he answers that it is not just to punish a man for a sin he did not commit! Death is the wages of sin, not - the wages of flesh (Romans 6:23).

Question 4: “Is it possible for a Christian to live a perfect life?”

Answer: “No.”

If there is precise and explicit scripture for this answer we have never seen it. On the contrary, scripture is full of exhortation to perfection and obedience, and if it is impossible such passages would be a mockery. In “Redemption in Christ Jesus” page 29, Barling says, “Must in the same way admit of offences of some kind.” Is this precise scripture, or gratuitous assumption? If he is right in affirming that it is not possible for a man to live a perfect life, then we are asked to do the impossible in Matthew 5:48. The Apostle Paul, in Galatians 5:16 is a liar. His commandments are grievous (1 John 5: 3) and there is the difficulty of explaining of how Jesus succeeded in doing the impossible.

Question 5: “Is what we term ‘natural death’ the ‘Wages of sin’?”

Answer: “I would like an elucidation of the expression ‘wages of sin’.”

Surely, any Christadelphian should have been able to give a categorical “Yes” to this. But Barling saw rough waters ahead and he met it by an evasion. Either natural death is the wages of sin or it is not. The Statement of Faith which he professed to accept defines Adam’s punishment as the return to dust of Genesis 3, and the inheritance of a physical law of decay as the result of sin, bringing corruptibility to all his descendants. If this is truly the case why did W.F.Barling require an elucidation of the term? Because he foresaw that E.Brady would want to know why natural death comes to innocent creatures who are not sinners. The truth is that death came in the natural course of events to creatures who were created corruptible. The wages of sin in reality, was the expulsion from Eden, involving condemnation to a death which would exclude from hope from hope of any kind. Natural death may be regarded as a result of sin, since had Adam been obedient he may have been rewarded with eternal life before natural death terminated his probation. But as it will not debar anyone who is a believer from eternal life, and as it is the universal law of creation, it is utterly wrong to speak of natural death as a punishment. Only a judicial death can be a penalty, and such death will engulf all sinners and finally terminate their existence.

Question 11: “Did Adam have all natural desires?”

Answer: “Again, I want a definition of the term ‘natural desires’.”

Anyone knows what is meant by natural desires - the needs and appetites of the normal person. Why did Barling need to hedge and evade? Because if Adam had them before he disobeyed, then they were not sinful; and on the other hand, he must have had them, otherwise he could not have experienced temptation. So W.F.Barling wished to avoid giving a categorical yes or no. But in answer to the next question he was obliged to reply “No, not in the way we experience them now.” How on earth could anyone presume to state as a fact something which is utterly contrary to all reason and evidence? I asked W.F.Barling the same question in correspondence and he replied “If by natural you mean ‘animal’ the answer is yes.” Thus we have a “Yes” and a “No” to the same question.

Question 13: “Did Adam have free will?”

Answer: “Yes.”

We agree, but where is the precise scriptural proof of the fact? It is purely a matter of reasonable deduction. I also asked him “Was Adam on probation, and what for?” His reply was “Adam was on probation, because he was under law, but what for is not revealed.” Thus he can infer the facts that Adam had a free will and was on probation, yet the next step - which is equally plain - he dare not take, and evades by saying “it is not revealed.” A babe could give the answer, and in fact, the Statement of faith, which he professes to accept, states: “Adam was adjudged unworthy of immortality.” Also “Christendom Astray,” page 58 tells us, “Adam was originally created with a view to possible immortality.” It is obvious that if Adam was under law and on probation, it must have been for something he did not have! Freewill has been the basis of all God’s requirements” (Law of Moses,” page 96). “If Adam had been incapable of sinning he would have been incapable of holiness; that is, he could not have been a free agent; or in other words he could not have been an intelligent or intellectual being — they must also have been in a state of probation — placed under law,” (Dr Adam Clarke, on Romans 5) .

Question 14. “Have we free will?”

Answer: “The will is present, yes.”

Why could W.F.Barling not reply simply “Yes” instead of, in this and questions 15 and 16, refusing to commit himself to the only answer possible to a reasonable being? Because he knew that the doctrine of Sinful Flesh contained in the Statement of Faith is absolutely contrary to the truth that we have free will. If all creation became constitutionally impregnated with sin at the fall, then his talk about freewill would be utter nonsense, and that is why W.F.Barling was so guarded in his reply. If the teaching of the Bible was as he teaches, then there is a certain power of the will present, but that it is necessarily ineffectual against the bias to sin which is also present, then religion has no meaning. John 3:16; John 7:17; and Exodus 25:1 are clear and precise proofs that it is not nature or bias that is at fault, but actions.

Question 17. “Was all creation reproductive?”

Answer: “Presumably, yes.”

This question, and similar ones, give the lie to Clause 5 of the Statement of Faith and so-called Original Sin. All living things, animals, birds, fish and plants are termed “natural,” and each has its seed within itself and, like man, was to be fruitful and multiply before Sin entered. If we ask for precise scriptural proof that Adam became corruptible and impregnated with evil desires as a result of sin, there is none. It is evident from W.F.Barling’s evasions and need of definition of creation, etc., that plain answers would have put him in difficulties. Even James said that nature can be and is tamed (3:7).

Question 28. “Is sin the transgression of law?”

Answer: “Yes.”

If this admission was kept in mind instead of a supposed secondary application of sin as a physical principle, most of the difficulties would vanish. Now I ask for precise proof that we can have sin apart from law. On this point W.F.Barling is in opposition to Paul (Romans 7:7,8), and his own leader, R. Roberts (“Christendom Astray,” page 58).

Question 30. “Are natural desires sin?”

Notice how W.F.Barling answers by misapplying and taking from context, Paul’s words, “sin dwelleth in me.” Paul was instancing himself as a Jew under the law, actually transgressing the law - it does not support the theory of sinful flesh. Deuteronomy 23:21,22 shows how sin can dwell in a person or not dwell in him. Scripture tells us that God can dwell in a man; Christ can dwell in a man, love can dwell in us. It is a question of what kind of spirit dominates us and rules our behaviour. If we are doing evil things then sin dwells in us; if we act in a Godly way, God dwells in us. But sin is no more in our physical flesh than Deity is. This damnable doctrine leads W.F.Barling to say that Jesus had the Devil in His flesh when John says “in Him is no sin.” The strength, or power of sin is the law.

Question 64. “Did Adam sell himself to sin?”

Answer: “Not in the sense you mean.”

This is not the only place where W.F.Barling thought himself smart and then had to admit that it was so in the sense which E. Brady meant. The Old Testament shows how others like Adam did so. "His servants ye are whom ye obey." Paul explains how he was sold under sin, and it would take more than W.F.Barling to prove that Jesus was also sold under sin.

Question 79. "Is original sin the sin of Adam?"

Again W.F.Barling wants to know exactly what is meant. He says it is a term he doesn't understand; and yet it is fundamental to his theory and he is a professed believer in Clause 5. We agree it is a poser for a Christadelphian, for Dr Thomas contradicts himself on it and, like W.F.Barling wants it both ways at once.

Question 80. "Is 'sinful flesh' (used in Romans 8:3) the same as sin's flesh?"

Answer: "Yes and vice versa."

Edward Turney has said all that is necessary on this point; but for a teacher of languages to answer in this way is quite sufficient to prove him utterly unfitted for his job. Farmer Green has a cow. We can describe the animal as "Green's cow," but W.F.Barling asserts that we should be quite justified to go looking for "a green cow."!

Question 81. "Can we have forgiveness of sins now?"

Answer: "I should readily say, Yes."

We congratulate him here, for he has advanced a stage beyond previous Christadelphian teaching. But if he was faithfully defending his professed faith he should have replied "we do not know." (See "Christendom Astray," page 82). "Not until... the spoken word... will they know he it is to fare with them." Paul knew; so did Timothy (2:1-12; 4:8), Job (19:25), David (Psalm 17:15). It is a fact that many Christadelphians have already abandoned the belief in a 40 years' Judgment Seat, and perhaps will at last get back to the truth which Dr Thomas once believed and taught, that the saints will rise incorruptible. We have had it from the lips of at least one well known Christadelphian that he believes now that Jesus rose incorruptible.

Question 85a. "Do you think that we believe or teach that human flesh is either 'clean' or 'unclean'?"

Answer: "I think in that respect your teaching is in my own writings."

We have shown that W.F.Barling does not, in fact, properly understand our teaching, as his own writings show. They are false on various points. He says "I cannot understand," "did not fully comprehend," "would like a definition." He also condemns what he calls "unscriptural expressions;" yet how many he has used! Think only of one like Dr Thomas's reference to Jesus, "He was as unclean as those for whom he died." ("Elpis Israel" page 128). Exodus 9:2; John 15:3.

Question 95. "Was Jesus' life His own, or forfeited in Adam?"

Answer: "I would like a definition."

Another evasion. The claim to know (Exactly, according to his Compiled Report) our teaching and supposedly knows his own. Any Christadelphian knows that "in Adam all die," but Jesus claimed to be from above, that no one could convict Him of sin, that the prince of this world had nothing (no rights) in Him, That He laid His life down of Himself, that no one could (lawfully) take His life from Him. The plain answer is that Jesus life was His own. Otherwise He could not have given it in sacrifice.

Question 97. "Did death pass upon Jesus?"

Answer: "Yes."

From the context, W.F.Barling includes Jesus in the "All men." From a syllogistic test he cannot produce a shred of Scripture to prove this. The only death that Jesus died was an unjust, violent death upon the Cross by wicked men. (Acts 2:23). Now I want you, as you so glibly asked with an air of boast, to give in words that cannot be disputed, that death passed upon all men including Jesus. If natural death of corruption was the sentence, then Jesus did not have it passed upon Him to release those who are supposed to

be under it, without the other items that W.F.Barling agreed was necessary for our redemption; blood-shedding, etc.

Question 98. "Did Jesus sin?"

Answer: "No."

We agree. "In Him is no sin" (1 John 3:5); "Who did no sin" (1 Peter 2:22). Then Jesus did not die for His sin, as the priest under the law. Now prove that it was for His nature or sin-in-the-flesh. He died for us; on our behalf; in place of us (Matthew 20:28; Romans 5:7,8), and not for Himself (Daniel 9:26).

Question 99. "Did Jesus receive special strength to overcome temptation?"

Answer: "Yes."

The Scriptures are full of records of God's deliverance (Psalm 34:7; 1 Corinthians 10:13). Jesus was no exception, and the only strength He had above us was that He was in a position to give His life, whereas we could not. E.Brady's statement is sufficient to illustrate our point without going to extremes, making God do it all and we mere machines. It was Jesus' loving duty, no compulsion, only from a willing moral obedience for the Sin of the world. The following questions speak for themselves. We agree with most; but notice the evasions and contradictions against Christadelphian teaching; "Jesus died as the victim," and when W.F.Barling was asked the second time he admitted that he could not fully appreciate the significance of an inflicted death. Their works are full of this teaching ("Elpis Israel" page 126; "Eureka vol. 1 page 279; "Ministry of the Prophets" page 155; "Echoes of Past Controversies" page 99 "Christadelphian Magazine" January 4th page 10, col. 3 etc.). Surely what others say "doesn't commit" W.F.Barling; yet he was there under a false pretence. For those who do not know, the redemption of the body is in the aggregate. It includes individuals, but it is the "body of Christ." (Pharanosis" page 45). Surely anyone can see the difference in having a resurrection and the need for redemption? Here is another evasion, but we want to rub salt in the wound to stop the poison spreading. Has W.F.Barling seen the light? Is he ashamed of the Birmingham Statement of Faith? To the question, "Did Jesus rise with the same body?" (Question 119) his answer of "I don't know" should make Christadelphians think, and not live in a fool's paradise. Is it a difficulty he has hastily dropped? Cannot he verify the teaching of his profession? Does the B.S.of F. "commit" him? Now we quote from his own work - "Redemption in Christ Jesus;" page 22, "As He rose from the dead exempt from all association with sin." He knows this! Then why, in the face of this, does he say, "I don't know"? I leave the reader to draw his own conclusions.

Question 120. "Do you recognise any difference between 'natural death' and 'judicial execution'?"

Answer: "There is frequently a difference, but natural death may be judicial execution."

Let us agree for the sake of further enlightenment. Can W.F.Barling produce a natural judicial death for a sacrifice? Death that is the wages of sin, however executed, is eternal. As W.D.Jardine has pointed out, there is a difference in the death of an innocent victim and that of a sinner. The sacrificial death is of Love. The death of the sinner is as wages.

Question 124. "Is it just that innocent people receive the "wages of sin"?"

Answer: "We will leave that because there is obscurity in the form of your questioning."

Here is another simple question that a child could answer. Is not the obscurity with W.F.Barling? The natural death which is the wages of sin is bound to obscure his vision!

Question 125. "Was Dr Thomas right when he said that in 2 Corinthians 5:21, Jesus was made a sin-offering?"

Answer: "No."

While we appreciated anyone who is not afraid to say that another person is wrong, so long as there is proof to the contrary, we have, ourselves said that Dr Thomas was wrong - and we equally say that he was right also, as in this case ("Echoes of Past Controversies" pages 42,44 & 45). Let us give W.F.Barling the benefit for the sake of examination. Where have we such phrases as "sin nature," "serpent nature"? Have we sue phrases as "an offering for sin"? (Romans 8:3 Revised Version); "Thou shalt make His soul an

offering for sin” (Isaiah 53:10). Plenty of writers agree, and so does the Emphatic Diaglott. Now we ask for explicit, crisp Scriptural proof that Jesus was made sin by being made sinful flesh.

Question 127. “Were sins laid upon the victim by confessing them over its head?”

Question 129. “Did Dr Thomas think Jesus bore away our sins in the same manner?”

Answer: “I don’t know.” - E.Brady: “I can tell you he did.”

Now I want to know how W.F.Barling could say that E.Brady was not justified in his form of words and giving the same idea, that this is explicit, precise and Scriptural. See Leviticus 1:4; 3:2; 8:13; etc. “Confess... sins putting them upon the head...” (Leviticus 16:2J “Law of Moses” page 223). There is unmistakable evidence in the writings of Dr Thomas and R.Roberts that this was the sense in which Jesus bore away the Sin and sins of the world. What is more simple and more harmonious than type and antitype? In the next few questions the reader can see evasive tactics again. “I do not understand” yet he knew that this evasion need not have been put against him. Also, the following questions show how he pleaded ignorance, and gave the answers when compelled by other questions.

W.F.Barling must make Jesus as unclean as those for whom He died - nothing short of blasphemy, without a shred of evidence. Read Titus 1:1.

Question 150. “Was Jesus the seed of man?”

Answer: “I have never heard that expression.”

This spells evasion, as the following answers prove. So much for such an answer from a teacher of language, and a Christadelphian. Dr Thomas has used it in several ways in his writings, and W.F.Barling confirms it. Explicit proof that Jesus was the seed of the woman. Then He could not be the seed of man or that of the serpent. If that was so the serpent nature would bruise the serpent nature. Anyone can see that W.F.Barling admitted all that was required of him. We have, in another place, shown the meaning of such references (Psalm 22) that Jesus could not have manifested holiness until He became responsible. This is the sort of argument you get so as to confuse others and make show of learning. He has committed himself enough to prove him and the Christadelphian Body to the judgment of God.

Question 167. “Do you recognise any difference between ‘flesh belonging to sin’ and ‘flesh belonging to God’?”

Answer: “Both of those expressions are unscriptural.”

How many unscriptural expressions has W.F.Barling used? But though he is a teacher of language it would be wise on his part to say “I don’t know.” Dr Thomas has used it, and the Scripture uses it. The Kingdom of God is God’s Kingdom - it belongs to God. God’s Son belongs to God. Sin’s sons belong to sin. (See Dr Thomas in “Pharanosis” pages 43 & 44). “Mary as His flesh,” Teachers indeed! They need simple folk to teach what their teachers taught us.

This debate is very unfortunate for W.F.Barling and company. They use terms that no one else must use. The word “Legal” is only one example. Yet he uses it. He answers the question and so betrays his case.

Questions 174 & 175. “Did Jesus need adoption?” & “Do we need adoption?” should settle the legal question. They prove that we were all aliens, sold under sin. Jesus abode always in the house. He retained the Tree of Life. We, in Adam, did not. He could redeem us, but no son of Adam could. W.F.Barling is inconsistent when he says Jesus was in bondage and did not need adoption. 2 Peter 2:19 applies to W.F.Barling but not to Jesus. Many of the questions are unfortunate for W.F. Barling, and Mr Brady could have tied Mr Barling up on scores of points, but we wanted your answers irrespective of your evasions, contradictions and “I don’t know,” so that others may read and see for themselves the hopeless position they are in by a man-made constitution. “The truth shall make you free. Ye are clean through the word.”

Question 193. “Do you agree that if Jesus had not died in obedience to the command of God He would have perished?”

Answer: “Yes, He would have been disobedient.”

We ask. What is the meaning of sacrifice? Can anyone read and study Isaiah 53 and say that it has the resemblance of an idea that Jesus had sin in any form in the flesh? Under condemnation? Involved for Himself and the people? Not by the mildest interpretation can any one make a just law curse an innocent man, or that Jesus was as unclean as anyone else, or that He abrogated the law of condemnation for Himself. You can neither verify nor furnish one clear shred of crisp Scriptural proof. Note "It is my view," "I preach," "my teaching." These are the only things that matter to him and which gives the lie that he accepted the Birmingham Statement of Faith.

Question 202. "Was the flesh of Jesus condemned?"

Answer: "I want to know what you mean by 'condemned.' And in answer to question 207, "I have no idea."

Yet in his article "Redemption in Christ Jesus" he can say "Adam's was physical." That Jesus had a "Blemish in His flesh." "The sentence ran in His blood" - R.Roberts. "Fixed Principle" - Dr Thomas. So we must come to the conclusion (though W.F.Barling has it both ways) that sin was poured out in Jesus' blood. This also explains that Jesus rose exempt from sin." ("Redemption in Christ Jesus" page 22). His flesh was cleansed by pouring out His blood and going through the grave.

Question 208. "Did Jesus receive back the price that He paid?"

Answer: "I have read nothing of the kind in Scripture."

There are many other things which Mr Barling has said that he has read nothing of the kind in the Scriptures. (See "Haman Hung with His Own Rope"). We would like W.F.Barling to explain how Jesus' body of sin was destroyed in fact ("Redemption in Christ Jesus" page 21), and not know with what body Jesus rose.

Question 223. "Was Jesus the Seed of the serpent?"

Answer: "No."

Yet He, Jesus was a sinless bearer of our serpent nature ("Redemption Christ Jesus" page 21). Has Mr Barling read anything of the kind in Scriptures? So the death of Jesus was just ("Redemption in Christ Jesus" page 24). Has he also read this in the Scriptures? How absurd it is for him to utter "unscriptural language," and then use such language to coin such terms as "Physically blemished," "Condemned Christ" and "a morally undefiled Christ," and at the same time be unable to distinguish between the character and nature of Jesus. Is this susceptible to double interpretation? ("Redemption in Christ Jesus" page 1)

Question 226. "Are we sold unto sin?"

Answer: "Physically, yes."

Here we have another distinction - sold physically! It would be very interesting to know how we can always be sold physically and bought morally - one without the other, and be in the dual position of belonging to God and the Devil at the same time and unable to make the distinction. Where is the clear, crisp Scripture for this? We either belong to God or every whit to the Devil. Mr Barling wants to make himself clear! Is not this as clear as mud?

Question 239. "In your opening address you said the Scripture said we were buried Christ."

Answer: "I don't, the Scripture does."

What an answer! Can he say "Scripture does" for all that he says? He, only, it appears, has Scripture on his side. He believes things in the Statement of Faith and doesn't know what the Scripture says of how Jesus rose. The Firstfruits of those that slept. His physical body was not destroyed. The body of sin is not the physical body. The Scripture says that Jesus might destroy the works of the devil. Might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. The power and strength of sin is the law. This is an offering by a sacrifice for sin, and not for sinful flesh.

Question 253. "Dr Thomas says that Jesus was the same flesh as sinned in Eden."

Answer: "Is the interpretation valid?"

We have mentioned one in debate - and there are many others - ("Sin whose wages is death, had to be condemned in the nature that had transgressed." "Eureka" vol.1.page 106). You will note that Mr Barling had agreed that Adam sinned with his very good nature (See answer to Q.11 See "The Lamp" Vol. 1. pages 104 & 145.

Paul says there is one flesh of men (1 Corinthians 15:39), Dr Thomas makes it one, and then two - three bodies. 1) The body of sin. 2) a body like Adam's before he sinned. 3) This second body changed... a spiritual body ("Anastasis" page 36). Is this the clear, crisp proof we have to deal with? Jesus could not be the same flesh as Adam before and after he sinned. Talk about gratuitous assumptions! Inability to deal with difficulties, etc. Contradicting not only themselves but Paul also. Are these the "utterly irreconcilable statements" that C.C.Walker had in mind?

Question 254. "Did Dr Thomas say that the ram offered on mount Moriah was a substitute for Issac?"

Answer: "He did say so, but what he said is irrelevant to this discussion, because I am basing my personal teaching, which I am now defending, on my own personal beliefs. I am speaking and defending it, as a Christadelphian, by my personal convictions, prepared as a consequence of those - not any statement others may make out of their context.

Dr Thomas did say so, in "Elpis Israel," page 257. Mr Barling is a member and not a member. He can say what he likes, but no one must say he is wrong. He has the wisdom as a teacher, that he can suppress the Statement of Faith and defend it where it suits him and leave the rest. Why did the Netherton Ecclesia choose such a champion under false pretence? If J.Carter was debating I am sure he would not be such an one to act in such a manner. Far better not to debate than to make such remarks. I have never witnessed such shamefulness as W.F.Barling has shown. Any simple soul can see the position he was in. As we have stated elsewhere we have embraced the foundation principles from Christadelphian works that are consistent. We could not be two-faced and say we believe the Statement of Faith and deny it at the same time.

Mr Brady was right when he said to W.F.Barling: "Producing this argument has knocked your case to atoms." Mr Barling is blind to this fact because if it means that all in Adam suffer the penalty of death, there will be those who have suffered natural or violent death in this life who will have a resurrection to a second death, and this proves that natural death is not the wages of sin.

We need not repeat previous arguments, but we ask the reader to try and take Mr Barling's statements and harmonise them with Clause 5. He has said that he cannot define the physical difference of Adam. Yet trying to prove a point he shows the difference between Jesus before death and after. In the one it is simple, but he cannot give a clear, crisp Scriptural proof in the case of Adam. Jesus' change is explicit, precise; Adam's is gratuitous assumption. If the implantation of a physical law of decay was introduced then there was a change, and thus three bodies instead of two - as Mr Barling has said, and thus contradicting himself as well as evading a straight, simple answer. He is like J. J. Andrews; "A change must, therefore, have taken place.... How.... effected is not revealed."

Question 284. "You admit that when a man is in Christ he can be obedient?"

Answer: "Yes."

Question 285. "The same physical evil constitution, with its implanted physical laws, can be obedient? Doesn't it prove there is no such physical implanted law?"

W.F.Barling has agreed that a person can be obedient, yet he says here that it "lacks sequence..." He has also admitted that the same members (of Romans 6), which have served sin, can also serve righteousness. How easily the 'Serpent Nature' of W.F.Barling can turn! Adam sinned before this implantation took place and yet it is impossible to do the commandments. Barling's changed conditions under which Adam lived favours the socialistic and immortal soul idea: give man good conditions and he can be good; give him evil conditions and he will be evil. Think of Adam and Solomon.

E. Brady said he was not able to justify what W.F.Barling said were the four or five of our fundamental beliefs. He stated our fundamental belief is that Jesus died for the ungodly - the Just for the unjust. There was no Scripture given, but any student knows that they were Scriptural quotations from Romans 5:6 and 1 Peter 3:18. But W.F.Barling, in a lawyer-like manner says, "Singularly unscriptural."

Anyone reading this debate can see the dominant attitude of W.F.Barling - he only is right; he only has precise Scriptural proof; that E.Brady's are purely and simply "singularly unscriptural," "airy assumptions," etc. but we have enough straight answers to simple questions in "one word" to condemn W.F.Barling without the evasions and "I don't know's" etc. These are without those of the Statement of Faith which he can please himself whether he accepts or rejects as "my teaching."

Mr Barling gave Hebrews 13:20 as his strongest proof that Jesus died for Himself. He made a lot of this and said we could not give proof for our beliefs as he had for his. We have given a separate article on this so that the reader can judge for himself. But we would emphasise the point that this is a difficult passage, which W.F.Barling wants everybody except himself to give clear Scriptural proof - you will note that it is upon such passages that he can shine. To state that it does not say that Jesus died for Himself and your proof will be regarded as no good.

In the few subsequent questions regarding the Sacrificial death of Christ, re compulsion, or loving obedience, I think H. Fry put the death-knell to this confusion when he said, "Make His death a penalty due to Himself personally, and you destroy both aspects of His loving obedience." ("Echoes of Past Controversies," page 60). Jesus' obedient life was for His own salvation or deliverance; His death was for our Redemption.

E. Brady's questions on Romans 5 and W.F.Barling's answers should be enough for anyone to see the very awkward position Barling was in. If Jesus needed access to God by blood, we want to know how He had access to God before His death. Jesus entered the Holy of Holies for us - not for Himself. W.F.Barling says "Don't put words which I have not said" but the very simplest can see that that is the only right answer to logical questions, however much Mr Barling dislikes it. Time closed the answer to E. Brady's questions; it does not need much imagination to see the answers to Romans 5. We leave the reader to judge righteous judgment.

If there are any questions that are not clear we would be pleased to answer them; for those who want to know but not debate.

We think the drawing, "Calvary" in "My Life For The Sheep" is the whole situation summed up in a glance. The true purpose of the Cross is taken away and a false one erected of terms and traditions and false interpretations.

Divisions must come. (1 Corinthians 1:18,19; Matthew 18:6,7; 24:12,13; Revelation 3:14-21). "If God be for us, who can be against us?" (Romans 8:31 2 Kings 6:16). "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." (2 Corinthians 3:17).

"Behold the Bridegroom cometh."

F. J. Pearce.

HEBREWS 13 : 20

“Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant...”

This Scripture was given as the strongest proof that Jesus died for Himself (Questions 294 to 297). This is the sort of Scripture we are asked to accept for a God-dishonouring doctrine. Re-read what Mr Barling said and remember that his Scriptures are “not susceptible to double interpretation,” and that they are “clear, crisp proof.”

We reproduce the following:

“It has been seen how difficult this verse has been for the translators, each one giving a different rendering: we further see that the A.V. rendering is not the correct one, because it makes discord with other scripture. And it is a safe principle that where several understandings of a passage are allowed by the grammatical sense of the words, those meanings are wrong which are out of harmony with other scriptures.”

Let us consider the verse more closely. There is no doubt concerning the textual readings of the MSS. All are agreed upon the wording in the Greek. The difficulties that exist have to do with the translation of the passages into English.

The translating difficulties are twofold. There is a difficulty in arranging the words, and a difficulty in translating the Greek word “en” which precedes “blood.”

We will first deal with the difficulty of arrangement of words. The Greek literally translated is as follows:

“The now God of-the peace the one-having-led-up out-of dead-ones the shepherd of-the sheep the great (here appears the word whose translation is uncertain to the translators - “en”) blood of-a-covenant age-lasting the Lord of-us Jesus knit-together you in every work good in-order the to-do the will of-him...”

The A.V. runs thus - that “God... brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus through the blood of the everlasting covenant.”

Other translators think that the sense intended by the writer of the Epistle is that Christ became the Great Shepherd through the blood. The Emphatic Diaglott, for example:

“Now may that God of Peace who brought up from the dead that Shepherd of the Sheep (become great by the blood of an aeonian Covenant) even our Lord Jesus, knit you...”

This is the sense approved by H. Fry” in his “Echoes of Past Controversies” page 103, and also the rendering of Barnes:

“Great by the blood of the Everlasting Covenant” is the rendering in Sharpe’s Bible.

“May God, the source of all peace, who brought back from the dead Him who, by virtue of the blood that rendered valid the unchangeable Covenant, is the Great Shepherd of God’s Sheep, Jesus, our Lord, make you perfect in everything that is good...” is the 20th Century translation. This accords with Zechariah 9:11, “By the blood if thy covenant I have sent forth (will send forth) thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water.”

It is easy to see, by the help of this verse, how Christ could become a Great Shepherd by (margin R.V.9 the blood of His Covenant. What a mighty “flock” it will be that He will lead into “peaceful pastures.”!

Nearly like the last is Weymouth’s translation:

“Now may God who gives peace, and brought Jesus our Lord, up again from among the dead - even Him who, by virtue of the blood of the Eternal Covenant, is the great Shepherd of the Sheep - fully equip you with every grace that you....”

Another, and third sense is as follows:

“May God... make you through the blood of the Everlasting Covenant perfect in every good work to do His will.” That is the rendering approved by Clarke.

Fenton’s translation also comes under this heading:

“But the God of Peace, who brought back our Lord Jesus from the dead, the great Shepherd of the Sheep, purify you with the blood of an eternal settlement, supporting you in everything good....”

A.L.Wilson renders the passage as:

“May God.... make you perfect in the blood of the Everlasting Covenant.’ (His reasons are given in his pamphlet “Jesus at the Bar.”)

Young’s Literal translation is in a class by itself:

“And the God of Peace, who did bring up out of the dead the great shepherd of the sheep - in the blood of an age-enduring covenant - our Lord Jesus, make you perfect.”

The Fifth class is that of the Revised Version, which reads as follows:

“Now the God of Peace who brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the Sheep with the blood of the eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus, make you...”

The consideration of these five variant renderings, and of the difficulty surrounding the word “en” must be postponed for reasons of time and space and ability. Meanwhile, without implying approval of the third rendering as the correct one, here is a tabloid exhortation:

“Moses said, This is the blood of the Covenant which God hath enjoined unto you, and he sprinkled the book and the people” (Hebrews 9:19,20). Then the people were in the bonds of the Covenant. Christ said, “This is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; and we are sprinkled with His blood (Hebrews 12:24), sanctified with the blood (Hebrews 13:12).

Dr A. Clarke: -

“Through the blood of the everlasting covenant. Some understand this in the following way; God brought back our Lord from the dead on account of His having shed His blood to procure the everlasting covenant. Others that the Lord Jesus became the Great Shepherd and Saviour of the Sheep, by shedding His blood to procure and ratify the everlasting covenant. The sense however, will appear much plainer if we connect this with the following verse: “Now the God of Peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep; make you, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, perfect you in every good work to do his will.”

We have thus seen how varied a choice of renderings lie at hand for the translator. In such a case we are better able to decide between the renderings than any of the translators are, if (as we suppose) we understand better than they the belief of the writer of the Letter to the Hebrews.

In this verse, it must be noted, is a concluding salutation in the letter, like 1 Peter 5:10, or Colossians 4:12; and we would therefore bring out no new point but would only refer to what had already been mentioned in the body of the Letter.

It was promised to show in the same Epistle the same Greek words used in the same connection. The Greek words referred to are “en aimati” (“with blood”). “With” has been chosen as the equivalent of “en” here, in accordance with the rendering of the R.V. To show the meaning which is attached to that word “with in Hebrews 13:20, we will refer to another verse where it occurs thrice.

“For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with (en) a shout, with (en) the voice of the archangel, and with (en) the trump of God” (1 Thessalonians 4:16).

Now the same words “en aimati” appear also in Hebrews 9:25:

“The High Priest entereth into the Holy Place every year with blood (en aimati) of others.”

This verse explains the other; Christ entered into heaven itself (9:24) with the blood of the everlasting covenant. In a figure, He ascended from the grave and entered into the Holy of Holies taking with Him the blood of the everlasting covenant. Other verses speak of this carrying of the blood into the Holy of Holies by the High Priest:

“Into the second went the High Priest alone every year not without blood, which he offered...” (Hebrews 9:7).

“Beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest” (Hebrews 13:11).

“Having therefore brethren boldness to enter into the Holiest by (en - with) the blood of Jesus... through the veil.” (Hebrews 10:19).

“En” is not always to be rendered as “with” of course. This is how that word has been translated in the A.V.; ‘among’ - 114 times; ‘as’ - 22 times; ‘at’ - 106 times; ‘into’ - 11 times; ‘by’ - 142 times; ‘in’ - 1863 times; ‘through’ - 37 times; ‘with’ - 139 times; ‘on’ - 45 times; also in several other ways.

In the following passages it was translated as ‘by’:

Hebrews 1:1 “By the prophets.”

Hebrews 1:2 “By His Son.”

Hebrews 10:10 “By the which will we are sanctified.”

Hebrews 10:19 “to enter into the Holiest by the blood.”

Hebrews 11:2 “By it the elders obtained...”

Some have good grounds for urging that the passage in Hebrews 13:20 should read, “Make you perfect in the blood of the everlasting covenant.”

It is a safe rule to compare Scripture with Scripture for a proper understanding. The “Treasury of Scripture Knowledge” (being a collection of the marginal references from many Bibles) is of great help in this.

We ask you to reconsider W.F.Barling’s answers concerning Jesus; how plain the Scriptures are that Jesus died for us; that Isaiah proves our contention - Jesus was cut off out of the land of the living “for the transgression of my people.” So you must choose which is in harmony with the whole counsel of God and between that which is doubtful interpretation and a man-made constitution.

So we answer W.F.Barling in his own language: “Your best proof is no good; it is no proof; not by the wildest interpretation. This is not clear, crisp Scriptural proof that Jesus died for Himself.”

We repeat that it is a safe rule to compare Scripture with Scripture for a proper understanding, and we believe that this has been done in the foregoing.

A.H.Broughton and others.

HAMAN HANGED BY HIS OWN ROPE

A Test for W.F.Barling upon his own Imposed Conditions.

We plead your pardon for asking the following list of questions. We know before we ask them that they cannot be answered with a “Thus saith the Lord” (such as One God, etc. Ephesians 4), because there is none. If this could be done there would be no debate; it was on “Controverted Aspects.”

We ask these questions for the benefit of Mr Barling, and to put him in the foolish and absurd position which he placed E. Brady so that he, Barling, could make a show of the learning he possessed of the Scriptures, for all his beliefs; and that E. Brady had none for his beliefs. Mr Barling also showed how unreasonable it is to demand of others that which he, nor anyone else, can produce.

We believe that W.F.Barling, from his answers “I don’t know,” “no information,” “I want a definition,” “no idea,” “don’t understand,” and other evasions, has proved we have reason and deductive evidence, gleaned from Christadelphian writings, and others, but mainly the Scriptures.

Now we ask for explicit, precise, scriptural proof which is not susceptible to double interpretation, which a babe in his belief would not hesitate to answer,

- 1) That Adam’s nature was changed
- 2) That he died the day he sinned
- 3) That he did not experience our temptations
- 4) That natural death is the wages of Adam’s sin
- 5) That Jesus died for Himself
- 6) That He rose mortal
- 7) That He had sin in the flesh
- 8) That He had the Devil in His flesh
- 9) That He had serpent nature
- 10) That He had a blemish
- 11) That He had a body of sin
- 12) That He died as a Representative
- 13) That it was just for Him to die
- 14) That He was made sin by having human flesh
- 15) That He was under Adamic and Mosaic curses

While all these are Christadelphian phrases, W.F.Barling has used most of them himself, although he was not defending Christadelphian teachings but his own personal ones, thus making it appear much worse for Christadelphians as a whole.

Here are a few of the charges against us:

- “Specious but unsound”
- “Not Scriptural”
- “Gratuitous assumption”
- “Statements we cannot verify”
- “Not fair”

Keeping these in mind and that Mr Barling said he knew exactly what we believe, there is no excuse for his vain bravado. None is so blind as those who will not see until they observe their fault in others (2 Samuel 12) - “Thou art the man.”

We do not object to words and phrases so long as they express and explain meanings, but until W.F.Barling has answered these questions with a “Thus saith the Lord,” he has no right to demand or denounce others after his fashion of learning.

“So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath showed no mercy; and mere rejoiceth against judgment.” - James 2:12,13.

F. J. Pearce.

W. F. BARLING'S FIVE BASIC PRINCIPLES ANSWERED

We here do solemnly declare we believe these five points which Mr Barling say we cannot verify.

1st - Question No. 9 by Barling: “Can you present me with a concise and explicit Scriptural proof of the fact that Adam’s life was paid for by Christ?”

E. Brady: “No. It is a process of deductive reasoning.”

No one could say more in a debate than that. We have placed Mr Barling in this absurd position, so despite the seeming outward show of failure we ask the reader to examine the deductive reasoning, not only from our point of view, but from W.F.Barling’s unscriptural phrases, which he cannot produce.

We have tried to drive home the lesson that law is the first fundamental basis which God has given, so that believer’s minds should be exercised therewith and not the wisdom that men teach. English grammar is not the rule to discern Spiritual Truths or to understand Scripture. Says Dr Thomas, “The phrase, therefore, ‘The Seven spirits which is,’ is a Hebraism like that in Genesis ‘Bahrah Elohim’ - ‘Mighty Ones he created.’ - Cases in which the rules grammarians are ignored for the convenience of the truth.” (“Eureka” Vol.1 page 125).

We have explicit and precise Scripture that Jesus was the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world (John 1:29). Jesus was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Revelation 13:8). Now W.F.Barling’s answers to these questions and others, all of which we agree with, justify our claim.

One covering passage, “Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures” (1 Corinthians 15:3), include all who will acknowledge God’s prerogative. None would say Adam was not included.

The Sin, The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world and the typical sacrifice in Eden, was the first special lesson enacted for our learning. (More under other headings).

We have it that Adam was a figure of Jesus (Romans 5:14). There are many such sayings as “the first man Adam” and “the last Adam,” “death by man (Adam)” “by man (Christ) came resurrection” (1 Corinthians 15).

Romans 5 is a continual contrast of these two Federal Heads, and we could produce a lengthy list.

All will agree that God is Just and what was transacted in Eden was contained in one man Adam and the one man Christ, as typified in the Lamb.

Dr Thomas, in “Elpis Israel” justifies our using it. “The constitution of sin hath its roots in the disobedience of the first Adam, so also hath the constitution of righteousness root in the obedience of the Second Adam. The two Adams are two Federal Heads.”

The Law of Moses, in no unmistakable way, proves that a life had to be taken for a life. As all men are constituted in the One Man Adam, so all are constituted in Christ - One sin of Adam, One Act of Christ. This is easily comprehended as a just principle - either in Adam, or in Christ.

Adam forfeited or sold his birthright, as did Esau for a mess of pottage. Having been sold under the sin (Romans 7:14), Jesus gave His life and bought us with a price, which W.F.Barling has agreed to, and to the principle of Redemption as explained by Dr Thomas. The one sin of Adam brought condemnation on all, so the one sacrifice of Christ brought justification of life.

Is it unscriptural to say Adam sold all when he sold himself, and that Jesus bought all when He paid the price?

The Rule, or Law is laid down quite plainly that all are concluded under the One Sin of Adam (Romans 3:9, Romans 5; Galatians 3:22). Scripture and God has done this irrespective of what W.F.Barling or anyone else says.

Scripture says God will have mercy on all (Romans 3:21-27). This is a reasonable solution to which many are blind. We are counted as members of the Adamic Body, or as members of the Body of Christ. These two Federal Heads cover all individuals and there is no need for more than one Head for each. We have the lesson again in Exodus 21:4, "The wife and her children shall be her master's Romans 6:16, "His servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness."

Is this not logical Scriptural deduction with sufficient evidence from W.F.Barling's answers and from Dr Thomas? I would rather believe this than man-made phrases of Mr Barling's. We defy him to establish his case to show there was a change in Adam's physical body, or that Jesus was under physical condemnation.

R.Roberts, "The death of animals was the due of the sinner" ("Echoes of Past Controversies," page 99). Our writings have dealt at length with this principle.

2nd - Question 11 (Barling): "You say the purpose of the virgin birth was to confer upon Jesus free life."

E. Brady: "I didn't. I said it was to give Him the freedom necessary for Him to be our Redeemer."

We know only too well that the term 'Free Life' has been, and is, made the ground of such slander as Mr Barling has used. "Not Scriptural" - R.Roberts "Free Life is a myth." Well it is no more unscriptural and a myth than the list of Barling's phrases we have presented to him. We have met this false misrepresentation of our writings. The virgin birth was indeed necessary - Mr Barling proves our interpretation of it, if he has not seen the force of it. Jesus was the Seed of the woman - the Son of God; man had nothing to do with the birth of Jesus. He would not have been born except for God's intervention. Jesus had His life direct from God at conception. "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee" (Luke 1:35). Jesus did not need adoption.

Adam had his life direct from God at creation; "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life" (Genesis 2:7).

Each of these were before moral character could be formed. If the Virgin Birth was necessary, then for what purpose was it? If the purpose of it was to be the same nature as sinful flesh, then there was no point in the Virgin Birth at all. There was plenty of that about, according to W.F. Barling.

The types of the animals under the law were essentially and legally clean, a point with which W.F. Barling is in agreement; and they were innocent and harmless. If they were unclean or defiled they could not be accepted. These and other references by way of the New Testament, prove that Jesus was separate from sinners - Holy (Luke 1:35); without sin (Hebrews 4:15); in Him is no sin (1 John 3:4): and The Lamb of God (John 1:29); without blemish and spot (1 Peter 1:19).

Again we have all the evidence of Scriptural reasoning spiritually discerned that Genesis 22 can teach in harmony with the whole counsel of God. Isaac, apart from God's intervention would never have been born. He was born after the Spirit in a literal manner (Galatians 4:29). God provided the only son of Sarah. He also provided the Ram in the stead of Isaac. Yet in spite of all this evidence, Mr Barling still wants to

believe that the evidence is of no use so that he can uphold a defiled and unclean Christ with the devil in Him, and of serpent nature, with blemish!

Dr Thomas is quite plain on this question, with which we agree, that if Jesus was born of the will of the flesh then the Spirit did not come down from heaven as Jesus said. (“Phanarosis” pages 31,34,35,43).

Adam was a figure of Jesus (Romans 5), and Jesus was, like Isaac, but in a greater sense, born after the Spirit, to redeem them (not Himself), that we might receive adoption (not Himself) (Galatians 4:5). And Barling agrees that Jesus did not need adoption!

Though God is the fountain of all life (Psalm 36:9), in whom we live and move and have our being (Acts 17), we must acknowledge the rules and laws that He has put into operation. The Federal Principle meets the case beautifully. This was the just and only way that God could be The Saviour and Redeemer in Christ, who was begotten of the Eternal Spirit. None could convict Jesus of sin in any way.

3rd - Question 13 (Barling): “You say that redemption and forgiveness of sins are two different processes?”

E. Brady: “Yes, although there is a connection - the one proceeds from the other; redemption must precede forgiveness.”

Can Mr Barling give any proof that we can have forgiveness before redemption? We have, in another place, referred to this misrepresentation of our writings in his book “Redemption in Christ Jesus” page 32. Do we need redemption every time we ask for forgiveness of sins? Does Jesus make intercessions for the sins of the world? - John 17:9. This was a lesson I learned when I was a Christadelphian. Little did I think it would be questioned by such a teacher of language.

“Ministry of the Prophets” page 646; “But no man is a son of the Second Adam or Son of God, otherwise than by belief of the gospel and baptism into Him.” “Elpis Israel” page 71; “This requires first the sanctification of sinners, then their probation; and afterwards their exaltation, or humiliation according to their works.”

Jesus is not only our Sacrifice, which is a finished work; but also our High Priest, whereby we can approach the Throne of Grace (Hebrews 4:16) any time, and plead forgiveness. (1 John 1:9; 2:1; James 5:14; Hebrews 10:26).

The types are passed away. Our High Priest need not offer daily sacrifice (Hebrews 7) like the high priests under the law. One Sacrifice has been made and we have made a covenant by that Sacrifice (Psalm 50:5). Hence our approach to the Throne of Grace. We are sanctified through the offering of Jesus one for all. One sacrifice for sins - the One Offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified (Hebrews 10). Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins (Hebrews 9:22).

There are two distinct stages of Remission of sins. Firstly by Redemption; release from Sin’s claim, as in Adam’s case. (Genesis 3:21; Revelation 5:9; 13:8; 1 Corinthians 6:20). Secondly, by forgiveness alone, as those under Grace (1 John 1:9; 2:1,2), when no further Ransom is necessary. “If obtained by the former then Jesus paid the price of their release. If by the latter, then the subject person must previously have been the subject of the former.” - A.L.Wilson. How simple to spiritual understanding; how in harmony with Dr Thomas on Redemption; How plain in Romans 6: how are we dead to the sin? (verse 2); How are we freed from the sin? (verse 7); How are we emancipated from the sin? (verse 18).

How have we passed from the death into the life? (John 5:24); How are we new creatures in Christ? (2 Corinthians 5:17).

4th - Question 17 (Barling): “You say that men are in Adam upon enlightenment, and not by being born descendants of Adam?”

E. Brady: “No. We are all born descendants of Adam.”

We ask: How did Levi pay tithes in Abraham to Melchizedec (Hebrews 7)?

Were not the twelve tribes in Abraham's loins at the same time?

Have all died in Adam that are in the grave?

Are not many in the grave who have died naturally, or otherwise, in Christ? Will not the final death of the responsible, who reject Christ, be wages of sin?

Are the irresponsible in Adam? Will they be raised?

Are the responsible rejecters dead sinners in the grave to be raised for the punishment of death as wages?

Which is the death in Adam?

These are questions which decide and rightly divide the word of truth. The Scriptures E.Brady quoted, such as John 5:17, 2 Corinthians 5:17, and others, prove there is a legal passing out of Adam into Christ; now do we put off the Old man and put on the New (Colossians 3:9,10) .

What is superficially right to one is not right to another who can see the difficulties. W.F.Barling cannot discriminate between things that differ. Christadelphian ideas cannot meet all the requirements, as Enoch and Elijah; and the saint's at Christ's coming will not have to die a natural death. It does not say natural death in Adam in 1 Corinthians 15:22.

The sin of ignorance (Leviticus 5:3) proves the justice of God's dealings with mankind. W.F.Barling agrees, yet he has to contradict himself to uphold natural death as the threatened punishment of Adam.

How were we alienated (Ephesians 4:18) and reconciled (2 Corinthians 5:18,19)? No one can serve two masters - no more than we can be in Adam and in Christ at the same time. This is the confusion of Barling.

Will all who die symbolically in baptism, who are unfaithful, die an inflicted death? Will that be dying in Adam or for their own sins? Is the death of those in Adam final? Was Dr Thomas right when he said a person must be introduced into a federal head? Is there a difference between a federal sinner in Adam and a sinner by actual transgression? Is 'in Adam' a legal term, denoting status and not a biological term? Are we descendants of Christ when 'in Him'? Is it not law that makes responsibility? If "in Christ" only means at resurrection, how have we put on Christ at baptism (Galatians 3:29)? Will persons who have been baptised into Christ, and are unfaithful, be in Christ at resurrection? They will have a resurrection, but will they be made alive in the sense of 1 Corinthians 15:22?

Is there not a difference between the natural death of the ignorant and the suffering for sin in second death? Is there not a difference between a rejection of the gospel and one who wilfully treads underfoot the blood of Christ? Would you say that though both will die eternally, one is more worthy of more stripes than the other? If natural descent implies being in Adam, are you not forced to say you are in Adam physically when you are baptised into Christ? If natural death, or nature, is the condemnation, then Paul is wrong (Romans 8:1), and we have not passed from death into life now. What is meant by "shall not come into judgment"? Is there any difference in dying in Adam and the soul that sinneth it shall die? What death is Romans 6:23?

Was the Law of Moses binding to the Jew? How did Paul die to the law? Can we die to the law of sin and death? Would you agree that Adam and Christ were our Doctrinal fathers?

5th. Question 29 (Barling): "You would say - I am correct in stating your views? - that Christ died to save men from violent death?"

E. Brady: No, I haven't said that.

It is easy to get confused by either side on such a question. When E. Brady said "No," he meant so in a general way, as explained in a separate article on "Enlightenment," and which he saw when further questioned. Jesus did not die to save the ignorant from a violent or judicial death. They are like the beasts

that perish. When a person is enlightened and then rejects Christ, he 'will die a violent second death, and in this sense, if the enlightened person accepts Jesus he will be saved from a violent death.

The wages of sin is death (Romans 6:23). "But God rejected this and substituted 'coats of skins' which necessitated the slaying of animals for their provision brought a representation of death before them as the wages of sin" ("Ministry of the Prophets", page 155).

"It is the one great principle enunciated from the day of the expulsion from Eden that 'without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins' (Hebrew 9:22)... The clothing of Adam and Eve in the skins of slain animals... and so was every shedding of blood under the Law of Moses" (Ibid page 648).

"Now if the Lord God had made no other arrangements than expressed in the sentence upon the woman and the man, they and all their posterity in all their generations would have incessantly gone to dust and there remained for ever. The wages of sin is death" ("Elpis Israel" page 13).

"By this is signified that when the Lord God appointed coats of skins to cover the man and woman's shame, lambs were slain, which they were taught to understand were representative of the Seed, who should be slain for the sins of all the faithful" (Ibid pages 125/6).

There should be no difficulty in deciding what were the wages of sin from these writers, and we could give more. The death of those animals (in type) saved them from death as wages. Every actual sinner that is responsible will have incurred this death, whether of omission (James 4:17) or of commission (James 1:15).

The death of infants and irresponsible persons, whether natural death or otherwise, is not the wages of sin. If sinners who are responsible will accept the provision in Christ, they will not suffer the second death as wages, though they may die in the ordinary way.

Jesus did not die to save us from dying, but from perishing (John 3:16) and W.F.Barling agrees in his book "Redemption in Christ Jesus."

Brother F.J.Pearce.

* * * * *

I think when I read that sweet story of old,
When Jesus was here among men,
How He called little children as lambs to His fold,
I should like to have been with Him then.
I wish that His hands had been placed on my
head,
That His arms had been thrown around me,
And that I might have seen His kind look when
He said,
"Let the little ones come unto me."

If Jesus were here and would smile on my song,
When to love Him and praise Him I tried,
With sweetest hosannas I'd join in the throng,
And would press myself close to His side.
And if they should chide me or send me away,
I would cling to His sheltering knee,
And I'd tell them the words He Himself once did
say,
"Let the little ones come unto me."

Yet still to the Bible I daily may go
And read of His wonderful love,
And His coming again to the nations below,
When He leaves the right hand of our God.
I long for that blessed and glorious time,
The fairest and brightest and best;
When the dear little children of every clime
Shall crowd to His arms and be blest.