

# **The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 285**

## **1st Quarter 2019**

### **In this Issue:**

Page 1 The Atonement	Brother Ernest Brady
Page 3 Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 5 Uncovering The Divine Spirit During The Six Day War	Benjamin Glatt
Page 9 Isaiah 53 and Sinful Flesh	Brother E.G.Parry
Page 11 God Doesn't Wait...	Brother Julian Shipley
Page 12 Home Poem	Anon
Page 12 The Meaning of Sacrifice	Brother A.L.Wilson
Page 17 Remarks On The Priesthood Of Israel (from 'Gleaner')	A Jew
Page 19 Sale and Purchase	W.L.
Page 19 Come Now and Let Us Reason Together	Sister Helen Brady

---

## **THE ATONEMENT**

### **FOREWORD**

*A straightforward and scriptural explanation of the Atonement which takes in all Bible facts and presents them fairly and in an easily understood way so that a child can see the truth of it.*

John the Baptist said, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" and the Apostle Paul, "we have before proved both Jew and Gentile that they are all under sin." It is evident that Jesus did not take away the sins we still commit, and Paul's words cannot apply to character because a person of moral goodness is as much "under sin" as the worst sinner. The truth is that the whole human family is estranged from God because of sin.

Adam was created at the beginning a man of flesh and blood with the same corruptible nature as all other living creatures. In order to develop character he was placed under a law requiring obedience. He transgressed and incurred the penalty of sin. The account in Genesis is almost universally misunderstood and it is believed that sin made man corruptible and his eventual death the punishment. But what actually happened proves that this is not so. He had been warned that in the day he sinned he would surely die, yet he lived on for more than 900 years. What is the explanation? Did God change His mind? If we look up all the other instances of the same expression as that in Genesis 2:17 (e.g. 1 Kings 2:37-42) we find that it implies an inflicted death on the day of the crime. Similarly, every instance of the punishment of presumptuous sin was a judicial execution (cf. Genesis 20:7). This is what Adam incurred but it is clear that he was not put to death; but how could he possibly escape if God was not to be untrue to His word? The explanation is the plan of redemption whereby Adam died in law, but under a typical sacrifice his life was spared - he was delivered as Isaac was when Abraham was about to kill him - and he lived to become the father of the human race. God did not change His mind, but He made it possible in His own wisdom to open to man the hope of regaining, by faith, what had been lost by disobedience.

In Romans 5:18, 19 the Apostle Paul shows how God has chosen to regard all men as involved in the Sin of Adam. "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." They were not made sinners in the sense of being created evil, or obliged by their nature to become sinful; the meaning is that we are legally classified as sinners in a similar way to that which we are by law citizens of the country in which we are born. The sentence of death incurred by Adam 'passes upon' all his descendants, since all who share his life would have perished in him if he had been put to death on the day of his sin. So that Adam is not only the man from whom we are all descended, but he is also appointed the federal head of all who are under the reign of Sin.

This is the relationship of being “in Adam” and its vital importance is because if we remain in it, that is, unredeemed, we are inescapably destined to receive the wages of sin.

Sin is literally the transgression of the law and one has to know that a law exists before, in justice, one can be held guilty under it, so that those who are ignorant of God and His purpose are not accountable. But sin is also personified as a king, or master, holding man in bondage, and the reason for this is given in Galatians 3:22, “The scripture hath concluded all under sin that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.”

The meaning is that God has appointed a second federal head, Jesus Christ, and the only way we can demonstrate that we have the faith which will make us acceptable to God is to recognize that our relationship, by birth to the first Adam by which we are in bondage under sin, can only be changed by getting ourselves out of Adam and into Christ. To do this we have to believe and obey, dying in baptism a symbolic death to our former life and being re-born by faith as children of God.

Law is the basis of the Divine plan. It is God’s will that we should not perish but have everlasting life, even though by our own efforts we cannot earn it. He wishes to be merciful and to show His love towards us, but He will not do so at the expense of the supremacy of law. So there is a double problem - to show mercy, and at the same time uphold a just law which must condemn sin - and it is solved in a wonderful way by the sacrifice of Christ.

Under the supreme law of a righteous God a man who is a sinner does not deserve to live, he has forfeited his life, which means that the death which came by sin is not so much a punishment as a debt. A sinner owes that which he cannot pay without perishing; he owes his life. The basis of the Atonement is that if someone else could be found with the means to pay the debt, and providing the supreme authority sanctions the transaction, the sinner might be free from his debt while at the same time the justness of the law is upheld. God brought Jesus into the world for this purpose.

When Jesus submitted Himself to the death of the Cross, He made Himself the sin- bearer, translating into reality the deliverance from the death foreshadowed in Eden when Adam was covered by skins of animals slain. His death was therefore an exact substitutionary sacrifice, not to appease the wrath of God by the infliction of undeserved punishment on the innocent in order that the guilty might escape; this would have been an injustice; but Jesus voluntarily submitted Himself to the condemnation passed upon Him by wicked men, because He saw Himself as paying the price of their redemption. He was wholly good and innocent; there was no cause of death in Him, but what Jesus knew was that He alone could pay the price of their deliverance. Why He alone?

This brings us to the vital factor in The Atonement which God kept concealed from the beginning - the fact that the Redeemer was to be His own Son. Most Christians believe what is revealed in The Gospels about His origin but they do not understand its true significance.

Born of a woman, He was the same natural flesh and blood as all other men, but as He was begotten by the Holy Spirit His life was not a continuation of the Adam-life but a new life direct from God. He was therefore born outside the state of captivity, not under the reign of sin but free, and therefore in a position to purchase the release of those who were enslaved. Jesus said (Matthew 20:28) that He came to give His life a ransom (*lutron*) for many; the word *lutron* means a price paid. The apostle Paul also wrote (Galatians 4:5) that Christ was sent to redeem (*exagorazo*) and this word means to acquire out of the forum, in the same way as slaves were bought, or prisoners ransomed. So this is how Christ redeemed mankind. We have been purchased out of bondage, the bondage of sin, by the payment of a price. It is a figurative transaction, but it was completed by a literal price, the life of Jesus which He laid down for us on the Cross.

If Jesus had not proved Himself personally sinless, He could not have offered Himself as a sacrifice for sin, because a sacrifice had to be perfect and unblemished before sin could be laid upon it. But, even though He had been sinless, if He had been the son of a human father it would have been impossible for Him to meet the legal claim of sin because his life would not have been His own to give; he would have been in the same hopeless condition as all in Adam.

Therefore, being the Son of God and having proved Himself obedient under temptation He was legally free and morally perfect. Though He could have claimed a kind of equality with His Father, he humbled Himself (Philippians 2:5-8) and became obedient unto death, suffering what was due to sinners, giving Himself the Just for the unjust that He might bring us to God.

The purpose of God in Christ is unique in history, in what it reveals of His mercy and love and in the logical perfection with which it meets man's needs, enlightens his mind and gives him hope. It spans the ages from the moment when God said "Let there be light" to the infinite future when He will declare "Behold, I make all things new." These are indeed things which even the angels desired to look into. Today they are open to us and they show the way to eternal life.

Ernest Brady. (1978)

\* \* \* \* \*

## **Editorial**

Dear Brothers, Sisters and Friends, greetings in Jesus' Name.

I have chosen to place the article "Atonement" by Brother Ernest Brady before this editorial because I want to talk about a closely related matter and a reading of the above may help one put into place some of what I wish to say.

In the Editorial for Circular Letter No 279, - Autumn 2017 we considered the matter of the serpent that tempted Eve in Eden, and by way of a reminder of what was in that article we concluded by saying, "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made" and realise that it was not God who made this subtle serpent but it is our own temptation within us whenever we desire to break God's laws. "Resist the devil and he will flee from you. Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you" (James 4:7).

While I think this is a alright as a working definition it seemed to me it was not a complete answer the question as to whom or what the serpent was and it left me thinking further on the matter.

For many centuries there has been a lot of talk about the origin of the serpent and a great deal of speculation has been put forward and most people, it seems, believe that God must have created it expressly to tempt Eve, so much so that it seems all modern translators feel they have to add to the scriptures so that Genesis 3:1 is made to read "the serpent was more subtil than any other beast of the field which the LORD God had made." They have added the word "other" to the scriptures rather than try to understand what the scriptures mean.

Add to this that many have said that because Eve was made "very good" she could not have been tempted by wrong thoughts for surely she must have had only "very good" thoughts, and so the serpent must have been made by someone else who could put wrong thoughts into her mind. But why would He make a serpent with super-natural powers of speech and reasoning for the purpose of tempting Eve to do wrong? There has to be mistake with this idea.

We feel it should be helpful to further develop these matters in order to get to the truth regarding who or what the serpent is.

In 1 Corinthians 10:13 we read "...God *is* faithful, who will not allow you to be tempted beyond what you are able, but with the temptation will also make the way of escape, that you may be able to bear it."

So the first question arises – how could Eve have been "very good" and yet be tempted to do wrong? I see only one satisfactory answer and that is, being tempted is not a fault; in other words, it is not wrong to be tempted for it gives us choice of whether we please God or not. I see no other way. God asks us to choose to do right and will reward us for it, and He warns us of choosing to do wrong and all that leads to. It is only by choosing to do right that anyone can show their love for God. In fact the apostle James saw the need for

temptation when he wrote, "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience. But let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing." (James 1:2 to 4).

In the book of Genesis we see how God chose Israel to be His special people and He gave them the Law of Moses. In Deuteronomy 6:4 to 6 we read, "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD *is* one! You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your strength." Putting such trust in God requires our all, He must come first before our own desires . . . and such faith is very rewarding. Jesus knew this; He knew it was worth being crucified for, and it was not for Himself but for us that He gave His life - so that we could join Him at the resurrection.

I think we have said enough to establish that it is not wrong to be tempted to do wrong - but it is wrong to yield to such temptation; while choosing to do right is seen as necessary to build good characters, well pleasing to God.

Let us turn again to the serpent. We read that the serpent was "more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made." What is the most subtil creature we know of? Snakes? Any of the other hunting animals? I think not. It surely must be mankind. There is no other creature that can compare for cunning, deceit and dishonesty or with the ability to organise into groups for communal selfishness. Man is the most dangerous animal in the world if he so chooses to be. Man's inhumanity to man is proverbial. But man can also show the highest possible attributes, loving kindness, caring and forgiveness - if he so chooses. It is all a matter of one's choice.

But what are we to make of these thoughts? Firstly, only mankind can make decisions which can profoundly affect their lives and the lives of their offspring and others around them. This ability to reason and choose is what distinguishes us from all the rest of the animal kingdom. By this we build our characters; it is our good characters which our heavenly Father seeks and for which He so generously rewards us. It is our good characters which go with us into our future life with Jesus Christ. God asks us to do His will, and His will is set out for us in His commandments, all of which make up good morals - but He also allows us to do our own selfish will if we want to.

At birth we know nothing; our characters are a 'clean slate' as it were and we quickly learn from things around us and it can be seen that we begin developing personalities at a very early age. It is quite natural and usual for you children to want to please their parents. Sooner or later they try getting their own way and with poor parenting this can lead to problems. Good parenting is not always the easiest way but children need encouragement to choose what is right and good for its own sake and here we see the beginning of a young person's character being built. With this choosing comes responsibility. Choosing to do what is right builds good character and choosing wrong will build bad character. So we have a mixture of good and bad; some better, some worse.

Needless to say, this character building can apply only to mankind and not to any other creature of this world.

Here we see that God did not make our characters but gave us the opportunity of making our own. And now we begin to see the answer to our question.

History has long shown that mankind nearly always chooses to make his own decisions and reject God's guidelines which are designed for mankind's good. Like it or not we make our own characters by choosing what we will, right or wrong and we see in Genesis 3:1, the reasoning in Eve's own mind choosing to reject God's will.

The Apostle Paul distinguishes between those who build good characters and those who do not in his letter to the Romans, chapter 6. Here he uses several different expressions such as "being in Adam" and "being in Christ"; "putting off our old man" and "putting on our new man."

We are born with life passed down from Adam and are said to be "in Adam" but in this Christian era we can choose to be "in Christ" by being baptised into His death and in symbol we die with Jesus and rise again

to a newness of life – A new life ‘in Jesus’ and if this is what we choose then it is said we have put off “the old man” and put on the “new.”

**In Genesis 3:1, God used a serpent as a figure of speech which defines the character man creates for himself when he or she ignores or opposes His guidance.**

This is what I see the ‘serpent’ to be, so I repeat it – it is our own individual characters which we make for ourselves when it is not guided by our Creator.

With these thoughts in mind we can see how fitting it was for John the Baptist to say to the Pharisees and Sadducees who came to him for baptism “O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?” ( John 3:7). And we see that Jesus went even further in His condemnation of the Jewish leaders of His day for in Matthew 12:34 He addressed them - “O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? ... an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things.” Again, verse 33, “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?”

And so the exhortation is to us, “Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? Or, What shall we drink? Or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? 32. (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. 33. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. 34. Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.” Matthew 6:31 to 34).

With love in Jesus to all our readers, Russell.

---

### **Deuteronomy 6:4 – 7,**

“Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD *is* one. You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your strength. And these words which I command you today shall be in your heart. You shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, when you walk by the way, when you lie down, and when you rise up. <sup>8</sup> You shall bind them as a sign on your hand, and they shall be as frontlets between your eyes. <sup>9</sup> You shall write them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates.

---

### **Introduction to the following article**

The Jews are indeed an exceptional people descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the twelve sons of Jacob, whose name was changed by God to Israel. The Bible gives their story and after they rejected Jesus, refusing to believe He was their Messiah and Son of God, they have suffered like no other nation and yet they have survived like no other nation. Then in 1948 the Jews became a nation once more in the own land and have thrived in face of continued opposition and persecution.

When writing about them in recent years I have said they seem to believe they have achieved their present position by their own hard work and determination and give their God little praise or thanksgiving for their undoubted successes in opposing their many enemies who wish to see them wiped off the face of the earth. No other nation has been hated so much; they are still persecuted and hated and yet they do not hate in return but are always prepared to give help anywhere and everywhere it is needed. They have specialist teams for search and rescue and are the first to help in any country in the world who suffer natural disasters and there has been no other nation which has given the world so much help in all areas of well-being, health and education.

All the nations of the world should be very thankful to them but they are not. For a small country, no bigger than Wales in the U.K. there is no way they could have overcome so much opposition except with



God's help and when we consider how much God has been with them in their miraculous growth and re-establishment of their country we wonder how much faith they really have.

However, I now wish to put the record straight by publishing the article below, an article which was declassified eighteen months ago and shows the joy of those who realised the hand of God in delivering Jerusalem into their hands in 1967. Their rejoicing is well founded and the world has yet to see how these events will continue until the setting up of the Kingdom of God for which all Christians should be earnestly praying. We are now living in momentous times. "Even so, come, Lord Jesus!"

Editor

## **UNCOVERING THE DIVINE SPIRIT DURING THE SIX DAY WAR**

BY BENJAMIN GLATT JUNE 7, 2017

Declassified documents reveal IDF rabbi's excitement over liberating Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Hebron.



*The iconic 1967 photo of Rabbi Shlomo Goren holding a Torah scroll as he leads the first Jewish prayer session at the Western Wall since 1948.. (photo credit: REPRODUCTION PHOTO: BENNY RON)*

In 1967, as Israel was preparing for the war that by all odds would likely see the nascent state almost annihilated or at the very least have it escape miraculously with only a narrow defeat, IDF Chief Rabbi Shlomo Goren was making his way back to Israel after a fundraising stint in Australia. Flying back to the Holy Land via the Pacific, he landed in New York an hour before Shabbat had started, spending the holy day of rest at a Jewish community near the airport. During Friday's service, someone recognized him, and immediately he was asked to speak during the services the following day.

"In the evening there was a big crowd in the synagogue. There was a lot of anxiety. People were crying and the general feeling was that we were about to have another holocaust," Rabbi Goren recalled in the testimony he gave to the Defence Ministry after the Six Day War, in documents that were recently declassified and released to the public for the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem and of the liberation of Judea, Samaria, Gaza and the Golan Heights. "When I saw their anxiety and that they were crying I opened up the ark and said, 'I swear, on this Torah scroll, that in any constellation, against any enemy that we will have to fight against, on whichever front it will be, against one Arab army alone, or against all of them – we will win. I told them that I was also planning on blowing the shofar at the Western Wall, and this greatly eased their anxiety.'"

Throughout his speeches, in New York, and previously in Australia, Rabbi Goren constantly mentioned that the build-up to the military conflict was indeed a tremendous opportunity to liberate the entire territory of the land of Israel. Although Rabbi Goren was a major-general, due to his mission overseas he had not been privy to all the information the IDF's top brass had received regarding the situation. His belief in the

upcoming victory no doubt stemmed from the extraordinary amount of spiritual work he had performed over his lifetime in order to see how God was setting up the pieces to bring redemption to His Chosen People.

But as he embarked on the flight to Israel from his stopover Saturday night in London, he learned that the feeling that he had about this amazing opportunity wasn't exclusive to him. Rather, whoever opened up their Jewish soul to let in an extra dose of faith in God, could also feel that victory for the Nation of Israel was nigh.

"There were only 11 people on the plane. They were all Israeli military officials returning home, except for one Jew from the US, calling himself 'Einzneir,' who said that he's flying to Israel because a Jew's place in a time of war is in the land of Israel, and that he would stay there until the end of the war, until the victory," Rabbi Goren remembered. "That's what he told me, and afterwards, I met this Jew at the end of the war, and the two of us cried when we met."

### **A Deal**

In 1961, Rabbi Goren had been chatting with commander Motta Gur saying that Central Command had promised him that whenever the IDF should liberate Jerusalem's Old City, he would be the first Jew to reach the Western Wall. Gur, who had been at loggerheads with Rabbi Goren over a religious issue, told him that if he wants to be the first one to reach the Kotel, they have to be at peace.

"What do you mean?" Goren remembered asking. "And he answered me, in this exact language: 'Because I am going to liberate the Old City.' I told him: 'If you promise to liberate the Old City, I'm making a peace deal with you.'"

In a special televised show bringing together the major players involved in the liberation of Jerusalem, Goren said to Gur, who by chance had his mission to the Sinai cancelled and instead was told to liberate the Old City: "If you were a rabbi, I would have seriously believed that the spirit of the prophets was upon you."

### **Into the Lions' Gate**

"I asked him: 'Where are you?' and he answered, 'We're going up to the Lions' Gate.'" Upon hearing that Israeli troops were heading into Jerusalem's Old City, the IDF chief rabbi didn't waste any time joining Paratrooper Brigade commander Gur on June 7, 1967, to enter the city of the perfection of beauty.

"I 'flew' straight to the Rockefeller Museum, left the car there and I took my Torah scroll and shofar with me," Rabbi Goren said. "I got out of the car, and with the Torah scroll in one hand and the shofar in the other, I started running toward the Lions' Gate. As I was running there, the brigade was getting ready to go inside."

In the meantime, Rabbi Goren told the Defence Ministry transcribers that he saw the Central Command commanding officer and the deputy chief of staff driving quickly in our direction.

"I didn't pay attention to them. I didn't want to drive there; I wanted to go by foot. I said it's not important if I'm killed or not, the most important thing is for us to reach the ancient city of Jerusalem," he said.

When they got to the Lions' Gate he started blowing the shofar as it says in the Torah to blow trumpets, or the shofar, in times of war: "When you go into battle in your own land against an enemy who is oppressing you, sound a blast..." (Numbers 10:9).

The whole way, Goren relived, he was blowing the shofar and reading Psalms. "I remember that I read the verses of 'Whenever the ark set out, Moses said, 'Rise up, Lord! May your enemies be scattered; may your foes flee before you'" (Numbers 10:35), and of "Hear, Israel: Today you are going into battle against your enemies. Do not be fainthearted or afraid... (Deuteronomy 20:3).

And then they reached the destination. After being expelled from the Old City for 19 years after having returned to it after an almost 2,000-year period – they were finally back in the dwelling place of God.

“When I got to the Temple Mount I blew the shofar, but first I fell to the floor and bowed down, as you are supposed to bow down at the site of the temple.

“I left the soldiers on the Temple Mount, as the inertia and my memories [of the Old City] pushed me to go to the Western Wall, even though I was standing right next to the site of the Holy of Holies, a place that is much more sacred than the Western Wall.”

Rabbi Goren remembered the exact psalms he read, beginning with Psalm 126, “When the Lord restored the fortunes of Zion, we were like those who dreamed,” and then reading Psalm 122, “I rejoiced with those who said to me, ‘Let us go to the house of the Lord.’ Our feet are standing in your gates, Jerusalem. Jerusalem is built like a city that is closely compacted together.”

As he stood on the Temple Mount, he saw that they were hanging a flag on the Western Wall.

“I didn’t notice who was hanging it. It was like I was in a dream, all the time I was running from place to place. And then I continued to run to the Western Wall.”

Rabbi Goren recalled that he didn’t know how to get to the Western Wall from the Temple Mount. After all he said, he had a custom of praying at the Kotel every Shabbat, and during the mourning period after his mother had passed away he would lead the prayer services at the Western Wall on the eve of every new month. But he had never been allowed to ascend to the Temple Mount.

“At that precise moment, an Arab appeared, started walking around, and told me in Arabic, ‘this way.’ He understood that I was trying to get to the Western Wall.”

He went straight to the Mughrabi Gate, finding there two officers, who were also running to find the Kotel. The way was long with many steps and many inner gates. Finally they broke open the last gate and descended to the ancient limestone wall, where despite it only being a remnant of the age of the temples, as fourth-century scholar Rav Acha said: “The divine presence has never departed from the Western Wall, as it says in Song of Solomon (2:9) ‘Look! There he stands behind our wall’” (Shemot Rabbah 2:2).

“This is the Western Wall,” Rabbi Goren said. “I immediately fell on the floor, kissed the floor, got up and made the Shehecheyanu blessing for special occasions and the ‘Consoler of Zion and Builder of Jerusalem’ blessing. There wasn’t a living soul there. It was as if the Divine Spirit was there.”

### **Mama Rachel**

“As I was in Jerusalem, on the Temple Mount, I said that we have additional tasks to complete.” Rabbi Goren was referring to Bethlehem, with Rachel’s Tomb, and Hebron, the site of the Cave of the Patriarchs.

With the Jordanian Legion completing abandoning the city where David had lived, Rabbi Goren and three of his colleagues searched the pitch black of Bethlehem to find Rachel’s Tomb. “When we entered, it was dark, we had a flashlight, and we also had some candles. We lit two of them, and I said the verses of Jeremiah the Prophet off by heart (31:15-17): ‘A voice is heard in Ramah, mourning and great weeping, Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted, because they are no more. This is what the Lord says, ‘Restrain your voice from weeping and your eyes from tears, for your work will be rewarded,’ declares the Lord. ‘They will return from the land of the enemy. So there is hope for your descendants, declares the Lord. Your children will return to their own land,’” Rabbi Goren recalled. “We fulfilled the vision of the prophecy of Jeremiah the Prophet.”

### **Fathers and mothers**

One of Rabbi Goren’s major efforts before the war in the Sinai in 1956 was to create a special prayer for the soldiers going to battle. Before the Six Day War, the Chief Rabbinate distributed hundreds of copies to the troops, with Rabbi Goren later saying “this prayer played a significant contribution to raising the general morale. Every last soldier had received the prayer from the chief of staff in veneration, and when I had gone



around to the various units, the officers and the soldier showed me that they were saying the prayer before going to battle.”

After the success of liberating Bethlehem and Rachel’s Tomb, Rabbi Goren and his team continued to Gush Etzion, about 15 minutes south. Before dawn, he was told, the troops would be heading even farther south, to Hebron.

“At 4 a.m., I stood on a tank in the middle, and all the soldiers gathered around me,” he recalled. “I spoke to them and I told them simply, ‘I want to tell you about the enormous merit that has fallen into your hands today. Today, you need to know what you are about to liberate, and for who you are going to war.

“Today we are going to liberate the second most holy city in the world – the City of Our Forefathers, Hebron, the site of the Cave of the Patriarchs, where for years, not only during our statehood, but long before was closed to us. And, today, it is in your hands to liberate the city.

“When I went inside the Cave of the Patriarchs, the Divine Spirit was there. The cleanliness and beauty was unbelievable – just like at the Western Wall. Also at the Western Wall I could really feel the clapping of the wings of the Divine Spirit.”

On June 10, the six days of battle ended. By the seventh day, Israel was just beginning the work it had been doing.

---

## **Isaiah 53 and “Sinful Flesh”**

Dear Brethren and Sisters,

If there was a chapter in which we should expect to find the doctrine of “Sinful Flesh” or any suggestion that this was the nature of Jesus, I think this chapter would be the 53rd. chapter of Isaiah. However, when we come to read through it and taking into account the marginal references, we find that instead of the doctrine of “sinful flesh” the opposite is the case.

Let us therefore consider the verses of this chapter for a few moments and while doing so, we will point out statements which have wrongfully been used to prove the “sinful flesh” theory and consider some of the interpretations placed upon this chapter beginning with the well-known verse 1 - “Who hath believed our report and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?” This is a declaration by the prophet to the effect that whoever has heard and believed the prophetic utterances of Scripture has understood what the Lord intended to do upon the earth, for it is a figurative statement; the arm being a chief operative member of the Body for action. It brings to our minds, no doubt, the words of Psalm 89:1, “His right hand and His holy arm hath gotten him the victory.”

What is it that we must needs understand, and what is it that the arm of the Lord has revealed, and who does Christ grow up before, in the singular sense, other than His Father? “For he shall grow up before Him as a tender plant and as a root out of a dry ground.” Now, we have no doubt whatever that the “tender plant” fits the short life of Jesus on this earth with the nature that you and I now possess; I would be very surprised indeed if someone said to me that it did not mean Christ at all - I very much doubt that this will happen, however.

But very strange is the fact He is not only known as a “tender plant” but the “root” as well. We should expect, even in figurative language that the “root” would be the beginning of the plant; but here we have a dual application. He is a “root out of dry ground, which is the figure of the nation of Israel in its “dry” state.

We see that whilst He was the first Lord or the beginning of a new creation, He was not in every sense the start of the nation; Jesus was unique in this event, however, just as He was unique in the offering He afterwards made for sin, for this act of love and obedience cannot be repeated.

One other strange fact, which we do not usually expect to find, is a plant or root growing in dry ground, at all, much less flourishing. This, however, was no ordinary “plant,” for its beginning was of the Holy Spirit causing a virgin to conceive and bring forth a son - this was a new beginning, for that which was born was the Son of God: out of dry ground, yes, because of the connection with Israel through Mary His mother - planted by God and made to grow.

No doubt, we shall recall the words in Luke 2:40, “and the child grew and waxed strong in spirit filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him;” verse 52 and “Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and man.”

A picture of the “dry” state of Israel is recorded by the prophet Ezekiel in the 37 chapter; “The hand of the Lord was upon me, and carried me out in the Spirit of the Lord and set me down in the midst of the valley which was full of bones, and caused me to pass by them round about and behold there were very many in the open valley, and lo they were very dry...” Verse 11, “Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel; behold they say, Our bones are dried and our hope is lost, we are cut off for our parts.”

Jesus, however, was to alter this “dry” state of Israel and bring fresh hope to the nation, for the time was to come when they should no longer be divided but would be one nation and one King would be king to them all. This also was the declaration by God through Ezekiel:- “My tabernacle also shall be with them, yea, I will be their God and they shall be my people, and the nations shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore.” (Ezekiel 37:28)

How was Jesus to accomplish this? He was wounded for our transgressions, and became despised and rejected of men. Isaiah 53:4, “Surely He had borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.” But was He stricken, smitten of God? No, He was not; He was stricken and smitten by men. God allowed it – for our sakes, verse 4, “He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him and with His stripes are we healed.” Verse 8, “He was taken from prison and from judgment and who shall declare his generation, for he was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgressions of my people was he stricken.”

“Who shall declare His generation?” That is a question that calls for an answer. He didn’t actually live a full Jewish generation, for He was only 33 years of age when He was put to death, and “He made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit found in His mouth; yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He hath put Him to grief, when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin; He shall see his seed and he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall proper in his hands.”

So although He died without being married, he died that He might be married after a higher order and for the love of His bride-to-be who was also to constitute His seed.

He was to see His seed because of His death, for His death as an offering for sin made the life of the seed possible. This can be understood from the 11th verse, “He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied. By His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities.”

The last verse is greatly misunderstood and made to bolster up the “sinful flesh” theory, yet this verse is really so plain in its teaching “and he was numbered among the transgressors.” Now why say He was numbered with the transgressors if indeed, He was a sinner and as much in need of salvation as those He came to save? No, Brethren and Sisters; a sinner cannot make intercession for sinners, neither can he give something that he has already sold.

Jesus, however, was in a position to pay the price, to lay down His life, as the price - for it was God who gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. If Christ had already been sold under sin God could not have given, and Jesus could not have paid with His life - because that is what was necessary under the Divine law of righteousness.

The verses do not suggest in any way whatever that Jesus had sinful flesh.

Jesus, however, in His love, went further than this: He paid the price instead of the sinner and providing the sinner recognizes this and associates himself or herself in the death of Jesus by being baptised into His death, they become free from the yoke of bondage in which sin held them, and if they continue to use this freedom as they ought they will be free indeed, and will receive incorruptible bodies and, as the angels, to die no more.

Jesus made intercession for the transgressors. He could not have done so had He been a sinner, but if some would read more carefully these verses they would understand that it was because He was completely free from sin, and because He gave this free life as a price or ransom for our freedom from the bondage of sin, that He is to receive the reward in the last verse of the 53rd chapter of Isaiah. "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great and he shall divide the spoil with the strong."

Why? Because "he hath poured out his soul unto death, and he was numbered with the transgressors and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors".

Read these verses again and consider.

E.G.Parry

---

### **Deuteronomy 4:5-8,**

"Surely I have taught you statutes and judgments, just as the LORD my God commanded me, that you should act according *to them* in the land which you go to possess. Therefore be careful to observe *them*; for this *is* your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the peoples who will hear all these statutes, and say, 'Surely this great nation *is* a wise and understanding people.' "For what great nation *is there* that has God *so* near to it, as the LORD our God *is* to us, for whatever *reason* we may call upon Him? And what great nation *is there* that has *such* statutes and righteous judgments as are in all this law which I set before you this day?"

---

Julian Shipley writes

### **'God doesn't wait until we have our moral life in order before He starts loving us'.**

Matthew 22:36-49, "Teacher, which is the greatest commandment in the Law?" Jesus replied: "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: Love your neighbour as yourself. All the Law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments."

This is a key passage in the New Testament as it is Jesus teaching us what the most important laws are - it's really simple.

Also John 14:21, "He who has My commandments and keeps them, it is he who loves Me. And he who loves Me will be loved by My Father, and I will love him and manifest Myself to him."

---

### **Galatians 5:22,23,**

"But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control. Against such there is no law."

---

## HOME

Affliction and sorrow and death shall be o'er,  
The saints shall unite to be parted no more;  
Their loud hallelujahs fill Heaven's high dome;  
They dwell with their Saviour forever at home.

The days of exile are passing away;  
The time is approaching when Jesus will say,  
'Well done faithful servant, sit down by my throne  
And dwell in My presence forever at home.'

May we then dear brother, midst pleasure or woe,  
For that heavenly kingdom our hearts prepare;  
And very shortly we most surely shall know  
And feel the joy of what it is to be there.

Anon

---

## THE MEANING OF SACRIFICE

### ANALYSIS OF ISLIP COLLYER'S ARTICLE

On reading through Friend Islip's pamphlet, I was disappointed at the absence of a technical definition of the term "sacrifice," since the Sacrifice of Christ is the most important event that ever transpired on earth.

We can afford to dispense with definitions, but I strongly advise the reader to refresh his mind by a scan over the definition, and candidly ask himself if Christ were under sentence of death on account of His (supposed) sinful flesh or condemned nature, could that 'death' be a sacrifice? Ask himself candidly, if there ever was a man on earth, or an Angel from Heaven who could sacrifice his own debt? Ask himself if it is possible to exhibit two more antagonistic terms. Does not the very term 'debt' blaspheme the term 'sacrifice'? "Understandest what thou readest?"

There never was, under the canopy of Heaven such a freak as 'sinful flesh,' nor 'condemned nature', because God alone is responsible for these. The only sin recorded in God's Book which changed the flesh is that of Lot's wife and of Miriam, Moses sister.

This eternal confounding of flesh with character the legal with the physical and possession with the quality of the flesh, is that intoxicating cup of her who has "Charmed all Nations".

Sin cannot exist apart from law. "Where there is no Law there is no transgression." Jesus says: "If I had not done amongst them the works which no other man ever did, they had not had sin." Your assumption turns the Master out of court here.

"The sting of death" is not your supposed condemned flesh, but positively condemned character. "The Sting of Death" is sin not flesh. And the strength of sin is the law. The law scrutinises not the quality of your flesh, but that of your character. Does our law hang a man for the quality of his flesh, or that of his character? Ponder this - "There is nothing unclean of itself," and "Every sin man performs is outside the body."

Paul is grievously misunderstood, due alone to this Pagan "Sinful Flesh" assumption. Peter especially warns us against wresting Paul's words to our own destruction. Indiscrimination of Paul's metonymy, that abridged figure of speech, peculiar to Paul alone, when literally construed admirably satiates the Creed Hunter and none more so than the sinful flesh glutton. Give us flesh to eat!

Paul, addressing the brethren, says: "Ye are not in the flesh." Did he mean, they were not flesh and blood? Even the phrase - "the body of sin" fails lamentably to prove sinful flesh. In English it means - the body "belonging to sin." The Greek ever uses the Genitive form of Possession. So it is in Romans 8:3. The adjective "sinful" is not there. Thus friend Islip's very criterion vanishes into oblivion.

When two nouns come together, it is a case of possession, except, however, it be a noun in apposition as 'John the Baptist' meaning the same person. We, in English, do not use the Greek genitive form of possession, unless the possessor be neuter, as "the roof of the house." We do not then say "the house's roof." (The following is a riddle to many - "If Moses were the son of Pharaoh's daughter, he was then, the "daughter of Pharaoh's son"). Paul's Greek genitive case converted me to Christ.

"The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." But don't forget that "the pure in heart alone shall see God." Whence this transformation? Would you advocate a surgical operation? Again, "Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." Here our opposing friends imagine this clenches sinful flesh. Permit me however, to point out that the first thing staring us in the face here is the Imperative or Commanding Mood. Something we are Divinely prohibited from doing. If our physical system be a compound of three fourths sin and one flesh, will you please inform me how to proceed? Must I resort to Anatomy?

In my Paul's inverted, elliptical, figure of metonymy (Meta = change; Nomen = the name) he speaks of "sin that dwelleth in me." Also, "the foolishness of God." If you force the literal into the former, you are irrevocably bound to force the literal into the latter.

Let us hear James: "Every man . . . " this included Adam in Eden, who, when he saw that the forbidden tree was pleasant to the eye, and to be desired. But we must not condemn Adam for these God-implemented natural desires until he "tastes" the forbidden fruit. Why then, condemn Dear Jesus, who ever subordinated His legitimate, natural, desires to "The will of His Father?" "Not my will but Thine be done." But let the Apostle proceed - "Every man when he is tempted, is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed, and when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."

I have now the utmost pleasure in transcribing Bro. Zilmer's Deductive Analysis of that Scripture, and Paul's metonymy. He says:-

"Lust conceived bringeth forth sin. Although there may be a desire for some forbidden object, yet sin does not become a fact until lust hath "conceived." What is this "conception" of lust? In the ordinary sense of the term conception comes from the union of two elements, the male and the female.

In the case with which we are dealing, there is a union between two mental faculties; and there are two mental processes. The first of these is the judgement. Man as a rational being, ordinarily engages in actions which his judgement approves. By this we mean that he somehow justifies such acts as right. Once the judgement approves one more element is necessary to effect the conception, that is "The Will." When the judgement approves, and the will resolves to carry the desire into execution, then the union is complete, conception takes place, and sin, as an act of transgression against the Divine Law, is the child that is brought forth!

Was R. Roberts anything behind the above when he declared:— "The phrase "Sin in the flesh" is metonymical. It is not the expression of a literal element or principle pervading physical organisation. Literally, sin is disobedience, or an act of rebellion. The impulses which lead to this reside in the flesh, and metonymically came to be called by the name of the act to which they gave birth."

I ask, is it possible to exhibit purer Divine harmony among any other three men on earth, the Apostle, Zilmer and R. Roberts? But allow R. Roberts to finish:-

"The impulses which lead to this existed in Adam before transgression as much as they did afterwards, else disobedience would not have occurred."



I here ask - was Adam, therefore doomed to death on account of his being created with natural desires? Absurd! Is it not, therefore, wild deduction to condemn Jesus for possessing natural desires? But let us hear R. Roberts finish:- "Our Friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no evidence of this whatever and the presumption and evidence are entirely the contrary way. There was a change in Adam's relation to his Maker but not in the nature of his organisation."

I ask therefore, how have our Christadelphian friends become "Flesh Changers" and ignorantly misrepresented us across the broad earth of being guilty of that pagan delusion?

On page 2, paragraph 3, our friend Islip says:-

"It is as though the prophet was anticipating this controversy when he wrote - "Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows. Yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten, and afflicted of God. But He was wounded for our transgressions..." But please observe the Prophet does not say "He was stricken, smitten, afflicted, wounded and bruised for what friend Islip is pleased to term "His own unclean, sinful, condemned, flesh, nature."

Reader! Think for yourself. Ask yourself candidly if that "idea" could honestly be read into that glorious declaration of the prophet?

We agree with friend Islip when he says, "Jesus was the son of God, the beginning of a New Creation, and that it is by His righteousness (and faith in His shed blood alone) we can be saved." But when, at the top of Page 3 he says - "God made His Son strong for the work of overcoming and condemning sinful flesh," then we are forced to part company, because this idea reduces Christ to a mere machine, reduces His trial to a mere sham fight and positively robs Christ of all merit.

We verily believe that God made His Beloved strong for our redemption, but we denounce the idea that His strength lay in His 'hair' like that of Samson. This supposed infinite strength idea is forced by the sinful flesh delusion, which alone is the 'father of the thought.' God tries no man above what he is able to bear, who every time makes a way of Escape, that he may be able to bear it. His commandments are not grievous. His burden is Light.

Jesus was truly "The beginning of a new creation, in whom alone was life". This is wherein His strength lay. "The Prince of Life," "The way, the truth and the life." Who "poured out that life blood unto death."

No sham fight here. No concocted yarn of receiving infinite strength to strangle His supposed sinful flesh or condemned nature. This Monster of all delusions.

Jesus was the property of God alone. Do you know what that means? If you will point out where the Adversary and God had equal shares in the Christ, we will proclaim peace tonight. We must not violate God's fundamental law of private ownership, and force Him into co-operation with the 'sinful flesh butcher.' Did Jesus sacrifice His own debt? Did He say, "This is My sinful body which must be slain for Myself? This do in remembrance of Me? Horrid idea!!!

"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

On page 3 bottom, friend Collyer says, "We recognise that it was in character, and not in nature that Jesus differed from us."

This Declaration we thoroughly endorse. But it evades the main point at issue and tacitly renews the false charge of our having changed nature. Is it not a deplorable fact that changed nature, with friend Islip and his adherents, is a foregone conclusion. His cherished criterion, which forces him to 'saddle the wrong pony' and mutilate the word of God to uphold? This fact alone exhibits the actual flesh changers. Will friend Islip point out to us, in God's book, where Jesus stood in a relation condemned to death on account of His sinful flesh or condemned nature and then define Sacrifice? A duty he, hitherto, positively has failed to do.

We do not accuse him of wilful indulgence, in subtle, hidden, under-currents. It is his own sinful flesh bias which prevents him 'spitting out' and speaking plainly. Friend Islip has become so much the slave of phrases that he has lost all capacity for meanings. No amount of reasoning in a circle will, to eternity, settle this question. This supposed change in the flesh of Adam is a Will-o-the-wisp, against which Robert Roberts declared: - "There is no evidence whatever, and the evidence and presumption are entirely the contrary way. There was a change in Adam's relation to his Maker but not in his physical organisation." Why then, change the flesh?

The Spirit portrayed that prior to the close of the age, there would be a cage of full-fledged, unclean and hateful birds.

Reader! Do you belong to that cage?

We therefore patiently await friend Collyer's "Definition of Sacrifice."

Dr. Thomas held that Christ was raised in mortal nature. See "Echoes of past Controversies" Page 80. This means, raised doomed to death. Peter declares: "He was quickened in Spirit." Paul says: "Not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." We must not violate God's law regarding The Passover Lamb. "None of it shall remain over until the morning." If God raised His own Passover Lamb in mortal nature on that glorious Resurrection Morn, does not the assumption force God to violate His own law? We must not believe all we hear; but prove all things. Because there never was a greater Babel of Tongues.

"When I see the blood, I will pass over." This was "The Great Stumbling Stone Laid in Zion." The great majority neglected the sprinkling of the door posts of their hearts, and sought deliverance by mere works of law." Works of law could not redeem life. Hence, "By works of law shall no flesh be justified." This demonstrates that Jesus was in a justified relation toward His own Father before works of law could count. His fidelity to the Divine law merited His reward of immortality by retaining His justified relation towards His own Father.

Here, then, stands One "Mighty to save." Before accepting His merited reward of immortality if He will now pour out His soul (Life) unto death, my salvation is eternally solved. Did my Lord do this? "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

"Greater Love hath no man than this." That Life blood has perished for ever; "He was quickened in Spirit." His merited reward according to the oath of God, via. - "This do and thou shalt live." This is my meaning of sacrifice.

Sinful flesh is 'top dog' throughout friend Islip's booklet. Page 7, top, he says, "The racial tendencies are a part of our physical nature." Do we deny this? Were they not in Adam also prior to transgression? Genesis 1:28. Did God hold Adam condemned for natural desires which God alone implanted? Horrid deduction!

Friend Islip continues, "For Christ to have been free from all desires of the flesh to please itself, would have involved a miracle of Divine energy for the express purpose of making His nature different from ours."

Here again is a subtle implication which forces changed flesh and condemned nature with a vengeance. Demonstrating to the hilt that friend Islip is the 'Flesh Changer,' who, on Page 3, forces God to a miracle of "Divine energy," imparting to Jesus "Infinite Power" for the overcoming and condemning of this supposed changed sinful flesh.

If Friend Islip would but leave off stewing Rome's sinful flesh and accept the Word of God that "there is nothing unclean of itself" it would save him from involving God in a miracle of Divine energy to save man from what never existed on earth, viz.- Sinful Flesh.

How long will they saddle the wrong pony?

Brother A.L.Wilson.

## Appendix

*"Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." - 2 Peter 3:13.*

A new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. If righteousness consists of acts of obedience to certain Laws how can it be understood to dwell in a person ("O Earth, Earth, Earth, hear the Word of the Lord" - Earth = persons), except it be by knowledge thereof not by indulgence therein. The same with "the sin that dwelleth in me" {see below}.

1 John 3:17, How dwelleth the love of God in him.

2 John 3, For truth's sake which dwelleth in you.

See Romans. 10, 3. A.V.

Candidly I do not think the statement, "Sin that dwelleth in me" is metonymical. The indwelling of sin is due to the application of the federal principle and is doctrinal not literal. Sin cannot literally dwell in man, neither does lust dwell in man as a constant inmate, it does not exist until something arises to call it forth. Its existence then is in the abstract realm of thought and cannot be a physical principle or property of nor pervading the literal flesh. Lust can only be said to dwell in one when and so long as the thoughts thereon, hence the principle (Rule) upon which Paul could base his speech is the federal. In no other sense could he rightly employ or use it. Hence R. Roberts' speech is most subtle and misleading. Isaiah 1:21, provides an example of this speech. Would they suggest righteousness was an indwelling physical principle and a lodger? What is a lodged? Answer: A person who temporarily resides in the house belonging to - another person (Apply the idea of bought and sold). Is this what was meant? In what form did righteousness lodge therein? Of what does righteousness consist? Is it concrete or abstracts is it acts of obedience or knowledge pertaining to acts in accordance with laws of justice = Just laws.

If only they would let every word perform its own function there would not be this indiscriminate mixing of thought with matter, abstract with concrete. In what sense does righteousness lodge within a person? Is it not by knowledge thereof? Hence I conclude sin is said to dwell therein in precisely the same manner, viz., by knowledge pertaining thereto.

Hence, instead of the statement, being metonymical, it is a statement of literal fact and pertains to the abstract realm of thought, not to the concrete flesh.

If the statement were metonymical where is the advantage in changing the name from lust to sin? Does this change convey a better idea of the thing said to dwell therein? What object could be served thereby? Are we intended to understand, lust to be a part of our physical make up by such an expression and by such use of metonymy?

It has become customary to understand that man - in connection with the law of God, is weak, on account, of his sinful flesh, his sin-in-the-flesh, a fixed principle termed "lust," yet Paul says it is the law that was weak through the flesh.

Here we have something via the flesh that rendered the law weak and I ask: is it consistent with sound reasoning to conclude that transgression, man's mental weakness and inability to obey the law took away the law's strength?

Paul says: "The strength of sin is the law," hence the law gave strength to sin. If it could give strength to sin and yet was weak through the flesh, would not such rather suggest that the impulses of the flesh towards sin were not strong enough to cause man to sin that strength might be given to the law. Surely such proves the theory of sin-in-the-flesh erroneous, and should cause all to reason these things out for themselves, trusting implicitly to no man's explanation without full investigation.

How, then, could there be something via the literal flesh that could render such a law weak, surely the literal flesh cannot act on its own initiative. Must we not turn to that other method in Scripture, its metonymical mode of speech, where the word flesh is employed instead of the word men or man, e.g., “the end of all flesh is before me.”

Does the passage in question include all men as in example quoted or to one certain person. A glance at the Greek solves the problem, for there we perceive the Definite Singular article, denoted in English by ‘the’ employed, and not only so but we have its grammatical meaning to assist us because the Accusative form - which indicates ‘sin’ as the Object - precedes the word for “sin” and the Dative form which indicates the time and the clue or fact given for locating the person to whom it relates, precedes the word ‘flesh.’

“Condemned THE sin in THE flesh.”

What particular sin was this and what particular flesh?

If sin, in the shape of lust, desire or the impulses were a “fixed principle” surely man could not refrain from sin. The average man does not desire to sin but desires to avoid sin because of its consequences. The average man could refrain from sin if he exercise his power to control his actions because “God tries no man above what he is able.”

We do not deny there are fixed principles which govern the flesh of man, which govern (rule over) his ability mentally to experience lust or desire, which principles were fixed at his creation (as witness their conception of sin; James 1:14, 15) but these “fixed principles” governing rules or laws - are known and exist in the mind of God alone. Man knows them not, his physical organism is controlled by them and man has no power to alter this law, tho’ he may damage the organism and prevent their perfect operation.

Paul further says: “there is nothing unclean of itself” hence the flesh “itself is not scripturally unclean, yet we read: “Ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.” Surely “it is not the putting away of filth of the (literal) flesh,” as Paul says but a legal transaction, “it” refers to the flesh and if the flesh is not unclean of itself all this talk of inheriting sin in the flesh as a fixed principle in the flesh or as impulses which lead to sin is contradiction of these clear concise statements.

Uncleanness pertaining to the flesh is imputed per the law. To what uncleanness via the flesh does it refer if not to that under which scripture - not man - hath shut up together all under sin? If they would refrain from repeating phrases without paying attention to the meaning thereof, they might be enabled to perceive how comprehensive is the above quotation. As Andrew said it answers the question “multum en parvo.”

What shall we say then that Abraham our father as pertaining to the flesh hath found (out) Romans 4:1? Yea, what shall we say? Shall we say he discovered it was full of a physical sin principle termed sin-in-the-flesh or that scripture hath legally concluded all under sin due to fleshly relationship to Adam our forefather under what is now termed the federal principle?

A.L.W.

---

## **Remarks On The Priesthood Of Israel**

**By a Jew.**

If the prophets be the glory of Israel, the priests, alas, were our weakness and our shame.

And I believe I may assert in perfect truth that since the destruction of the Temple, the priests, the descendants of the seed of Aaron, have led lives more chaste and pure, and more in accord with the traditions of their order than, as a corporation, their fathers led during the existence of their functional duties.

Can there be a more pitiful view of their moral degradation than that terrible picture painted by Ezra himself. In regard to the priesthood of the second Temple, we owe our national downfall to dissensions sanctioned if not directly fostered by them. Great and glorious as were the services of the Maccabean dynasty, and never to be forgotten in the annals of our race their attempt to unite again in one and the same person the priestly and the kingly function was fatal to our temporal nationality.

Our national misfortune was that we violated and set aside the safeguard of Mosaism. See how Moses, inspired by God, legislated for the priesthood! Celibacy was prohibited. The heart was not seared against its natural sympathies.

The priest was amenable to the common law of the land. His calling offered him no sanctuary against crime. With few privileges he had comparatively few duties, except the duties he performed in accord with all other citizens. And "as a married priest-hood" would soon have degenerate into a caste of sacerdotal nobility, holding their land as a patrimonial inheritance, by the nominal condition of serving at the altar, but neglecting, in fact, every duty which they were charged to perform. Moses met this by the law that the tribe of Levi should possess no real property. They were made dependent for their very subsistence on the nation's bounty alone. The fault of Israel's failure lay not in the law, but in the perversity of human nature in opposing and rejecting its safeguards.

Now let us cast a glance at the development of the secular elements. God willed us to be a nation of secular priests - in the language of Scripture, a kingdom of priests, a holy nation. It may be inferred that at first all Israel were permitted to eat of the holy sacrifices; but that on the erection and worship of the golden calf, the permission was withdrawn from Israel at large and given to the priests only. By our own defection we became saddled with a dominant priestly caste. We were nothing loath to play into their hands: and when the head of the nation, the king, lapsed into idolatry, he readily found false prophets and false priests to cajole and misdirect, and to license and tolerate the vices of the people, and through their vices to bring them under the yoke of priest-craft. As priests attempted to play the king, so there were not wanting kings who attempted to play the priest. I speak not of the earlier days of the nation, before a settled form of worship had been consolidated, but of a later period, even after the Temple service had been organised. Uzziah, splendid as had been his life while under the influence of the best of priests, Zechariah, attempted to perform priestly functions. This profane act led to his exile from throne and home. But such instances, where laymen sought priestly immunities, seem to have been few and far between. It was reserved for comparatively recent times to display the opposite phase; for secularists under the new name of Rabbi, to forget their own secularly, and to ignore that their very titles and claims to respect are founded on the ruins of sacerdotalism. The modern Rabbis, the most intolerant foes of free investigation if it touch their own assumed authority, are oblivious of the freedom of discussion of that grand book, the rained, which the Magna Charta of Judaism. When the anathematizing Rabbis are asked to adopt reasonable modifications they doom the applicants as with imperial mandate *ad bonem*. They have built up a system of pains and penalties, and support their structure on the two magic pillars - *non-possumus* and infallibility. They have impeded every path to improvement and left no passage open for any escape except through that unhappy and miserable slough, secession.

History offers no experience to such men. Could they, however, but live to see the mischief they entail by their unreasoning and unreasonable adherence to opinions which at their very inception were utterly wrong, and which are bolstered up because they are antiquated, they would stand aghast at the evil they engendered! "Peace in my days" is a doctrine as unrighteous as it is cowardly. To leave for successors a work that one should and can do in his own day, is the conduct of neither a brave nor an honest man. While retaining boundary lines to secure our precious tree of life, Judaism, let us defend our holy faith against the canker-worm of superstitions that ought never to have been permitted a lodgement on the foliage.

The time is fast approaching, if it has not already come, when all authority will be obliged to give an account of its *raison d'être*, its pretensions and its exercise, and those who claim our allegiance must prove their title in the court of reason.

Selected. GLEANER.



## Sale and Purchase.

It has been said that it is not scriptural to speak of redemption as a purchase. But there is a portion of Scripture on the point. The 28th verse of the 20<sup>th</sup> chapter of Acts will show that it is analogous to a commercial transaction – “Take heed therefore, unto yourselves, and unto all the flock over which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood.”

Is it not a sort of commercial transaction? Anyone understanding a debtor and creditor account should be able to see it. Paul speaks of being sold under Sin, and then it is said, “Ye are bought with a price.” Another Apostle says, “Ye have not been redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.”

You will see that if the life had been condemned in Adam, the life would not have been precious, and Jesus would then have needed someone to redeem Him, as is the case with us.

There are other passages in Scripture which I need not quote, justifying the commercial aspect of the affair. Now if a man had his coat in pledge for 5/-, and another man wished to redeem it, would he have to pay 10/- for it? No, he would not. What was in pledge for Adam? It was his life Jesus. Jesus, having His own life free, was in a position to lay it down for the purpose of redemption. But as Bro. Smith has said, and truly, redemption is separate from salvation. We are bought back – ah! some are bought back who have denied the Lord who bought them. These, however, will return to the dust from whence they came.

We shall not be saved unless we have been diligent to make our calling and election sure. Jesus has conditionally obtained eternal redemption for us, and we are in the way to it; but unless we act properly we shall not reach it.

W.L.

---

### **“COME NOW, LET US REASON TOGETHER”** **SAITH THE LORD.**

For over seventy years the Nazarene Fellowship has been circularising the Christadelphians in an effort to enlighten the members of that community about the apostate and blasphemous doctrine Christadelphianism contains.

We have undertaken this thankless task because of a genuine concern for the friends and relatives many of us were forced to leave behind when we discovered Christadelphians did not know or preach the truth about the Sacrifice of Christ and the nature of man as it has been revealed in the Bible.

Sadly our efforts during these years have with a few notable exceptions been met with indifference or outright hatred. We have been called trouble makers and renegades, our views when not suppressed have been misrepresented and we have been treated like outcasts.

We have explained our views in opposition to Christadelphianism many times and in many ways, always inviting comment and debate in an honest endeavour to bring believers to the knowledge of the true Gospel and God's purpose with the world.

During these years we have discovered that although Christadelphians are fully prepared to take on a member of any other denomination professing an interest in Bible truth, no Christadelphian has yet been found to answer or disprove the vital matters of doctrine written in opposition to Christadelphianism and available for all to read in a wide range of Nazarene publications.

My father Ernest Brady produced many of these writings and in preaching unassailable scriptural truths he took up the fight that Edward Turney began over a hundred years ago in opposition to Robert Roberts. My father died in 1986 aged eighty having waited for forty years to see one Christadelphian emerge from a world

wide community to point out where Nazarene beliefs deviate from scriptural teachings. He waited in vain. Those of us that remain alive are still waiting,

It appears to us that the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith means more to Christadelphians than anything contained in the Holy Scriptures. But no logical Bible student could call the clauses contained in the Statement of Faith "The Truth" when honestly compared with scripture since one completely contradicts the other.

For the benefit of those readers who may be unfamiliar with the questions of doctrine at issue and for those Christadelphians who have not read their Statement of Faith to which membership of that community binds them, we have set out in tabular form the opposing views—:

### ***CHRISTADELPHIAN***

1. Disobedience defiled human flesh and caused man to become a dying creature, sinfully inclined.
2. This was the penalty of sin which Adam incurred and finally suffered when he died aged 930.
3. All descended from Adam inherit this wholly evil nature, making them inevitable sinners and doomed to death in consequence.
4. This is the Sin-in-the-flesh, which makes obedience impossible and the punishment of death just,
5. Jesus, being the Son of God was specially strengthened to enable him to overcome his evil nature.
6. His death was an exhibition of what was due to sinful flesh.
7. It was necessary for himself, as a son of Adam and under the same condemnation.
8. Redemption is future, a prospect only to be realised after resurrection.

### ***NAZARENE FELLOWSHIP***

1. Disobedience alienated man from God and brought him under legal sentence of death.
2. This sentence was remitted and man allowed to live his natural life span.
3. the sentence passes upon all who come to knowledge, but is remitted individually upon repentance and faith
4. There is no such thing as sin-in-the flesh, and therefore obedience is possible.
5. Jesus received no special power. He was made and tempted in all points like we are.
6. His death was the actual penalty incurred by sin.
7. It was for us alone. As Son of God He was free from Adamic condemnation.
8. Redemption is a present reality. "Now are we the sons of God."

It will be readily seen from this comparison that there are wide and fundamental differences between us. We reject completely the theory that the flesh which God created very good was changed to what is called sinful flesh; we reject completely the theory that Jesus needed redemption and that God punishes with death every individual of the human race on account of Adam's sin; we believe that these ideas are traceable back to the apostate doctrine of Original Sin and that they are destructive of truth and inimical to true holiness.

***All Christadelphians should ask themselves and their leaders the following:***

1. If men are born with sin in their flesh, on what just principle can God punish them for being sinners?
2. If human flesh is inherently sinful, how did Jesus manage to live a perfect life?
3. If the object of the crucifixion was to destroy sinful flesh, what was the purpose of the virgin birth?
4. If Jesus death was necessary for his own salvation, how can it be termed a sacrifice for us?

HELEN BRADY