

Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 156

September 1995

In this Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 2	From Your Letters:	
Page 8	The Usage of "MUTH TEMUTH" and "B'YOM"	Compiled
Page 10	Correspondence	
Page 14	An Interesting Feature of the Greek Language	Brother George Armonis
Page 17	Reply to above	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 18	Comments on 'The Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith'	Brother John Stevenson
Page 20	Contemplating the First Transgression	Brother John Stevenson
Page 21	Ezekiel's Temple - Part Four	Brethren Bert Gates and Edgar Wille

Editorial

Dear Brethren and Sisters and Friends,

Greetings in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

It is very pleasing to receive so many letters and I wish to thank all who have written since the last Circular Letter.

Discussion continues on many subjects such as whether the Temple Ezekiel saw in vision is to be the house of prayer for all nations, and whether there will be animal offerings in the Kingdom age? On how high were the altars, were there steps up to them? Was Jesus Christ a Priest during His life here on earth, or not until His resurrection, etc? Brother John Stevenson writes upon the B.A.S.F. and asks help in making his treatise suitable for a booklet; he also gives us a thought-provoking allegory on the first sin, while Brother Dennis Hayward queries the events at the coming of Christ regarding the dead and those who are living at the time. Others are concerned whether it is right to consider any parts of Scripture as we know it in our English translations as spurious.

Certainly a great deal of food for thought, but we are not here to win arguments, we are here to win Christ, so let us remember whose we are and whom we serve that all may be done in love to show to all that we have the mind of Christ.

Welfare: Several brethren and sisters have been unwell during recent months but most are now coping with their condition or are getting better but we are concerned about Brother Harvey Lingood who has been in hospital for several weeks suffering from anaemia and angina, and needless to say, depression too. During the summer He also had operations on each of his eyes in order to save some sight. The success of these operations is not yet fully known. On phoning Brother Phil Parry this morning I understand Brother Harvey is hoping to go home again within a few days. May he be in our hearts and prayers, and Sister Evelyn and their family too. May God Bless you and keep you, Harvey.

Sincerely your brother in the Master's service,

Russell Gregory.

* * * * *

From Your Letters:

Brother Leo Dreifuss writes:

Concerning Christ's Priesthood - He was definitely not a Priest during His earthly 3½ years ministry, for, 1) He was not of the priestly tribe, and, 2) He was declared twice, in the same chapter - John 1:29 & 36 - to be the Lamb of God. So surely He cannot have been the Priest at the same time. He was declared the Priest after the order of Melchizedek after He had ascended to the Father (Hebrews 5:6,10 and as predicted by David in Psalm 110:4). This, I think, is clear and straight forward. There could be a parallel, although not explicitly stated in Scripture, between Christ's 3½ years ministry and the three days of the Passover lamb to be set apart before it was sacrificed.

Regarding the slaying of animals in the future age I don't want to be dogmatic over this but I fail to see why God inspired Ezekiel to write about it if they are not to take place – not for those who have been raised in the first resurrection; these are to be priests and administrators, but for the Israelites who had gone astray and perhaps some of the Gentile population. I always thought it referred to the time after the great pleading in the wilderness of the people (Ezekiel 20:35) and the great national mourning as prophesied in Zechariah 12:10-14.

I know the objection, Hebrews 6:6, about putting the Son of God to an open shame. Let us read the verse: “if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.” Now if we take the verse in its full context by reading Hebrews 6 from the beginning, we find that Paul here speaks against people falling back. The epistle is addressed to Hebrew believers and there were many so steeped in the traditions they were brought up in that they found it hard to live with the New Covenant. Don't forget, these traditions, centred round animal sacrifices, were in force for some 1,400 to 1,500 years. It must have been quite a wrench to get away from them. So much we also gather from the account in Acts 15, of the important apostolic meeting, when some wanted the Gentile converts to be circumcised. But the animal sacrifices referred to in Ezekiel are to educate those who have never known anything about sacrifice and redemption, to teach them the need for reconciliation. These sacrifices in the Old Testament pointed forward to Christ, those in the future age backward. This is how I see it. But as said earlier on, comments invited.

But I would like an answer to this - Why does Ezekiel mention them on God's inspiration, if they are not to take place?

Leo Dreifuss.

Brother Phil Parry writes:

I enjoyed reading John Stevenson's letter and the account of his meeting with Christadelphians at their study group. Of course Arthur Fletcher's statement about two classes of people who do not understand the Atonement - “those who say they don't and those who say they do,” is based on his own experience and admission that during his own study of a probably long period as a Christadelphian he himself had not come to a complete understanding of its meaning and purpose. The Atonement being so important to man's salvation from under the Law of Sin and Death, such ignorance of its meaning would place any person beyond the pale of salvation and still in Adamic condemnation.

What a shocking position to be in when Christadelphians profess to have the Truth! Arthur Fletcher's “Dying comments exposes his own ignorance; the general ignorance of Christadelphianism; and that contained in their Clause V; the false theory that prevents their understanding of the Atonement.

I am not surprised that after John's commendable disputation concerning Clause V, Arthur Fletcher gave a look of expectation of further disagreement from John about Clause VI, yet John said he had no quibble with that one. I can quite appreciate that on the surface the contents would appear plausible to a person who is not too well grounded in the Christadelphian erroneous belief that the Law of Sin and Death is a physical law of man's nature, and natural decay and death the penalty for Adam's sin also passed on to

his posterity through physical descent. This is one of the greatest blunders made in Christadelphian history, for Clause VI denies any further hope for Adam and his posterity on account of Adam and his posterity partaking of a penalty which God had never set aside.

So therefore if we consider the Law of Sin and Death as a legal position, not a physical, then Paul's statement in Romans 8:1-2 makes sense of both his own position and that of Adam and his posterity, for in what way could the race be rescued from destruction if all died physically under the penalty as sinners?

In the words of Paul, Romans 6:1-2, How can any have died to sin if they are still under its penalty? Impossible. This Clause VI contains several references to Scripture and what God has done through His Son Jesus, but it bars to Christadelphians the Atoning work of God in Christ by the statement that God did not set aside the penalty Adam incurred by his sin for they die as sinners by physical descent from Adam (See "Natural Death & Judicial Death" – A commentary on Peter Watkins "Cross of Christ").

The truth is that Adam was rescued from destruction while in the Garden of Eden or he would not have continued to live out his natural span of life which in his case was 930 years. That rescue, correctly called Redemption, was the very means of existence for his posterity whereby a probationary life through introduction into Christ by symbolic death unto sin's claim, they might by faith attain unto eternal life, not of works but by the Grace of God and the Gift of His Son who suffered in the place of Adam, the death required by Adam's breach of the Law, and under which God has legally concluded all on the Federal Principle.

Please note: I have not based my comments on the Carter/Cooper unity book though I understand it is the same doctrine of the original, dressed up in different language.

It is quite evident from the 1908 Amended Statement of Faith that Clauses IX and X are stark staring contradictions which speak of Jesus suffering two totally different deaths – the death required by the righteousness of God's law to Adam, Clause IX which Jesus evidently suffered in his stead by the shedding of blood, and not as believed by Christadelphians, by natural means of decay and ultimately death and return to dust, passed on Adam and all men which Clause X states Jesus shared as a partaker of their nature.

Phil Parry.

* * *

Brother Harold Dawson writes:

I was interested to read Brother Stanley Jelfs letter re the aspect of Priesthood relating to Jesus Christ in C.L.155. In my belief, based on the words of Jesus, He was never a Priest, nor claimed to be, by His statement "For the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life as a ransom for many."

The first advent of Jesus was to do just that and to be an example to those who would follow Him. We also see in this example Jesus gave us, the power - in His miracles – the wisdom and discernment and of course, His love and kindness. Jesus was as a lamb to slaughter led before Pilate. He opened not His mouth, but He did say to Pilate, "You would have no power over me unless it were given you from on high." It was not the time for Priesthood or Kingship and Jesus knew it. On the other hand the disciples were hoping that Jesus was the one (they had seen His power) that would restore the kingdom to Israel, from under the heel of Rome. But Jesus knew that that also was not yet to be. Regarding the baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist, - it was indeed "to fulfil all righteousness;" another example for Believer's to follow, in a type of death and burial, the ministry of three years culminating in His sacrificial death on the Cross - commenced a period of three years and at His baptism the Holy Spirit descended on Him, like a dove. Before that however, Jesus alone would know if He had anything to wash away in baptism. But during the 3 years up to His Crucifixion He kept perfectly the Ten Commandments. There is nothing mysterious about His righteousness; Jesus kept the Law and brought to the Cross that perfection plus the other and main qualification, the fact that He was not the son of Joseph, but the Son of God, through the Holy Spirit. Jesus could have sinned, i.e., broken the Law, but He knew His mission, even from twelve

years of age. When He died on the Cross and just before He said “It is finished” and the veil of the Temple was rent from top to bottom, the way was open hitherto by the 'fleshly High Priest,' once a year, but now through the victory of Jesus over Sin, the bridge back to God, for us all, was created.

Jesus, next time will be more than a Priest; He will be a King and replace human government's failure, with Divine Success and a world truly at peace, and then ultimately God will be all in all.

May we all have a part in that glorious time,

Brother Harold Dawson.

* * *

Sister Evelyn Linggood writes:

We have never seen such a thorough investigation into the doctrine of the Trinity as that given by Anthony Buzzard; he does however seem to think that Christ was pre-existent (C.L.155, page 6, middle paragraph).

....a comment upon what Bro. Phil wrote concerning the Temple: - Zechariah 6:12-15 cannot possibly be referring to the spiritual temple of saints and Christ's first advent; Zechariah prophesied for the nation of Israel, not the saints and verse 13 sets the time to be when Christ sits upon His throne as King and Priest in Jerusalem. No doubt Gentiles also will help in building the literal temple as they did also in Solomon's day, and other parts of Scripture tell us plainly that Israel will obey the voice of the Lord during the Millennial reign, so the condition of verse 15 will be fully met. It would seem by Bro. Phil's quotations from Hosea 6:5-7, Micah 6:6-8 & Hebrew 10:1-10 that he thinks animal sacrifices were in themselves displeasing to God, but how could that be seeing they came into being by God's appointment from Adam to Christ? The fact was that they became a stink in His nostrils because they were not offered in faith of the One they represented even Jesus, unlike Abraham, they didn't rejoice to see His day; to them it became just a ritual when offered according to the law which was not of faith but when they of faith such as Abel, Noah, the Patriarchs and Prophets offered, they were as a sweet smell to God, e.g. Genesis 8:20-21. We learn from Ezekiel that animal sacrifices will again be offered for the mortal population in the Kingdom, looking back presumably to the one Great Sacrifice of our Lord, and we may be sure they will then be offered in faith when the wounds of His crucifixion will be clearly seen by all. The mortal people of the earth will need a place of worship and what better than the literal Temple visualised by Ezekiel, and Isaiah tells of a house of prayer for all people. The passage from Hebrews quoted by Brother Phil is concerned with Spiritual Israel as are all the Epistles; these, as we know, have a separate destiny in the Kingdom.

Evelyn Linggood

* * *

Brother Phil Parry writes:

I have made a few comments as a result of the July/August C.L. The mention of the Altar and steps, Ezekiel 43:17, where this appeared to be a contradiction of what God instructed in Exodus 20:26 - “Thou shalt not go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon.” Previous to this statement God gives instructions on how the Altar should be built which suggest it was not very high, also God speaks firstly of an “Altar of earth, then if it was desired to make an Altar of stone it was not to be built of hewn stone: “for if thou lift up thy tool upon it thou hast polluted it.”

I have always regarded this latter as referring to the antitypical Altar, Jesus, who came not by the reproduction of man - and was like unto the stone cut out of the mountain without hands - the stone God laid in Zion, elect and precious, which the builders rejected but is become the head of the corner - the Lord's doing and marvellous in our eyes. The former reference to steps and nakedness being discovered upon it I always took to mean a figure for sin or nakedness before God as in the case of Adam and Eve, not literal nakedness for did not the Priests wear breeches under their robes as commanded, and if commanded where

is the breach of the law if it is not the going up by steps? I have looked for a commentary on this and found Adam Clarke stating that the idol worshippers built their Altars as high as they could for men to look up to, and they came to be known as the High Places. This fact has not been lost in our own day where in this so-called Christian dispensation, the Cathedrals, Abbeys and Churches boast in their high Altars, with ascent by steps up to them. Our Altar is in Heaven, Jesus. Hebrews 13:9-15.

In concluding my remarks on this matter for the time being I must say that the reading about the Temple seen in vision by Ezekiel suggests a restoration of the offerings under the Mosaic Law and makes mention also of the Sons of Zadoc, these being of our present nature. Are there any sons of Zadoc in existence now who are reproducing that line? If not, where, if this Temple is yet future, will these sons of Zadoc suddenly appear?

Are we to accept the view of the Concordant Sect that this period relates only to Jews and that we of the New Covenant in Christ, Jews and Gentiles, are in the heavenlies exalted to a higher authority not confined to the earth?

I am not dogmatic by dispensing with the Temple, because the matter of the expanse of water issuing out of the sanctuary feeding the trees on each side of the river, etc., whose leaves did not wither but were for medicine. Ezekiel 47. This seems like a fulfilment of the result of the cleaving of the Mount of Olives in the midst. Zechariah 14:8. Yet for all this I cannot reconcile a re-introduction of the Mosaic Temple worship unless it can be proved that future Jews of the flesh will be put through the same laws experienced under the Old Covenant by their ancestors to the exclusion of the saints in the first resurrection. It is confusing to say the least.

Phil Parry.

* * *

Brother Geoff Hampton writes regarding the correspondent who prompted the Editorial in the last C.L-

I am hard against the idea that the Spirit of inspiration and Holy men failed when it came to send on the Gospel of the Good news and I very much doubt it was beyond the attributes and the jurisdiction of Christ to honour His Father. This is what He said, "My words shall not pass away"- Mark 13:31, if indeed Matthew 28:19 is His word it won't be broken. It is only Trinitarian if you view it that way - as a bias. Consider 2 Corinthians 13:14 - "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you" - is this also a lie? And 1 John 5:5-9, who sayeth this is a Trinitarian insertion? Did not Jesus come by water and blood, and did not the spirit of truth bear witness? Does it not say in verse 9, "the witness of God is greater"?

Now all the witness you have used against Matthew 28:19 were historical and outside the canon. However, it is the honour of kings...

When the King James Version came out, and I believe it to be "inspired," it contained the Apocrypha, but later became the Apocrypha-1 and was removed. The perplexity is, who included it in the King James Version and who removed it? The power of God, or man?

"Consider the work of God; for who can make that straight, which he hath made crooked?" - Ecclesiastes 7:13, is this so? "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?" - James 3:11.

Is it possible you could say unto the Adjudging Angel, "I believe the Bible is Holy, the inspired word of God, not mans, and if there is corruption in it you seemeth if to have preventeth it not.?" Would I get away with that? For it is written, "When the Comforter is come it would lead one in to all truth and speak not of itself."

Just where does the responsibility lie for the continuation of sound words down the centuries? How and with what are the lambs to be fed if the spirit of God cannot keep His word.

Holy Scripture is inspired and profitable - things you know. Seeing as your article of research on the authenticity of Mathew 28:19 caused consternation in some, could it be reversed, I wonder, in as much to ask of them in the next C.L.? Can any one put forward three sound reasons in both spiritual and scriptural terms (not historical) as to why it is there, and in a formula apparently opposing Acts 4:12 (“Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby ye must be saved”) and Matthew 28:18 (“All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.”)?

In this sort of way or idea:

John 6:44-45 “No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.”

John 6:65 “Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.”

John 6:63 “It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life”

John 5:37 “And the Father himself which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape.”

John 17:3 “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.”

For Psalm 12:6, 119:140, 160, Proverbs 30:5,6, etc. etc., does not explain its presentation or with what it harmonises.

A search is called for: Proverbs 25:2. Acts 17:11. Is Mathew 28:19 a dishonouring thing? I doubt it.

However, dear brother, these are just a few of my scribbled thoughts - forbear that I might understand the more.

Geoff Hampton.

Editor's comment: It was because Matthew 28:19 didn't fit in with (other) Scripture that its authenticity was questioned. For example, what does it mean - baptise “in the name of the Holy Ghost”? This cannot be answered by using Scripture. - Russell.

* * *

Brother Phil Parry also writes in answer to our correspondent regarding the authenticity of certain passages such as Matthew 28:19:

On the matter of your correspondent's complaint referring to C.L. 131 accusing you of doubting the authenticity of some of the words and phrases we find in the Authorised Version of our Bibles, if, as the writer says, “The Lord God has prepared only one Holy Bible what is he doing with the other versions which also claim to be the Word of God? Did the Lord God tell King James to prepare a Bible that would alone be accounted as a true record of His Holy Word? If so, then why the discrepancies contained in some of the New Testament recordings? For example, where in some cases the word “Redemption” is used instead of the word “Deliverance”? Also the accounts of Peter's denial being at variance - Mark 14:69 & Matthew 26:69. Also Mark 11:17 & Matthew 21:13 & Luke 19:46. Which is correct?

Again, why should it be necessary for your correspondent to reject the fact that Adam should be under sentence of judicially inflicted death by bloodshedding in the day he ate of the fruit, instead of adding 929 years plus to the time of eating? Is he not making himself a victim of his own accusations? Again, are we

to accept as it reads 1 Peter 3:18-20 that Jesus after His being placed in the tomb as a dead corpse, He went and preached to those people destroyed by the flood, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the Ark was being prepared? Does not this translation need some modification in order to make sense? Would not the poorest of the poor be misled into believing this actually happened? I know that the Mormons accept and teach it, but of course they believe in immortal-soulism and that we had a pre-existence in Heaven before being placed on the earth, the Heavenly experience being blotted out in order to experience existence on earth, both experiences being restored in due time. Compare with this adding to the word, the Nazarenes and others would appear guiltless, even if correct from the start. Perhaps your correspondent would be better occupied by restricting his criticism and declaring his own belief and faith on the basis of accepting as it is written in "the one Bible God has produced" without resorting to adding and taking away. He will no doubt find that discrimination must prevail in reading the Holy Scriptures and understanding them, even the King James Version. One thing I have read concerning the 47 men commissioned to translate the Scriptures into English language is that they relied much on Tyndale's translation who was under threat from all sides and eventually was strangled and burned at the stake in his desire to bring the truth of God to English people in their own language at the risk of his own life, unlike those 47 who had the protection of King James 1. Yet it is said that some of their inaccuracies had to be corrected in the revised version by people more qualified in understanding of Hebrew and Greek. Taking everything into consideration I wonder sometimes what the belief and faith really amounted to of these varied translators. Were they brought up in the Apostate doctrine of that period? Had they been Baptised into Jesus by water and Spirit? If not, how could they be relied on for a correct translation? Should we not think God would have used a person or persons "in Christ" and therefore "in the Spirit," rather than persons who did not qualify?

I know God by the Holy Spirit spoke through Caiaphas the accuser of Jesus, and that He can use evil men as well as good intentioned people to fulfil His purpose and therefore we can thank Him for what light we receive through the sincere labours of men past and present. But the fact remains, that the inspired word that came in old time was not by the will of man but through God speaking to Holy men under His covenant and by His Holy Spirit and in Old Testament times and New Testament times they were living sacrifices and witnesses to His Word.

I can definitely assure your correspondent that I use regularly the James 1st version of the Bible and on inspection he would find no pages missing on account of true or false translation, as when rightly divided by logical discrimination and reading and comparing of the Scriptures one can come to a knowledge of what God desires to reveal if one's prayer and desire for Truth is uppermost and honest. This is not to say that we should not read and compare other translations and versions. I assumed from the criticism of your correspondent that I knew him, nevertheless I have great respect for his sincerity in defence of God's Word and also his moral conduct related to it.

Phil Parry.

* * *

Brother Harold Dawson writes in response to a point I made in a personal letter regarding Brother Leo's statement that there "will be (a time) after Christ's return when God commands to kill sinners." (C.L.155. page 3, 2nd paragraphs. Brother Leo's exhortation, touching on Christ's work in the world after His return – on the face of it I agree with your quoting "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool."

This verse does sum up the division between Jesus' post-advent work and the part done by God Himself. My opinion is though as follows - We cannot, if we are wise, make dogmatic statements about the future age if we cannot accept and be guided by what we are told.

The return of Christ and the outworking of God's purposes are no concern of ours. We are not in partnership with God, to institute His coming Kingdom on earth. We will be affected by it if we are permitted to be around then and to have orders ourselves to fulfil, and I hope we shall be and have. But we do not know really, apart from the eye of faith and hope. It is not wise to say what God will and will not

do, or what Jesus Christ will and will not do, because we just do not know. What did Jesus say? - "Pray that ye maybe accounted worthy."

This should be our guide and prayerful hope and then leave God to see to the matters He will attend to in the day He has appointed, when the world is judged in righteousness by and through Jesus Christ whom God appointed. No doubt there is much that needs to be eradicated but we are not called on to be the judges as to what those things will be, so we can be quiet, stand still and hopefully see indeed the salvation of our God.

Harold Dawson.

THE USAGE OF "MUTH TEMUTH" AND "B'YOM"

"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." "*Muth temuth*" (Genesis 2:17, was the warning which was given Adam. Some wrongly think that the marginal rendering "dying thou shall die" is a correct translation of the sense of "*muth temuth*," and believe that the death that eventually came upon Adam was the one of which he had been warned (and had incurred). The following passages will prove that it was a suddenly inflicted death, and not a process of gradual dying, of which the Elohim warned Adam.

The comparative phrase is "*muth temuth*" and the Authorised Version rendering is underlined. The context of each passage will show that "*muth temuth*" can mean nothing less than and inflicted death, and cannot mean the gradual wearing out process such as Adam actually experienced.

1 Samuel 14:39-44:

"For as the Lord liveth, which saveth Israel, though it be in Jonathan my son, he shall surely die... And Jonathan told him, and said, I did but taste a little honey with the end of the rod that was in mine hand, and, lo, I must die. And Saul answered, God do so and more also: for thou shalt surely die Jonathan."

1 Samuel 22:16-18:

"And the King said, Thou shalt surely die, Abimelech, thou, and all thy father's house... And Doeg the Edomite turned and fell upon the priests and slew on that day four-score and five persons that did wear the ephod."

Genesis 20:7

"Now therefore restore the man his wife; for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live: and if thou restore her not, know thou that thou shalt surely die, thou and all that are thine."

2 Kings 1:4,

"Now therefore thus saith the Lord, Thou shalt not come down from that bed on which thou art gone up, but shalt surely die. (Also verse 6)... So he died according to the word of the Lord which Elijah had spoken."

Jeremiah 26:8-19,

"... the priests and the prophets and all the people took him, saying, Thou shalt surely die... Then spake the priests and the prophets unto the princes and to all the people, saying, This man is worthy to die... Then spake Jeremiah... if ye put me to death, ye shall surely bring innocent blood upon yourselves... Then said the princes... This man is not worthy to die... Certain of the elders... spake... saying... Micah... prophesied... Did Hezekiah put him to death?"

Ezekiel 3:17-21 & 33:8-15,

“Son of man... give them warning from me... When I say unto the wicked, thou shalt surely die and thou givest him not warning... the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand... When a righteous man doth turn from his righteousness...and I lay a stumblingblock before him and he die... If thou warn the righteous man...and he doth not sin, he shall live... When I say unto the wicked. O wicked man, thou shalt surely die... Again, when I say unto the wicked, thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right... he shall surely live, he shall not die.”

1 Kings 2:36-46,

“Build thou an house if Jerusalem--for--on the day that thou goest out... thou shalt surely die... And it was told Solomon that Shemei had gone from Jerusalem to Gath and come again, and the king sent for and called for Shemei, and said unto him, Did I not make thee to swear by the Lord, and protested unto thee, saying, Know for a certainty, on the day thou goest out, and walkest abroad any whither, that thou shalt surely die?... So the King commanded Banaiah the son of Jehoiada; which went out and fell upon him that he died.” Genesis 2:17,

“Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

“*Muth temuth*” and “*B'yom*.”

It is evident that ordinary Biblical usage of the words *Muth temuth* mean a putting to death in a violent manner, and not a dying via the natural channels.

The following quotations should be conclusive:

Genesis 2:17,

“Thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day (*B'yom*) that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die (*Muth temuth*).

1 Kings 2:36.37,

“Build thee an house in Jerusalem, for on the day (*B'yom*) thou goest out... thou shalt surely die.”

A more exact parallel could not be desired. Did Solomon and Shemei understand “*Muth temuth*” to mean a natural death, or 930 years to be meant by “*B'yom*”? Of course not. What was meant by “in the day” of Genesis 2:17 was in the literal day.

Genesis 3:5,7,

“For God doth know that in the day (*B'yom*) ye eat thereof, then your eyes will be opened... and the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked.”

Genesis 3:8,

“In the cool of the day (*B'yom*)” can only mean that very day. Literal, not metaphorical. In fact, of the many occasions “day” is used in the first three chapters of Genesis, only one can be shown to be used metaphorically - Genesis 2:4, “-- in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens.”

If the penalty threatened by God was that Adam should become a dying man, it follows that such a threat cannot again be used. However, the threat is used in all the passages cited above.

It is important that we have a right understanding of the usage of the words “*Muth temuth*” and “*B'yom*” as they affect our understanding and appreciation of the sacrifice of Christ.

We ask why did Jesus Christ suffer a death of execution if it was not in accordance with the plan of redemption, which plan would have been unnecessary if God had not spared Adam the punishment that was due to him?

We answer. His death by execution was the death due to Adam. The life is in the blood (Leviticus 17:11-14) and the shedding of blood necessitates violent death, for in natural death blood is not shed. Violent death includes death but death does not necessarily include violence.

Compiled.

Correspondence

The following letter has been sent on by Brother Phil Parry and his reply to it follows;

Dear P.Parry, Some years ago I corresponded with Ernest Brady and he sent me some information about the Nazarene Fellowship. I used to be a Christadelphian and found some of it hard to handle. However, subsequently I can see the validity of some of the points made. Your address was on one of the pamphlets and I note that you are still listed in the telephone book.

I would be grateful if you could send me more information about the Nazarene Fellowship and a list of publications available. I would also be interested to know if you hold any meetings or gatherings-

I look forward to hearing from you. With Best Wishes, Gordon Allan.

Brother Phil's reply:

Warm greetings in the Name of Jesus. Thank you for your letter received as above date, with request for more information about the Nazarene Fellowship and list of publications available. You say you corresponded with Ernest Brady some years ago when he sent you information at that time when you were a Christadelphian finding some of it hard to handle. I'm not sure which of the two you mean you found hard to handle, whether Nazarene views or Christadelphian, but I can definitely say that the Nazarene views are quite simple to understand when the false assumptions and the indoctrination of the Christadelphian pioneers and subsequent leader-writers are put aside for the confusion they contain. My wife and I were Christadelphians for 17 or 18 years and were not aware of the many divisions and the contradictory clauses of their Statement of Faith, but on studying for ourselves decided there was something wrong with a community which taught there is sin in the literal flesh – that Adam's nature was condemned, not his sin - that he was changed to a nature he already had as his creation, and worst of all, that Jesus was as much under condemnation and in need of redemption as those He came to save. I was given the impression the so-called Clean-Flesh people were a cranky lot who had left the Truth and were anti-Christ. By study of the Word we came to the same views of the Nazarenes without having read their literature (this was suppressed); resignation was the result. Eventually we got acquainted with Fred Pearce of Newbridge, Gwent, and Ernest Brady. Both are now asleep awaiting resurrection. Brother Brady died on October 5th 1986 and Jessie his wife, 24th July 1993. Fred Pearce died December 20th 1957; we miss them all and try to carry on their excellent work. I am 77 yrs. and my wife 78. Most of the work of publication is done by Brother R.V.Gregory. I have enclosed five booklets where you will find a list of publications at the end. We are too isolated to hold gatherings and meetings but keep in contact by Circular Letter.

Our Kindest Regards, Phil and Rene Parry.

* * * * *

A regular reader of the Circular Letter for the past four years writes:

Dear Brethren and Sisters, Having read of your thoughts on the true nature of Adam and his fall from grace might I offer my own thoughts on this matter for your consideration?

“In the beginning God created heaven and earth...” Genesis 1:1. “God saw all He had made, and indeed it was very good.” Genesis 1:31. This goodness was not like our understanding of goodness, for Yahweh's thoughts are not our thoughts nor our ways His ways (Isaiah 55:8). In this newly created world all creatures and plants lived, died and regenerated as they do today - for most living creatures rely on the destruction of other living plants and creatures for their own well-being. Without this the planet would be in stasis; even the universe about us requires the destruction of the very stars, our own sun included, to provide the energy for the creation of heat, light and new elements from which all things are made. Yet among all this turmoil God made one exception – Adam. For at creation he was made from the dust in the likeness of God, yet possessing a material body similar to the rest of the animals; requiring nourishment, capable of being destroyed, or else the threat of death from God would have been pointless, if he was immortal -

For Yahweh God planted a garden in Eden, which is in the east, and there he put the man he had fashioned. From the soil, Yahweh God caused to grow every kind of tree, enticing to look at and good to eat, with the tree of life in the middle of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

Garden is translated from the word ‘*gan.*’ which is from a root signifying “to cover” or “overshadow” and is used to express a piece of ground, differing from the open fields by being enclosed by a hedge (Isaiah 5:5) or a wall (Proverbs 24:31). It was planted with trees (Job 8:16; Song of Solomon 4:15; 6:11). It sometimes had lodges (Isaiah 1:8) or even watch-towers (Mark 11:1) and was under the charge of a keeper (Job 27:18; John 20:15). In other words it was a place different from its surroundings and protected from the events without its boundaries, which in this case, was the world immediately after the creation.

Here dwelt Adam in a sinless state, as without knowledge of sin, no sin could be imputed. Then Yahweh God gave Adam this command; “You are free to eat of all the trees in the garden. But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil you are not to eat; for, the day you eat of that, you are doomed to die.

It is not unreasonable to assume that Adam having access to the fruit of the tree of life, ate of it and whilst doing so was incorruptible.

Yahweh God said “It is not right that man should be alone. I shall make him a helper.” Thus was Eve made from Adam's rib and brought to him. She having a nature similar to Adam. God saw all He had made, and indeed it was very good.

Adam's (and Eve's) apparent longevity can be answered by assuming that as they had access to the tree of life they both ate freely of it and could have lived for ever had they not disobeyed God's command.

Now, the snake was the most subtle of all the wild animals that Yahweh God had made- It asked the woman, “Did God really say you were not to eat from any of the trees in the garden?” The woman answered the snake, “We may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden, but of the fruit of the tree in the middle of the garden God said, “You must not eat it, nor touch it, under pain of death.” Then the snake said to the woman, “No, you will not die! God knows in fact that the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened and you will be like gods, knowing good from evil.” Thus came to Adam and Eve the knowledge of good and evil, and with it the ability to sin.

Then Yahweh God said. “Now that man has become like one of us in knowing good and evil, he must not be allowed to reach out his hand and pick from the tree of life too, and eat and live for ever.” Thus were they cast out into the world which had not changed since it was first created, which they had been sheltered from whilst being within the garden, now being denied access to the tree of life, doomed to die because of the nature with which they had been created.

Their children, sinful or sinless, would also suffer a similar fate for no other reason than that they had no access to the fruit of the tree of life. This was not a punishment,, just a simple fact that all things would die. (Though in each of us is a nagging doubt that it is not possible for our id to die, echoing the serpents words “No! You will not die!” These words have tempted mankind down the centuries, leading to all the strange cults and beliefs which bedevil us to-day.) From this predicament the Creator has provided us with a solution - that by a sacrifice which will follow a prescribed pattern, we, by accepting and recognising this sacrifice, can be given the gift of that which we never had - eternal life. Symbolic of this was the sacrifice of animals to provide skins to cover the bodies of Adam and Eve and also to inspire sorrow in the minds of thinking persons, the sorrow that their actions have caused the death of innocent creatures. Later to be in the form of our Lord Jesus Christ which would also inspire sorrow in the mind of the believer.

Your Brother in Christ, Paul Watson.

My reply to Paul:

Dear Paul, It is refreshing to read your letter for there are several points you make which are well in advance of Christadelphian teaching; you see the true nature of Adam, created mortal and corruptible; and who dies a natural death which is not a punishment; and this death is the one which naturally ends life for all his descendants; also you have rejected sin-in-the-flesh, first introduced in the 4th century A.D. by the Roman Catholics and held so tenaciously in the B.A.S.F.

Your view of the Garden of Eden and of Adam and Eve being expelled into the world outside is not unlike that held by us all.

You mention that Adam and Eve's longevity can be explained by their taking of the fruit of the Tree of Life which, taken regularly would prolong life indefinitely, but their longevity was outside the garden, and they no longer had access to the fruit of the Tree of Life. Surely their longevity was due, first of all to the fact that it was God's design that their life span should be longer during that early period, also Adam and Eve were created in the best of health and without the myriad diseases and stresses of life we face to-day which contribute to the shortness of our lives. When the Kingdom comes, without all the worlds diseases and troubles, longevity will again be the case for the mortal population of that age.

You quote from Isaiah 55:8, “For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord,” yet in the previous verse we read, “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts and I will have mercy upon him.” It is the wicked and unrighteous whose thoughts and ways are not God's thoughts and ways. Ours ought to be.

You write “From this predicament (of our mortality) the Creator has provided us with a solution - that by a sacrifice which will follow a prescribed pattern, we, by accepting and recognising this sacrifice, can be given the gift of that which we never had - eternal life.” I'm not sure what I am supposed to understand here. How does this work? What do we recognise in the sacrifice, and what is it we are to accept? Just saying we recognise and accept is not nearly enough; we need to know and understand what the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ involves. It is our personal understanding of the Gospel and our response to it which will fit us for salvation.

We should be very thankful God spared Adam and Eve for by it we have our present life and the opportunity to come to know and believe in our Creator as our Father in heaven and do His will and be rewarded abundantly for our faith in Him. So when God says, “Come now, let us reason together,... though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool” (Isaiah 1:18), He is expecting us to raise our thoughts and ways up to His perfect standard and reason on the subject of the Atonement; on how our sins are forgiven and on what basis we are accepted by Him.

However, the important aspect to be faced here is the meaning of “In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.” There is no reason at all why we should not take this as it reads, rather than build into it some other meaning as is the wont of Christadelphians. “The day,” Hebrew “B'yom,” means literally, the very day and not at the end of an extended period. While “surely die,” Hebrew “Muth temuth,” means a

penalty of being put to death. An article on “The Usage of 'Muth temuth' and 'B'yom'“ is reproduced on page 7.

You agree that natural death is not the punishment, so the punishment by death (capital punishment) was not carried out upon Adam. So now we ask, Why not? Did God change His mind? No, not really, it was more a case of not telling Adam and Eve in advance of the plan He had for when they failed to keep the law given them. We have another case not unlike this, in the story of Jonah. God told Jonah to tell the people of Ninevah that their city would be destroyed in forty days (Jonah 3:4), and when the forty days was up God did not do as He said He would (verse 10). Ninevah was spared just as was Adam.

The sacrifice of the animals in Eden was a type of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The slaying of the animals could not take away sin; only Jesus Christ could do that, by paying the corresponding price - the debt owed by Adam.

We agree that Adam, though he transgressed the law given him, did not suffer the penalty. We also know we can have forgiveness of our transgressions only through Jesus Christ. Let us trace the steps between these two facts, and for this I quote from Ernest Brady's writings - (See “I Can't understand...” Pages 3 & 4, which also gives quotations): -

- a) Adam was created a natural man and placed under a law.
- b) By disobedience he brought himself under sentence to a violent death.
- c) In God's mercy this penalty was only inflicted in type.
- d) The sentence comes upon all Adam's descendants when they are enlightened.
- e) If they remain in Adam, thus neglecting salvation, they will suffer the penalty in the second death.
- f) Christ was born with the same nature as Adam and placed under a law.
- g) By perfect obedience He merited life, and as God's Son He did not come under Adam's sentence.
- h) His sacrifice was the voluntary suffering of the actual violent death which Adam incurred.
- i) The sentence is therefore remitted for all who belong to Christ; they pass, in baptism, from death to life.

You will notice that Jesus merited His inheritance to eternal life through perfect obedience before His crucifixion. His going to the Cross was not any part of obedience to a command of His Father. It was His Father's wish certainly and this was enough for Jesus, but He gave His life voluntarily for us. His eternal life was already secure. It is an interesting point to note, when Jesus said, while in agony on the Cross, “It is finished,” that the word for 'finish,' teleo, which is correctly and usually used in the sense of finish, end, fulfil, etc., but there are two occasions where it means 'pay,' The one is in Romans 13:6, “For this cause pay {teleo} ye tribute also...” and the other is Matthew 17:24, were the disciples were asked “Doth not your master pay {teled} tribute?” This is the sense in which I like to understand the final words of Jesus before He died; “It is paid.” We have been bought with a price, and what a price He paid that we might have life and have it more abundantly!

My Kindest Regards and Love in the Lord, to you. Mely and your family, Russell.

* * *

Brother Dennis Hayward writes:

Ernest Brady is very incisive in dealing with A.D.Norris. Even the most ardent supporters of A.D.Norris must feel that he stretched their loyalty in maintaining that Jesus “did and didn't” deserve to die and it was a case of 'merited murder' - puzzling to us non-intellectuals!

Grattan Guinness is very sound and reasoned on the separate resurrections: whilst Phil Parry's treatise on Michael Ashton's "Raised to Judgement" is excellent.

Now whilst I've long been persuaded, there is an area which seems to conflict with 'immortal emergence,' and which I have a little difficulty in reconciling. One can hardly think it has escaped your Nazarene notice! and yet I can't remember seeing it dealt with in your writings. It arises from 1 Thessalonians 4:17. Those who "are alive and remain" are caught up together with the "dead in Christ," to form one company as they "meet the Lord." So, if the dead in Christ are immortal as they rise, then so must those who are alive and remain also be at this stage. Yet it hardly seems appropriate that they should have been "changed" before meeting the Lord.

Which brings us to "the change" (1 Corinthians 15): "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed" (verse 52). The "all" being both "those who sleep" and "those who are alive." Yet the change takes place (in the twinkling of an eye) at the "Last (7th?) Trumpet," which heralds the resurrection (verse 52)???

The "change" is described as putting "on incorruption," which necessitates the presence of the corruptible body, which is to be "changed." Two bodies are therefore involved, 1) The "terrestrial," "of the earth," and 2) The "celestial," "our house from heaven" (2 Corinthians 5:2), which Christ brings with Him, and with which we are "clothed upon" (verse 4). Does it seem fitting that a "celestial house" should come up from the earth? We are told it is "from heaven" and is transposed upon the "earthly" body - i.e. "putting on."

Furthermore the celestial bodies are not all the same (1 Corinthians 15:41) and there is discrimination (verse 38) according to the use of talents, which can only be assessed in the Lord's presence (1 Thessalonians 4:17)

We must not set Scripture against Scripture, but look at the picture as a whole. Perhaps we put too narrow a sense on the word "raised." Evidently there is a process, or a series of events, involved in being "raised," and by that we don't mean that it involves a judgment, to decide whether "the dead in Christ are in Christ. That is nonsense! If you die "in Christ" you are "Christ's at His coming." But clearly there is an apportionment of rewards - perhaps determining the appearance of the "celestial body" which will obviously, take place upon meeting the Lord.

As with the word "raised," so also with the word "judgment;" it can carry different meanings to different people: i.e. 1) to receive judgment, or vindication, 2) to assess gains; to classify one's efforts, 3) to decide as to one's basic identity. Our Christadelphian view of the matter has been distorted by the erroneous idea that a saint is, at one and the same time, "in Christ" and "in Adam." To me it seems simple; if one is seen by God to have proved unworthy of his/her calling, that person is reserved unto the second resurrection - to be condemned.

We can only go so far in our knowledge, beyond which our finite vision loses focus and the time factor becomes unsure. Obviously we should try, to the extent of our capacity, to understand - and not to write everything off as incomprehensible, as do some. There's much we could, and should understand, but not to impose it upon others who can't. Sufficient if our understanding has a solid base, and gives us a sense of awe and gratitude and humility, rather than censoriousness.

I am infinitely grateful to the Nazarenes for correcting my hitherto wonky ideas about a defiled Saviour Who needed to save Himself. The "violent death" thesis, I can fully understand; but feel it is based on a fundamental misconception - which I am trying to put on paper in simple terms, without getting bogged down in jargon, and tram-track guided thinking.

I feel I've succeeded in expressing what I've in mind. Most cordially, to you all in the Master's service,

Dennis Hayward.

It seems to me that it's as well it all happens "in the twinkling of an eye."! But seriously, I think I would like to hear what others have to say. I can't recall any Nazarene Fellowship literature which covers the points raised, and I must thank you for raising the matter.

Russell.

The following article was sent to me by Brother Phil Parry who received it from Charles Blanch, a Christadelphian, of Tasmania. Charles Blanch adds a note: "This article is written by a Greek brother who knows what he is talking about. There are a number of Greek brethren in Australia. Bullinger's Critical Lexicon and Concordance supports it. The Commentary of Jamieson Fausset and Brown supports it.":-

An Interesting Feature of the Greek Language

OBTAINING REDEMPTION

There is probably no passage of the New Testament that has been so much misused, misinterpreted and misunderstood as that in Hebrews 9:12. It lies at the very foundation of the divine work manifested in the Lord Jesus Christ, and establishes the reason and purpose for which he sought redemption from the corruption that is common to man. This article looks at the interesting structure of the verse.

In Hebrews 9:12, Paul shows that the mediatorial work of the Lord Jesus Christ could not be fully realized until he was physically made appropriate for the work: by being clothed upon with the garments of immortality. The verse states: "Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption (for us)." (Hebrews 9:11-12).

To properly understand the principle of divine redemption seen in the Lord Jesus Christ, it is helpful to examine the Greek tenses used in this quotation.

Firstly, it should be noted that the final words "for us" are not in the original text, and should be eliminated. They do not conform to the structure of the verse, and have obviously been introduced by the translators who could not understand the principle that the sacrifice of Christ was firstly for his own benefit, so that he could become the Redeemer of his people.

The first section of the quotation identifies the subject of the whole exposition. It concerns the appointment of Christ as a "high priest of good things to come." Thus, Christ first "enters the holy place." Why? In order to "obtain eternal redemption." Why so? Because he did not beforehand possess it, having been born into the "constitution of sin" in common with his brethren (Hebrews 2:14-16).

We now wish to carefully examine the last four words: "having obtained eternal redemption," "Having obtained" is one word in the Greek: *euramenos*. According to Greek grammar, the word is in the masculine gender - which agrees with the subject: Christ. Further, it is in the Middle Voice, and is a participle.

We should explain that a unique feature of the Greek language is its division of words into three "voices:" Active, Passive and Middle.

1) The Active Voice denotes an action has taken place, or is taking place (e.g. "the boy plays with the ball" - the active part is the boy).

2) The Passive Voice denotes an action performed by another on behalf of the person (e.g., "The child is having a bath, bathed by his mother" The action part relates to his mother for the child - not to being in the child. The phrase "is having a bath" is one word in Greek, recognized by its ending).

3) The Middle Voice denotes an action that a person does for himself and for his own benefit. The action of the subject returns back to himself - i.e. "The boy is dressing himself." He does it himself and for his own benefit. Again the phrase "is dressing himself" is one word in the Greek, recognized by its ending.

Let us now find in the Scriptures this very same word in the Three Voices-

The root word for *euramenos* is *eurisko*. It occurs many times in the Active and Passive Voices, but remarkably only once in the Middle Voice - in Hebrews 9:12.

Notice the word occurs in the Active Voice in 2 John 4, "I rejoiced greatly that I found (eureka) of thy children walking in truth." The active part is the children. What were they doing? They were "walking in truth."

The Passive Voice occurs in Galatians 2:17, "While we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found (*eurathemen*) sinners." Who does the action here? God does. For whom? For us; thus it is in the Passive Voice.

The word in the Middle Voice is only found in Hebrews 9:12, "having obtained (*euramenos*) eternal redemption.,.) It is not "in himself," as some translate it, but "for himself." For his own benefit exclusively.

The translation "in himself" does not give true justice to the Middle Voice of the word *euramenos*. This is not only because it appears in the Middle Voice (and Paul could have used either of the other two voices), but the word *euramenos* is also found in the participle form. Now, as the Middle Voice demands that the action of the subject returns back upon himself, so the participle demands that the subject (Christ) takes part himself of that action.

There are no exceptions whatsoever in these rules of the Greek language.

The word *eurisko* means "to be found." So Christ has found eternal redemption for himself,

How do we come to this conclusion? Because of the use of the Middle Voice and the Verbal Adjective Form (which qualifies the noun). This agrees with other words of Paul:

"The husbandman that laboureth must be first partaker of the fruits" (2 Timothy 2:6) and with the words of the Lord: "I send you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labour: others (not other men) laboured, and ye have entered into their labours" (John 4:38).

Putting these two quotations together reveals that Christ, who laboured together with his Father, first found eternal redemption for himself, and opened the way for others. Brother H.P.Mansfield stated: "The Lord obtained for himself redemption (Hebrews 9:12 R.V.), and having saved himself, is able to extend salvation unto others [Romans 8:34]" ("Story of the Bible" vol.10, p. 180).

Obviously, if the "redemption" obtained by his sacrificial death (Hebrews 9:12) were for us and not for himself, we would already be redeemed; why then the need for us to "make our calling and election sure"? It is, in fact, not until Hebrews 9:14 that our own redemption is brought into view, and then it is firstly a moral cleansing. The Statement of Faith clearly teaches that "by dying (Jesus Christ was to) abrogate the law of condemnation for himself, and all who should believe and obey him" (Clause 8). Clearly the "dying" referred to is the "death, even the death of the cross" (Philippians 2:8), being a sacrificial death. Thus, when we understand that the redemption mentioned in Hebrews 9:12 is expressed in the Greek Middle Voice, which form of grammar demands that it was for himself, and for his benefit, and that the Participle relates it to the subject: Christ, therefore he must, of necessity, be a participant in that redemption. In his offering he provided not only for his own need but also for that of his family, inasmuch as both "he" and "his children" (Hebrews 2:13) are thereby saved.

George Armonis.

My observations on the above article: -

On reading this article through I looked up Hebrews 9:11,12 and found I had made notes years ago which agree with George Armonis regarding the Greek grammar and the elimination of “for us” at the end of verse 12. I am in complete agreement with him on this, and I am grateful for the extensive detail he goes into, confirming what I already believed to be the case.

But, Oh dear! Some of his conclusions leave much to be desired!

When the writer says “the mediatorial work of the Lord Jesus Christ could not be fully realized until he was physically... clothed upon with the garments of immortality,” we think he means that Jesus Christ wasn't a High Priest until He received eternal life, a fact with which we agree wholeheartedly, and it is by this statement that George Armonis destroys his own article along with Christadelphian teaching.

To be consistent with Christadelphian teaching he must say that Jesus Christ was the High Priest before His crucifixion in order to offer first for Himself and then for the people, and as George Armonis proceeds with his article he takes it for granted that this is the case - and fails to see his own contradiction! I would like to see the writer get this sorted in his own mind and then rewrite his article.

Jesus Christ was the Lamb of God and being the Lamb for the Offering He was not the High Priest at the same time. The High Priest under the Law of Moses represented God. In the antitype it was God who made the Offering and His Son was the Lamb which God gave in sacrifice. “God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son” as His Lamb; while Jesus, the Son of God accepted this tribulation because of His love for His Father and for His Father's faithful children.

Jesus Christ had, prior to the crucifixion, merited His inheritance of eternal life by perfect obedience to God's Law and He then “offered Himself to God” as the Lamb “without spot” (Hebrews 9:14). That is to say eternal life was His inheritance by right subject to remaining sinless and this He succeeded in doing.

“Obedient unto death” does not mean that He was required to die on the Cross as a matter of obedience to any command, and for a comparison text we have only to look at Psalm 48:14 where we read that “God... is our guide even unto death.” Literally, He is not. He is our guide unto life; and we all know this is what it means. Even so Jesus Christ lived all His life in perfect obedience and was thus the Lamb without spot or blemish to be the Offering for the sin of the world. If only people would see and accept this one simple fact it would save a great deal of wasted effort in trying to find reasons and excuses for passages which they find so baffling to their conceptions of the work of God in Christ.

When the writer says Jesus Christ “did not beforehand possess” eternal life, he is right of course for He could not have died once He had received it, nevertheless eternal life was the inheritance which He possessed from His birth and which was promised from the foundation of the world. It was His by right which He received for Himself for His own benefit.

The word *lutrosis* here translated “redemption” means “deliverance” and has nothing to do with Jesus' sacrifice. His sacrifice was solely for us. H.P.Mansfield stated “The Lord obtained for himself redemption, and having saved himself, is able to extend salvation unto others,” but we cannot agree with his understanding and use of the words “obtained” and “redemption” The words mean that Jesus received deliverance – and this ‘for Himself.’ He lay down His life for the faithful of all time.

In the last paragraph the writer states “Obviously, if the “redemption” obtained by his sacrificial death were for us and not for himself, we would already be redeemed; why then the need for us to make our calling and election sure?” Does George Armonis not know that our present life is our redeemed life, and that we must make our calling and election sure in order to obtain eternal life?

Russell Gregory.

Brother John Stevenson reports:-

I enclose a copy of my comments on the B.A.S.F. (printed below). I sent copies to four of the Christadelphians in the Bible Study Group that I reported to you previously. I will let you know what develops from this.

You may notice that I have expressed myself rather too strongly, but that is my nature. May I suggest that you publish the comments, together with a request that any of the Nazarene Fellowship suggest additions, improved wording, or any amendments they think necessary to help me revise it so that it would be suitable for a pamphlet. I also would like criticisms; some brethren might see some comments to be irrelevant, e.g., my remarks on Clause 4, although I think they are valid. Scripture does not tell us exactly what was Adam's physical nature initially. I agree with those who believe he was created corruptible physically, like all the animal kingdom. I'm also looking forward to member's comments on the allegory I sent you recently... I look forward to N.F. literature and letters, they give me enlightening reading each time.

Love and Best Wishes to all, John Stevenson.

Comments on The Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith

All man-made creeds purport to be Bible-based, though their partisan devotees rest assured of their integrity. The Nazarene Fellowship confronts the B.A.S.F. as a fallible and delusive human document.

Clause four states that Adam was placed under a law through which the continuance of life was contingent on obedience. Then follows a list of six scriptural references, none of which have any bearing on that assertion. Scripture clearly states that an abrupt death would follow disobedience, but no-where does Scripture say that continuance of life was contingent on obedience. You might argue plausibly that such was a reasonable deduction even though not explicitly stated. We of the Nazarene Fellowship would disagree on the basis that it is reading too much into the concise scriptural text. Whereas any brother or sister may maintain that unsubstantiated personal opinion, it is entirely inappropriate to insert that concept into a statement of faith.

Clause five begins with the statement that Adam, having broken the law, was adjudged unworthy of immortality. Precisely the same arguments apply here; it is nowhere stated that Adam was adjudged unworthy of immortality, and although individual brethren and sisters might argue that it is a reasonable deduction, it should never be inserted into a statement of faith. The fact is that Adam was granted a second probation. The next phrase asserts that he was sentenced to return to the ground. That erroneous concept comes from misreading the sentence passed, which is the sweat of his brow, and thorns and thistles. The allusion to returning to the ground is only a footnote qualifying the duration of the sentence. Returning to the ground can only be misread as the sentence if you entertain the concept, along with most Christian sects, that disobedience brought about changed physical nature. This is precisely the fundamental fallacy of Christadelphian belief, in common with the Roman Catholic and most Protestant sects. "A sentence which defiled and became a physical law of his being and was transmitted to all his posterity."

We of the Nazarene Fellowship perceive that disobedience estranged Adam from God, and brought a legal condemnation, which encompassed his posterity. This view is essentially disparate from Christadelphian concept of physical defilement which then became hereditary. Christadelphians generally state that the sentence changed Adam to mortal and began a slow process of ageing and death so that, over nine hundred years later, he returned to the ground from whence he was taken. This again is without specific scriptural support.

The Nazarene Fellowship say that the death sentence was suspended, and that a second probation began with the sacrificial death of animals and clothing of skins. We take this view because it is consistent with all other Scriptures, whereas the hereditary physical defilement theory is not. Once again, in the long list of Scripture references following this clause, few have any bearing on the issue, and those that do, support the Nazarene Fellowship view better than the Christadelphian view.

Clause eight states that Jesus Christ was raised up in the condemned line of Abraham and David, wearing their condemned nature, and was a representative of Adam's disobedient race. We of the Nazarene Fellowship find this wresting of Scripture not only fallacious, but also abhorrent. Jesus was representative of God's holiness and righteousness and love. He was born of Mary so that His physical nature was identical with ours. His Father was God so that He was outside the legally condemned progeny of Adam. And again, none of the twenty-nine scriptural references appended supports the Christadelphian theory against ours. Another objection to clause eight is that Jesus Christ obtained a title to resurrection by perfect obedience. What arrant presumption! We insist that Jesus was Divine Royalty, being Son of God; He did not have to earn anything.

Clause nine states that the miraculous begetting of Christ of a human mother enabled Him to bear our condemnation. Christadelphians support this by asserting that He inherited from His mother, Adam's physical defiled nature. We emphatically repudiate that concept. Jesus did not have to bear our condemnation; He did so by voluntarily submitting to public execution by the hands of the servants of the devil (I use "devil" in the Bible sense, although Christadelphians have falsely accused us of believing in a personal devil).

Clause nine goes on to say that Jesus, bearing our condemnation, rose after suffering death required by the righteousness of God. We cannot possibly condone the concept that God required Jesus to die because He inherited defiled physical nature. We see that as a grotesque repugnant concept, obverse to the fact that God does not wish that anyone should perish. Again, none of the scriptural references contravene our interpretation, nor substantiates the Christadelphian theory.

Clause ten states that Jesus suffered in the days of His flesh from all the effects that came by Adam's transgression, including the death that passed upon all men, which He shared by partaking of their physical nature. Surely it is palpably preposterous to argue that the inflicted death of Jesus by public execution is in the same category as Adam's death of old age nine hundred years after his transgression, which Christadelphians maintain was his penalty. We insist that Adam's penalty was the sentence of inflicted death which was then suspended (as judicial sentences often are), and that Adam's sentence was ultimately paid by Jesus voluntarily to the servants of the devil, and thus He redeemed mankind for God. Once again the scriptural references have no bearing on the difference. Scripture repeatedly asserts that Jesus was sinless, spotless, and undefiled but Christadelphians are teaching that Jesus had to die because He inherited a defiled nature through no fault of His own. That is not like God's justice.

In clause twelve, the B.A-S.F. extends the same concept, suggesting that the Jews and Romans were "but instruments in the hands of God" for the execution of Jesus as "representative of Adam's disobedient race" for the condemnation of sin in the flesh which God had aforetime determined to be done. All that is perilous heresy. It is untrue, it is unauthorised, it is treacherous, it is diversionary, it is an abhorrent caricature of the truth. Jesus, of His own volition, laid down His life as our substitute, to redeem us from Sin, and to present us faultless to His Father. Surely the uttermost ingratitude is to allege that He had to die for His own salvation, because as clause twelve says, God had determined to condemn sin in the flesh. Shame!

I will not just now enter into discussion of clause twenty-four beyond pointing out that a superficial reading of some of the scriptural references seem to agree with Robert Roberts' contention that the saints will be raised mortal to face judgment at the same time as the wicked, but it completely ignores those texts that unequivocally teach that the elect will be raised incorruptible.

The lists of biblical references appended to each clause look very impressive, but when they are perused they throw no light onto the defiled flesh controversy, and that fact should put believers on their guard against the B.A.S.F., a man-made creed. It should be publicised among the brethren, that regarding

these disputations between Christadelphians and “clean flesh heretics” John Thomas never adjudicated, and his writings are inconsistent, sometimes supporting one theory and sometime the other. However, after his death, Robert Roberts stepped into his shoes and did adjudicate and drew up the B.A.S.F. as a test of loyalty, and began excommunicating brethren and sisters who did not “toe the line.” Thus the Christadelphian Ecclesias descended to the level of other common Christian sects. It is deplorable that in Christadelphian circles, interest in these topics leads to summary expulsion and refusal to discuss. To counteract misleading rumours emanating from “The Christadelphian” and “Logos” offices, here is a list of what we do NOT believe, which should also help those who are sincerely trying to understand.

We do not believe in immortal souls, nor in hell or heaven-going, a supernatural devil, the Trinity, Christening, Original Sin, sin in the flesh, that people are born sinful, that Jesus died for Himself, that Jesus had divine nature, that Jesus existed before He was born, that the dead in Christ rise mortal.

The Nazarene Fellowship is purely Bible-based, and has no constitution, no man-made creed, no churches, and no official ministers, and is opposed to disfellowshipping and sectarianism. For any Christadelphian interested in biblical truth, abundant literature is available free, to show the biblical basis of Nazarene Fellowship interpretation, and the unbiblical basis of the Christadelphian concepts of human nature, the virgin birth, and the atonement. The present co-ordinator of the Nazarene Fellowship is Russell Gregory. 5 Heathfield Road, Sutton Coldfield. West Midlands. B74 4JA. U.K.

I would be pleased to join in discussion of these topics if anyone so wishes,

Yours sincerely in the love of the Lord,

John Stevenson.

Contemplating The First Transgression

May I share an idea which came to me suddenly, since I last wrote? I am still unsure how correct or valid it is; you could help me think it through. It refers to Genesis chapters two and three, and I present it in the form of an allegory.

Chapter One. One morning, as Mr John walked along the street, he was passing Mrs Lord's home, and he noticed little Freddie, aged three, playing with a football on the front lawn. He would kick the ball, then chase after it and retrieve it. Once it came over the fence, so Freddie came out of the gate to recover it from the footpath. Mrs Lord called from the front doorway “Freddie, you must not run onto the road, or you will die for sure, before you are much older, I promise you.”

Just then Freddie kicked his ball again, and this time it bounced on the fence and then onto the road. He ran out and retrieved it. Mrs Lord shouted, “Freddie, give me that ball. Now, I am going to keep it until you are old enough, so you can't have it at all now. And go into the back yard; the front is out of bounds until further notice. You will play in the back with restrictions, until you prove yourself trustworthy.”

I will now re-tell the story, and add three missing chapters. The concept behind all this is that God is a God of love, and that everything He has done for us, had love as its motive.

Chapter One. One morning, as Mr John's walked along the street, he was passing Mrs Lord's home, and he noticed little Freddie, aged three, playing with a football on the front lawn. He would kick the ball, then chase after it and retrieve it. Once it came over the fence, so Freddie came out of the gate to recover it from the footpath. Mrs Lord called from the front doorway “Freddie, you must not run onto the road, or you will die for sure, before you are any older, I promise you that.”

Chapter Two Mr John stopped when he heard that, and said to Mrs Lord “Would you really kill your son for running onto the road? Mrs Lord gave him a strange look and replied “Now, Mr John, you must be out of your mind if you think I would hurt my precious child. I grew him in my body, and I birthed him

with great joy; I nourished him with pride, and now I am teaching him skills and manners. I was just trying to get into his thick little head that if he runs onto the road without looking, he will get himself slaughtered, very smartly.”

Chapter Three. Just then Freddie kicked his ball again, and this time it bounced on the fence and then into the road. He ran out and retrieved it. Mrs Lord shouted “Freddie, give me the ball. Now I am going to keep it until you are old enough, so you can't have it at all now. And go into the back yard; the front is out of bounds until further notice. You will play in the back with restrictions, until you prove yourself trustworthy.”

Chapter Four. When Freddie had gone, Mr John asked “Is that his punishment?” Mrs Lord replied “Not exactly. It's for his own good. You can't blame my beloved little boy for being a bit stupid at that age. I told him not to go on the road but he ignored me, so I have to teach him somehow. I want to keep an eye on him, and supervise his playing to ensure he doesn't come to serious harm. But don't worry, he will get the message. I am confident he will end up as smart and responsible as I am. He just needs time, until he learns the rules.”

Of course Freddie would sometimes regard his mother as a tyrant during his probation but as he grew in wisdom, he would come to appreciate her love and protection.

No allegory could ever represent all the various facets of the Bible story, but this seems to highlight the love relationship of God to his creation, and humanity's tardy response to that love.

I also have a question about the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Obviously no ordinary tree could preserve or dispense such knowledge. I envisage a tree of knowledge of good and evil as a great library, or a university. Furthermore, what is the fruit of such a tree? What would the fruit be called, if it had a name? Would it be Proficiency? Supremacy? Domination? Profligacy? Delinquency? How about Selfishness, Greed, Self Will (opposed to God's will)? I think it enables knowledge of fact and fiction; right and wrong; of reality and imagination. Such knowledge could make us saints or devils. As God realized, who knows what mankind would get up to? Just look at the modern world. Therefore he was evicted from Eden's garden and proscribed from the tree of life until he learns moral responsibility.

John Stevenson.

EZEKIEL'S TEMPLE

Part Four

The object of this publication is to build up a positive and detailed picture of the Divine arrangements to be established in Jerusalem and throughout the world in the near future. To do this means very close study of complex portions of the Word, notably the last eight chapters of Ezekiel. So far we have considered Jerusalem in the age to come, the land divided among the tribes in the Millennium and the broad plan of the Temple as given by Ezekiel.

The first two numbers left us no room for a vast Temple such as Brother Sulley envisaged. The third number gave a picture of the Temple which ordinary brethren and sisters, without any special architectural knowledge, could relate to the actual words of Ezekiel. Some have remarked how simple it all seemed. They could actually find in Ezekiel all the things we talked about. On the other hand few will claim to have been able for themselves to find Brother Sulley's picture in Ezekiel. Like ourselves, they may have put this down to their ignorance.

Now however, comes the question quite naturally, how then did Brother Sulley arrive at his picture? It is so utterly different from what Ezekiel seems to say that readers are puzzled and even worried at the discrepancy. Until this reaction was expressed to us we had wondered whether to pursue the study disregarding Brother Sulley's findings, but now we feel that until the reader understands Brother Sulley's

views and their basis, there may linger some nagging doubt about our expositions. To discuss the temple of Ezekiel's prophecy in Christadelphian circles makes unavoidable a consideration of Brother Sulley's expositions.

This is the more inevitable since "Logos" are publishing the late Brother F.Bilton's defence of Brother Sulley's views. We shall sharply contest the majority of Brother Sulley's views as incompatible with Scripture. We shall have occasion to speak plainly, but wish it to be understood that we do not for a moment doubt Brother Sulley's love of the Hope of Israel and zeal for the Truth. Our object is not controversy; "Prove all things and hold fast to that which is good." We beseech brethren not to let prejudice blind them. The Word must be exalted in all things. Quite often all we shall need to do is to summarise the support for Brother Sulley's view and the reader will be able to make his own assessment. This number may be difficult simply because we are looking at things which cannot be found in Ezekiel- The reader will, we imagine, go back with relief to number three of this publication.

We assume that the general plan of Ezekiel's Temple as given by Brother Sulley is known to the reader. Briefly it consists of a vast square of buildings, one mile, approximately, each way. This outer square has a double range of buildings separated from each other by an open court or roadway of 80 cubits width. At each corner of this square there is a tower 240 cubits high. Inside this double square of buildings there is an open space which contains a circular range of buildings and inside this again there is a hill surmounted by an altar. This hill with the altar is said to be the Most Holy Place.

The Gates

Brother Sulley begins his exposition by a journey through one of the gate buildings. In detail there are possible alternatives, but these we hope to consider in a later number. However, Brother Sulley does not accord with Ezekiel on the number of gates. As we showed in issue number three, Ezekiel defines three inner and three outer gates and mentions none on the West. Only the North and South gates are used by the people (Ezekiel 46:9 and 44:1,2). This seems, at first sight, insufficient for vast numbers of people, so Brother Sulley concludes that "gate" must be a noun of multitude, like the gate of the zoological gardens where there may be eight sub-gates with turnstiles. He assumes that for proper traffic control the number of gates would need to be spaced along the whole of the sides and concludes that there would be nine or eleven per side. He also places gates on the West side, thus where Ezekiel gives six gates, Brother Sulley gets 88! Eleven gates, each 150 yards from the other, along the whole side of the Temple cannot be described as one gate. To do this makes the whole side a gate.

The West Side

Brother Sulley deduces that there are gates on the West side, not from the chapter dealing with gates (chapter 40), but from the chapter dealing with the inner house (chapter 41) and from the part of it dealing with inner furnishings of the house: -

"The posts of the temple were squared, and the face of the sanctuary; the appearance of the one as the appearance of the other." (Ezekiel 41:21).

This verse is simply saying that the holy place (Temple) and the most holy (sanctuary) had similar frontages. Brother Sulley lifts it from its context and reckons it proves that the West gate is the same as the others, although chapter 41 is not talking about gates at all. Read it in any version and you will find no suggestion of gates here.

Between the Gates

Ezekiel saw a pavement all round the outer court. He could see the pavement and upon it were thirty chambers (40:17). Brother Sulley completely covers this pavement with arched buildings so that the whole of each side is a continuous building punctuated by built-in gates. Take a look at his picture (plates I & VIII in his book); there are no thirty chambers visible, but the continuous row of buildings is split into ten parts by his 9 or 11 gates on each side. You could not describe these ten parts as chambers, for they contain a number of subdivisions which would better qualify for this description. He assumes that each of these

subdivisions are the same size as a gate and are similarly arched. Thus he gets on each side a succession of 85 arches. If eleven of these are gates, as he suggests, then the chambers are topped by the remaining 74 arches. And ten chambers topped by 74 arches means 7.4 arches per chamber. What does .4 (i.e.4/10ths.) of an arch look like? A correspondent in the Christadelphian who pointed this out received no explanation from Brother Sulley. And in the Temple book Brother Sulley does not mention the problem but simply draws the sides of the Temple 4 different ways, making the thirty chambers of Ezekiel 40:17 all kinds of size. Just look at his Plates I, II, III, & XIII and count up the number of arches between gates and you will find no consistency whatever. Sometimes there are 5 equal arches per "chamber" and sometimes there are 9.

It was this gross inaccuracy that first made us wonder about Brother Sulley's exposition.

Note too, that where Ezekiel has thirty chambers, because Brother Sulley must have them on the West side as well, he increases this to forty!

The Inner House

Brother Sulley makes this into a circle. Look where you will in Ezekiel 40:44 to the end of 41 and you will find no support for this. However Brother Sulley thinks that Ezekiel 40:44 requires a circular Temple. Here by the inner gates we have some chambers for singers. That by the North gate faces South and yet the one that faces North is not by the South gate as we would expect, but by the East gate. Some versions, such as the Septuagint, have "South gate" here, or there are other explanations which we will see later.

But Brother Sulley's explanation is incredible. Look at Plate II. He divides his circle of chambers into two semi-circles. One is entitled "cella at side of North gate with Southern prospect." Even though the two ends of the semi-circle would be 1/4 mile from the North gate perhaps such a description is just about tolerable. The other semi-circle is entitled on the plan, "cella at side of East gate with Northern prospect." Look well at the plan. Some of the semi-circle is much nearer the Western side than the East. How can chambers next to the West gate, nearly a mile from the East gate, be describes as "at the side of the East gate"? Words mean nothing in such circumstances. Or, to put the problem another way, if it is correct to describe the Southern half as being at the side of the East gate, it is equally correct to say that the Northern half is likewise at the side of the East gate. Brother Sulley has not solved the problem but only added to it. A circle of buildings is no explanation.

Against a Circular House

There are features in Ezekiel's description which militate against the idea of a circle. For instance:-

"Now the building that was before the separate place at the end toward the West was seventy cubits broad; and the wall of the building was five cubits thick round about, and the length thereof ninety cubits" (Ezekiel 41:12).

Where is this building toward the West on Brother Sulley's plan? We cannot find it. Why does Scripture place it at the West and not North, South or East? According to Brother Sulley it applies to the wall at the end of each of the thirty block of buildings around the circle. It applies to all points of the compass. Why then does the Word state this building was at the West? If it was repeated all round the circle why the mention of West? Such a point of note in meaningless if West does not mean West.

Allied to this is the statement in Ezekiel 47 that the forefront of the house faced eastwards. How is this possible in a circle of buildings which face in every direction?

It is clear from these two passages mentioning "West" and "East" that the inner building is not a circle which faces in all directions.

Furthermore, there is mention in Ezekiel 46 of "a place on the two sides westward" marked off for the use of the priests to boil the offerings, (verses 19 & 20). Now where are these two places at the West on

Brother Sulley's plan? We cannot find them. They must not be confused with the four corner courts, for these are mentioned in the very next verses. The two places for the Priest's use are additional to these, but Brother Sulley has no place for them anywhere.

Again the conclusion is that there is a definite east-west orientation of the inner house. It is not a circle.

The Whole Limit Most Holy

A further verse upon which Brother Sulley relies for the idea of a circle, in the centre of which is the altar, is found in Ezekiel 43:12:-

“This is the law of the house; upon the top of the mountain the whole limit thereof round about shall be most holy. Behold this is the law of the house.”

And the verses following describe the altar which Brother Sulley assumes is on “the top of the mountain.”

In considering this verse we note first of all that it does not say “the Most Holy.” There is no definite article and there is thus nothing to suggest that this is the name of a part of the Temple but only a term defining the holiness generally. It is not a parallel verse to Ezekiel 41:4 - “this is the most Holy place.” And as regards the words “most Holy” we find in Numbers 18:10 that the priests were to eat the offerings “in the most Holy Place.” Yet this was not the innermost room of the tabernacle called “The most Holy” but, as we can see by reference to Leviticus 6:16, was simply the court of the tabernacle. So the reference in Ezekiel 43:12 simply means that the whole area of the Temple - the whole square, right to the outer wall, is “most Holy” - very Holy, superlatively so, even compared with Jerusalem, the Holy oblation and the rest of the Holy Land. In any case, the reader familiar with Brother Sulley's drawings showing the mountain in the centre with the altar on top, will know that his mountain slopes away to the circular range of buildings. This whole limit, he says, is the most Holy. The reader will notice that the buildings are at the bottom of the mountain, and the verse ought then to read, “At the bottom of the mountain the whole limit shall be most Holy. But it does not say this; it says, “the top,” and logically could only apply to the altar on the top of the mountain on Brother Sulley's plan.

A Journey from the inside of Brother Sulley's Circle

Having shown the flimsy support upon which Brother Sulley bases his broad argument for a circular inner house, we now turn to some of the details by which he builds it up. (See Plates IX, X, XI in his Temple book).

To follow Brother Sulley's procedure, our examination of his edifice has to start from the inside, from the centre, and proceed outwards. Brother Sulley states that this is the direction followed by Ezekiel:-

“Now from the place where Ezekiel saw the altar measured, i.e. from the centre of the circle he is brought to the Temple buildings (Ezekiel 40:48). Coming from the altar Ezekiel would arrive at some point of the inner circle and begin his description of the porch from inside the circle.” Page 96.

Remember then, Ezekiel is supposed to begin his description from the inside of the circle. Now the angel had just measured the altar and its court:-

“So he measured the court, an hundred cubits long, and an hundred cubits broad, four square; and the altar that was before the house.” (Ezekiel 40:47).

This altar and its court, according to Brother Sulley, is in the centre of that vast circular area which he styles the Most Holy. Ezekiel and his guide are therefore in the Most Holy when the altar is measured. They then walk down the hill and come to some point on the inside of the circular range of buildings. According to this interpretation the Most Holy was then behind them: they had left it. Ezekiel records next how they measured the porch, then the Temple beyond it. He records details of doorways and pillars, and the length

and breadth of a first room - 40 cubits x 20 cubits - and then another inner room - 20 cubits x 20 cubits. Immediately upon this last measurement the angel declares "This is the Most Holy Place."

What was the "Most Holy Place"? Could it be that vast circular area in which was situated the altar? Of course not. They had left that part, it was behind them. The 20 x 20 cubit room was clearly meant when the angel said those words. It was the Most Holy Place. If the 20 x 20 cubit room was the Most Holy Place, some vast enclosure with the altar in its midst cannot also be the Most Holy.

Brother Sulley, in order to prevent this obvious deduction, has to say that the angel returned to the inside of the circle and was again facing the circular space when he made that pronouncement. But there is nothing in the record to indicate this. And in fact everything is against such an assumption. Would not the angel have said, "This is the Most Holy" when they were actually in the circular area and before they had reached the circle of buildings? It is a pure invention of Brother Sulley to say that the angel retraced his steps through the building and was facing the circular space when he uttered those words. We can make the words mean anything if we just keep turning in another direction every time a difficulty is encountered.

The plain and simple teaching, which anyone can see, is that the 20 x 20 cubit room is the Most Holy Place, for this is what the angel had just measured when he said these words.

And if this is so, if it is correct that Ezekiel and his guide had left the altar and its court behind them and had moved onwards through the porch and to a building beyond – dimensions of which are given as 40 x 20 cubits for one room called the Temple, and 20 x 20 cubits for an inner room called the Most Holy - then the altar and its court are not in the Most Holy, for they are far removed from it. And all the fine arguments about the fitness of the altar being in the Most Holy are quite valueless, because it is not so the record shows far otherwise.

The Word for Temple

Brother Sulley refers to the word "*hekal*," which is used for the 40 x 20 cubit room and seeks to invest it with the idea of vastness. See page 101:-

"The word '*hekal*,' translated Temple, involves the idea of capacity, and its general signification is any great and splendid edifice, palace, nave or hall. The 'twenty cubits of breadth, and twenty cubits of length,' which Ezekiel saw measured immediately after the doors of the Temple (verse 4) does not convey this idea, unless other features which imply a building of great extent are taken into consideration."

The reader has only to consult a concordance to find that the word "*hekal*" is used in 1 Kings 6:3.5, etc., in respect of Solomon's Temple - a building which was considerably smaller than Brother Sulley's idea of Ezekiel's Temple. To say that the word implies something far greater in extent and capacity is misleading, to say the least.

Brother Sulley's Porches

But let us return to the inside of the supposed circle and see what further difficulties arise if we follow Brother Sulley's exposition-

Ezekiel and his guide first come to a porch and measure it; Ezekiel takes note of posts, and pillars, and steps. The record is in Ezekiel 40:48,49.

We immediately strike a difficulty for we are faced with the problem of how Ezekiel and the angel got into the porch, because there is no access from inside the circle. There are no steps, says Brother Sulley, and the angel and Ezekiel would be faced with a 12ft. wall (6 cubits). This may be no obstacle to angelic nature, nor to a man in vision, but it would seem incongruous to begin a description where there is no access. The only alternative to this difficulty is to say that they approached the Temple from the outside of the circle by way of Brother Sulley's "covered openings" - the gaps between each of the 30 blocks of buildings in the circle. In this case the measurements must have started from the outside of the circle; and

then further difficulties would arise over measurements for the doorways as we would then have the smallest on the outside of the circle.

If Brother Sulley is right about this porch on the inside of the circle then we have every right to ask, "What is it for?" A porch is for entrance surely. But this one is not. No steps are provided and there is a 12 ft. wall to scale. And, as far as we can see, no use whatever is made of this porch. It cannot be used, for it is barred in both directions, as we shall see.

Brother Sulley assumes there is another porch on the outside of the circle and this porch is provided with steps for entrance. But there is nothing at all in Scripture to support the idea of dual porches; only one porch is mentioned, and when the true layout of the Temple is realised, the incongruity of a porch beyond the Most Holy place is appreciated. Brother Sulley's only proof for a duality of porches is the expression "on this side and on that side," which, on page 95, he makes to apply to each side of the Temple buildings. But he is most inconsistent, for on the very next page he makes the same expression apply to each side of the same porch. He can not have it both ways. The fact is clear that there is only one porch, only one is described and this one has steps; there is not a porch without steps. One porch against Brother Sulley's 389 on the outside and 389 on the inside.

But let us presume that Ezekiel and his guide have by some means obtained access to the porch which is supposed to be on the inside of the circle, and have been able to measure the length and breadth and note other details, as narrated in verses 48 & 49. What follows now? "Afterwards he brought me to the temple," the Scripture runs, (Ezekiel 40:1) and the posts and the doorway of the Temple are measured. One would then expect the angel to proceed in orderly fashion and continue inside the Temple to make other measurements. But no, says Brother Sulley, the angel returns to the porch which he has already left to measure the sides of the porch (verse 2), five cubits, which he has already measured once (Ezekiel 40:48). There is, it would seem, absolutely no sense in the angel going back to measure again something he has already noted. And because one measurement cannot be fitted in with Brother Sulley's plan, he says it must be applied vertically. This is the measurement of 40 cubits in verse 2, and the reader will find this assertion on page 101. We shall return to this in connection with the "Temple" or "Holy Place."

Then the angel is supposed to return from the second visit to the porch back to the Temple to measure the door "6 cubits and the breadth of the door 7 cubits" -verse 3.

Brother Sulley's views on "The Table of the Lord"

We might ask how Ezekiel and his guide got into the building at all. According to Brother Sulley's plan there is a table barring the entrance - the "table before the Lord" which, in his plan, runs the whole length of his circular building, i.e., some three miles, and is situated right in front of the doors. We wonder whether this table folded out of the way or whether they climbed over it. We are not being unnecessarily sarcastic about this, because every item in this Temple must be of practical use, and for ourselves we cannot see the sense of a door with a table right in front of it. A door is for entrance or exit, and must be clear to be of any use.

We will examine this "table" a little more closely. We find, according to Brother Sulley, that it is not a table at all but a water trough. We will quote his words, since the reader will hardly give credence to our own description of what Brother Sulley suggests:-

"This altar may carry or convey the sacrifices from the inner porches of the Temple to the turning point from which they ascend to the altar. The height of the structure is probably three ordinary cubits (not the cubit and a handbreadth), that is about four feet six inches high and three feet wide. If its base and its walls (or sides and base) are of wood, it may form a timber enclosure containing a floating conveyor round the circle of the Most Holy, or that part of it so required. It could be fitted with metal floats, probably of gold, suitable for holding the blood and the fat which is to be offered upon the altar. From the place of ascent, i.e. from the turning point, on the Eastern side of the circle, a similar conveyor may transmit the offering to the altar, there to be consumed under the direction of the higher order of priests." Page 134.

So we have the fantastic suggestion of a water trough running along the whole 3 mile circumference of the circle to a place on the East. Little golden boats carrying fat and blood travel along this conveyor to this turning point at the East and then ascend to the altar on the hill centre. Priests (said to be immortal) are employed to put the fat and blood into these boats as they pass the doorway openings on the inside of the circle. We have never come across a more fanciful suggestion than this, and we can hardly credit a brother putting it forward in all soberness. But this is not all- Brother Sulley has forgotten one thing. On his own plans this “table” or “water conveyor” does not run unbroken round the circle; it comes to an end at each wall which divides one of the 30 blocks of buildings in his circle from the next, and there is a 20 cubit gap between each block! How does the water conveyor get through these walls and across these gaps? Brother Sulley has forgotten this vital necessity.

The table of the Lord is in fact a small altar in front of the 20 x 20 cubit Holy Place. (See Ezekiel 41:22).

Inside the Inner House with Brother Sulley

However, let us return to Ezekiel and his guide who have, by some means surmounted the obstacle presented by this “table before the Lord” and have gained access to the inside of the Temple which Brother Sulley says has a ceiling after the groined vaulted pattern of cathedrals, (he regards this idea as the explanation of verse 7). Let us examine the measurements given by Ezekiel and the measurements as given by Brother Sulley. If the reader will consult Brother Sulley’s book, page 101 as mentioned briefly above, he will find that Ezekiel 41:2 is quoted as follows:-

“And the breadth of the entrance ten cubits and the sides of the entrance five cubits on this side and five cubits on that side; and he measured the length thereof forty cubits, and the breadth thereof twenty cubits.” See dimensions of twenty same width as the porch. The forty cubits is applied vertically. “Then went he inward (or inside) and measured the post of the door two cubits and the door six cubits, and the breadth of the door seven cubits.” “So he measured the length thereof, twenty cubits, and the breadth twenty cubits, before the Temple; and he said unto me, This is the Most Holy.”

We find it amazing that Brother Sulley should quote from Ezekiel and then ignore what he says. The verse quoted is absolutely against Brother Sulley's interpretation,

First we note his assertion (without any proof) that the forty cubits is applied vertically (and in the porch at that!). This is clearly wrong. And secondly he has no place for the breadth of twenty cubits. The verse is quite clear in teaching that there is a first room of 40 x 20 cubits ground area and then a second room of 20 x 20 cubits ground area.

He also treats the door of six cubits with side pieces of seven cubits in Ezekiel 41:3 as two doors. The first measure of six cubits, says Brother Sulley, is of the door on the inside of his circle, whilst the seven cubits applies to the door on the outside of his circle; the difference of one cubit being supposed to be just right to allow for the larger circumference on the outside of the circle. But there is nothing in Scripture to indicate that the angel suddenly traversed a distance of sixty cubits between the two measurements. This again is pure assumption.

The Disappearance of Ezekiel's Measurements

We mentally go through the first door into Brother Sulley's Temple and what do we find?

A building which does not correspond with the measurements of 20 x 40 cubits and 20 x 20 cubits at all. His building consists of a vast hall divided off into bays by pillars, and these bays measure 22 x 16 cubits - figures which nowhere appear in Ezekiel's specification. We will quote his words to show we are not misrepresenting him:-

“Since also the entrance to the Temple and the entrance to the ribs are both from the place left, the distance from centre to centre of the ribs must be the same as the incolumniation of the posts of the Temple, i.e. sixteen cubits, all round the house, so the lines of the vaulting on plan are shown as parallelograms, 22

cubits by 16 cubits on the inner side, expanding to 17 cubits on the outer side in correspondence with the axis of the posts of the Temple, representing the distances approximately from centre to centre of the rib supports. In this delineation of the structure of the Temple the 20 cubits of breadth (verse 4) is taken to specify the span or breadth of the rib-work, and the 20 cubits measure of length before the Temple is applied to the elevation of the ribs, or to the height of the apex of the arched rib from the juncture of the ribs with their supports.” Page 104.

So we see what Brother Sulley does with straightforward measurements of length and breadth. He applies them vertically and puts in their place bays of 22 x 16 cubits. With the strongest possible emphasis we say there is no justification for this and we believe it is a tampering with the Divine Word

Brother Sulley has now arrived at a vaulted chamber measuring 68 cubits long and 16 cubits wide (3 x 20 cubit bays and 2x4 cubit pillars). These measurements he reckons he has arrived at from verses 3 and 4 of Ezekiel 41, but we cannot find these dimensions in these verses, or anywhere else, and they are not even consistent with his 22 by 16 cubit measurement quoted above.

The 30 Sections of Brother Sulley's Circle

What does Brother Sulley do now? He multiplies this bay by 13 to produce a building on a curve approximately 208 cubits long (13 sets of bays each 16 cubits wide) plus end walls. He then says there are 30 of such buildings around the circle, each one being separated from the other by a 20 cubit space. And what does he base this on? Simply upon Ezekiel 41:6:-

“And the side chambers were three, one over another, and thirty in order; and they entered into the wall which was of the house for the side chambers round about, that they might have hold, but they had not hold in the wall of the house.”

This is the only verse Brother Sulley has for the 30 blocks of buildings formed by the vaulted chambers and constituting together his vast circle, He alters “side chambers” in chapter 41 verse 6 into “ribs” and applies it to the “groined vaulting” idea. But we fail to see how this helps him, for logically the verse can then only mean that there are 30 “ribs.” Even by rendering it “ribbed chambers” we still have only 30 of them whereas Brother Sulley has 13 sets of 3 in each of 30 blocks, making a total; of 30 x 13 sets of ribbed chambers. 30 x 13 ribbed chambers would be 390 where the Bible says 30, and even then, in his arithmetical proof, Brother Sulley has to contradict his own 390, for his measurements require 389 of such ribbed or vaulted chambers, not 390. He seems to forget the necessity of being able to divide the total numbers of chambers equally by 30. 389 should divide equally by 30 - see page 108. It cannot be done and the necessity arises of making one of the blocks of buildings in the circle contain only 12 chambers instead of 13.

In any case Ezekiel 41:6 is speaking of 30 three story chambers round the 20 x 20 cubit holy place and 20 x 40 holy place. This is quite simple (see number three of these articles).

Before leaving Bro. Sulley's inner circle, we must consider the word “Qir” which is translated “wall” and which he says means some special kind of wall. On page 105 of his book he prefers to call this particular wall a “rampart,” as follow:-

“The height of this wall, six cubits, is mentioned (verse 5) but its thickness is not stated. This also may indicate that the wall referred to is a rampart, or raised foundation floor of the Temple,..”

In other words it is not a vertical wall, except that it presents a vertical face of six cubits on the inner face of the circle which prevents access to the circular range of buildings from the inside, (remember - no steps!)-

Now if the reader will carefully examine verse 5 he will find first of all that no mention of height is made but it is more likely to be thickness which is meant by the measurement of 6 cubits. Secondly, he will find in verse 6 another mention of wall. This, Brother Sulley implies, is another and different sort of

wall; and by his omission of the Hebrew word in this case gives the reader the impression that it is indeed different. Let us quote his words on page 106:

“The ribs are said to finish into a 'five cubit wall without' and to be 'holden of it.' Thus we read; 'the ribs entered into the wall which belonged to the house (baith) or place for the ribs round about, that they might have hold, but they had not hold in the wall (qir) of the house.' The thickness of the wall, which is for the ribs without is five cubits; and that which is left is the place of the ribs which are within.” verse 9.

Brother Sulley, in this quotation, omits to put the Hebrew word in brackets after the first mention of “wall.” It would have been damaging to his theory to have done so. For the word is exactly the same in this case as in the other. It is “qir.” In fact, as the reader can see for himself from Young's concordance, this word is used for every wall mentioned in chapter 41; there is nothing special about it and Brother Sulley's pleading for something particular in respect of the six cubit wall is quite unjustified. If there is anything special in the word “qir” then it applies to all the walls and not to Just one.

Rejection of the Circle Idea

The reader may think that any expositor is liable to make mistakes over some items at least. But let such a reader remember this; that the details all add up to make a whole and if the basic details are wrong, such as the application of measurements, then the whole picture will be wrong also. Let the reader seriously consider the evidence which Brother Sulley brings forward for his conception of a circular range of buildings and he must come to the conclusion that the evidence is not only insufficient, it is not there at all! There is not a shred of evidence.

Looking at his plan as a whole we can only conclude that he has utterly failed to prove that the inner house consists of a circle. To get his circle he has had to take Ezekiel 41:1-4, alter the measurements given therein, multiply them 389 times; he has had to take verse 6 and make the phrase “thirty in order” to mean 30 blocks of buildings; take verse 10 and multiply “the wideness of twenty cubits” thirty times; and above all take the phrase “This is the Most Holy Place” (verse 4) and apply it to the area which the angel obviously did not intend.

The circle idea, with all its details, must therefore be rejected. It is not scriptural. And together with this rejection must go Brother Sulley's idea of great statuesque figures representing the man and the lion. We suggest that a straightforward reading of Ezekiel 41:18-20 will show that these figures are internal decoration upon the walls of the Temple in the same way that Solomon's Temple was decorated. (1 Kings 6:29).

Brother Sulley's River

We turn now to the river which flows Eastward from the Temple. Brother Sulley is most difficult to follow in this section of his exposition and we doubt whether anyone can make sense out of it. Briefly, he thinks that the water has its origin at the top of the mountain underneath the altar. It flows down the South side of the hill and underneath the gateways to form a river flowing Eastwards. On his plans, however, he shows similar streams flowing from under the gateways on the North side, but he does not explain how the water got there when it flowed Southwards from the altar. Further, he says that similar streams flow out at the West side, half going North and half going South, then curving round the corners to join the waters at the North and South sides. But this Western stream he does not show on his plans.

Let us quote the actual passage of Scripture dealing with the river:

“Afterward he brought me again to the door of the house; and, behold, waters issued out from under the threshold of the house Eastwards: for the forefront of the house stood toward the East, and the waters came down from under from the right side of the house, at the South side of the altar. Then he brought me out of the way of the gate Northward, and led me about the way without unto the utter gate by the way that looketh Eastward; and, behold, there ran out waters on the right side.” Ezekiel 47:1,2.

Now how does Brother Sulley's conception of the river match up with these verses? Several things are wrong. Firstly, he has waters running out of the South, North and West sides, whereas the Scriptures say nothing of this. On the contrary, the implication is that the waters flow out at the eastern side only, the very side Brother Sulley has no water! Secondly, he has the water starting at the altar, whereas the Scripture does not say so, but says that the water flows from under the threshold of the house and flows past the Altar on the South side; it then continues and flows out at the East.

Let us make these points clear. Ezekiel was led again to the "door of the house." Where is this? Is it one of the gateways of the outer court which is meant? We do not think so. "The house" is a term usually applied to the inner part of the Temple, whilst "the door" is almost always applied to the door of the inner house. (See usage of both these terms in Ezekiel 41), Furthermore, it is clear from the passage itself that the door of this inner house is meant from the fact that after seeing the waters issuing from under the threshold Ezekiel is led out of the gate Northward. Thus he was inside the Temple enclosure and then led outside. In other words Ezekiel was not outside and seeing the waters issue forth from the outer gateways as Brother Sulley has them. He was inside and close to the door of the inner house. The source of the stream is thus under the threshold of the inner house.

Consider what this means to Brother Sulley's theory. His "inner house" is the circle of buildings and it would mean that the waters must start at some point or points around this circle- They would then have to flow up the hill to the altar and flow Southwards from it. Brother Sulley would have the same difficulty regarding gravity if the waters did start at the altar and flow South, for how would part of the water get to the Northern side anyway?

How simple and plain is the course of the stream when the true layout of the Temple is understood and the verses quoted are given their straightforward interpretation. The stream simply starts at the threshold of the inner house, flows Eastwards by the South side of the altar and passes out of the Temple on its Eastern side.

Sundry Discrepancies

The reader will also notice in Brother Sulley's plan the 100 cubit measurement of Ezekiel 41:13 is made to include part of the porches on either side of the Temple. This is most arbitrary for the porch has its own individual measurement of 20 cubits x 11 cubits. It is unreasonable to include part of the porch in the Temple measurement, and it is only done to make other measurements fit.

Brother Sulley does the same sort of thing with the outer court. The Scripture plainly says that a distance of 100 cubits separates the face of the outer court gate to the face of the inner court gate; but Brother Sulley makes this measurement to include the porches of the gates, outer and inner, which face each other. He thus reduces the effective distance between the two gates to 80 cubits. He does this in order to make the corner courts fit ($50 + 50 + 80 = 180$ cubits for the corner courts). Whilst this certainly makes things fit, it does not seem proper to interpret Scripture in this way, and there is no need to do this when the true layout of the Temple is perceived.

Brother Sulley's vast corner courts; each larger than St. Paul's Cathedral, are manufactured by assuming that Ezekiel 46:21 to 24 is dealing in reeds, (1 reed = 6 cubits), and that 40 long by 30 broad means 40 high by 30 square! Any measurement, however obviously of ground area, if it does not fit must be up-ended and made vertical!!

Another point of practical importance is the arrangement whereby those entering the Temple at the Northern side go out by way of the South, and vice versa.

Now with Brother Sulley's plan (see figure 9) vast crowds enter the Temple by way of the eleven gates on the Northern side, (he regards a plurality of gates essential for the entry of such multitudes as he thinks will attend), and vast crowds do the same at the Southern side. They then assemble in the four triangular corners of the inner court for worship and then proceed to the opposite side for exit. What this means is that all the people have to squeeze through the space between the inner circle of buildings and the buildings on the outer square. A glance at Brother Sulley's plan will show what we mean. The point is that

if it requires eleven gates of 50 cubits width to get all the people in, how much more necessary is it to have sufficient space at the point where the people have to cross each other's path?

Brother Sulley's Architecture upsets God's Plans for the Priests

We have left till the last the way in which Brother Sulley's plan of the Temple completely upsets the fundamental principle of God's arrangements for the worship of that day (See figure 10).

In Ezekiel 42 we read of special chambers where the priests eat of the most holy things and where they lay their garments before going out to the people:

“When the priests enter therein, then shall they not go out of the holy place into the utter court, but there they shall lay their garments wherein they minister; for they are holy; and shall put on other garments, and shall approach to those things which are for the people.” Ezekiel 42:14

And again in Ezekiel 44:19;

“And when they go forth into the utter court, even into the utter court to the people, they they shall put off their garments wherein they ministered, and lay them in the holy chambers, and shall put on other garments; and they shall not sanctify the people with their garments.”

Two vital points of God's arrangements are here stated:-

a) the people are in the outer court - they are not allowed in the inner court.

b) The priests must not have contact with the people in their holy garments - they have to change them before going where the people are assembled.

These two arrangements are completely upset by Brother Sulley's plan. Firstly, where are the people in his arrangement? Let him answer;

“The people of the land, also an immense multitude, assemble in the four triangular corners of the inner court, ranged in close, but not crowded. From right to left, extending around the three mile circuit, they fill the spaces allotted to them before the “door” of the Eastern inner gate, and offer worship through the Lord of Glory.” Page 183.

These triangular corners which he speaks of are his version of what the Scripture describes as “the separate place.” Why separate? Clearly because no-one is allowed there. That is the first error of Brother Sulley -

Secondly, he states the people are in the inner court, whereas the Scripture states they are not; they are in the outer court. The people have no right in the inner court - that is for the priests. Thus Brother Sulley upsets the Divine arrangement in this particular.

We note a further impossibility which borders on the absurd. He states that the people in the four corners are before the door of the Eastern inner gate. How ridiculous! How can people a mile away be worshipping at the door of the Eastern gate?

But worse than this is Brother Sulley's defilement of the priests by contact with the people. For this is what it amounts to.

The chambers set apart for the priests as changing rooms he states quite clearly are in the outer square, they are in his inner range of chambers on the Northern and Southern sides. They are not in the inner circle for he makes it quite clear that these are chambers for the singers- Firstly we will quote concerning the priest's changing rooms. After quoting Ezekiel 42:13 he says;

“Remembering that Ezekiel and his guide up to this point had traversed the Temple outer courts, and also the separate place and the inner court from South to North, his description of what he has seen (verse 13) must refer to the ten cellae on the North and the ten cellae on the South constructed between the outer courts and the separate place.” Page 78.

Concerning the inner circle of buildings, Brother Sulley says;-

“These verses cannot refer to the cellae of the priests described in sub-section VI, page 76, because those buildings are set apart for a different purpose, and it is not possible to construct the cellae of the priests at the side of the East gate having a prospect to the North. Further we have seen that these same buildings flanking the outer court are inaccessible from the inner court, and are chambers in which the priests lay the garments in which they sanctify the people, whereas when they enter the inner court and the “chambers” within the inner court they must wear different garments.” Page 92.

Later, after quoting Ezekiel 42:19 he says;

“This regulation respecting change of garments in the ministrations of priests (chapter 42) and of the Levites (chapter 44) indicates that the “chambers” flanking the outer court are the “chambers” referred to. These are conveniently placed for the use of the Levites who are the “priests” referred to and who serve in the manner described in the prophecy.” Page 150.

It is quite clear then that Brother Sulley regards the inner range of the outer square of buildings as the holy chambers where the priests change their garments.

Consider what this means. The priests in their ministrations of the holy things are in the inner court and in the inner circle. Some, indeed, would actually be in the “Most Holy Place” and attending at the altar. Parts of the sacrifices they have to convey to the holy chambers, eat them there, and change their garments before having contact with the people.

Yet in Brother Sulley's arrangement, with the people in the separate places - the four triangular corners of the inner court - the priests have to walk through this vast assembly of people before they can reach their changing rooms! Their holy garments and the holy offerings are thus defiled by contact with the people and God's arrangements of separateness and holiness are defeated!

Has confusion ever been worse confounded? The very thing which God says must be avoided is thus committed in Brother Sulley's plan. He has got the people in the inner court (where they have no right to be) and the priests changing rooms beyond them, bordering the outer court. This glaring fault is most damaging to the whole conception of Brother Sulley.

Priests' Cooking Chambers

A similar error occurs through Brother Sulley's neglect of the priests' cooking chambers which are mentioned in Ezekiel 46:19,20.

“After he brought me through the entry, which was at the side of the gate, into the holy chambers of the priests, which looked toward the North; and behold there was a place on the two sides Westwards. Then said he unto me, This is the place where the priests shall boil the trespass offering and the sin offering, where they shall bake the meat offering; that they bear them not into the utter court, to sanctify the people.”

Now where are these two cooking places for the priests on Brother Sulley's layout? We cannot find them. They must not be confused with the four corner courts which are cooking places for the people, but without any special mention we have to assume that in Brother Sulley's plan the priests have to use these corner courts. And this again means that the very pollution which God says must be avoided is incurred. For, as we have seen previously in respect of the priests' changing rooms, the priests have to walk through multitudes of people and go where they are assembled and cook [their holy meat in the people's cooking courts! Thus God's principles are defeated. Please look up again Leviticus 6:27.

It is clear that the priests' chambers, for eating, for changing clothes, for cooking, must be kept quite apart from the people. This is not done in Brother Sulley's arrangement.

Conclusion

This has been a difficult number to write, partly because it is so difficult to make Brother Sulley's confusing concepts clear. Also it is difficult to avoid fairly strong censure of Brother Sulley's mishandling of Scripture, yet we do not wish to arouse emotion in the reader brought up, as we were, on Brother Sulley. We hope brethren and sisters will dispassionately examine the matter for themselves and stand by what is true.

If God permit, we propose to go on to the arrangements for worship in the Temple in our next number. Who are the priests of the Temple? Who are the sons of Zadoc? Who worships in the Temple? Who is the prince? What is the object of revived sacrifices in the age to come? Attempting to answer these questions will give us the Temple in action and prepare us for an examination of the finer details of the architecture of the Temple. On such a background we shall also be able to look at the supposedly "broad" arguments whereby many brethren entrench themselves in the idea that Brother Sulley must be on the right lines, even though they admit they cannot understand his book; arguments which weigh so heavily with them that they overlook plain Scripture.