

The Nazarene Circular Letter No. 212

March/April 2005

In This Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2	The Love of Christ	Brother Phil Parry
Page 5	Comments on "How Did Jesus Die?"	Brother John Stevenson
Page 7	"The Fatal Spear-Thrust	Brother A.H.Broughton
Page 14	Further comment on Brother Cyril Marsters talk on "The Clean Flesh heresy and The Statement of Faith"	Brother Phil Parry

Editorial

Dear Brothers, Sisters and Friends,

Loving Greetings,

Sometime ago I made a few comments about a survey that was carried out in 2002 into what the Church of England believed. The result shewed that 76 per cent of clergy believed Jesus Christ died to take away the sins (sic) of the world, 68 per cent believed that Jesus rose physically from the dead and 53 per cent believed faith in Jesus was the only way to be saved. Among women clergy, the figure was about 10 per cent lower in each category.

These figures were quoted at a meeting in February this year of the House of Laity who apparently meet before the full Synod begins. Proposals to set up tribunals to try doctrinal cases were rejected by the Synod last year but the House of Laity, at this latest meeting voted overwhelmingly to reintroduce them. Members of the laity criticised liberal clergy for diluting traditional teaching, quoting the usual definition of an Anglican as someone "who can believe anything as long as it is not too strongly."

One lady from Chichester said that the original proposals for tribunals were thrown out partly because they had tried to deal with broader issues such as clergy wearing the correct vestments. "It is far, far worse if we have clergymen and women preaching heresy and who do not believe in the tenets of the faith, the Virgin Birth and the bodily resurrection of Christ. What is faith if we do not preach Christ crucified, Christ risen"? What indeed, we could not have put it better ourselves. Another good idea was mooted by a Brigadier "We need to raise the profile of doctrine in Church. Sadly our image is one of doctrinal indifferentism." Doctrinal absenteeism would be even more exact. In my various experiences in churches in the past, I don't think I have ever heard a doctrinal exposition on any topic. That is not to say that I have not heard some thoughtful and thought provoking sermons, but not ones containing spiritual food in the form of Bible doctrine.

Churches are very little interested in the Bible or Bible study except for the accounts read out at Christmas of the birth of Jesus and at Easter when his death and resurrection are recalled. The readings from the Old and New Testaments used in most services are not explained or explored. To so many now the Bible is an old book, out of date and the speculations of various more modern theologians are preferred.

Jesus Christ is supposedly the centre of all Christian faith. To us He truly is the author and finisher of our faith and the Bible is the only place where we can learn about Him and His Father and the plan for redemption and salvation for humanity. So apart from a questionable reference to Jesus in the writings of Josephus the Jewish historian, it would seem that the Bible is the only vital tool for anyone searching for truth. If it contains the truth about our Saviour it follows that everything else is true too.

It is therefore a continuing mystery that so much that is contained in the Bible is thought to be irrelevant and myth and only the person Jesus worth some attention. His father's commands can be ignored and Jesus own advice and injunctions to His followers similarly ignored. It will be interesting to see if the Church of England does institute tribunals for the Godless among their clergy, if it does it will certainly concentrate the minds of those examining and being examined and force careful consideration of the contents of the Bible, and that can only be a desirable thing.

Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost. (Romans 15:13).

Love to all, Helen Brady.

The Love of Christ

A consideration of the importance of St. Paul's second letter to the Corinthians chapter 5, verses 14 and 15 in relation to the meaning of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, necessitated for the salvation of all upon whom passed, through Adam, 'The death by sin.' Romans 5:12.

I quote: "For the love of Christ constraineth us (compels us in gratitude; forces us to the realisation); because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: (proof, Romans 5:15). And that he (Jesus) 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).

"For none of us live to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and living." (Romans 14:7-9).

These powerful words of the Apostle Paul are addressed to those who accepted (and none other) the Lord Jesus as having died in the place of Adam 'the death' due for his sin and which legally passed upon all men – not in all men as mistakenly believed.

Therefore Paul's words in Corinthians 5:14 do not apply to the people who believe natural death to be the penalty for sin. Therefore they reject Paul's words; they reject Jesus death as substitutional; they ignorantly reject that they owe their existence to the fact Adam did not die in the day he transgressed by reason Jesus died as the antitype of the lamb slain in Eden. A rejection which could be deliberate through voluntary subjection to a man-compiled Creed and self-satisfaction, requiring no research to validate that Creed, amounting to irresponsibility where Redemption and Eternal Life is concerned, in the place of Scripture.

The Bible I am using has giant print, ("Broadmen & Holman, Publishers, Nashville, Tennessee. The text conformable to that of the 1611 Authorised King James' Version). I mention this because on the heading of Genesis chapter 22 on the subject of Abraham's offering of his son Isaac, it states the following: A SON ON THE ALTAR – A SUBSTITUTE SACRIFICE. Reading the account it is stated in verse 13 that Abraham offered the ram as a burnt offering in the stead of his son. And Abraham called the name of that place Jē-hō-vāh-jirēh as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." That is, 'The Lord will provide.'

Was not this a demonstration of the faith of Abraham in God's promise to him of a 'seed' that would come in the line of his son of the free woman, Sarah? The writer of Hebrews in chapter 11 verse 19 says of Abraham's faith, "Accounting that God was able to raise Isaac from the dead, from when also he received him in a figure."

This is how God receives those who in faith have died unto sin in the 'likeness' of the death of Christ by symbolic immersion in water and birth of the Spirit. The 'likeness' of a man whose death was by the shedding of blood – not by natural decay. A 'likeness' of a man raised up in glorified nature but not yet in that nature. That is the meaning of true baptism taught by the Apostle Paul, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the 'likeness' of his death, we shall also be in the 'likeness' of his resurrection. (Romans 6:3-5). Now this is not a physical operation of immersion by water of unclean condemned flesh as some believe, for that same flesh emerges again unaltered and still condemned if Scripture teaches such a theory, which it does not. Verse 6 - "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin (owned by sin) might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin (as his servants). For he that is dead is freed from sin." Paul says of himself in the legal and moral sense, "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me."

Believing the error that prior to baptism we have 'condemned flesh,' 'sin-stricken nature' or 'sinful flesh' this is not baptism into Christ's death nor a 'likeness' of it. Christ's death by the shedding of his own blood was the equivalent of a life given unforfeited by sin, as a sacrifice in the place of Adam and all upon whom the 'death by sin' had been passed or imputed. There is no such thing recognised in the Scriptures as sinful, condemned, sin-stricken nature; - Jesus did not destroy such a mythical invention on the tree of Calvary. God did not suffer His Holy One to see corruption, He came from the tomb flesh and bones, yet the writer to Hebrews, chapter 2 verses 14,15 says that "Through death he destroyed him that had the power of death." St Paul likens this power to a sting, and declares, "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law." In what way does he mean this? It is plainly taught in Romans 5:19-20 that the law entered that the offence of Adam's sin might abound in contrast with the grace of God which abounded and reigned through the righteousness of Christ unto eternal life.

It is recorded in the lecture by Cyril Marsters in 1995 as a result of his study of E.Turney's lecture "the Sacrifice of Christ" and that of "The Slain Lamb" by R.Roberts, that at Turney's use of the word "forfeit" Roberts jumped up and down in a rage of temper and anger, shouting at the top of his lung-power that the word was not in the Scriptures and therefore Turney was not using words which the Holy Spirit teacheth. What arrogance! Who is more guilty of using unscriptural terms than R. Roberts and his close followers in addition to those I have mentioned? And did not Jesus use and teach the very meaning of the word 'forfeit' in Mark 8:36? "For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul (life)?"

This is the Roberts who in 1869 believed with Dr Thomas that Adam was created a living soul or natural body of life capable of dying as a result of his dependence on the breath of life and food for his sustenance – not being of the nature of angels.

And now after this confessed belief with Dr. Thomas and the record of Genesis, E.Turney in agreement with both, Roberts discarded those views, in chapter IV of his book "The Visible Hands of God" by stating at bottom of page 32, of Adam, "His was an animal nature that would not die left to itself, a natural body free from death," also he stated that death did not wait him in the natural path, but had to be introduced as a law of his being before he could become mortal. He means here, capable of dying, decaying physical nature, and not the true legal meaning of 'mortal' which is judicial legal sentence of death upon one who is already subject to dying naturally through creation from the dust.

Here is a man who refutes the truth of what he and Dr Thomas believed on the nature of Adam at creation, in exchange for the doctrine of an ever living soul that left to itself could not die. The reader will know now the origin of Clause V of The Christadelphian Statement of Faith among other of its erroneous clauses which I can readily expose. Roberts goes on in page 34 (bottom), "God sent forth His Son in the 'death written nature' that in Him it might be cleansed, redeemed and perfected, since by man came death, by man also the resurrection of the dead, this death," says Roberts, "was written in Eden. It is the writing of God; no man can blot it out." But he is here speaking of natural death which I agree only God can blot out. But Jesus did not die to blot out man's natural death, but that death by sin, the legal sentence through breach of law. So Paul in 2 Timothy 1:10 says of the man Christ Jesus "Who hath abolished death and brought life

and immortality to light through the gospel.” Now if Christ abolished death, it is plain enough that Paul is not referring to natural death; this has gone on since Jesus died on the Tree. What Jesus abolished was the power of sin and the wages due to the servants of sin if they chose to remain in that bondage. Jesus paid with His natural life in the blood what Adam owed to the Law of Sin and Death. This has been taught for years from the Scriptures, especially by Jesus, St Paul and the other Apostles, with Edward Turney and others following on the same theme in the legal and true concept, not the mistaken and physical concept.

Robert Roberts made much play and contempt of Edward Turney’s use of the term ‘likeness’ which Paul found it necessary to use in his Epistle to Romans 8:3 in that “sinful flesh” as we know was not a correct translation but should be in the possessive case – “Sin’s flesh” or ownership. Paul knew that God would not produce a man with condemned flesh when He had never condemned the flesh of His own creation. Paul’s teaching as that God sent forth His Son in the likeness of the nature in which sin was committed by Adam in order to prove that a man in the same nature was capable of obedience and by that obedience justified God in condemning sin, not the flesh.

In other words, Jesus was not sin’s possession, but God’s. Sin was condemned in the conduct of Jesus, not in His flesh; God was manifested in the flesh of Jesus through whom He condemned sin. Robert Roberts ignored the letter sent to him by David Handley and expounded by Edward Turney later to a correct understanding of the work of Christ and has left a legacy of confusion to those Christadelphians who choose to follow him.

It is very sad that if the present day followers of Thomas and Roberts read their written works, do not notice the errors and contradictions as I have done since leaving the environment that they must be right, seeing that they both revived the so-called Truth. Sad indeed. Especially when after reading “The sacrifice of Christ” lecture by E.Turney and The Slain Lamb lecture by R.Roberts, Nazarenes and Christadelphians find the allegations against E.Turney to be unscriptural and untrue as in many parts of the Roberts doctrine including Gabriel’s message to Mary, “That Holy Thing that shall be born of thee.” The Roberts’ doctrine is that Jesus was not Holy but had a death-written body of condemned sinful flesh, Christ’s obedience required death and God’s condemnation of sin in his flesh of which God was responsible and Gabriel described to Mary as Holy. He quotes St Paul’s words in 2 Corinthians 1:9 out of context by applying it to natural death as the penalty for sin, whereas Paul is talking of the threat of death by their preaching of the gospel. “We had the answer to that in ourselves, as a result of persecution and despairing of life” (verse 8). See “Visible Hand of God” chapter IV, page 34 and Clause V of the B.A.S.F.

I find that there has been no greater of the expounding of inventive and unscriptural phrases than Robert Roberts; what then of those who use them? What for example of the term ‘substitute’ in its true meaning for the sacrifice of Christ? Its understanding was never in the mind of Robert Roberts until in “The Visible Hand of God” he addressed the subject of Enoch’s exemption from death, chapter V page 42. He says:

“The disapprobation of God in the case of Adam was expressed in the sentence of death: here we have exemption from death as the result of God’s approval of Enoch. It naturally occurs to us to marvel how this exemption could take place in view of Enoch’s inclusion in Adam’s sentence (as yet untaken away in Christ), reader mark the bracketed words for it begs the question, ‘How could natural death as a penalty for Adam’s sin be taken away when he had already experienced it at the age of 930 years? Surely Enoch’s association with the lamb sacrificed in Eden must have been associated firstly with the DEATH BY SIN which passed upon Adam and all in his loins and freed Adam from its claim through the shed blood of the covering which foreshadowed Christ?

Neither Adam nor Enoch could associate themselves with animals which died of themselves, for they would not be typical of Christ’s death by the shedding of his blood. “Without the shedding of blood is no remission of sin.” In regard to Enoch’s association with sacrifice, then it must relate to Adam also while he was alive, “since no device nor work is found, nor faith nor hope beneath the ground.” If the association with sacrifice could free Enoch from Adamic sentence of supposed natural death why did Adam experience it?

It could only be inflicted death by blood-shedding which Adam was freed from by the shedding of the blood of the lamb which foreshadowed the death of Christ in the same manner. Adam's natural death was the result of this redemption allowing him to continue his natural life in accordance with his created physical organisation; left to itself as God made him, he died at the age of 930 years, unto the Lord, we hope. (Romans 14:7,8).

I do not wish to criticise Robert Roberts on everything he wrote in "The Visible Hand of God" – he did express some valid points and if it were not for his mistaken view that the sentence upon Adam is that recorded in Genesis 3:17-19, his comments on Enoch and on those alive in Christ at His coming, would show that the legal sentence of death passed upon Adam and themselves on the federal principle, had been removed first by animal sacrifice and secondly by baptism. Physically, neither die 'judicial death by sin' but symbolically through Him who did, as a substitute, the Lord Jesus.

Roberts says on page 42 "But our difficulty eases when we realise that Enoch's "walk with God" included the regular offering of typical sacrifice in which Christ's great work was foreshadowed and by which Enoch identified himself with that work. There was no more a setting aside of God's appointed order than there will be in the case of those who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, and shall not see death." Yet following with the correct understanding that Christ's death was substitution (in the place of), by their retrospective crucifixion with him.

In other words, crucifixion with Christ emblematised in animal sacrificial offerings, or by baptism, has nothing to do with exemption from natural death, for it is obvious that Adam died, Abel died, Seth died and others who were of his faith such as Noah and Abraham of whom, Jesus said "He liveth unto God."

So contrary to what R.Roberts says, that "There was no more setting aside of God's appointed order," there has been in the case of those alive at the coming of the Lord, they have already by crucifixion with Christ associated themselves with the law of Sin and death under which they were concluded (Galatians 3:22 & 1:19,20), they have died unto sin and are no longer included under that position but wilful sin can place them individually under the power of the second death. (Hebrews 10:26-39).The lesson is, to be sure we are baptised into the Lamb of God, Jesus Christ who died the death due to Adam in his stead by the shedding of blood, not by natural decay and return to dust.

Robert Roberts was bound to resort to 'substitution' to escape his dilemma; why should his followers not agree with him?

Or correctly I should say, the Nazarene's teaching which he used in the similar way unwittingly as did Caiaphas. (John 11:49-52). And also when he falsely accused E.Turney of believing Jesus did not come in the identical physical flesh of his brethren.

He that readeth let him understand.

Brother Phil and Sister Rene Parry.

Comments on "How did Jesus Die?"

"Experts" are a big help to us lay people in forming an opinion on many important subjects, but in the long run each of us must decide for ourselves between truth and error. A century ago a large group of "Modern Higher Critical Bible Scholars" were posing as "experts" and telling us that the Bible was largely fiction; in fact some of them doubted whether Jesus ever really existed. We regard Dr. John Thomas as an expert; most "expert" bible scholars would laugh at us. We regard Edward Turney as an expert; hardly anyone would agree. Galileo was an undoubted expert who was jailed for his expertise. And the "Experts in the Law" two thousand years ago sentenced Jesus to death. But whatever experts may decide, each of us is personally responsible for deciding exactly what is truth in relation to our own selves. I am sorry that Bro. Allon has decided that Jesus was not killed by the spear-thrust; I have long ago decided, on the

comprehensive evidence presented in a booklet “The Fatal Spear-Thrust,” that it was the cause of His sacrificial death. (A copy follows next)

I feel strongly that the support of the very oldest manuscripts for that interpretation is very convincing evidence for accepting it as truth. Another of the strongest arguments is that according to Levitical Law the sacrifice must be alive before its blood is shed.

Mel Gibson had his business head screwed on properly when he produced his outlandishly unrealistic film “The Passion of Christ.” The public love blood and violence, and he piled both on excessively. Jesus had his skin cut to ribbons, but the two criminals beside Him did not have a mark on them. He had the nails put through the palms of Jesus’ hands, whereas Allon correctly states they were through His wrists. Unlike Allon, I have never encountered the idea that the preliminary whipping could be fatal. Nor have I read of excessive blood loss or how it could be measured. But I have read that crucified criminals could live for a week before expiring from dehydration. It would be hard to check on such things from two thousand years ago.

I question whether hanging by the arms would cause constriction of the chest and breathing difficulties. I tested this by hanging from the rafter in my shed, but because of my age I was not able to hang any longer than half a minute. I would like a young person to try it. I feel sure breathing would still be easily possible. Breaking of the legs to end their life because of the coming Passover Sabbath had nothing to do with preventing breathing. Because bones are alive, not just framework of the body, they contain blood vessels, which enables broken bones to heal within weeks. The femur, or thighbone, is the largest long bone in the body, and when broken it would bleed profusely, especially when the legs are hanging downwards and are not bandaged to limit swelling. I think such a situation would cause enough blood loss from the circulation to deprive the heart and head, causing death; it would be immensely painful and cruel, but better than a slow death taking several days.

From my medical training I can say definitely that the pericardium could not hold half a litre of fluid; anything near that volume would prevent the heart from filling, as it must prior to each beat. Pericardial effusion could be caused by a coronary occlusion, or by failing strength of the right ventricle, or severe bruising of the heart; in either case causing the person to be extremely ill.

Ascites is an abdominal effusion caused by various types of peritonitis, cancer, chronic nephritis, or dropsy. Again, the person would be very ill. Those sources of “water” could not have applied to Jesus; He was not in a state of serious illness when arrested, nor the day before. I have wondered how to account for the water, and my conclusion is that the fatal spear-thrust may have passed through the stomach before reaching the heart. That is less likely, but still possible, if the spear entered the right side of the abdomen (as is generally believed) and pierced upwards to the heart. The crucified people would be elevated so that the soldiers could watch that no-one would try to rescue them, (but not extremely high up as depicted in popular church art, so the spear-thrust would be upwards through the abdomen, not through the rib-cage. I think it may have been done in kindness, in response to the mockers, because considering that the centurion knew that Jesus was a good man and not a criminal, very likely some of the soldiers also knew that. In any case, it was all under God’s control. His cry “it is finished” would have been when He knew that the soldier was about to kill Him, completing His sacrifice of Himself.

In 1985 I purchased a second-hand book “A Doctor At Calvary” by Dr. Pierre Barbet, translated by the Earl of Wicklow in 1953, certified Nihil Obstat M.L.Dempsey, S.T.D. and Imprimi Potest Archiep Joannes Carolus of Dublin. That is where I first met the theories that Brother Allon Maxwell has propounded, and at the time I was amazed that Dr. Barbet, evidently a medical doctor, could proffer such medically untenable concepts. I am sorry to be so disagreeable to Allon’s thesis, but I have always felt that accuracy in detail is valuable for verifying truth.

Yours in Jesus’ precious Name, from John Stevenson.

The Fatal Spear Thrust

Summary

It is generally thought that our Lord was pierced by the Roman spear after He had died.

The purpose of this pamphlet is to show that He did not die by hanging (impaled on a stake), but by the spear-thrust and the immediately subsequent blood out-pouring, followed by the great cry.

It is written that without the out-pouring of blood (Gr. *aimatekcheO*. Hebrews 9, 22) there is no remission of sins. This means the life-blood. Our Lord poured out His soul unto death, not after death. Isaiah 53:12. This was the blood of the New Covenant shed for many for the remission of sins.

Chapter One will present some words which, although written by Matthew, do not appear in the AV. It will also produce the evidence of the authenticity of those words, and will explain how the words came to be excluded from some manuscripts.

Chapter Two will prove that there is a serious error in the rendering of John 19:34 in the A.V, R.V, R.S.V. etc.

Chapter Three will present the correct translation of a word in Isaiah 53:5.

These three chapters, then, will each deal with a single passage or word of Scripture. Together they combine to prove the truth set out in the second paragraph above.

Chapter Four will present and answer some objections.

Chapter one - The excluded words.

Some words, written by Matthew, have been excluded from some Greek texts at Matthew 27:49. The words are as under:

“and another took a spear and pierced His side, and out came water and blood”

The R.S.V. places these words in a marginal reading. If we insert them into the context the whole reads:

Verse 46 - “about the ninth hour... some of the bystanders... said: ‘This man is calling Elijah.’ And one of them at once ran, and took a sponge, filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave it to him to drink. But the others said: ‘Wait, let us see whether Elijah will come to save him.’ And another took a spear and pierced his side, and out came water and blood. And Jesus cried again with a loud voice and yielded up his spirit.”

The Textual Proof. The two earliest manuscripts in our possession are known as Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. They were written in the fourth century. All other manuscripts were written in the next and later centuries.

Both those early manuscripts contain the ‘Excluded Words.’ The words have not been added since the first writing of the mss. Now the Vatican Ms. is generally considered to be the most reliable of all. (See e.g. F. Kenyon: ‘Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,’ page 204), and when that ms. is supported by one of the other good mss. there is very strong evidence indeed for the reading. Certainly Sinaiticus is a good ms. Tischendorf thought it to be the most reliable of all. The ‘Excluded Words’ are also found in other good mss. (See Objection Two in Chapter Four).

English Translations. There are three English versions which include the ‘Excluded Words’ in the text, - Concordant, New World Translation and Fenton.

Westcott and Hort, being undecided, placed the 'Excluded Words' within brackets in their Greek edition. Accordingly the following translations include the 'Excluded Words' in the text, but within brackets: Moffatt, Twentieth Century. The following place the words as an alternative reading: R.V, A.S.V, R.S.V, Emphatic Diaglott and Cunningham (Adelphi NT 1919).

How did the 'Excluded Words' come to be abandoned? It is seldom possible to ascertain when and by whom a spurious passage was introduced into the sacred text, and it is also seldom possible to ascertain by whom and when a genuine Scripture was excluded from the text. In the case of the 'Excluded Words' of Matthew 27:49, we do have some definite information. The information is supplied by Westcott and Hort in their 'Introduction to the New Testament' (Notes on Particular Texts), as follows:

In a letter partially preserved in Syriac (ap. Petr. jun in Assemani B.O. ii 81) he (Severus) mentions the reading (i.e. the 'Excluded Words' — A.H.B.) as having been vigorously debated at Constantinople in connection with the matter of the patriarch Macedonius, when the magnificently-written copy of St. Matthew's Gospel said to have been discovered in Cyprus with the body of St. Barnabas in the reign of Zeno (? A.D. 477) was consulted and found not to contain the sentence in question. The 'magnificent' copy of St. Matthew... was doubtless of quite recent origin, the discovery having been opportunely made by Anthemius, bishop of Salamis when he was vindicating the independence of Cyprus against the patriarch of Antioch, Peter the Fuller. The opposite view to the reading is implied in a sarcastic statement of the Chronicle of Victor Tununensis (in Canis - Basu Lect. Ant. i 326) that:

“at Constantinople the holy Gospels were by command of the Emperor Anastasias censured and corrected, as having been composed by unlettered (idiotis) evangelists”

Re-instating the 'Excluded Words' we have a vivid, graphic, and poignant narrative. Impaled on a stake, accursed in order to take away the Curse of the Law, the Messiah becomes our Passover Sacrifice by the sudden plunge of the weapon, causing the agonised shout and the shedding of blood of atonement from the Living Sacrifice.

Chapter two - John 19:34.

According to the AV, RV, & RSV, it was after He was dead that the Roman soldier pierced with his lance the side of our Lord. Now all three versions are in error here. That, of course, is an astounding charge to make. We must therefore examine the matter and see if the charge is true.

We shall not need to be Greek scholars: it will not be necessary to write or quote a single word in Greek. We are, perhaps, in a position similar to that of a jury at a trial. The jurors are not Queen's Counsel; they are ordinary men and women who may not know anything of the law on the subject of the accusation. What they are required to do is to listen to the accusation and the questioning and the summing-up and then to pass judgment. It is they, ordinary people, who pass judgment, and not the judge. He may pass sentence after the Jury have made their judgment.

The first evidence to which we shall listen is that of Dr. G. B. Winer, a recognised authority on the grammar of New Testament Greek, and I quote from the translation of his Treatise, which was written in German, the eighth English edition - translation by Dr. Moulton. This evidence is of a general nature. Winer, then, says:

“The New Testament grammarians and commentators have been chargeable with the grossest mistakes in regard to the tenses of the verb”

- Treatise on NT Greek pt. III sec XL (1).

Is that accusation true? It is certainly a wide-sweeping charge to make. We must examine the matter, therefore. (Of course, when Winer wrote his Treatise in 1855 neither the R.V. nor the R.S.V, with which we shall be dealing, had been made, so his remarks were directed to the A.V, to Tischendorf's N.T. and to the German and other translations that were available to him. We shall find, however, that his accusation of 'grossest mistakes' will apply to the R.V. and R.S.V. as well as to the A.V.).

In passing we may note that the A.V., R.V. and R.S.V. do not agree among themselves in the matter of the Greek tenses. Furthermore, not one of them is consistent in the translation of the Greek tenses. The proof of this assertion will appear during the course of this Enquiry.

We have heard the serious charge made against the New Testament translators. Let us pause a moment to listen to the charge of another recognised authority on New Testament Greek. That scholar is Bertholdt. And his charge is against the inspired writers themselves! He wrote:

“It is well-known that in the use of the tenses, the New Testament writers were very little bound by the laws of grammar” - Bertholdt: Einleit VI 3151.

We shall see, before we have ended this Enquiry, that the case is far different, and that it is the translators, not the writers of the inspired text, who have ignored the laws of grammar.

The Submission. I submit that the text of John 19, 34 should read: “but one of the soldiers with a spear had pierced his side...” and not “but one of the soldiers pierced ...”

The difference is as between the use of the pluperfect (had pierced) and the past (pierced). In other words, did the piercing occur at that point in the narrative, or had it occurred at a previous time? This is what we shall ascertain.

Next to deal more specifically with the text of John 19:34. First I will produce the statements of two acknowledged authorities on New Testament Greek, viz. Winer (already mentioned) and Saml. G. Green.

Winer says: “In narration the Aorist is used for the pluperfect.” Treatise pt III sec XL (5) (a)

Green says: “In narration, an Aorist that starts from a time already past may be translated by the Pluperfect” - Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek New Testament sec 364 (b)

We do not have to accept these assertions untested. So let us now put them to the test.

The Pluperfect Defined. This article is being written for those of us who left school a very long time ago, and many of us have forgotten the elements of English grammar. So first of all, let us read two definitions of the term ‘Pluperfect’. From Nuttall’s English Dictionary - “denoting an event that took place previous to another past event”. From Green’s Handbook (above referred to) - that which was completed at some past time, as – ‘it had been founded on the rock,’ and in Acts 14, 23: ‘on whom they had believed.’

The Aorist in John 19:34 and elsewhere. In our examination of the assertions which have been made let us, in order to simplify our study, confine ourselves to the consideration of one form of the Greek verb, viz. First Aorist tense, Indicative mood, Active Voice. It will not be necessary for us even to know what is meant by the ‘First Aorist’ or the ‘Indicative’ or the ‘Active Voice.’ Sufficient for us to notice that all the verbs hereafter marked IAIA are of the same tense and mood and voice, the 1st Aorist, Indicative, Active. (The fact that the verbs I cite are truly ‘IAIA’ may be ascertained by those not conversant with Greek by reference to Bagster’s Analytical Greek Testament where every verb is analysed).

The Enquiry Begins. After all that lengthy prelude we may now begin to test the assertions of Winer and Green, and see if they are correct in saying that in narration the Aorist may sometimes be translated by the Pluperfect. Let us first take Mark 16:1 -

AV “when the Sabbath was past Mary had bought (IAIA) sweet spices”
RV “when the Sabbath was past Mary bought (IAIA) spices”
RSV ditto

Which is correct? The question is soon answered, for Luke 23:56 shows that the faithful few had bought and prepared the spices before the commencement of the Sabbath day. This proves that the A.V. in

this instance is correct, and the other two versions incorrect. It also proves the Rule that in narration the Aorist may sometimes be translated by the Pluperfect. Another example is found in Mark 3:16 -

Here all three versions A.V., R.V. & R.S.V. agree in saying that Simon was surnamed (IAIA) Peter when he was appointed as an apostle. But in John 1:42 we read that Peter was given that surname immediately on his first introduction to Christ. This shows two things - that the three versions err in tense here, and that the rendering should have been in the Pluperfect, viz. “and Simon he had surnamed (IAIA) Peter.”

Matthew 28:2. The same three versions err also here. Neither the earthquake nor the rolling away of the stone occurred while the women were at the tomb. All this had happened previously, as the words of the angel imply when he said, “He is not here, for He was raised” verse 6 Marshall’s Interlinear. The facts prove that those versions should have read “an angel of the Lord, descending out of heaven and approaching had rolled away (IAIA) the stone” (Marshall’s Interlinear with pluperfect adjustment).

Matthew 14:3. In this example we find all three versions correct in using the pluperfect tense for the Greek ‘IAIA’ verb, thus - “for Herod had... bound (IAIA) him.” And here are some more passages where all three versions have correctly used the pluperfect for the Greek IAIA verb –

Luke 2:39 and when they had performed (IAIA) all things
Luke 7:1 when he had ended (IAIA) all his sayings
John 13:12 so after he had washed (IAIA) their feet

The R.S.V. correctly gives the pluperfect tense in the following passages:

John 11:30 Jesus was still in the place where Martha had met (IAIA) him
John 4:45 having seen all that he had done (IAIA)
John 4:46 Cana . . . where he had made (IAIA) the water wine
Matt. 26:48 now the betrayer had given (IAIA) them a sign.

John 18:24 The versions present variant readings:

A.V. Now Annas had sent (IAIA) him bound unto Caiaphas
R.V. Annas therefore sent (IAIA) him bound unto Caiaphas
R.S.V. Annas then sent (IAIA) him bound to Caiaphas

The A.V. is correct here in using the pluperfect, and this is proved by the fact that at this point in the narrative the Lord was already present before Caiaphas, to whom Annas had sent him.

Conclusion. It will be seen from our examination so far that the A.V., R.V. and R.S.V. have been inconsistent, not only with one another, but each in its own version, in the way they have treated the ‘IAIA’ Greek verb. (Yet Bertholdt said “the New Testament writers were very little bound by the laws of grammar.” The looseness is not with the New Testament writers, but with the translators.!!)

Other examples could be brought forward, but I think, fellow-Jurors, we have heard sufficient to assent to the following judgment:

(1) that Winer’s accusation has been proved, viz. that the New Testament translators have been chargeable with the grossest mistakes in regard to the tenses of the (Greek) verb, and

(2) that in narration a Greek Aorist verb should sometimes be translated by the pluperfect. (NB: I do not say “should always be translated by the pluperfect”)

Finally. From all that we have seen we may conclude that John 19:34 should be rendered thus: “When they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs, (but one of the soldiers had pierced his side with a spear).” See Objection 1 on the word for ‘but’ in this verse.

Let us compare two Greek words that could not be more closely comparable. Both are verbs, both in the same tense, same mood, same voice, both of the third person and singular number, both written by the same author, John, and both in narration, the same narration. Yet in John 18:24 the A.V. correctly gives the Pluperfect - "Annas had sent" but in 19:34 gives the past definite 'pierced' instead of the pluperfect 'had pierced.'

Chapter three - Isaiah 53.5

We have seen that the Lord poured out His life-blood unto death when He was pierced by the Roman spear. It was the blood of atonement, shed for the remission of our sins; it was the blood of a Living Sacrifice.

This is in accordance with Isaiah 53:5. The A.V. translation sounds well, but it is incorrect. It is not a translation of what Isaiah wrote by the Spirit of God. This is a statement which must be proved. Let us therefore hear what three acknowledged Hebraists have to say on the matter - Drs. R. Young, Parkhurst and Gesenius.

Young (a) his Literal Translation reads "He is pierced for our transgressions"

(b) his Analytical Concordance gives the meaning of the Hebrew word *chalal* as 'pierce, wound, stay'.

Parkhurst renders the root word as 'make an opening, pierce, break in'

Gesenius gives the meaning of the root word as 'pierce through, perforate, lay open'.

The rendering of Young in the Literal Translation, as given above, is in accordance with the meaning of the relevant Hebrew word, has the approval of the three Hebraists cited above, is in accordance with other passages of Scripture having that Hebrew word, and is in accordance with the facts of that awful deed when our Lord was killed by the spear-thrust.

Chapter four - Objections

1. The word for 'but' in John 19, 34 viz. 'alla'. The objector says that the use of 'alla' is inconsistent with the view which I put forward, and that another Greek word would have been more suitable.

It should, however, be noted that that word 'alla' is used in several different senses. Green's 'Handbook' sec 404 gives five of those ways, one of which is —

INTERRUPTION: 'alla' is used when a train of thought is broken by some limitation, modification, correction.

This is the case with John. I have sought for other passages having a similar construction, where 'alla' is used in a manner similar to John 19, 34. As the word appears in the N.T. more than 630 times it is not listed in Young's Analytical Concordance. I have come across these three examples. There are no doubt others, but these three are sufficient. As in John 19:34 the word 'alla' contrasts a present happening or condition with a past happening or condition.

Galatians 4:7-8 Thou art (present indicative) a son... but (*alla*) ye served (1 Aorist Ind.) as slaves.

1 Timothy 1:15-16 I am (pres. ind.) chief of sinners ... but (*alla*) I obtained (1 Aor. Ind.) mercy.

John 20:6-7 Peter beholds the kerchief not lying (pres. ptcple.) with the sheets, but (*alla*) having- been-wrapped-up (perfect ptcple.) in one place.

This last specimen is in close proximity to John 19:34. Furthermore, that the word *alla* is not always strongly adversive is seen from its occurrences in the same narration – 18:28 but (*alla*) that they might eat. 18:40 not this man, but (*alla*) Barabbas. 19:21 write not ... but (*alla*) that that man said. 19:24 not tear it, but (*alla*) let us cast lots.

2. Textual criticism. Another Objection takes this form: “After a great deal of vacillation, textual critics in general lean towards the ‘Western’ text. . . and therefore against the lance-thrust phrase in Matthew”.

This objection has to do with textual criticism generally, and there has been and still is a ‘great deal of vacillation’ among textual critics. This pamphlet, however, deals with a specific case. Out cancelling all theories of textual criticism, both the sound and the unsound, is this basic fact, that the ‘Excluded Words’ were written in the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus texts when they were first written (4th cent.), and are found in C (Ephraemi Rescriptus: 3rd cent.). The words are also found in the Palestinian Syriac Mss. and in the Ethiopic version when first written. Moreover Chrysostom (4th cent.) quotes the passage.

The ‘Excluded Words’ are also found in the majority of the OLD LATIN translations, and those translations were made within “a generation or two of the time at which the sacred books were themselves composed” (F. Kenyan in ‘Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, page 238). The Vulgate Codices contain the excluded words, and the Vulgate NT was copied from the older Old Latin Codices, with slight revision. There are in existence some earlier papyri, but none contains anything of Matthew after chapter 26.

(To verify the statements made in this pamphlet concerning the text, reference could be made to the footnotes in the Variorum, to the Greek Testament published by the BFBS 1954, and to that published by the United Bible Societies in 1966).

O. L. Barnes makes the following summary: writing of the ‘Excluded Words’ —

“the Mss, etc. evidence is divided, but it is significant in this case (more so than the witness of Vaticanus) that the reading is given by the Latin r², which, with certain other evidence, takes us back to Justin and Irenaeus, behind Syr c & s and Tat diat and approaches more nearly to Graeco-Syriac of A.D. 125.”

3. The alleged transplant. This Objection asserts that the excluded words were transplanted from John 19:34 into Matthew 27:49. This is a very frequent allegation. It ignores altogether the alternative that the phrase was transplanted into John’s narration from Matthew’s. We shall see, however, that the phrase was not copied from one to the other, in either direction. However, let us look at some of the rash and irresponsible sayings of some Greek scholars. We select Burgon, Scrivener and A. T. Robertson.

Burgon “From the slender relics of their iniquitous performances which have survived to our time, we are sometimes able to lay our finger on a foul blot and to say This came from Tatian’s Diatessaron...’ The piercing of our Saviour’s side, transplanted by Codices Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Ephraemi Rescriptus from St. John 19:34 into St. Matthew 27:49, is an instance of (this), which... Westcott & Hort (alone among editors) have admitted into their text” - Revision Revised 1885.

Dr. Burgon was very careless. Among the errors in the above are three glaring ones. The first is in overlooking the fact that the Greek NT published by Cardinal Mai in 1860 contains the excluded words at Matt. 27:49.

The second glaring error is in supposing the alleged transplant to have been possible. For the excluded words do not coincide with the passage in John 19:34, and there is so great a difference in the wording and the order of the words as to preclude the idea of copying. Here are the two passages, the top line is the EW from Matthew and the lower line the passage in John 19:34.

allos de labOn logchEn enuxen autou tEn pleuran kai exElthen udOr kai aima

all eistOn stratiOtOn logchE autou tEn pleuran enuxen kai exEtthen euthus aima kai udOr

The third error is in supposing that the ‘transplanting’ took place when the Codices he mentions were written. We saw in the answer to the previous Objection that the EW appeared in texts written centuries earlier. The Old Latin mss. were made within a generation or two of Matthew, and they contained the ‘Excluded Words’. And they would have been made from even earlier copies.

This is that Dr. Burgon who was ‘conspicuous for his vehement, even intemperate’ opposition to the RV. Sir F. Kenyon wrote of him —

“Dean Burgon tilted desperately... and even went so far as to argue that these two documents (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) owed their preservation, not to the goodness of their text, but to its depravity, having been, so to speak, pilloried as examples of what a copy of the Scriptures ought not to be!” - ‘Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts’ pp 182-3; 204; 316.

Scrivener: 1873-1891. “We are here brought face to face with the gravest interpolation yet laid to the charge of B (Vaticanus)... a sentence which neither they (Westcott and Hort) nor any other competent scholar can easily believe that the Evangelist ever wrote... words borrowed from John 19:34 with a slight verbal change, and representing that the Saviour was pierced before his death...”

- Introduction to the criticism of the NT, 4th edn. Revised by Miller, vol 2 1894.

How careless these scholars can be! While the sense of the EW and the passage in John 19:34 is the same, the words are so different, and the order, as to rule out the possibility of ‘borrowing’ or ‘transplanting’.

A. T. Robertson. “a manifest and blundering harmonistic addition.” That is how Robertson refers to the EW in his Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the NT, 1925, p. 217.

Yet the actual wording of the Greek text shows that there was no copying from John 19:34 - nor from Matthew 27:49. Moreover, the narration in Matthew, after re-incorporating the Excluded Words, is so smoothly running that there is nothing ‘blundering’ and nothing manifesting an attempt at harmonising whatever. This can be seen by reading the corrected RSV reading in chapter One of this pamphlet.

A strange oversight. The whole difficulty vanishes when it is realised that in John 19 the narration ends with verse 33, and verses 34 to 37 inclusive are John’s comment upon the narrative, written to show how the OT. prophecies came to be fulfilled. (For other examples of editorial explanatory comments in John see 2:21-22; 3:13; 6:71; 7:39; 12:33; 13: 29; 18:14; 19:34-37; 20:9; 20:30-31; 21:24; 21:25).

Why do so many people assert (in the face of clear evidence to the contrary) that the Lord Jesus Christ was not a Living Sacrifice - that therefore the Blood of the New Covenant was an unholy thing - the blood of a corpse? Why all the baseless objections?

4. Blood-shedding. “The first shedding of blood was the piercing of the hands “and feet”. So runs this fourth Objection. And it ignores the previous scourging. (I do not cite Luke 22:44. The textual authenticity of the verses 43-44 is uncertain). But let us examine the Objection fully.

The phrase ‘shedding of blood. The phrase is used literally, and also idiomatically. It is used in the literal sense in Hebrews 9:22. The Greek is *aimatekchusia* = a pouring-out of blood, (*aima* = blood, *ekcheO* = to pour out). The sense of this last word *ekcheO* is obtained from its other occurrences in Scripture —

John 2:15	poured out the changers’ money
Acts 2:17	I will pour out my Spirit
Acts 2:18	will pour out ... of my Spirit
Revelation 16:1	pour out the vials of the wrath of God.
Revelation 16:2,2,4,8,10,12,17	- poured out the vial

So we see that this literal sense of blood-shedding cannot be applied to the loss of blood from the piercing of hands and feet of the Saviour. Let us look at the idiomatic sense. This is seen in Genesis 9:6; “whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed.” Again in Deuteronomy 21:7: “they shall answer and say, Our hands have not shed this blood”. The slain man in both verses could have been killed by drowning, by strangulation, by stoning, by poisoning, or by any other means not involving loss of blood. In the Ten Commandments the phrase is ‘Do no murder.’ Exodus 20:13 R.V.

It is true that our Lord lost a little blood from the wounds in hands and feet, perhaps more in the scourging, but none of this can be called “the Blood of the New Covenant shed for many for the remission of sins.”

But when the Roman soldier took a lance and killed our Master, His blood was shed in both senses - literally and idiomatically (i.e. death by murder).

The Law. The words of Leviticus 17:11-14 should be heeded here: “The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life... he shall pour out the blood thereof... for as to the life of all flesh, the blood thereof is all one with the life thereof... R.V.

The Types. The Messiah did not die in order to comply with the types of the OT. Contrariwise, the shadows in the OT. were made to prefigure the death of our Lord. Those shadow-figures in the Tabernacle and in the Temple invariably pointed to the death of the Coming Sin-Sacrifice, and they portrayed that Sacrifice as death by blood-shedding. In no case was it permissible for a dead animal to be brought to have its blood shed at the altar.

If we refer to the type of Abraham and Isaac we find that Abraham tied his son and was ready to slay him with the thrust of the knife. It was not his intention to wound Isaac and leave him to die of exposure or exhaustion, but to slay him suddenly by a knife-thrust and consequent blood- shedding. Thus did the Most High pre-figure the death of His Son, our Saviour.

A. H. Broughton.

Further comments on Brother Cyril Marsters talk given in 1995 on the subject of “The Clean Flesh heresy and The Statement of faith”

Dear Readers,

I read a copy of what Cyril Marsters (a Christadelphian) said in his lecture to a company of people in July 1995 as a result of his belated reading of “The Sacrifice of Christ” lecture by E.Turney and “The Slain Lamb” lecture that followed the next evening. He had also read “A Review of The Slain Lamb” by F.J.Pearce which many have not done, seeing that so much scriptural Truth was withheld from the rank and file whose names and addresses were not in the A.L.S. Diary but only the Recording Brethren and lecturers; this was the only way available for the dubbed “Clean Flesh” people to send literature or write to the leaders of Christadelphian Ecclesias.

The position had become exactly that of which Jesus accused the lawyers (Luke 11:52) “Woe unto you, lawyers! For ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering ye hindered.”

In opposition to the views of Dr Thomas and Edward Turney mentioned by Cyril Marsters in his 1995 lecture, Robert Roberts had departed from the true teaching of Genesis that Adam was a natural body of life with a nature lower than the angels. R.Roberts saying “Adam would not have died if left to himself as God had made him (R.Roberts “The Visible Hand of God” chapter 4, page 32)

He says, “It required a miracle to bring about Adam’s death.” Dr Thomas says in opposition, “It required no miracle for the infliction of death.” See Eureka Vol.1 page 248, “Seeing that man had become a transgressor of the divine law there was no need of a miracle for the infliction of death (please note the word ‘infliction’ which means the opposite to what follows) – “All,” says Dr Thomas, “that was necessary was to prevent Adam from eating of the Tree of Lives and to leave his flesh and blood nature to the operation of the

laws peculiar to it.” This indeed cancels the Roberts view but it is not the meaning of the penalty Adam had incurred by sin which was infliction of judicial death and taking away of life in the blood after transgression through eating of the forbidden fruit of the Tree. R.Roberts is totally wrong; Dr Thomas is nearer the truth if natural death could be styled the penalty, but natural death did not take place until Adam was 930 years of age. Was he 930 years of age when he ate the fruit and then died? Was he not guilty of an inflicted death when he disobeyed God’s law? Surely Dr Thomas’s theory does not involve any action to mean ‘infliction’ on Adam’s body – only as he says - a matter of preventing access to the “Tree of Lives” and to leave his flesh and blood nature to the operation of the laws peculiar to it.

This was indeed the position of Adam after being spared the infliction of death through the typical slain lamb in his stead, but natural death could not be regarded as the penalty for sin seeing his nature was already related to decay and death as Dr Thomas says and as Holy Scripture confirms in the physical sense of the creation.

We must appreciate that the position which arose in the Garden of Eden became a legal one based on God’s law to Adam and referred to by Jesus and brilliantly expounded in Romans for all to understand, but unfortunately we find Robert Roberts and Dr Thomas ignoring Jesus and Paul by their confusing the legal with the physical for indeed Paul is treating the subject of ‘death by the sin’ of Adam, not the ‘death that entered into the world’ as a result of corruptible nature – flesh and blood nature which would die if left to the operation of the laws peculiar to it; no guilt attached in this case in the absence of Divine Law, sin being transgression of God’s law, correctly understood and related by Cyril Marsters on page 2 of the copy of his 1995 lecture and continued on page 3. My disagreement being that Jesus as the antitypical Lamb of God offered Himself to God willingly that His Father might offer Him up freely for us all; this Jesus did (not as Edward Turney mentions) by His ascent to the right-hand of His Father, but when He allowed wicked hands to nail Him to the tree. Romans 8:31,32. Acts 2:23,24.

In the first paragraph of his introduction, Cyril Marsters should not have used the term ‘Heresy’ in application to E.Turney’s views. Allow me to quote from “The Concise English Dictionary” the meaning of ‘Heresy.’ “Departure from what is held to be true doctrine, especially when such opinions lead to division in the Christian Church.”

Now I maintain, true doctrine is that which is inspired of God through Jesus, the Apostles and Prophets and has been written for our benefit involving the Gospel of Christ which St Paul declares “Is the power of God unto salvation unto everyone that believeth.”

It is plain Adam did not need salvation from the position he was in at his creation, so natural decay and death could not be a penalty but a result of his created nature. This in fact was confirmed in 1869 by both Dr Thomas and Robert Roberts – that there was no evidence in the Scriptures that any change of physical nature took place and we find Edward Turney agreeing with this and teaching it in his lecture as read and understood by Cyril Marsters, Praise Be!

Then as a result of Turney’s presented views Robert Roberts produced his adulterated formula of defiled, sinful, physically changed flesh which would make the Creator the author of it.

Robert Roberts poured scorn on Turney’s statement that sinful could only apply to the character, not to the physical quality of the flesh and followed with the comment, “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.” Now in view of such scriptural ignorance, the answer of Turney and the Nazarenes would be, “Seeing that in the teaching of Roberts all flesh was physically unclean, sinful, and also condemned, including that of Jesus – the sinless character of Jesus would make His substance which produced it, perfect and ‘very good’ as Adam when created.” This destroys Roberts’ reasoning as unacceptable.

In consequence of all that is stated on page 7 of the copy of the lecture by Cyril, I am forced to protest against what he says in the first paragraph, third line down of page 1 of his opening remarks as follows, “But seriously, I ask you, what could be more exciting than an actual heresy bursting upon the Christadelphian scene one evening, being eclipsed by a masterful exposition of received wisdom on the next?” Well, from what I have written it is very obvious that Cyril has got the facts in reverse. It was a Roberts ‘heresy’ that

was already on the Christadelphian Scene which was eclipsed by Turney's masterful exposition of received wisdom from above. (James 3:17). Incidentally, Robert Roberts stated that he received his wisdom from Dr Thomas and there was nothing else for him to learn; this I read in a booklet "Eureka at a Glance" and I referred to it in one of my articles in the Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter some time back.

Now I quote Cyril Marsters words bottom but one paragraph on page 7, "Now this leaves my simple mind with an unanswered question, as to how this evil fixation in literal flesh came about, and Dr Thomas as we probably all know, provides the answer. The definition of this physical principle. The quotation (second hand to me, it is from Turney's) is from "Elpis Israel" page 113, paragraph 3 as follows, "The word sin is used in two principle acceptations, it signifies in the first place the transgression of law, and in the next it represents that physical principle in the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh which has the power of death, and it is called sin because the development or fixation of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression." (Please note, I have quoted directly from 'Elpis Israel' page 113).

Now I say emphatically, Dr Thomas has not provided the correct answer according to the teaching of the inspired word of God in that he jumps from the legal position of transgression of law to the physical position that prevailed before Adam transgressed and which, as he says, concerned the animal nature at creation including Adam. In 1869 he and Robert Roberts declared of Adam's transgression of law, "There was a change in Adam's relationship to God but not in the nature of his organisation." (Animal nature with no scripture evidence of change – Dr T. & R.R.).

Here again we have Dr Thomas believing the Law of Sin and Death being this fixation of evil or sin in the flesh having the power of natural death. He could not as a result understand or explain the Apostles teaching in Hebrews 2:14,15, that through death Jesus destroyed, or rendered powerless the legal sentence which passed upon all men through the sin of Adam, for if it involved what he has described 'a fixation of evil or sin in the flesh' it is still with us and only our physical deaths can remove it, so the term is used for Jesus, "In himself," not for us. St Paul's words also in Romans 8:1, 2 are ignored and dismissed on account of this erroneous teaching of Dr Thomas and his followers. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk in the spirit and are not in the flesh (alienated from God), for the law of the spirit of life in Christ hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Paul was still a body of flesh and blood therefore he was not made free from a physical law of decay and fixation of evil and sin resulting in natural death, which must lead to the fact that Paul is referring to his legal position before baptism into the death of Christ.

It is also written of Jesus that He "abolished death" and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. The writer could not have been referring to natural decay and return to dust for that is the experience now of human beings, but Jesus by His death rendered powerless the 'death by sin,' a legal sentence under which God has concluded all men with the exception of His own son who died the 'death by sin' in the place of Adam. Refuse this and you reject what Jesus said He had come for – "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many/all" Matthew 20:28. 1 Timothy 2:6. Galatians 4:4).

Even Dr Thomas states in Elpis Israel that "a person through obedience to the one faith passes from under a sentence of death to a sentence of justification of eternal life." This of course excludes natural death by decay for 'the death by the sin' of Adam, a legal sentence passed upon all.

Well, I must say in conclusion, I have read the whole of Elpis Israel since my resignation from Christadelphia and its foundation upon the confused, contradictory, erroneous teaching of changed flesh.

Over fifty years ago I had become a marked man for expressing similar views to those of Edward Turney yet never having heard of him or read his lecture. It was a mystery to me of being warned of the threat of disfellowship if I continued expressing 'Clean Flesh' doctrine which among other things I had pointed out that sin was abstract transgression of law affecting the conscience and could not be a physical element inflicted into the flesh as with a hypodermic needle and in regard to Clean Flesh doctrine all I knew about it was that its advocates believed Jesus did not come in the same flesh nature as ourselves.

The outcome was a loan of the booklet “The sacrifice of Christ” by Edward Turney, a reading of which confirmed my views and returned it to the man who had loaned it – he was the recording Brother, uncle of the former Bishop of York, Stewart Blanch. The address of F.J.Pearce was on the back cover of the booklet and in writing to him, Ernest Brady and others came into the picture from whom I learned much of the history.

I have no regrets for having left the community who will not listen or discuss the Scriptures person to person in a friendly manner, but it appears sticking to the Truth demands unacceptable separation to them. I am not sure what Cyril means in his last paragraph, page 9 but I feel sure that if Turney’s views had been accepted and built upon as with the Nazarenes, no Statement and added Clauses would have been necessary, nor a long list of doctrines to be rejected. Nevertheless I thank Cyril for presenting his lecture as a result of his understanding of what he read in the booklets and not second-hand misrepresentation.

Our sincere thoughts and Kind Regards to him and all readers of the Nazarene Circular Letters and literature.

Phil and Rene Parry.