

# Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 193

January/February 2002

## **In this Issue:**

Page 1 Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2 Christ Our Passover is Sacrificed for Us	Brother Phil Parry
Page 9 Exploring Bible Language	Bro. & Sis. Alan and Fowler
Page 11 Comment on above	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 13 Did You Say OK?	Ann Lawton-Bending
Page 15 Ezekiel's Temple Vision	Brother Phil Parry
Page 17 History of The Christadelphians	Brother A.R. Wilson
Page 20 Comment on above	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 22 Copied for The Service of The Truth	Sister Lena Wilson

---

## Editorial

Dear Brothers, Sisters and Friends, Loving Greetings.

Amos lived in Tekoa, a village in the Judean hills about six miles south of Bethlehem. He was a sheep farmer, and also gathered the fruit of the sycamore tree (a kind of fig).

In Amos's day it was a time of relative peace and prosperity. What Amos saw were the negative results of this relaxation, results much as we see in the world today: luxurious living for the rich, exploitation of the poor, loose moral standards, corruption in public life, and religious observance based on ritual rather than real piety. It was against these abuses that Amos was called upon to preach. "The Lord roars from Zion, and utters his voice from Jerusalem: the pastures of the shepherds mourn, and the top of Carmel withers."

Amos's fierce attack on the establishment was resented and a local priest sent a complaint to King Jeroboam accusing the preacher of sedition. 'Amos has conspired against you in the midst of the house of Israel; the land is not able to bear all his words. For thus Amos has said, "Jeroboam shall die by the sword and Israel must go into exile from his land." (Amos 7:10,11).

Apparently the authorities failed to take action and the priest himself tried to persuade Amos to leave. 'O seer, go, flee away to the land of Judah, and eat bread there, and prophesy there.' Amos replied that he was not a prophet nor a prophet's son, but had been called by the Lord from his regular occupations.

He repeated his warnings in even fiercer terms; Therefore thus says the Lord: "Your wife shall be a harlot in the city, and your sons and your daughters shall fall by the sword, and your land shall be parcelled out by line; and you yourself shall die in an unclean land, and Israel shall surely go into exile away from its land." (Amos 7:17). When Amos's wrath rises to a climax he catalogues Israel's sins and makes them specific and vivid. They are profane, immoral and above all callous and inhuman towards their fellow men '...they sell the righteous for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes.'

Amos is thought of by some as a blunt rustic when compared with intellectual urbanites like Isaiah and Jeremiah. Certainly he is familiar with the sights and sounds of country life. Yet at the same time he reveals a wide knowledge of contemporary events, a grasp of political and social issues, and a literary skill of a high order.

It is also considered that in the evolving theology of the Old Testament, Amos makes a great leap forward for he is the first to propound the concept of a God who is universal and not just the God of the tribe of Hebrews. What God demands of man is moral purity and social justice, rather than the rituals and

sacrifices of organized religion: "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Even though you offer me your burnt offerings and cereal offerings, I will not accept them." (Amos 5:21,22), Amos tells us that God judges all nations, but has a special covenant with the Hebrews. This makes demands on them. More than other peoples, they must observe a stern ethical and social code.

Men of God like Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah served as the moral conscience of the community, and the fearless critics of its rulers. How the world would benefit from people of their calibre today. But evidently they are not required or they would appear. The prophetic books of the Old Testament are sufficient for those who have ears to hear. It is a fact that these books are among the most sublime ethics and poetry the world has known.

After the events of September 11th in New York and the subsequent effects in the Middle East and politics world wide we can only watch and wonder if the climax we look for is imminent. Next year Jerusalem?

Love to all, Helen Brady

---

## **Christ Our Passover is Sacrificed for Us**

The account of the exodus of the Children of Israel from Egypt after their bond-service of 400 years duration, appears to be in the purpose of God a magnification of the "bondage to Sin" personified as a "Master" unto which Adam by disobedience sold himself and all in his loins, and that this fact of the need for redemption should not be forgotten.

A careful examination of Romans 7 will show the discriminate reader that Paul is also emphasising the fact that the ritualistic and strict observance of the Law of Moses, no matter how genuinely and zealously carried out convicted the person as in need of redemption in Christ, the true substance or antitypical offering, thus magnifying and bringing into perspective the "Sin of the world," the "Sin of Adam," by which men are brought into bondage.

In this sense Paul declares "the Law was our school-master to bring us to Christ." (Galatians 3:24). For if righteousness were by the works of the law then there was no need of Christ and His death would have been in vain. Paul further declares, Romans 5:20, "Moreover the law entered that the offence might abound." Which offence? Why, the offence of Adam - see verses 17 to 19 of Romans 5, and as we were in the loins of Adam, members of his body, so by enlightenment we acknowledge that God reckons us as constituted in the same offence and as members (plural) it becomes also our offences, so Paul could say concerning Jesus, "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ..." (Romans 4:25).

Robert Roberts in "The Slain Lamb," page 10, scoffed at Edward Turney for advancing Paul's spiritual discourse on how we are constituted sinners without being actual sinners having not been born when Adam sinned. But of course, R. Roberts had such a one track mind on the subject of physical condemnation that rather than ask Edward Turney to enlarge on what he meant, he preferred not to reason as becomes humility while he had the opportunity, but chose to write "The Slain Lamb" and deliberately misrepresent, not only the above but more of the truth advanced by Edward Turney most of which was at one time, previous to the lecture, believed and advanced in his own publications as self-appointed shepherd of the Christadelphian Flock. His refusal to accept D.D.Handley on account of his view of the Papal doctrine of "Original Sin" comes to mind - a doctrine that later, in "The Slain Lamb" he went all out to prove should be accepted as true.

"The Slain Lamb" is so full of misrepresentation, self contradiction and wrested Scripture that it fails utterly to present the Gospel but gives the reader an impression of a ranting and raving spoilt child deprived of having its own way. I am sorry for the digression but I could not dismiss lightly R. Roberts' criticism of

Paul's beautiful and enlightened exposition by the Spirit written in his epistle to the Romans and revealed to Edward Turney, and thanks be to God, to us.

An unbiased reading of our recently printed booklet, "What the Law Could Not Do," will show the fallacy and foolishness of Robert Roberts' reasoning, and those who have received the booklet and ignored it are only blinding themselves to the truth.

Let us now return to our consideration of the events and conditions laid down of God through Moses for the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt.

All the first-born of Egypt were to die, both man and beast, but against the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast that ye may know how the Lord doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel. (Exodus 11:7). Malachi speaks of a discerning between the righteous and the wicked; between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not.

The Children of Israel were about to leave their "Bond Master" in a new freedom to serve the God of Abraham but there was only one Law applicable and conditional to the participation of the Passover Lamb, as it was to be later called, for reasons known to you all - the "passing over" of the Lord when he saw the blood-sprinkled lintel and door posts of the houses of Israel. Exodus 12:49 - "One law shall be unto him that is homeborn, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you," if they will eat of the Passover then they must be circumcised, the outward token or sign that they acknowledged themselves to be the seed of Abraham who "received the sign of the circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also." (Romans 4:11).

We accept then, with Paul, that Abraham was justified by faith, not by circumcision and this also applies to all others though they are circumcised in accordance with the Divine command. Stephen realised this when he condemned the hypocrites of his day as "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have now been the betrayers and murderers: who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it." (Acts 7:51-53).

Whatever would Stephen think of Clause 12 of the Christadelphian B.A.S.F? Or page 12 of "The Slain Lamb" where R. Roberts states that God created human nature incapable of keeping the law for which he, Stephen, was condemning them through the Holy Spirit?

Let us consider the lamb which the Children of Israel were about to slay; was it their choice? No, it was not of man's choosing but of God; chosen without spot or blemish in the physical sense; a male of the first year. There were conditions laid down concerning the blood wherein was the life thereof. The blood was to be collected in a basin and sprinkled by means of hyssop on the lintel and two side posts of the door of the houses of the Children of Israel. Choosing of the lamb from the flock or herd was important. God's description of the kid or lamb must be imprinted on the mind and securing of the lamb must be with care for not even a bone must be broken; it must be perfect in every part according to God's description, therefore His influence and guidance was necessary.

Jesus, the antitypical Lamb of God said, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him... Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh to me." (John 6:44,45). Surely this is the only and true way to select the lamb of God's choosing, whether typical or antitypical, to get the scriptural and Spirit's teaching and description, it is important and necessary to differentiate between Jesus the Lamb of God's providing and one who does not meet the conditions and the qualifications. Some prefer to select Jesus for His character and reject Him on account of His supposed but falsely so-called "sinful flesh;" others accept the words of Jesus most palatable to their "gentle Jesus" type minds, to the exclusion of His strong and forceful words of hatred against the hypocrites of His day. But the Lamb of God, typical and antitypical had to be wholly accepted and consumed literally and symbolically, nothing was to be left over, no picking and choosing of what was palatable and rejecting that which was not; such conduct would amount to rebellion against God and His way of salvation. The eating of the Lamb had

to be accompanied with the eating of unleavened bread and though the sacrificial lamb eating ended within the specified period, the eating of unleavened bread continued for seven days; no leavened bread was to be seen even in the dwellings of the Children of Israel, but at the end of seven days was to be a feast to the Lord.

It was a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt. It was faith in God's instructions and the life of the lamb which saved them from death. Had any ignored God they would have suffered the same fate as the first-born of Egypt. "And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt." (Ex. 12:13).

It is obvious that the sight of the blood was a sign that a life had been taken for everyone in their household; in other words a substitute, a life free of condemnation for a life under forfeit. These were the conditions for the exit from bondage in Egypt, the 'Sin Constitution' of the darkness of this world concerning which Paul speaks of Moses, "Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasure of sin for a season." (Hebrews 11:25).

The eating of the Passover was not to be likened to a banquet of ease; it was a serious thing, a matter of urgency, life or death; "Life" if the journey was to be undertaken. It was to be a journey to the promised inheritance fraught with many trials and tests of faith, nevertheless at the end there was a rest for the people of God. The Divine injunction was "thus shall ye eat it; with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand; and ye shall eat it in haste: it is the Lord's Passover." (Exodus 12:11). For this journey they needed to put on the whole armour of God, to be able to withstand in the evil day and having overcome all, to stand.

Paul takes hold of this as a counterpart to the true converts of his day and it is also relevant to us. Ephesians 6:14- 19, "Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked- And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit... in order to make known the mystery of the gospel."

Like Adam, like Abel, like Seth, like Enoch, Abraham, Noah, Isaac, Jacob, we have acknowledged by faith our deliverance or redemption from the bondage of Sin into which Adam by disobedience sold himself and all in his loins. We and the above mentioned have acknowledged the price paid for our release, either in the figure of a sacrificial lamb or in the figure of baptism into the death of the antitypical Lamb of God. All the above mentioned had knowledge of the restoration of the paradise of God and prepared themselves for it under conditions laid down to them of God. They all found grace in God's sight as persons, not as disembodied characters separate from the flesh or nature as Christadelphians believe and teach in their literature. They walked by faith, believing God and it was accounted unto them for righteousness; nevertheless, redemption applied to them firstly before their pilgrimage toward the paradise of God, as it also applies to us. "Ye must be born again." How? "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot see the Kingdom of God." (John 3:5).

We also have been called of God as was Abraham, who went out of Ur of the Chaldees not knowing whither he went, but was strong in faith "for he looked for a city which hath foundations (not quicksand), whose builder and maker is God." (Hebrews 11:10). In symbolic death with Christ through baptism we have died unto sin, not as He died unto sin, for He suffered physically, the Just for the unjust, for God laid on Him at Calvary the Sin of the world that He might take it away; thus John the Baptist prophesied and declared "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the Sin of the world," he added also many more arresting words in John 3:27 to 36, to which the "condemned nature" theorists are blind when they read them especially verses 35 and 36 - "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand... and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." Can any sensible person believe or state in the face of this declaration of John the Baptist, "The flesh of Christ is unclean and obnoxious to His Father;" that nothing was given into His hands, no free will in laying down His life, but commanded and compelled to do so at the expense of His inheritance as Son and Heir? Anyone reading

John 3 will realise why Jesus could say of John the Baptist, his cousin and friend, "Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist." (Matthew 11:11).

Unlike the prophets before him John was chosen as a witness to their prophecies of Christ and was told of God in what way he should be made known, "And I knew him not" says John, but "upon whom thou shall see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he... and I saw, and bear record that this is the Son of God." (John 1:33,34). "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," the words of the Father which John heard.

Did John think they applied only to the character and not to the substance that produced the character? Edward Turney maintained in his scriptural and logical reasoning from the Scriptures that "sinful" was applicable to a person or persons disobedient to God's law and was not a description of the quality of the flesh or nature.

If Robert Roberts was correct then the animals also were sinful in flesh for he says that Adam's nature was depressed to the level of the beasts that perish on account of sin. It also follows that as the character of Jesus was at all times of His life sinless, then this sinlessness should apply to His flesh if the reasoning of R. Roberts were correct, which proves that he, like current Christadelphians, continually confused the physical quality of the flesh with the spirits teaching and reference to the flesh as meaning the mind of the flesh, and we should discriminate at all time and keep in mind the context when reading the Scriptures, otherwise we simply wrest them to our destruction.

Take a simple example from Romans chapter 8 where Paul is addressing the converts of Rome as being of flesh and blood yet telling them that if they are in Christ and consequently Christ was in them, they were not in the flesh. Was Paul addressing disembodied spirits? Of course not. He was addressing flesh and blood beings who, in figure had died unto sin in baptism and risen to newness of life in Christ - a legal and moral possibility but a physical impossibility. Thus, being "in the flesh" they had been "in Adam" and not now being "in the flesh" were not "in Adam" but "in Christ," no longer "in the flesh" but "in the spirit" for they that are "in the flesh" cannot please God; yet Paul demonstrates that in both states, or relationships, the literal flesh is unchanged.

Let us thank God for His Son who made it possible for those "in Adam" to pass now from "death" to "life" without any physical change of nature and to serve Him as adopted Sons unto the time when they shall be made like unto the Angels, in body, to die no more.

Those who are truly in Christ never have purported to have destroyed the irrepressible 'Adamic Nature' in baptism. That same nature which went under the water came up again out of the water as flesh and blood - a change of Masters but not a change of nature. It is sad to see such unscriptural and foolish doctrines reproduced in print as that of the late Peter Watkins, and it shocked me when I first read his words and I wondered if he had gone over to the Roman Catholic Church. Then I thought, No, it would not be printed in the Christadelphian Magazine if this were so and in any case I was a Christadelphian at the time, but I do not recall reading it then but it is surprising how much can be passed over by a traditional Christadelphian. We should be pleased, not offended, when such error is pointed out. The following is the paragraph referred to in the Christadelphian Magazine, December 1947 and signed P. Watkins:

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

"It is not we that have sinned." Do not all Christadelphians include the "we that have sinned" as themselves when appearing before the Judgment seat of Christ? And do they not also emphatically believe that they stand before Christ's' judgment seat at His coming in the very Adamic nature which they purported to have destroyed in baptism and thus their resurrection is indeed a revival of that same Adamic nature? You

should indeed heartily deplore the fact in view of Paul's statement that the dead in Christ, asleep in him shall be raised incorruptible.

Were not Adam and Eve at their creation blessed of God and told to be fruitful and multiply and replenish (refill) the earth? Could the product of their union be styled "sin" as affirmed by Peter Watkins? Should he not have accepted the scriptural definition of sin as "transgression of God's law" (1 John 3:4) and not resort to the invented 'physical sin compound' of Robert Roberts and the Papacy? Will you still stand before Christ and declare "It is not we that have sinned but the irrepressible Adamic sin nature" defiled so by your Father's sentence in Eden which made sin possible to be transmitted from Adam and Eve to their posterity. Can you not accept that where there is no law there is no transgression? That "by the law is the knowledge of sin" (Romans 3:20) and not by Adamic reproduction and hereditary physical law of the species.

Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away that which God has laid upon Him - not in Him. The sin of the world, the abstract guilt of Adam under which all are concluded on the federal principle. Choose therefore the Lamb of God's description, not man - the Lamb whose life blood releases from sin's bondage and judicial death, into the spiritual adoption of sonship and service towards the promised rest of the people of God. "Put on the whole armour of God that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places, - Ephesians 6:11,12. In these two verses the Christadelphian devil of flesh and blood is slain in the time it takes to read them.

Let us not feast on the leaven of malice and wickedness but on the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. "The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world" (John 6:33). This being so, the world was dead and in need of life. Could Jesus, the bread of God, give life to the world if He were not alive to give it? And could He give a life which was forfeited to transgression as was the case with the world, and did He give His life before resurrection or after? The answer is obvious as He sacrificed nothing after resurrection or He would not now be alive at the right hand of God today. And if cleansing were necessary through death then Christ was an unclean offering, and would never have got as far as the Holy Place, much less through to the Holy of Holies, even heaven itself.

"Behold the Lamb of God" Are you unable to choose your Lamb for the Passover, are you void of understanding? "From the rising of the sun, even to the going down of the same, there shall be offered unto my name a Pure Offering. For my name shall be great among the nations. But cursed be the deceiver who hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing. Should I accept this of your hand, saith the Lord? Count not the blood of the covenant wherewith we are sanctified a common or unclean thing; trample not the Son of God, despise not the spirit of favour. Hebrews 10:29, even denying the purchasing power of the blood of the Lamb of God.

Were the animals constituted sinners through Adam's disobedience? Of course not. The life forfeited to sin was human life by a person under law. The animals were not under this law though a corruptible species like Adam. So then, as the lamb in Eden was free of condemnation physically and legally, it was God's property as Creator, therefore He could say concerning the blood of the animal sacrifices offered by the priests, "I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls." (Leviticus 17:11). So then seeing that the law could make no demand on sinless animals, in like manner it could make no demand on Christ, the antitypical Lamb of God, whose male genealogy started with God and whose life was not reckoned from Adam, and therefore not forfeited to Sin, but who, nevertheless was of the same nature (not of the same ownership) as Adam who had sold himself to Sin by disobedience to God, his former Owner and Master.

It is obvious God could not ransom or buy back from "sin" with coinage that already belonged to "Sin." The coinage or life of Christ was unclaimed through Adamic sin, "wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God... By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." (Hebrews 10:6-10).

When that body was offered up freely for us all it was a living body, not a lifeless corpse as Robert Roberts stated. Furthermore, Jesus offered Himself without fault to God through the eternal spirit before God spared not His only Son but gave Him up freely for us all. Jesus was begotten by and through the eternal spirit so that as a free-born Son of God and remaining so under trial, He was free to give His life, not His character, for the sin of the world. His life was not taken, it was given; no man had the right to take it, none could condemn Him as a sinner and He was not even under the law of sin and death, but He was subject to the law of corruptibility common to all God's creation and could have died a natural death; but judicial death due to Adam was the reason for His birth of Mary, as we have already explained, but such a birth is superfluous and unnecessary to the "unclean Christ and filthy flesh" mongers of the past and present, on their reasoning God could have worked equally as well through any Jew providing he was of the condemned line (their words) of Abraham and David. They contend that "an unredeemed Jew, if he had kept the law in all parts, would have been in the very position of Jesus and it would have been in his power, by dying, to cleanse himself from the Adamic condemnation.

"God will keep no man in the grave if he be individually righteous." This was written by Robert Roberts and it is absolutely contradicted by Dr Thomas, but both are off the mark in regard to the truth. The above is directly opposed to the attributes and revealed will of God in the Scriptures where He declared "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh unto me." (Leviticus 10:3). Those who violated the Mosaic ritual of cleansing died without mercy; not even the High Priest could enter the Holy Place before being cleansed by blood, so it is utter ignorance to talk of a Jew being in the same position as Christ who was the antitypical Cleanser and Way into the Holiest of All. Where was the need for the birth of Jesus of Mary by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit if, as Christadelphians claim, He had to be given superhuman strength to be obedient to the will of God? Could not God have strengthened a Jew of Adamic descent in the same way? Surely you should by now be able to see the difference between the position of a Jew born in the service of Sin's Bondage on account of the disobedience of one man, Adam, and the position of Jesus a Son of God born in the household of God and never anything but a free servant of His Father and never alienated from the life of God through Adam's sin-constitution or personal sin.

Did not Jesus say to those Jews who professed to be Abraham's seed, "If the son therefore shall make you free ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36)? Was not Jesus the Son of God when He made that statement or would you rather believe with Robert Roberts that this was the word of God speaking through a mindless, condemned body of sinful flesh? Does God dwell with the unclean? Can any other than Christ who was One with His Father from birth, ram-stam direct into the Holy of Holies without even wiping their shoes on the doormat?

"It is a marvellous piece of new-born wisdom to say that 'sinful' applies to the character but not to the substance that produces the character,"

again, Robert Roberts in "The Slain Lamb,"

"so then, if there had been a Jew who kept the law in all things and by dying cleansed himself from Adamic condemnation, God would not keep such a man in the grave, being individually righteous in character."

R. Roberts has not only got things in reverse but he also should have accepted his own argument, namely, that 'sinless character' should also apply to the substance that produced it for man is a person not a separate element from the flesh. My understanding of the Genesis account is that if Adam had been individually righteous there would have been no grave in which to keep him; he need not have died but if he had, it would not have been judicial death but the result of his corruptible nature not being changed to the incorruptible. This is the position in which Jesus found Himself as the "New man," the second Federal Head, the beginning of a new creation, who was the individually righteous, unadopted Son of God, who sacrificed His natural life by partaking, or tasting, the death due to Adam's sin which was judicial and inflicted by blood-shedding; hence the Lamb of God, without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. If Adam had suffered the penalty due, we would not have been here; if Jesus had not suffered the penalty due to Adam, though we may be here, we would be without hope. "I am the way, the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the father but by me," said Jesus. (John 14:6). How then does this conjured up Jew of R. Roberts get into the fold? Jesus said, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but

climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep, to him the porter openeth, and the sheep hear his voice, a stranger will they not follow; for they know not the voice of strangers.”

Reject therefore the “strange fire” offered up by Robert Roberts and his followers and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls. Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, “Behold the Lamb of God,” “I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly John 10:10). Reconciliation first, then service to God by a restored probation through Christ. R.Roberts and company have never understood Romans 5; they have, as a community, left it too late but there is still hope for individuals to re-examine their position if they are prepared to exercise humility and discard their bias toward ‘sinful flesh,’ condemned nature,’ and an ‘unclean Christ.’ Let then read and believe with us 2 Corinthians 5:14 to 21, and whatsoever Jesus was made for us in verse 21, we are made the opposite. By faith the children of Israel passed through the Dead Sea as by dry land; because their motive was the promised inheritance. The Egyptians assaying to do the same for a different motive were drowned. As with baptism today, the effect is the same. The one party shows by understanding and faith the reason for such a ritual and commences the journey to the promised inheritance in Christ on emergence therefrom, but the other party, though performing the same ritual is without true knowledge and understanding of its purpose and consequently abides in death; therefore no inheritance in Christ.

“Whatsoever was written aforetime was written for our admonition and learning that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.” Romans 15:4. The lessons of the journeyings of Israel were also written for us, which is proof that God desires to help us if we trust and serve Him as adopted sons, and the reward of faith is at the end of our journey even the prize for the high calling of God in Christ Jesus who also for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, and that joy was being able to see His bride, taken from His side and presented to Him a glorious ecclesia. Ephesians 5:27 to 32.

As we read Peters first epistle, chapter 1, let us take to heart his expressions of the spirit word and as a result gird up the loins of our mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ, as obedient children, not those who say it is impossible. “Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us” (1 Corinthians 5:7); redeemed by his precious blood (1 Peter 1:19); “Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word.” (1 Peter 2:7-8).

We brethren and sisters, stumble not at the word, we believe the record God gave of His Son and the witness we have in ourselves, which is the Spirit of Truth. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son; he that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not, life. (1 John 5).

We read nothing in Hebrews 11 to warrant that list of faithful ones standing before a judicial inquisition in the presence of Christ and the Angels of God. They have all obtained a good report through faith and their pilgrimage was made possible through the slain Lamb of God and in due time will receive the promised inheritance and perfection, for the which we also are journeying by and through the same faith.

“Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us (a possibility now), and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.”

**[Footnote:** The clue to the whole matter resulting from Adam’s sin is God’s foreknowledge and predestination, allowing for enlightenment, belief, faith and obedience on the basis of free-will on the part of the individual. Predestination does not mean we cannot fail but that we have not failed our calling and election.]

Brother P. Parry (October 1982).

We are grateful to Brother Eric Cave for sending the following extract from

## “Exploring Bible Language”

by Alan and Margaret Fowler,

(Ortho Books, High View, Litchard Rise, Bridgend, CF31 1QJ. U.K.

**Page 58:-** One wonders whether those who postulate a deathless world before the fall have given serious thought to the radical changes required by this theory. Our world is not just a vegetarian world into which God has introduced some wild beasts such as wolves and lions! The whole ecology and balance of nature is based on a complex web of food chains so that it is true to say that new life arises from death. Food chains are essential for life on earth for two reasons:

1. All plants and animals reproduce by producing far more seeds, eggs or offspring than are needed, so that a balance between species can only be maintained by the elimination of the excess by death at various stages of development.
2. Food chains recycle the earth's resources. For example, the excreta of birds that follow the plough give back to the soil grubs (beetles, centipedes, etc) which have fed on protozoa and minute worms (enchytraeids) which have fed on bacteria and fungi which have fed on decaying plant life.

Anyone familiar with the biosphere and the operation of 'food chains' will know that the theory that sin brought animal death would necessitate a completely new creation after the fall. We have no evidence for this new creation in Genesis 3, nor do we have any evidence of a deathless creation in the fossil record.

Relevant to the question of death before the fall is Genesis 1:30 which reads, "And to every beast of the earth, and to every bird of the air, and to everything that creeps on the earth, everything that hath the breath of life, I have given every green plant for food."

This verse is often thought to teach that the original creation was deathless and entirely vegetarian. But there is another interpretation which reveals a fundamental truth about life on earth. In the oceans the basis of life is phytoplankton which consists of countless billions of free-floating minute photosynthesising plants. These are eaten by minute animals called zooplankton and both kinds of plankton provide the food for all marine life. On the land, vegetation (photosynthesising plants) provides the food for all terrestrial animals except those that live by fishing. So when a lion eats a deer it is consuming vegetation that has been processed in the stomach of the deer. *It will therefore be evident that the basis of all life on earth, whether on land, in sea or air, is plant life which derives its energy from the sun.* Thus Genesis 1:30 is expressing a profound biological truth - That all life depends on green plants. The essential lesson of Genesis 1:29, 30 is surely that God has made the natural world self-sustaining.

Of course we do not deny that God could have redesigned and recreated the living world as often as He wished. But in the absence of any compelling Biblical or scientific evidence, are we not justified in asking whether God would have inflicted disease and death on the whole animal kingdom because of Adam's sin?

**Augustinian 'original sin'**. Augustine went much further. He taught that the sin of Adam and Eve alone brought death and disease and physical and moral depravity to all mankind. This view is difficult to reconcile with God's declared principles of justice.

A fundamental principle is that God does -not punish men because of the sins of others. So important is this principle that a whole chapter (Ezekiel 18) is devoted to it; we read in verse 20:

"The soul who sins shall die. The son shall not bear the guilt of the father, nor the father bear the guilt of the son."

This principle was clearly stated in the Law of Moses and was the reason why Amaziah did not slay the sons of his father's murderers (2 Chronicles 25:4).

"The fathers shall not be put to death for their children, nor shall the children be put to death for the fathers; a person shall be put to death for his own sin," (Deuteronomy 24:16).

If God does not punish children because of the sins of their parents then would He have condemned all mankind because of one man's sin?

**'In Adam' and 'In Christ'**. To answer this question we need to look at the second half of Romans 5 because this is used to support the Augustinian teaching that our mortality and depravity are the result of Adam's sin alone. In verse 14 Paul says that Adam was a type of Christ and he then draws six contrasts between Adam and Christ which are summarized as follows:-

15. By one man's offence many died.  
-by one man, Jesus Christ, many receive grace.
16. Judgment from one brought condemnation  
-the free gift brought justification.
17. By one man's offence death reigned  
-through one (Jesus Christ) the gift of righteousness reigns.
18. Through one man's sin all are condemned  
-through one man's righteousness all are justified.
19. By one man's disobedience many were made sinners  
-by one man's obedience many will be made righteous.
21. Sin reigned unto death  
-grace reigned to eternal life.

These verses appear to teach that just as Adam brought death to all men so Jesus brings life to all. But Jesus made it clear that He only brings salvation to those who believe in Him (Mark 16:16, John 14:6). So Paul's words are elliptical, the contrast is between Jesus who brings life to all who follow Him and Adam who introduced death as a penalty for all who sin. Looking again at verse 12, which introduces this section of Romans 5, it is clear that Paul accepted that all men die because all men are sinners.

Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned.' (Romans 5:12).

When Adam sinned he suffered the consequences - he was expelled from Eden and deprived of the tree of life. Like Adam "We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God." For this reason the tree of life is still barred and remains out of reach until Eden is restored (Revelation 22:2). Adam was the first sinner and as a result the tree of life was barred but when Adam passed off the scene the cherubim remained at the gate of Eden to guard the tree of life because all have sinned, Adam is the archetype of all men, we each repeat the history of Eden and we each receive the 'wages of sin' which is death (Romans 6:23). We are paid for what we do, we all sin, so we all die.

Just as Adam is the archetype of the 'old man' so Jesus Christ is the archetype of the new man, Jesus reverses Edenic history. He conquered temptation and by living a sinless life had the right to eat of the tree of life. So Paul wrote, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." This statement is elliptical, Paul could mean that because we all follow in the way of sinful Adam we all die, but all those who follow in the way of Christ will receive the gift of everlasting life.

A casual reading of Romans 5:13, 14 might appear to support the Augustinian theory that Adam's sin brought death by contaminating the whole race:-

"For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is a figure of him that was to come."

However, these verses cannot contradict the plain statement in the previous verse which teaches that all men die because all have sinned. Adam died because he was denied access to the tree of life. But Adam was not responsible for the fact that the tree of life remains barred to all mankind. It remains barred because we all sin, even though we do not sin after the same manner as Adam.

As Paul affirms in Romans 3:9, 10 all men are “under sin,” “there is none righteous no, not one.” Sin is the sting of death (1 Corinthians 15:56), “And so death passed upon all men because all sinned.” (Romans 5:12). Immortality is the gift of God (Romans 2:7) which will be bestowed at the second coming of Jesus, when He will grant access to the apocalyptic tree of life which bears twelve fruits (Revelation 22:2).

The problems imposed by the Augustinian doctrine of original sin have been the cause of much heart searching - so much so that one commentator on Romans 5 wrote, “Unquestionably the mystery of the effects of the fall is extremely great and painful” (H.C.G.Moule, “Epistle to the Romans,” Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. 1889, page 104). We suggest that if we accept the effect of the fall was simply to deprive Adam of access to the tree of life, then the painful doctrine of original sin will disappear. There is no need to postulate a change in man’s human nature as a result of Adam’s sin. Deprived of the tree of life, Adam’s nature reverted to its original corruptible state. We inherit Adam’s corruptible nature and since we all sin, we too have no access to the tree of life. We are not condemned because of Adam’s sin but because we follow his example.

This interpretation of the fall in Eden provides us with an alternative understanding of the so-called ‘defilement’ of the human race as a consequence of sin. It explains our nature as being the result of a loss of privilege rather than a positive change in our make-up.

**But both views reach the same conclusion which is far more important: we are all sinners and we are all in need of salvation from death.**

\* \* \*

### **Comments arising from the above:**

In the first part of this extract from “exploring Bible Language” by Brother and Sister Fowler show that natural life and death existed from the time of creation as it does today through a balance between all species living and dying in a worldwide system of ecology and concludes that there is no evidence whatsoever, neither from fossil records nor from Bible teaching, for a deathless world before Adam’s fall

The next part shows the ‘original sin’ doctrine formulated by Augustine for the Roman Catholic church to be against Scripture teaching in that God does not punish anyone for the sin of another - “The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, nor shall the father bear the iniquity of the son.” Ezekiel 18:20. Again, “The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin” (Deuteronomy 24:16).

The reference to Romans 5 is apposite in as much as Paul shows contrasts between Adam and Jesus Christ as the two Heads under which we either die or live; because we are concluded or constituted under one or the other, we call them Federal Heads.

The writers claim Paul’s words in Romans 5:12 to be elliptical, that is to say, Paul’s words need something added which, because, not being stated, it is implied. Indeed, three times in this extract do the writers use the word “elliptical” and all these I challenge. The problem here arises from a misunderstanding of Paul’s teaching, for we must distinguish between natural death and judicial death. Natural death is not a punishment but is a result or consequence of having been born - as the writers have acknowledged, “balance between species can only be maintained by the elimination of the excess by death at various stages of development.” In this respect man has no pre-eminence above the beasts, as one dieth so dieth the other (Ecclesiastes 3:9).

Under the Law given to Moses, when someone committed a crime worthy of death he received the due penalty by being put to death. Such a course of action carried out God's instructions - a "man shall be put to death for his own sin" - Deuteronomy 24:16. Let us also bear in mind that under the Law of Moses, when an animal was put to death for someone's sins, that person did not die; that is to say they were not put to death for their sin, although of course they died eventually, but their continuation of life was spared by Grace.

When we read in Romans 5:12 that "as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin," it should be understood that Paul was talking of the putting to death for sin, so we ought not to switch the meaning by saying Paul was talking about natural death. He was not. "Death by sin" cannot be natural death but it was the due penalty incurred by sin, which is judicial death, a matter of law. But the writers go on to say "we each repeat the history of Eden and we each receive the "wages of sin" which is death (Romans 6:23). We are paid for what we do, we all sin, so we all die." But this is not so and we should be very thankful for the grace of God in this matter. The previous verse, Romans 6:22, tells us, "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." **The faithful, "being made free from sin," do not receive the wages of sin.** And why not? Because Christ has forgiven them and so their sins are taken away. Romans 11:27. God is not so unfair as to forgive sins and then require sentence to be served. Also Hebrews 9:26 - "But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Jesus allowed Himself to be put to death that He may take away our sins; Galatians 3:13, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us."

I maintain therefore that if natural death was the penalty for sin then there was no point in Jesus Christ giving Himself as a sacrifice for sin.

If the above comments regarding verse 12 are accepted then the writers observations regarding verses 14 to 21 are also brought into question.

Throughout chapter 5 Paul uses the word "zoe" for "life," which is the life given of God to those in Christ, so the teaching and context of Paul in this chapter is of eternal life for those reconciled to God through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, so when in verse 18 we read of justification for all men it is obvious from the context that it refers to all men in Christ. "Zoe" is not given to those 'in Adam.'

Another thought - since Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden of Eden and deprived of the tree of life - is the tree of life therefore still barred? No. "I am the way, the truth and the life." said Jesus, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." Does not this make Jesus "the Tree of Life" for those in Him? Those "in Adam" do not have access to the tree of life because of Adam's disobedience and all his offspring are born into the same position; but all who come out of Adam and choose to be in Christ have access to the Tree of Life because of Christ's perfect obedience. This is the way Jesus "reversed Edenic history."

The concluding remarks of Brother and Sister Fowler need some comment,

1 "There is no need to postulate a change in man's human nature as a result of Adam's sin"

**Comment** - Agreed.

2. "Deprived of the tree of life, Adam's nature reverted to its original corruptible state."

**Comment** - This is an unnecessary assumption as there is no evidence that Adam's original corruptible state was put on hold. Adam's nature was created corruptible and remained so.

3. "...and since we all sin, we too have no access to the tree of life."

**Comment** - Again, not so. We have access to the Tree of Life through Jesus Christ. Indeed He is our Tree of Life

4, "We are not condemned because of Adam's sin but because we follow his example."

**Comment** - This is not so. We are all concluded under sin until we become 'in Christ' and the reason for this is given us by Paul in Galatians 3:2, "But the scriptures hath concluded all under sin that the promise by faith of Jesus might be given to them that

believe.” All who stay ‘in Adam’ remain concluded under sin but all who are Christ’s through baptism into His sacrificial death, are no longer ‘in Adam’ and “therefore there is no condemnation” for them (Romans 8:1).

In conclusion the doctrine of original sin either as formulated by Augustine around 400 AD or as formulated by Robert Roberts in the Birmingham Statement of Faith around 1875 are unfounded and are merely the product of man’s imagining. While the interpretation of the fall in Eden as given by Brother and Sister Fowler is an alternative understanding to the usual Christadelphian teaching and in some ways an improvement upon it, and so perhaps a little more acceptable in that it rules out Clause 5 of the BASF, it has much further to go before being compatible with Scripture teaching.

“For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead. And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.” 2 Corinthians 5:14,15.

From this we learn that Jesus’ death by crucifixion enables those who will to come out of Adam, the one Federal head and be counted worthy of eternal life by being born again by baptism and so coming under the other Federal Head, Jesus Christ. Having been baptized into His death we no longer live unto ourselves but unto Jesus who died for us.

Brother Russell Gregory

---

## **Did You Say OK?**

Billy Graham’s daughter was being interviewed on the Early Show and Jane Clayton asked her “How could God let something like this happen? And Anne Graham gave an extremely profound and insightful response. She said, “I believe that God is deeply saddened by this, just as we are, but for years we’ve been telling God to get out of our schools, to get out of our government and to get out of our lives. And being the gentleman that He is, I believe that He has calmly backed out. How can we expect God to give us His blessing and His protection if we demand that He leaves us alone?”

I know there’s been a lot of e-mails going around in regards to Sept.11/01 but this really makes you think. If you don’t have time, at least skim through it, but the bottom line is something to think about.

In light of recent events... terrorists attack, school shootings, etc. Let’s see, I think it started when Madeline Murray O’Hare (she was murdered, her body was found recently) complained she didn’t want any prayer in our schools, and we said, OK. Then someone said you better not read the Bible in school... the Bible that says, Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, and love thy neighbour as thyself. And we said, OK.

Then Dr Benjamin Spock said we shouldn’t spank our children when they misbehave because their little personalities would be warped and we might damage their self-esteem (Dr Spock’s son committed suicide). And we said, an expert should know what he’s talking about, so we said, OK.

Then someone said teachers and principals better not discipline our children when they misbehave. And the school administrators said no faculty member in this school better touch a student when they misbehave because we don’t want any bad publicity and we surely don’t want to be sued (there’ a big difference between disciplining and touching, beating, smacking, humiliating, kicking, etc.), and we said, OK.

Then someone said, Let’s let our daughters have abortions if they want, and they won’t even have to tell their parents. And we said, OK. Then some wise school board members said, Since boys will be boys and they’re going to do it anyway, let’s give our sons all the condoms they want, so they can have all the fun they desire and we won’t have to tell their parents they got them at school. And we said, OK.

Then some of our top elected officials said it doesn't matter what we do in private as long as we do our jobs. And agreeing with them we said it doesn't matter to me what anyone, including the President, does in private as long as I have a job and the economy is good.

And then someone said, Let's print magazines with pictures of nude women, call it wholesome, down-to-earth appreciation for the beauty of the female body. And we said, OK. And then someone else took that appreciation a step further and published pictures of nude children, and then stepped further still by making them available on the internet. And we said, OK, they're entitled to their free speech.

And then the entertainment industry said, let's make TV shows and movies that promote profanity, violence and illicit sex. And let's record music that encourages rape, drugs, murder, suicide and satanic themes. And we said it's just entertainment; it has no adverse effect and nobody takes it seriously anyway, so go right ahead.

Now we're asking ourselves why our children have no conscience, why they don't know right from wrong, and why it doesn't bother them to kill strangers, their classmates and themselves. Probably, if we think about it long and hard enough, we can figure it out. I think it has a great deal to do with "WE REAP WHAT WE SOW."

"Dear God, Why didn't you save the little girl killed in her classroom? Sincerely, Concerned student."  
And the reply "Dear Concerned Student, I am not allowed in schools. Sincerely, God."

Funny how simple it is for people to trash God and then wonder why the world's going to hell. Funny how we believe what the newspapers say but question what the Bible says. Funny how everyone wants to go to heaven provided they do not have to believe, think, say or do anything the Bible says. Funny how we are quick to judge but not to be judged.

Funny how we can send a thousand 'jokes' through e-mail and they spread like wildfire, but when you start sending messages regarding the Lord, people think twice about sharing. Funny how the lewd, crude, vulgar and obscene pass freely through cyberspace, but the public discussion of God is suppressed in the school and workplace. Funny how someone can be so fired up for Christ on Sunday, but be an invisible Christian the rest of the week.

Are you laughing?

Funny how when you go to forward this message you will not send it to many on your address list because you're not sure what they believe or what they will think of you for sending it to them. Funny how I can be more worried about what other people think of me than what God thinks of me.

Are you thinking?

Pass it on if you think it has merit. If not, then just discard it... no one will know that you did. But if you discard this thought process, then don't sit back and complain about what a bad shape the world is in!

Ann Lawton-Bending. November 11, 2001

[http://www.ioa.com/~'belleek/bendmg3\(a\)horne.com](http://www.ioa.com/~'belleek/bendmg3(a)horne.com)

---

## **Ezekiel's Temple Vision**

While my thoughts were on the "Temple Vision" of Ezekiel being an actual measurement of the one to replace that which Solomon built and to include the laws and rituals of the former under the Mosaic covenant, I could not accept it could be any other than that. Then I thought of Paul's epistle to the Galatians who could have been Jewish converts to Christ through the gospel preached to them and were being seduced

by certain ones to return to the works of the Law. Paul explains, “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?”

It is evident that these particular Galatian believers were not present at the literal crucifixion of Jesus. What then is the lesson Paul is driving at? It is plain that they had believed the Gospel of salvation through Christ and justification in His name and not by the works of the Law, for as Paul realised himself, the Law was not of faith and they had not received the Spirit by the works of the Law. “He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Even as Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.”

Jesus said, “Think ye not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil.” And He also said, “Not one jot or title of the law shall fail till all be fulfilled.” This then had been Paul’s motive of preaching, namely to set before the eyes of their understanding the reason for Jesus being crucified on the tree of Calvary, the law had been fulfilled in Him, to return to it would profit nothing. The blotting out of the handwriting of ordinances that was against those under the Mosaic law, if returned to, would be a negative step and a rejection of faith which cometh by love (Colossians 2:14).

These very handwritings of ordinances were shown to Ezekiel in his vision of a Temple non-existent at the time but would be built on the same lines as that of Solomon’s, it is also to be noted in its functions a governing law, which indicates bondage. (See Ezekiel 43:12).

One only has to see from Hebrews 7:11 that Ezekiel’s vision and description was of a Levitical order of priests whose actions were governed by law, and by reading the rest of the chapter the contrast is seen with this old covenant procedure and that of Jesus by the new covenant instituted by His own sacrificial blood; “If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.” So if as Paul says “the Mosaic law is not of faith and Christ is the end of the law,” then the law that shall go forth of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, this law and word must require faith in its acceptance by those who hear it.

I personally believe this will result in the preaching again of the everlasting Gospel which will be “Jesus Christ set forth crucified among you” and yet alive and visible for confirmation of His sacrificial mission, not another Gospel, for says Paul, “I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” (Galatians 1:8-12). This Gospel was so important that any who preached a perversion of it should be accursed according to Paul’s view, and what did his Gospel begin with to the Corinthians? “For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.” (1 Corinthians 15:3). This being so there can only be one explanation of how and why Christ died and that is according to the Scriptures, not some perverse reason derived and invented as a result of the false theory of Adamic flesh having been condemned and changed as a result of sin. “And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints.”

Thus the created Adamic flesh not having been changed, and proved by the spirits in the prophets, and by not believing false prophets, true belief and confession is made by that spirit, that Jesus came in the flesh which God created in the beginning. Any that believe or teach that Jesus came in a flesh that had been condemned and also changed as a result of Adam’s sin are of the spirit of antichrist. (See 1 Corinthians 14:32, 33 also 1 John. 4:1-3).

If people would endeavour to remove this bias of sinful and condemned flesh from their minds, what a great wealth of spiritual wisdom is open to them in the reading of the epistles, especially where they deal with the Mosaic Tabernacle and successive Temples after the same pattern! The epistle to the Hebrews is most profitable and enlightening if read properly and effectively, which some fail to do by comparing Jesus with Aaron, as with Hebrews 5:1-4, and 7:27. Jesus was of the tribe of Juda according to flesh but a Son of God by begettal; Aaron was neither. Jesus could not be a priest on earth nor of the tribe of Levi, nor could

He offer as did Aaron for his own sins and then for the people; he had no sins to offer for, therefore it is wrong to manipulate the Scriptures to fit the false theory that in the absence of personally committed sin, Jesus offered for His condemned nature.

Even under the priesthood of the old covenant God would regard such an unclean animal offered by the priest as sacrilegious and worthy of judicial death, not being typical of the Lamb of God, slain, not on account of a nature of sin, but to take away the sin of the world. It was essential that the priest should understand this important ritual.

The animal was a substitute for the time present until the substance it foreshadowed should appear and eventually be slain, thus removing its purpose and weakness in being unable to take away sin, Edenic, and sins, Mosaic, both these points should be clearly understood.

From Adam to Moses was the Edenic constitution of faith in the acknowledgement of redemption from under the law of sin and death, freewill offerings being made mainly by animals slain in gratitude and thanksgiving to the Creator for His Grace and provision in allowing these rituals.

Under the Edenic dispensation, Noah exhibited faith when he and his family went forth out of the Ark. "And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And the Lord smelt a sweet savour" (Genesis 8:19-21). Such was the difference in offering by faith and offering by compulsion under the Mosaic Law which was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made" (Galatians 3:19).

"In burnt offering and sacrifices for sin thou hast no pleasure (which are offered by the Law). Then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will O God. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."

If therefore the blood of bulls and goats.... sprinkling the legally unclean, were typical of the sanctifying and purifying of the conscience, how much more shall the blood of Christ purge the conscience from dead works (unjustified by the Law) to serve in newness of life, the living God? And for this cause he is the Mediator of the new covenant, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant (Isaiah 53), they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth (Hebrews 9).

I therefore maintain that Jesus was the mediator of the everlasting covenant which involved all of faith from Adam to Calvary. Read Galatians 3:17 to 29 as confirmation that if the Temple of Ezekiel's vision is yet future, apart from the living waters of Spirit and Trees of healing (he that readeth let him understand), then Paul's statement or implication that it was faulty must be opposed! That his statement that Jesus by His death blotted out the handwriting of the ordinances Ezekiel saw in his vision nailing them to Calvary's Tree, and in the context of all Paul declares in Colossians chapter 2 must be ignored and a return advocated to that which would have to be ratified by the death of Jesus the Testator who now has no blood to shed!

Modern day saints in Christ celebrate His sacrificial death in retrospect, yes, but through the symbols of the Bread and Wine, those of His body and blood, not the blood or bodies of animals- Yet not having been under the Law of Moses they understand why He was born of a virgin, His mission and death; because it is taught and revealed in the Old Testament Scriptures and the New, which John confirms in the following words, 1 John 2:21 and 27: "I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth... But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you: ye shall abide in him."

I believe I have rightly divided the Word of Truth on this subject of Ezekiel's Temple vision. Some of you will have had access to previous Nazarene Circular Letters dealing more fully with the subject, so hopefully you will understand and observe the points I have raised. I think it has been wrong to presume Ezekiel's vision concerned a Temple plan for the time of Christ's second advent when it seems more likely

the plans and ritualistic matters of the Solomon Temple could have been lost through Israel's captivity in Babylon and the rebuilding required these and were given to Ezekiel for that purpose.

There are reports that some Jews in Israel are intending to build a Temple, but what of the plans and patterns? If Mosaic, then as I have said, these types will be of no value while the Testator liveth which is the antitype Jesus, who cannot die anymore.

Brother Phil Parry

---

**We thank Eric Cave for the following excerpt from a book by A. R. Wilson which was first published in 1985:**

## **The History of the Christadelphians (1864-1885)**

### **The Emergence of a Denomination**

**By A. R. Wilson. BA. MA. ARHistS.**

The above volume is a 600 page illustrated and authoritative history of the emergence of the community known as Christadelphians; it also contains information regarding the various splits and defections from that community in its formative years. It includes the following notes of the dispute between Robert Roberts (the editor of the magazine "The Christadelphian" and Edward Turney, resulting in the separation of what Roberts termed the "Renunciationists" now known as the Nazarene Fellowship.

Page 135. "In the late 1860's Dr Thomas commanded a unique degree of respect, even reverence, within Christadelphianism... Energetic strides towards maturity were being made by a number of younger brethren, led by Roberts. One of these young men, Edward Turney, made sufficient strides to attract the excitement and complaint of the Bishop of Lincoln. However, in an exchange of views in the pages of the Nottingham Journal, Turney gained the support of a number of correspondents, including the Journal's editor."

Page 138. "Following the conversion in 1870 of the Baptist local preacher John Martin further excitement was generated by the printing in the Christadelphian, by Roberts of correspondence between an ex Methodist lay preacher and Edward Turney, who live in Nottingham. Turney in years to come proved a formidable opponent in debate and was for a time a great asset to the Christadelphian movement."

17 Page 141-145. "However this stabilization had only just been effected when Renunciationism, based in Nottingham and piloted by Edward Turney and David Handley, burst upon the scene, producing waves of turbulence. In his pamphlet The Sacrifice of Christ (transcribed from a very long lecture delivered by Turney 28th August 1873 in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham), Turney quoted from a letter written by Handley to Roberts in 1871 which he said was clearly accepted by the editor (R.R.) after he had six months to consider the matter. In this letter Handley summarized his position as follows:-

"Here I think we see the wisdom of God in redemption, a body in OUR NATURE, a LIFE INDEPENDENT of our race; the LIFE of the Flesh is GIVEN for the Life of the world, here is what men of business call twenty shillings to the pound. But again I say, there could be no virtue in the giving up of his LIFE if he was a MERE man, or if he had derived his life in any way from the SEED of Adam, for all who DERIVED Life from Adam, LOST it, for in him All Sinned. But Christ in Our Flesh could suffer the penalty and then REDEEM his brethren., for he had never forfeited his Life by personal transgression, and his life being independent of the race, he could GIVE for a RANSOM. To me this appears clear, while no man could give to God a Ransom for his BROTHER, the Son of God, who was bone of our bone and Flesh of our Flesh,

could, having the Price of Redemption in his own POWER. You will see from these few lines what I wish to convey to the brethren. If you think the letter worthy of insertion in the Christadelphian, use it, if not, refuse it. My house all joins you in love to thee, and to thine house, and the household of faith.”

Farewell. David Handley. Maldon.

It has been argued that Turney’s assessment of Robert’s 1871 position was quite wrong, that Handley’s views of 1871 were only ‘embryonic’, and that it was not until Edward Turney took up Handley’s views in 1873 that the full implications were worked out. Whichever school of thought is correct, it is the case that, whilst Robert Roberts took no action against Handley in 1871, he acted with speed and resolution in 1873. He delivered a sixteen thousand word lecture in reply to it the evening following Turney’s lecture, and, during the four months August to November 1873 reprinted in The Christadelphian many letters from ecclesias throughout the country supporting his position.

In the August issue of the magazine remarks made on the subject by Dr Thomas (who died in 1871) in nine separate publications were cited by Roberts to bolster his own position; in October he published a series of 85 objections to the Renunciationists views and in the 48 page long October issue there was scarcely a page which did not allude to the folly of Edward Turney’s views - even Dr Thomas was not given space in print in that issue - a fact for which Robert Roberts apologised:

“For the first time since the death of Dr Thomas, we appear without a contribution from his pen. This is not the result of intention, but of a demand upon our space which six months ago we little anticipated could arise. We continue in this number of The Christadelphian the fight for the truth, inaugurated in previous numbers. Thanks be to God, necessity will not call for much further exertion in the battle, at first a treacherous and successful surprise from within the camp, is fast turning into a rout of the cover loving foe, whose overthrow will more than ever strengthen the standard of King Truth though attended with present pain and disadvantage. We deplore the mischief to them and to the truth, but the bitterness of death is past. We have learnt that evil is sometimes the most powerful agency of good.”

How speedy this rout would be Turney had no means of knowing, but Roberts had clearly decided that after seven years of combating Dowieism that the long grind of national tours, persuading ecclesias at the individual member level was too exhausting. He now appealed over the heads of the ‘managing brethren’ to the members by post:

“I find it necessary to address you from retirement forced upon me by the weakness of this sin-stricken body... this is no matter for the managing brethren, whose duties are confined to the working affairs of the ecclesias as established on the truth. They have no jurisdiction in questions affecting the constitution of the ecclesia itself... Nor is it a matter to be dealt with between brother and brother... My request is, that if you agree with me, you will sign and return the declaration which you will find at the end of this letter. Addressed to me at the Athenaeum Rooms it will reach me in my retirement. And on my return I will ask you to meet me at the Athenaeum Rooms, on Thursday night, Oct. 30th that our united declaration may be promulgated, and that we may take such further steps as may be called for, after which it will be necessary to redraw ecclesial roll, that we may know who thereafter constitute the Birmingham ecclesia on the basis of unadulterated truth.”

Roberts’s declaration on the ‘Clean Flesh’ or ‘Renunciationst’ heresy was as follows: -

### **DECLARATION**

“I do not agree with the doctrine concerning Christ which has emanated from Nottingham, in the tract entitled “Thirty-two Questions” and otherwise, within the last

three months. On the contrary I believe that Jesus, in the days of his flesh, was a manifestation of God, in the mortal nature of David, and therefore, inheriting in his flesh, equally with ourselves, the mortal effects of descent from Adam, from which, by the Father's power, he was himself delivered by obedience, death, and resurrection, and is now the deliverer of all who truly come unto God by him. I hereby withdraw from all who do not believe this."

*By this action, Roberts established a precedent for dealing with doctrinal dissidence. As he indicated at the beginning of the letter in the November Christadelphian it was a course of action forced upon him by pressure of work on a mortal frame. These pressures built up on future occasions notably in 1885, when he adopted a similar tactic in dealing with Robert Ashcroft and the "Partial Inspiration" controversy. However, stirring deep in the sensitivities of Roberts' brethren was the impression that this type of action was altogether too summary and abrupt amongst a congregation of brethren. In 1885, many Christadelphians reacted to a repetition of Roberts' conduct of 1873 by forming an entirely new sub-sect known as the Suffolk Street fellowship.*

Page 161. "The death of Edward Turney on 18th March 1879, by robbing Renunciationists of their greatest champion only served to move more of them nearer to Christadelphian orthodoxy again.

Page 186. Under a photograph of Edward Turney entitled c1820-1879, the caption reads:

"Editor of the "Christian Lamp" (Previously known as "The Christadelphian Lamp") Turney died suddenly in March 1879, though his health was impaired for much of his later years. Of his death Robert Roberts wrote: "It is with sincere sadness that we record the death of Edward Turney. His last days have been made desolate by isolation. He was separated from the people who adopted his views in Nottingham, severed from the magazine he started, and estranged from his relations in business. There were some who did not give up hope that, sooner or later, he would relent and return to his former fellowship, and co-operation in the gospel. But he has chosen to leave the adjudication with Christ."

"The Christadelphian" 1879 pp 176-177.

Pp 343-345 'Clean Flesh' Theory or 'Renunciationism'

In 1873 a schism occurred over what came to be known as the 'Clean Flesh' or 'Renunciationism' view. The two leaders of this movement, as in the case of the Inspiration Division in 1885 had both previously been important individuals in other denominations - Edward Turney amongst the Methodists, and David Handley amongst a small group of evangelical Christians, not dissimilar to the Baptists, known as the 'Peculiar People.'

Turney's and Handley's view was that if Jesus Christ was to have been a 'ransom for all' that must have implied that his own nature was not stained by the Adamic curse. He died not as an exemplar, but as a substitute to satisfy the requirements of a divine equation that necessitated the sacrifice of a perfect, unstained 'free life' to balance out the effects of "Sin."

The traditional view of Christadelphians had been that Christ, like a High Priest under the Law of Moses, sacrificed first for himself, then for the people - not that he had committed actual sin, but that being human, he carried potential in his nature - and that Christ died as an example to his followers both of how to follow God's commands, and of what the weakness of human nature merited, namely annihilation.

This controversy was not 'argued out' into its fine doctrinal ramifications, but summarily dealt with by Roberts by the 'Postcard method.' The result of this was that, whilst Christadelphians knew this was a sensitive issue, and tended to keep clear of it for that reason, **no-one had actually won the argument** about the nature of Christ. Thus, this issue remained beneath the surface as a potential threat. It reappeared during the 1950's with Ernest Brady - part of whose platform was that Edward Turney had never actually been proved wrong.

The analogy with the problem of statehood detected by political scientists is difficult to avoid. How can a war end, without a real victory? There was no real victory on this issue within Christadelphia, and the problem dragged on. Brady also contended that the argument from Hebrews 7:27 about the High Priest offering first for himself, then for the people, and the deduction that therefore Christ's nature was tainted, was invalid because in Hebrews 13:11-13, Christ was equated to a sacrificial animal which did not die for its own sins, but for the sins of others.

As in the case of Chas Dealtry, Robert Roberts treatment of the disaffected minority was such as to guarantee a hardening of attitudes between the two groups. There could be no doubt that, of the two leaders of the Renunciationists, Edward Turney was the more strong minded, because two years after Turney's death in 1879, David Handley recanted and the Renunciationist movement collapsed. Yet two years before Turney's death, the Renunciationists held out an olive branch to the Central fellowship. This was met with a frosty and negative reception from Roberts. "If they have changed their minds... there is no difficulty whatever in the way of the reunion they ask for. If they have not changed their minds, the proposal is inexplicable." There was in this response no joy, no proposal of Roberts of a meeting to discuss any outstanding differences so that a brotherly affection could be restored - merely cold indifference and a distinct 'us' and 'them' emphasis.

[Footnote: According to the two magazines, 68 individuals and one large family were influenced by Renunciationism in the period. Of these 62 returned to the Central fellowship and six remained permanently disfellowshipped. The family concerned was mentioned especially since it was the family of David Handley].

A.R.Wilson

\* \* \*

### **Comment on above:**

It was interesting to read these extracts and it is abundantly clear Brother Andrew has done a thorough job of researching Christadelphian history and presented the facts fairly. Not having read any more than these few extracts it is impossible for me to comment on the rest of the thesis, however, one may expect this to be a worthwhile book for those wanting to know some of the Christadelphian background.

There are just a few points on which I would like to comment, the first regarding Edward Turney's age. The writer says (page 135) "Energetic strides towards maturity were being made by a number of younger brethren, led by Roberts. One of these young men, Edward Turney..." I would have thought he was past being a young man and somewhat older than Robert Roberts. I notice in the obituary, Roberts gives Turney's birth as around 1820 so that he was around 51 at the time of Dr Thomas's death and 59 when he died eight years later. I have always thought of him as being nearer Dr Thomas's age. This is not of course an important matter but does any reader have any certain knowledge of Edward Turney's birth date?

David Handley's letter to Robert Roberts in 1871 gives a succinct outline of our beliefs but it contains two words- "MERE man" which I feel would be better expressed as "son of Adam." It would then read "...there could be no virtue in the giving up of his LIFE if he was a son of Adam." This letter is more than 'embryonic;' it is a surprisingly clear and comprehensive understanding of the Atonement.

Brother Andrew very briefly contrasts the views of Turney and Handley with the traditional Christadelphian view and then points out: "This controversy was not 'argued out'... The result of this was that whilst Christadelphians knew this was a sensitive issue, and tended to keep clear of it for this reason; no one had actually won the argument about the nature of Christ." It was indeed a sensitive issue but this was because of the fear of Roberts' wrath. Had he not acted as an autocrat the issues could have been 'argued out' and clear answers arrived at but by and large the true issues were hidden from the general Christadelphian body by a large measure of false reporting in The Christadelphian.

The response of Robert Roberts to Edward Turney's lecture "The Sacrifice of Christ" on 28th August 1873 was indeed swift, but "The Slain Lamb" was not a reply in the sense of countering any of Edward Turney's teachings as has been claimed by many Christadelphians over the years. It was unworthy of Robert Roberts to so misrepresent Turney, and his lecture was more of a rant driven by an impetuous nature and in no way was it a reasoned argument. It was torn to shreds by Edward Turney and again by successive Nazarene Fellowship writers over the years.

"How speedy this rout would be Turney had no way of knowing..." I suppose this is the way Christadelphians saw the situation but there is another view. "Renunciationism" has never had a large following but it has been fairly constant. The writer, in the footnote, numbers 68 individuals and one large family as following Edward Turney; not a great following, and most of whom went back to the Christadelphian ecclesias after the death of Turney eight years later. This left a very small group who would not recant. Ever since, there has been one here and one there who have seen these same truths for themselves and have either been withdrawn from or have chosen to leave the Christadelphians for a better way. Then there were always those who kept their thoughts to themselves.

The writer says "The Renunciationist movement collapsed" and "It reappeared during the 1950's with Ernest Brady." However, there were many others in the intervening 75 years and we have many booklets which were published during this period by such writers as Andrew Wilson the nephew of Benjamin Wilson (known for his "Emphatic Diaglott") who was for a time contemporary with Robert Roberts and I believe died in the 1940's; G. Reeves, William Laing, F.C. Maycock, William Richmond, A.H. Broughton, H. Taberner, and Mrs French, all of whom published pamphlets or booklets before Ernest Brady. Again, the Christadelphian Crabtree Road ecclesia became Nazarene Fellowship 'en masse' for a time but later reverted, leaving one or two in isolation. I understand there were others also but have no details. Then there were those who remained nominal Christadelphians, some of whom were silenced with the threat of excommunication if they spoke their minds publicly. One such was Harry Warre of Suffolk Street. I still have dozens of his letters given to me by his daughter - correspondence with other Christadelphians sharing their views in private. The earliest of these letters is dated January 1911, though it was not until the 1930's that he was silenced, - "beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God." During this time Islip Collyer, editor of The Christadelphian, had occasional letters from Renunciationists such as those which follows these comments.

Ernest Brady was a well known and highly respected Christadelphian with an enquiring mind. 'How can Christadelphians reconcile the fact that Christ was tempted in all points as we are, with the view that He was specially strengthened by God to overcome temptation?' When he read Edward Turney's "Sacrifice of Christ," he knew he had found the true answer.

A point which could hardly be surpassed is the simple clarity with which Andrew Wilson has highlighted the Christadelphian error of claiming that Jesus Christ was like a High Priest under the Law of Moses who sacrificed first for himself and then for the people and the deduction that therefore His nature was tainted, when quite clearly it was not possible for Jesus to be an High Priest while on earth, not being of the tribe of Levi. Indeed as Ernest Brady pointed out from Hebrews 13:11 to 13, Jesus Christ was the Sacrificial Offering, the Lamb of God - who gave Himself to be the Offering, and was not the Offerer:

"For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are buried without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach."

Brother Russell Gregory

## Copied for The Service of The Truth

### **Letter to Islip Collyer, editor of "The Christadelphian":**

I have before me your little pamphlet "The Meaning of Sacrifice" written in response to a request, and for the purpose of helping and explaining to others a phase of the Truth regarding the nature of Christ, through which you desire to point out the meaning attached to sacrifice.

I heartily endorse your statements in the second paragraph on page one. Fully appreciating and approving your motives for writing and trust you will give me credit for the same earnest intentions.

Now in paragraph three you quote R.Roberts (another earnest labourer for the benefit of others, according to his own light thereon) and express your own opinion and approval of this statement. Permit me, dear Friend, to call your attention more minutely to this statement and to ask yourself why was repudiation of the flesh as flesh necessary, seeing that God was the Creator of that flesh? Had the flesh itself been any cause of offence or was it the person that had given offence?

You proceed, and say that human flesh was rejected as unable to effect any redemption and that this fact was shown or proved by Christ being born, not in the ordinary mode or according to the will of the (human) flesh, but by the power of the Highest.

What kind of flesh then, do you advocate for Jesus seeing you imply that He was not human flesh, otherwise according to your own reasoning He likewise would have been rejected? Was He divine flesh or what is the kind of flesh you advocate for Him seeing we know of no other than the divine and the human in connection with the human race and its Maker? Wherein lies the difference between the flesh of one born of the will of the flesh and one born of the same flesh through the exercise of divine power?

Surely there would be no difference whatsoever as regards the quality, composition or nature of that flesh? Wherein does the difference lie, between Adam, Adam's posterity and Christ who was born of one of Adam's descendants? Does the difference lie in the difference between the nature of their flesh or in their different relation to the Law which Adam transgressed? Wherein lies Christ's redemptive power?

Can we not arrive at a solution of this by asking what was it Christ possessed which every other man lacked, and what was it He gave as a ransom price to redeem man?

Is not the scriptural answer to that, that He gave His life a ransom and for the sheep? Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:45, John 10:11, etc.

Here you may say, 'Well every other man did not lack life seeing there were living men descendants of Adam all down the ages to this present time, hence life cannot be the redeeming property.' But let us reflect a moment upon the statement of Christ in Matthew 8:22, "Let the dead bury their dead." Christ here refers to living men as dead. Why so? There can be but one answer according to Scripture, and that is that their life was lost in the first transgression in Eden in which all in Adam's loins were sold under sin. See Greek section of Diaglott "having been sold under the sin." The Lamb of God that taketh away "the sin", not sins note, and consequently they were all doctrinally dead men ("ye have no life in you") unless they become the subject of redemption.

How then did Christ escape this dead state?

I answer, by being born Son of God deriving His life direct from the Fountain Head and not through transmission from the forfeited Adamic source. Jesus was born Son of God not Son of Adam His elder brother.

Now no Son of God can possibly come under condemnation unless he individually sin. Therefore Jesus was free from condemnation because He did no sin and consequently was free to give His life a ransom for Adam His brother, because whilst under Law, Christ earned (retained) a title to resurrection to eternal

incorruptible life, hence, through the providence of God both He and His brother, and those in Him, who obey that form of doctrine appointed for their participation therein, could be saved to live eternally. Thank God.

“Without the shedding of blood (or the giving up of the life which is in the blood) there is no remission,” thus proving that remission depended upon the giving up of the life in the blood to redeem men, therefore, as it is written, “He poured out his soul (life) unto death.”

May I now suggest a careful perusal of the enclosed written copy of “Jesus My Substitute” by A.L.Wilson, the which I pray the Lord will help you to digest that the light of the truth may shine forth in your heart, to the end that ye also may attain to the salvation of the Lord.

Sent in all sincerity in the Master’ service for the benefit of all having ears to hear.

Lena Wilson.

**Response from Islip Collyer:**

Dear (Lena), I would help you if I could but I fear it is impossible.

You raise technical objections to the scriptural doctrine of the rejection of the flesh as a basis of approach to God, and then try to set up the monstrous idea of Substitution. That God regarded all lives as forfeit in Adam and then brought forth His Son with an unforfeited life to die instead of us - yet to be raised again - nothing but the dreadful evil of fleshly controversy could produce such ideas.

The simple truth is that God determined that no flesh should glory in His presence. Christ partook of our weak and fallen nature but by the character and power that God gave to Him, He conquered it and condemned it and overcame it, by every act of His life and by His death.

Thus He opened a way in which we can follow.

I cannot find time to enter into correspondence. I sometime wish I could be quite beyond the reach of the post.

Yours in the hope of Israel, Islip Collyer.

**Answer to above:**

Dear Friend,

Many thanks for returned copy (“Jesus My Substitute”) and reply to my letter.

I am really rather loathe to begin this present correspondence, seeing you declare you have not the time to spare, but trust you will forgive my persistence, due alone to my love for truth and my neighbour.

Now I must confess I cannot understand anyone objecting to the use of the term ‘substitution’ in connection with the sacrifice for redemption purposes, seeing that such express what does indeed take place when anyone redeems anything in ordinary business; and seeing that such terms as ‘redemption’ and ‘bought with a price’ and ‘sold under sin’ are used in Scripture to express the procedure of which they record.

Next I fail to perceive where the credit generally accredited to Jesus, in regard to His contest between His own natural desires or will and the desires or will of His Father if He were endowed, as you affirm, with extra power to enable Him to overcome. Surely if this were so He has no true right to pre-eminence above His brethren. We could have done every whit as well as He if God had bestowed that extra power upon us. Wherein lies the justice of God in giving to Jesus extra power to overcome His natural tendencies to indulge His own will against the interdict of His Father? I can perceive none in that case. Moreover, could He honestly be said to have been tried in all points as we are if He were endowed with extra power to resist?

To be equivalent to ours the antagonistic force and the resistance must surely in each test have been equal in capacity, otherwise He could not truly be said to have been tempted in all points as we are. Is it not so?

Surely the fact that He conquered every time whereas-we sometimes fail does not necessitate His endowment with extra power to resist, but merely proves He exercised His natural powers to resist every time whereas we sometimes fail.

I understand the word of God to declare “no man is tempted above that he is able,” thus proving every man has it within his own power to resist, providing he exercise that power as Jesus did without any need for endowment with extra power to do so, hence all credit is due to Jesus in that of Him alone can it be declared “In Him is no sin” “He did no sin.”

He offered no sacrifice for His own transgressions, a fact which the Jews could not deny when He asked of them, “Which of you convinced! - or convicteth - me of sin?” Not one could come forward and say “We saw thee offering animal sacrifice” a token of transgression.

He closed the mouth of every Jew yet Christadelphians dare to preach a sin-contaminated Christ and declare He inherited sin in His blood and thus they, the only denomination under the sun, count the blood of the everlasting covenant an unholy sin-contaminated thing and thereby pollute the Table of the Lord.

“Come out,” dear Friend, “and touch not the unclean thing” while there is yet time.

Think again re my recent correspondence and write again if need be and D.V. we will do our best to help you discover the pure truth of God which alone is able to save.

Now I should like to explain what I consider is the reason why man cannot glory in God’s presence and that is that the reason lies in man’s utter helplessness and inability to work out his own salvation other than in the Way appointed by God, namely, through the redemption that is obtainable through the Lord Jesus. The fact that redemption is the only way out of man’s difficulty very forcibly brings home to man the fact that he is a captive or slave in bondage and he must needs be bought with a price before he can be liberated and become a free citizen in the Kingdom of God.

Consider here the statement in 1 Peter 3:21, “the like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us” and note specially that Peter in parenthesis declares it is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh or their supposed filth of Sinful flesh.

Even works of the Law cannot count until he has first been redeemed and inducted into the household of God. Hence the necessity for the Saviour, Jesus, He who shall save, being born Son of God and in a free state.

Could one born in captivity honourably set his fellow captives free? Would he not require to sneak out himself first before he could attempt to liberate his fellow prisoners? Would you suggest that God was a party to such procedure?

Next, I think that the statement you quote, 1 Corinthians 1:29, has reference to the humbleness of mind that is a prerequisite that man may humbly accept the simple written word of God instead of the wisdom of so-called wise men, who like the Scribes and Pharisees are, by the people supposed to have discovered the whole truth of God.

Man hath whereof he may glory or boast before men when he, like Abraham has stood the test and trial of his faith and obedience, but he has not thereby whereof he may boast or glory before God because in His sight he has only done that it was his duty to do.

Now I gather you also reject the idea that all lives were forfeited in Adam as unscriptural. What then is meant by the expression “As in Adam all die”? Are not our lives but a continuation through transmission of

the one life began in Adam? Did not Adam forfeit this life in Eden and did not God slay Jesus typically when the animal was slain in Eden? Does not Revelation 13:8 distinctly declare this to have been so? Was not the animal a substitute upon which was inflicted the death incurred?

I implore you to think again re those matters and then I trust the Light of the truth will penetrate and show you the true appointed way to salvation.

The simple truth does not lie in the fact that God determined that no flesh should glory in His presence, but in the fact that God so loved that He gave His own Son as our redemption price to redeem us from the captivity and bondage of Sin into which Adam's transgression threw us all.

It is a legal transaction and carried out in a legal manner because God cannot lie nor alter the word that has gone forth from His lips.

Think again, dear Friend, I am ready and willing to help. With sincere wishes for your welfare,

Lena Wilson.

P.S. Can you point out to me any command in God's Book that is beyond the power of man to observe?

If not, why was it necessary for Christ to be endowed with extra power to overcome?

Ask yourself candidly, was there ever an act of disobedience that you, yourself could not have avoided had you tried?

If it were beyond our power to obey, would God be justified in holding us responsible?

Will you kindly oblige me by answering these questions as I am anxious to know if such could be?

\* \* \* \* \*

## **Pearl of Great Price**

If Jesus was by virtue of His coming from God superior to mankind in general, a super-human being, then how could He be "like unto his brethren" and what special honour is due Him for overcoming?

If He was a 'God man' partly Divine and partly human in His nature, He ought to have overcome and what need of Him "being made perfect through suffering" for He was already superior to Adam at the start.

And furthermore such a being would not be any kind of example for poor humanity to attempt to follow, as such a being could not be tempted in all points as we are" for God cannot be tempted, neither can He sin.

But Jesus was of such a nature like unto His brethren that He was tempted in all points as we are yet without sin.

He overcame temptation and thus showed by His great example that it was possible for others to overcome evil and live sinless lives.

Author unknown