

Note concerning the Netherton Debate:

When the Netherton Debate took place in 1949, two stenographers recorded what was said in debate and the following week stencilled copies were sent to Brother Ernest Brady and W.F.Barling for corrections and amendments to be made. The amended copies were then exchanged by the two parties for each others approval.

This being done the corrected copies were then returned to the stenographers for re-typing and amended copies were then returned to Brother Brady and W.F.Barling. It seems, however, that more than two copies were originally sent out for I have now learned that I was using an uncorrected copy when I sent out the last Circular Letter; in which the stenographers had attributed several questions and answers to the wrong speaker, amongst other mistakes, and Brother Phil Parry has now very kindly lent me his copy which he received from our late Brother Fred Pearce, who was instrumental in arranging the Debate.

I hope shortly to re-type the portion published in the last C.L. so that all readers have a corrected copy.

Even now, those of us who have studied this later copy cannot be certain we have it exactly right, as the original is of very poor print and neither is it set out well, which makes it very difficult to follow in places. However, we feel enough has been said by both parties for us to know wherein the truth is to be seen.

Russell Gregory

THE NETHERTON DEBATE

PREFACE

The debate here recorded took place in May 1949, and although the Netherton Ecclesia claim the right to publish it, they have not done so, and have, in fact, done their utmost to prevent anyone doing so.

My reason for reproducing it and an examination of some of the replies of W. F. Barling are as follows:

1) Because I am convinced of the Truth that Jesus was uncondemned, without spot or blemish from Original Sin.

2) The debate proves both from Scripture and from Christadelphian writers that this is the only view which justifies God and is consistent with common-sense and reason.

3) It is evident that man-made constitutions have made the Word of God of none effect.

The report which follows was taken by an independent reporter and only minor corrections have been made, to which W. P. Barling and the Chairman agreed according to the Compiled Report. It could have been published years ago apart from the obstructive tactics of the Christadelphians. Even now we are unable to include Mr Barling's Opening Speech as they have refused to let us have a copy of it on the grounds that it is illegal for us to reproduce it. Perhaps readers will be able to get a copy for themselves.

The word "debate" itself indicates that there are two sides, and the fact that clearly stated doctrines are not involved should help the reader keep an open mind. In fairness to both sides it should be said that debating is not always the best way to bring out the truth, as there are many points which need explanation, but questions and answers produce evidence from which thoughtful people can draw their own conclusions.

Apart from my efforts there would never have been a debate at all, and neither, apparently, would there have been a report. I shall certainly get no financial benefit from it. All I want is the satisfaction of knowing that the work is solely for the Truth, and to enable those who are interested to read and judge for themselves.

Arguments will still go on, but the important question is: have we a conscience void of offence towards God and man?

F. J. PEARCE.

* * * * *

WHY THE CROSS?

Controverted Aspects of the Nature And Sacrifice of Christ
Debated by
Mr E. BRADY of Birmingham (Nazarene Fellowship)
&
Mr W. F. Barling of London (Christadelphian)
Under the Chairmanship of Mr R. A. Overton
In Netherton. 7th May 1949

ORDER OF DEBATE

30 minutes Address by E. Brady
30 minutes Address by Mr W. F. Barling
15 minutes questioning by Mr E. Brady
15 minutes questioning by Mr W. F. Barling

INTERVAL FOR TEA

15 minutes questioning by Mr E. Brady
15 minutes questioning by Mr W. F. Barling
15 minutes questioning by Mr E. Brady
15 minutes questioning by Mr W. F. Barling
15 minutes questioning by Mr E. Brady
15 minutes questioning by Mr W. F. Barling

TEN MINUTE INTERVAL

15 minutes questioning by Mr E. Brady
15 minutes questioning by Mr W. F. Barling
15 minutes questioning or concluding Address by Mr E. Brady
15 minutes questioning or concluding Address by Mr W. F. Barling

* * * * *

Opening Speech by E. Brady

In 1944 I was at a lecture given by a Christadelphian in the Midland Institute in the course of which and exposition of the Sacrifice of Christ was given which I considered to be false and unscriptural and dishonouring to God. Believing that a Christian is required to uphold and defend the Scripture as the inspired revelation of God and that to love and honour God is the first Commandment, I felt it my duty to challenge the speaker to defend his assertions in a debate.

For nearly twenty years as a Christadelphian I had thought that where Scriptures and truth were concerned Christadelphians feared no man, and you may imagine my amazement when my invitation was declined, not only by the speaker but also every other Christadelphian who was approached. In those days I was new to the so called clean flesh heresy, and there were many things I did not understand, but I felt the

position was so unsatisfactory that I inserted a note in one of our pamphlets making the same challenge a general one, and I understand it is this which has led to the present meeting. I must also mention that I debated with a Christadelphian at Portsmouth in 1945 and we hoped to publish a record of what was said, but again you may judge of our astonishment when my opponent (whom I will not shame by naming) blankly refused to release to us the shorthand writer's report of the speeches. No doubt he realised the extent of his own admissions and blunders and the prospect of seeing them in print, appalled him ~ as well it might.

Since then no one has ventured and Mr Philip Hall, after trying by a very questionable stratagem to inveigle a Mr Southall of the Bereans into the fight, confessed that both J.C. and I.C. had been asked and declined and said he had never been so bitterly disappointed and humiliated in his life.

I ask you to believe that my purpose in making that original challenge and in agreeing to debate with Mr Barling is utterly impersonal and for the sake of truth alone. My sole wish is that truth may prevail. I have nothing to lose and everything to gain by the establishment of the truth. A victory or defeat in debate means nothing besides the truth. If Mr Barling can show that our view of the atonement is false I shall feel nothing but gratitude, because I believe with you that our eternal life depends upon a true knowledge of Jesus Christ and Him Crucified. On the other hand, it is my earnest prayer that if any of you begin to realise the true implications of the Christadelphian view you will let no consideration but truth weigh with you in deciding your course of action.

Most of the members of the Nazarene Fellowship were originally Christadelphians and we willingly and thankfully acknowledge our debt to what has been a stepping stone to fuller truth. Unfortunately, many people conclude from this that we are simply an offshoot of that body, composed of unusually cantankerous elements who have split off on a few minor matters of interpretation. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is a wider gulf between the Nazarene Fellowship and Christadelphians than there is between the Christadelphians and the Roman Catholics for this reason: that the doctrine of Original Sin, which the Nazarene Fellowship rejects, is held by the Christadelphians in common with all other denominations of Christendom, including the Roman Catholics. That false doctrine of Sin-in-the-flesh enters into every phase of religion and colours and conditions not only doctrines but also behaviour and way of life. If well meaning Christians, whether Catholic or Christadelphian, did not believe they had the devil in their flesh they might be more successful in avoiding the works of the Devil,

Before I go on to outline our answer to the question "Why the Cross? I will indicate the very simple issues which are before us so that you may keep them in mind as we proceed:

1) Christadelphians teach that the Sacrifice of Christ was necessary for Himself. We deny it. We believe He died simply and solely for us.

2) They believe He was physically defiled by sin. We believe He was in every sense pure and undefiled.

3) They affirm that the reason He was the Son of God was to give Him the special strength necessary to overcome temptation. We believe it was in order to give Him the legal freedom necessary if He were to be our Saviour and Redeemer.

These issues are perfectly plain and straightforward, and while in the course of the debate we shall be led into involved arguments and fine distinctions, if you constantly come back to Christ and these simple questions there is nothing but what any ordinary person can easily understand. Robert Roberts once said one needed a prolonged Spiritual education before he can comprehend the Sacrifice of Christ. Don't believe it - it just is not true. If you will have the courage to think for yourself and follow the pure stream right from its source you will be able not only to understand why Christ died but the message of Calvary will give you comfort and confidence and a real purpose and direction in your life.

Why did God choose to associate the Salvation of man with the tragedy of the Cross? Why is forgiveness of sin conditional upon the shedding of blood? I have affirmed, and I repeat it here, where Mr Barling has a full opportunity to refute it, that no Christadelphian can explain it or give a satisfactory reason. You will listen carefully, as I shall, for his explanation' The Christadelphian view is that the Cross is an

example of vengeance for sin, a demonstration of God's displeasure and wrath against sinners, that it was a ritual exhibition of the destruction of sinful flesh. We believe that this view is terribly wrong and its implications so dishonouring to God that those who hold it will be disowned by Christ when He returns. If flesh is sinful God made it so: then why should He destroy it? If man is sinful by nature can he help being a sinner? Then how can a just God take vengeance upon him for being what he is? Above all, what diabolical injustice to inflict an awful death upon a sinless man because he had a sinful nature!

The Cross speaks not of vengeance for sin, but of redemption from sin; it tells not of punishment but of forgiveness. The key to the mystery is in John 3:16, "For God so loved. . ." On the authority of that text alone I would say that a theory which makes ritual destruction and punishment the motive behind our Saviour's Sacrifice is a wrong theory. It was love and love alone which led to Calvary. There will be punishment for the wicked, there will be a time of vengeance, but it is not yet. "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his evil way and live." When Jesus was baptised John said "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." The first question is, then, what is the sin of the world? Paul tells us "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin." We must therefore go back to that man by whom sin entered and decide what happened to him and how it affected his descendants. We have no need to speculate about Adam's nature. We are told that he was created from the dust, a living soul, of the earth, earthy, and dependant for his existence upon the natural processes of an animal organism. He was therefore corruptible, the only difference between man and the lower animals was in his endowment with mind, the powers of the intellect, reason and memory.

Now when Adam was placed under law and disobeyed God, what difference did it make to him? Did it change his nature? Did it implant an evil principle in his flesh which was not there before? There is no such suggestion anywhere in Scripture. Adam sinned with the very good nature of his creation, so why suppose that his flesh was changed to give him a bias towards sin? The change was in his relation to God, in his legal position. He came under condemnation; he incurred the sentence of death.

But, you may say, if Adam was corruptible, or capable of dying before he sinned, how could he incur death? Take, for example, the Chairman: he is corruptible and in the ordinary course of nature he will eventually die. At the moment he is not very troubled about it, although it is not a pleasant prospect, and it will come to him as it will come to all of us as surely as tomorrows' sun will rise.

But suppose he went out and shot a policeman and was sentenced to death, he would feel very much different about the prospect of death, and in fact he would be in a very different position. He would be legally a dead man, and if the law took its course in a few weeks he would pay the penalty and his life would be cut off in a highly unpleasant manner. Now: is that what happened to Adam? Not exactly.

God had said "in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." He certainly incurred the penalty - but did he pay it? Did he die in the day he disobeyed? He certainly did not. He lived his natural life span of over 930 years. Was there implanted in his flesh a physical principle of decay which brought about that ultimate death? The Bible does not say so, and we do not believe it. Was his ultimate death the penalty? It was not for "Thou shalt surely die" means a judicial death. Was he forgiven? He was not: for there was no basis for forgiveness in the law of Eden. Adam was in a desperate position and he knew it. That is why he was afraid and hid himself.

But the love of God was equal to the situation. His wisdom found a way by which His just law could be met and upheld, and yet Adam be delivered, and in the process such a demonstration of love and mercy and self sacrifice as is unique in history. Do not forget if God loves us and does not wish us to perish. He also loved Adam and wished to save him.

Paul says, "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin." Yes, Adam brought into the world death as a penalty for sin, but if he had suffered the death he incurred that would have been the end of him and of the human race. If God had inflicted upon him the death he had incurred he would have been cut off, put to death as a criminal there and then, and then you and I would never have had any existence; so that whatever the means by which Adam was saved from the wages of sin we owe our lives to it. It is perfectly true, as Paul says that death came by sin - and whose death was it? It should have been Adam's; he was the guilty one, but it was actually inflicted upon the animal with whose skin Adam was covered. That was the

first sacrifice and the type of the Lamb of God who was to come, slain from the foundation of the world to take away the bondage of sin and death which bars the way to eternal life.

When Adam sinned he incurred death and legally he died. Scripturally he forfeited his life and became servant, or debtor, to sin. He had left the house wherein he was a Son and sold himself into slavery to a new master, and since he was no longer free, his life was no longer his own but pledged to sin, all his children to whom he transmitted that life were equally in bondage and slaves to sin; not necessarily sinners, but belonging to sin. This changed position is purely a legal matter involving alienation from God. Adam's nature was not changed, ours is not changed; it is still the same as when it was created, and we are today as capable of obedience, good and evil, as was Adam when he was first formed, but we are "sold under sin" because Adam forfeited his life and ours in his. This is what is meant by the declaration "God hath concluded all under sin" - not in order to punish all, but in order that He might have mercy on all.

Now, man, by his own action, having chosen to serve sin - thus becoming Sin's bondservant and earning the wages of sin - how could he be set free from his bondage and reconciled to God? Nothing he could do himself would help him; even perfect obedience from that day forward was utterly useless to effect his liberation. His life was forfeited to the law and only payment of the exact price would liquidate the debt. If he had paid it himself his life would have been taken and he would have perished. No child of Adam could redeem him by paying it for him because the life of every child of Adam was lost in his. No child of Adam could redeem himself let alone another. God alone could help Adam "when there was no man, no intercessor. His own arm brought salvation," or, as Job prophesied, "deliver him from going down into the pit, I have found a ransom." God came to the rescue by bringing His own Son into the world. The second Adam, and gave into His charge the task of delivering the human race from the bondage of sin and death. And this plan was carried out strictly and perfectly in accordance with the legal principles of ransom and redemption which had been so carefully laid down in the law of Israel.

In order to meet the necessities of the situation and to be in a position to carry out His Father's purpose, it was necessary first that Jesus should be of the same flesh and blood as Adam, that is why he was the seed of the woman. Then He had to be free from the condemnation which covers all descended from Adam, otherwise His own life would have been forfeit and He would have been in the same bondage as all others. This was the reason He was the Son of God. He received His life, like Adam, direct from the Source. The difference was that Adam was the created Son of God, while Jesus was the Begotten Son of God, related to Adam but not descended from him. Lastly, it was necessary that He should be put on trial, like Adam, and prove Himself perfect in character, for had He failed in His probation He would have lost His own life and would have been unable to help. So we have a parallel and a contrast. Adam lost his life by disobedience - and remember his life was the life of the race. Jesus kept His by obedience - and remember His life was His own, and that is why He was in a position to buy us back. That is how He was rich whereas we are poor. The Father had given Him to have life in Himself, that is how He was strong whereas we are weak. Who need ask the question, then, "Why the Cross?" "But whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister. . . for even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and give His life a ransom for many." What can we say of the perversity and the ingratitude which will turn round and tell our loving Saviour "Your life was a ransom for yourself.?" "Though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor that we through His poverty might become rich" (2 Corinthians 8:9), "For while we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly" (Romans 5:6).

We think then of the lowly Jesus, reared by the holy mother in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, reading in the Jewish Scriptures the account of man's creation, how Adam came under condemnation, incurring a debt which therefore was still outstanding. Realising perhaps from hearing the doctors in the Temple and asking them questions the meanings and the limitations of the Sacrifices which He saw offered every year, and then learning from His mother the strange circumstances of His birth. He came at length to the knowledge that He was in a position to do what no other member of the human race could do - redeem His brethren by laying down His own life in payment of their debt.

Could He have sinned? Of course He could, for He was made in all points like us and tempted as we are. But had He sinned He would have failed. He was touched with the feeling of our infirmities and He learned obedience by the things that He suffered. How, then, did He overcome? By the exercise of His own will, the same power that God has given to every one of us, if we would exercise it, to resist temptation.

If you assume that because He was God's Son He was specially strengthened to overcome sin, you rob Him of all His honour. He may as well have been a puppet worked by strings. His victory over sin was His own - "Therefore I have set my face like a flint and I know I shall not be ashamed." The belief that the purpose of His birth was to endow Him with special power to resist sin is the most disastrous misconception of Scripture, for not only does it rob Christ of His honour and make God's ways unjust, but it leads to the entirely false conclusion that we are physically incapable of obedience. Further, it draws attention away from the true reason for the Virgin Birth, which was that His life came direct from God and not via the condemned channel, and puts in its place a fallacy which makes Christ's death nothing but a display of meaningless bloodshed.

Jesus, then, voluntarily and of His own free choice, determined to do His Father's will and take His place in the arrangement which was foretold and prefigured in Eden and again on Mount Moriah. He went voluntarily to the death of the Cross and gave up His life for the sake and in the stead of His brother Adam, a life for a life, the Just for the unjust, the innocent victim bearing the penalty of the guilty sinner.

Was it substitution? Of course it was. Do you reject it on that account? If so, you reject Salvation, for unless Christ died for you, you are yet in your sins. If, because you dread the false conception of substitution as the punishment of an innocent man instead of the guilty, you accept the view that Christ died for His own defiled nature. You are treading underfoot the blood of the Covenant and counting that wherewith you should be sanctified an unholy thing.

Was it unjust for Christ to bear our sins and die for us? It would have been unjust if He had been under compulsion - or under condemnation. But He was not. It was a case of paying that other Lord Sin the price for our release, and He voluntarily undertook His task for the joy that was set before Him. We are not so foolish as to believe that it would have served any good purpose for God to punish Jesus instead of us, nor would it have been right. But is not the Christadelphian view as bad or worse? Would it not have been unjust for God to require His death, an innocent sinless man, because He was human nature, a thing over which He had no control? It would be as unjust to inflict death upon a sinless man because he possessed a defiled nature as it would be to punish the innocent instead of the guilty.

But Calvary speaks not of punishment, but of love and forgiveness; not a simple act of remission, because that while showing, love would not have established the principles of justice and truth. It was a very carefully conceived plan of redemption, designed to excite the interest and the love and enlarge the minds of all succeeding generations of mankind, and if, as I believe Christadelphians have done, the true principles of ransom is lost, the Cross becomes an insoluble mystery, it loses its regenerative influence upon the mind and becomes a hindrance to our faith rather than the foundation of it.

We have no fear of the taunt of Substitution. We believe our Saviour died for us and we love Him for it. We believe that apart from the love of God in giving His own Son to be the Saviour of the world we would never have had life at all and therefore could never have received that life more abundant, which is the gift of God to those who love and honour Him. We believe that had we been put on probation like Adam we should have failed, but we know that we can only blame ourselves and confess that we are sinners because Jesus was tried just the same and He overcame. And we believe that had He chosen, or had His courage failed in the supreme moment. He could have claimed eternal life as His right, called to His aid more than twelve legions of angels and passed into eternity alone, leaving us and all mankind outside to perish as sinners deserve to perish. But how, then, should the Scriptures have been fulfilled: who would then have justified the forbearance of God in passing over the sins done afore-time in order that man might be saved? Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ, for the joy that was set before Him in bringing many sons unto glory. He did not flee in the face of evil. He gave His back to the smiter and hid not His face from shame and spitting. For Himself? - shameful thought! He was wounded for our transgressions. He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him and with His stripes we are healed.

To summarise - He found us like treasure hid in a field, and He went and sold all that He had and bought that field. The field is the world that God so loved. The treasure hid is whosoever will, that shall not perish, and the price that Jesus paid to buy that field was His own life.

We see the mercy of God when we see that He regards the first sin of Adam as the sin of the world, covering and including the many sins that we have committed, because we see that if our sins had not been covered by Adam's then we could not have been covered by the Sacrifice which redeemed him. This is the hidden wisdom of God, whereby one perfect offering has been sufficient to ransom a multitude whom no man can number. If we had been put individually upon probation requiring perfect obedience, then we failed we would each have perished or else we should have required an individual Saviour, on the principle of life for life, eye for eye, blood for blood. The federal principle whereby all are legally included under the One Sin can also legally include all under the One righteous act which made atonement for that Sin. When we discover by the light which has come into the world that we are by nature in Adam and in bondage to sin and death, all we need to do is to accept what Jesus freely offers - a receipted bill, a passport back into the glorious freedom of the sons of God, which He has purchased for us with His own blood, thus, when we look toward the Cross and see Jesus hanging there, enduring the awful pains of a criminal execution, we can thankfully and lovingly say "He suffered that for us." He endured literally the suffering of that dreadful death which was justly due to rebels against God, so that we might not suffer it; so that we might not perish.

Because Jesus loved us and gave Himself for us, all that is required of us is that we signify our belief and acceptance of Him as our Saviour, by going through the symbol, in baptism; to signify that we have come out of the Adamic bondage of sin, that we have been bought by God and paid for with the precious blood of His beloved Son, and become adopted Sons in the house of our heavenly Father.

SUMMARY. Our view is that the Cross was not an act of retribution, it was not an example of punishment, its purpose was not the ritual destruction of sinful flesh, and it was emphatically not necessary for Jesus' own salvation. We reject utterly and completely the idea that human nature is essentially evil, or that sin is a fixed principle in the flesh, or even had it been so, that it would either be just, or serve any good purpose whatsoever to put to death a sinless man for no other reason than that He was possessed of such supposed sinful flesh.

It is our characters which are at fault, which require cleansing and perfecting, and the contemplation of the sufferings of Christ, with the revelation that He died there upon the Cross for us has a far higher regenerative power upon the mind than would the infliction of pain upon the body.

It is the effect upon the mind of man which caused God to choose the way He did. He could have punished Adam for his sin. He could have simply forgiven him. He could have prevented him from sinning, but had He taken any of these courses, where would have been displayed the supremacy of law, the beauty of justice, the depth of His mercy, or the wideness of His love?

Brother Ernest Brady.

**The opening speech by W.F.Barling
has not been made available.**

THE DEBATE

AFTERNOON SESSION. Following the Opening Addresses

Mr E. Brady questions Mr W.F.Barling

E. Brady: I have framed my questions, as far as possible, so that you can answer “yes” or “no” or in one word. If you cannot answer “yes” or “no” we will pass it, as I want to get through.

1. Do you accept the Christadelphian Statement of Faith?

A. Yes.

2. Are you satisfied you understand the Nazarene Fellowship?

A. Yes.

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

A. No

4. Is it possible for a Christian to live a perfect life?

A. NO.

5. Is what we term ‘natural death’ the ‘wages of sin’?

A. I would like an elucidation of the expression “wages of sin.’

6. Is ‘natural death’ the result of sin?

A. It is a result.

7. Was Adam created from the dust.

A. Yes.

8. How many natures are there?

A. It depends what the question means.

9. How many kinds of human nature are there?

A. Well, in Corinthians we have ‘bodies celestial’ and ‘bodies terrestrial.’

10. Is the answer, two?

A. On that evidence, yes.

11. Did Adam have all natural desires?

A. Again, I want a definition of the term ‘natural desires.’

12. Did he experience the feelings of temptation that ordinary people do when he was created flesh?

A. No, not in the way we experience them now.

13. Did Adam have free will?

A. Yes.

14. Have we free will?

A. The will is present, yes.

15. Have we free will?

A. That is the answer.

16. Is that the answer: ‘The will is present with me’?

A. Yes.

17. Was all creation reproductive?

A. Presumably, yes.

18. Was Adam to “be fruitful and multiply”?

A. Yes.

19. Was all creation corruptible?

A. I need a definition of ‘all creation.’

20. Man, the animals, vegetables, all things that are. Are they corruptible? Were they created corruptible?

A. One question at a time I

21. The question is. Was all creation corruptible?

A. I explained in my opening address. I don’t think I am being given a fair chance to answer here.

22. Is it ‘Yes’ or ‘No’? Failed! We’ll pass it.

Chairman: I do not think you should demand answers of ‘yes’ or ‘no.’ It is not fair. I would like to ask you a question: Have you stopped beating your wife? (Laughter).

A. We are in need of deliverance from the bondage of corruption (which in our case - the term ‘bondage of corruption’ ~ is due to Adam’s sin), and the way in which we are ‘delivered’ from the ‘bondage’ is, in apostolic phraseology, by ‘the redemption of the body.’

23. Was all created corruptible?

A. I would like a definition regarding man, but within the limits of that, yes.

24. Is corruptible the same as mortal?

A. So far as I can see from the New Testament, yes.

25. Could Adam have lived for ever without a change of nature?

A. I cannot answer; we have no information.

26. Did Adam sin with the very good nature of his creation?

A. Yes.

27. Is the pain of childbirth an unmitigated evil?

A. I do not know.

28. Is sin the transgression of law?

A. Yes

29. Can we have sin apart from law?

A. Yes.

30. Are natural desires sin?

A. When they proceed to the extent that Christ defined in the Sermon on the Mount, of a life of evil intention, without the opportunity necessary to indulge transgression if the opportunity arose,

31. Is the word sin an abstract noun?

A. It can be.

32. It can be? Can an abstract term become a physical condition?

A. Yes, within this limit - that the consequence of a certain course of action may affect the individual physically.

33. Did Adam's sin change his nature?

A. Will you give me a definition of the term 'change of nature'?

34. After he sinned, was he of a different character? Was his nature a different kind? Was it inferior to what it had been?

A. Will you allow me to give. . .

35. No, we will pass on. Did any change that took place as a result of this sin make it impossible for him to be obedient?

A. Perfectly, yes.

36. Was the change the cause of his ultimate death?

A. The condition of that nature is the reason why we go to the grave. I would like to correct a misrepresentation in your address under this heading.

37. You will have your time. I want to ask my questions now. Do we all suffer penalty for Adam's sin? Do we suffer anything for Adam's sin?

A. Yes, we suffer the misfortune of being born in sin, subject to death.

38. Can infants sin?

A. No.

39. Do infants die?

A. Yes.

40. Do they suffer this misfortune because of Adam's sin?

A. I would say they are born in sin and iniquity. Thus do their mothers receive and conceive them.

41. Does 'sin-in-the-flesh' imply that a physical principle of sin pervades the physical flesh?

A. Sin dwelleth in me, says Paul.

42. Does sin-in-the-flesh imply that a physical principle of sin pervades the physical flesh?

A. I would prefer the term 'Sin in the flesh' in the sense Paul uses the term in Romans 7.

43. Had Jesus 'Sin in the flesh'?

A. Yes.

44. How did He offer Himself "without spot" to God?

A. "Behold," says God, "my servant whom I uphold."

45. Was Adam's sin the cause of all subsequent sin?

A. Indirectly, yes.

46. Was the threat to Adam, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shall surely die"?

A. Yes.

47. Was that threat carried out?

A. Yes.

48. Was it? If a man is sentenced to five years' imprisonment does it change his nature?

A. No.

49. If man is sentenced to death, can it change his nature?

A. It can do, yes.

50. In what way, in the case of Adam?

A. If the man legally changed his nature, in the sense that the term ‘man’ applies to those who are living now, I should say, no.

51. Did Adam die “in the day” he disobeyed?

A. As was intended in the threat? Yes: lie became subject to death.

52. I asked the question: Did Adam die? He disobeyed on a certain day. Did he die on that day?

A. In the sense in which the term ‘die’ is used in Genesis 2:17, Yes.

53. If you were a corpse on the platform, you would be dead. Did Adam die in that way that day?

A. No.

54. Did he live the normal span of life according to the laws of his creation, and eventually die a natural death?

A. I would say, according to the laws which governed him after he sinned.

55. Did he eventually die a natural death?

A. In the sense I have explained I would say he did die a natural death, yes.

56. Is deliverance the same as redemption?

A. Yes, according to Romans 8.

57. Do you agree with Dr Thomas on redemption?

A. It depends what you mean by Dr Thomas.

58. Redemption is release for a ransom. All who become God’s servants are therefore released from a former lord by purchase. The Purchaser is Jehovah; the price or ransom paid, the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot and without blemish. Do you agree?

A. Yes, I agree.

59. Did Adam need redemption before he sinned?

A. No.

60. Did Adam need deliverance before he s ruined?

A. Again, I need a definition.

61. When I asked you. Could Adam have lived for ever without a change of nature, you said. No. So he did need deliverance before he sinned?

A. Would you repeat my answer to that question, must have put down the wrong answer. I said that, as far as I was aware, we could not tell.

62. Well, did Adam need deliverance before he sinned?

A. Will you give a definition of ‘deliverance’?

63. I do not want to waste time defining. I want to go through rapidly. Is sin personified?

A. Yes.

64. Did Adam sell himself to sin?

A. Not in the sense you mean.

65. You don’t know what sense I mean.

A. You haven’t asked me if I understood.

66. Paul speaks of us being “sold under sin.” Did Adam sell himself to sin in that sense?

A. Yes.

67. Could Adam redeem himself?

A. No.

68. Could any other in bondage redeem him?

A. Yes, in bondage.

69. Was Adam forgiven?

A. Forgiven what?

70. His sin.

A. I would say that the record of Genesis 3 is very precise. There was sin; there was the punishment threatened; and then a process of reconciliation set in operation, whereby Adam could escape from the consequences of that sin.

71. If you cannot answer that question categorically we will pass it. I don't want you to make a speech. Do you agree that nakedness is figurative of consciousness of sin?

A. It is, often.

72. When it says, "his eyes were opened," is that literal or figurative?

A. Both.

73. Did God provide clothing of skins?

A. Yes.

74. Does this provision of skins imply that an animal was slain?

A. Yes.

75. Was Jesus "The Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world"?

A. Yes.

76. Is blood-shedding the condition of redemption?

A. We are told so.

77. Would you agree that the animal slain in Eden was a sacrifice?

A. Yes.

78. Do you believe that the change of nature was the result of sin or that an actual miracle was performed to bring it about?

A. "The eyes of them both were opened" I cannot profess to be able to explain the mechanism of that change. If you call it miraculous, I would say, yes.

79. Is 'Original Sin' the sin of Adam?

A. Well, here again I must do what you have prevented me from doing, and ask to know exactly what you mean by the term used in your opening address - Original Sin. It is a term I don't understand.

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

A. Yes, and vice versa.

81. Can we have forgiveness of sin now?

A. I should readily say, yes.

82. Can the condemnation which came as the result of Adam's sin be removed in this life?

A. If you mean 'condemnation' as 'transgression,' yes.

83. Is there a condemnation without personal transgressions?

A. Yes.

84. Are you still under the impression that the Nazarene Fellowship believe in the personal devil?

A. I have never accused them of believing it. I accuse them of being committed, quite logically, to that belief by implication, through their taking. . .

85. Do you think that we believe that flesh is either 'clean' or 'unclean'?

A. Would you repeat the question.

85a. Do you think that we believe or teach that human flesh is either 'clean' or 'unclean'? We are spoken of as the 'Clean Flesh Heresy.' Do you think that we believe that flesh is inherently clean?

A. I think in that respect your teaching is in my own writings.

86. Answer, what does 'clean' and 'unclean' mean?

A. I cannot answer a question which I do not fully comprehend.

87. Tell me, do you believe that flesh is 'unclean'?

A. I believe that flesh is sinful.

87a. Is the flesh unclean?

A. The Bible does not use that expression. I would like a definition.

88. When you speak of the 'Clean Flesh Heresy' you know we do not believe in 'clean flesh.'

A. I don't speak of it myself.

89. But you believe that we teach that Jesus did not come in the flesh?

A. Of course not.

90. You understand that we do believe that Jesus came in the flesh and was of one flesh with us?

A. Yes, I have made that clear.

91. Was Jesus our representative?

A. Yes.

91a. Was Jesus our substitute?

A. No.

92. Will you tell me the difference?

A. The difference is obvious. A substitute suffers the penalty completely, so that others who were under it do not suffer it. Whereas a representative can suffer the same penalty and by that very means secure redemption from it. That is, he is one of the 'company,' in Biblical terms.

93. Was the virgin birth necessary?

A. Indeed.

94. Do you recognise a distinction between being 'made a sinner' and being 'an actual sinner'?

A. Yes.

95. Was Jesus' life His own or forfeited?

A. I would like a definition.

96. Does it say of Jesus, "in Him is no sin"?

A. Yes.

Chairman: Brother Barling has twelve minutes to question Brother Brady.

1. You do not believe that man's life ends in the grave, as a result of Adam's sin?

A. Yes, I do.

2. You are quite clear? Do you believe that our life ends in the grave - that we die, all men die, what you term 'natural death' - because of Adam's sin?

A. No, I do not believe that.

3. Do you believe that man's nature is sinful?

A. No.

4. Theoretically, it is possible that you are wrong on either or both these matters?

A. Yes, theoretically, I might be wrong altogether.

5. If, then, a convincing Scriptural case were presented for either, you would accept it?

A. Yes.

6. If you were compelled to, in either of these respects, how would you stand in relation to the theology you have presented this afternoon?

A. I would abandon it, like that.

7. You would feel compelled to shed the beliefs which you now cherish?

A. Yes.

8. Now there are certain things which are basic to that theology. They emerge in the course of your address and your questions. You said, I think, that Christ's life was paid instead of Adam's life. Will you furnish me with concise and explicit Scriptural proof of that fact?

A. Not unless you will allow me to present it as I did in my opening speech.

9. Can you present me with a concise and explicit Scriptural proof of the fact that Adam's life was paid for by Christ?

A. No, it is a process of deductive reasoning.

10. But although it is a basic principle of your theology, you cannot furnish me with clear, crisp, Scriptural proof?

A. No.

11. You say the purpose of the Virgin Birth was to confer upon Jesus a 'free life'?

A. I did not say so. I said it was to give Him the freedom necessary for Him to be our Redeemer.

12. Can you now give me explicit. Scriptural proof for what that means?

A. NO.

13. You say that redemption and forgiveness of sins are two different processes?

A. Yes, although there is a connection, the one proceeds from the other: redemption must precede forgiveness.

14. Can you give me Scriptural proof of that?

A. Not off-hand.

15. Could you possibly express the idea in Scriptural language? You say there is a difference between redemption and forgiveness of sins.

A. It arises from the necessity for redemption to take place before we have any standing whatsoever in the sight of God.

16. But can you substantiate them with Scripture?

A. I cannot do that off-hand.

17. You say that men are 'in Adam' upon enlightenment, and not by being born descendants of Adam?

A. No, we are all born descendants of Adam.

18. But are we 'in Adam' in the sense of 1 Corinthians 15:21, by "in Adam all die"?

A. No, we are not in that sense.

19. When do we become 'in Adam' in that sense?

A. When we realise that Adam existed and God has a purpose; upon enlightenment.

20. Could you substantiate that from Scripture?

A. "This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world," and "men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."

21. It doesn't prove, you see, that men are 'in Adam' when they are enlightened.

A. Of course not; you need a number of passages to establish my case.

22. Establish that men are 'in Adam' only upon enlightenment.

A. "In Adam all die"

23. But that doesn't apply at birth, automatically, you say, but upon enlightenment, upon realising the purpose of God,

A. Well, I take the words of Jesus, "except I had come they had not had sin."

"This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world." Those two are sufficient.

24. You attach a particular technical significance to the term 'In Adam.' Can you support the attribution of that technical meaning to the expression, by Scripture? The Scriptures you quoted do not establish that.

A. Don't they? I should say the passage "for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" establishes it.

25. But in that verse the term "in Adam" is not defined that 'because we descend from Adam we die'?

A. Yes, I should agree with that.

26. But you insist that it is not superficial?

A. We are not justified in taking that.

27. It is obviously a superficial one, that particular interpretation. Now I want your Scriptural proof for that particular technical interpretation of the expression 'in Adam,' if you have one. If you have none, say.

A. Yes, I will say I cannot produce it off-hand. I should need to establish a case.

28. If you will intimate to me that you would like me to ask these questions again this evening, because you have thought of a proof to put forward, I shall be glad to let you do so.

A. I would be glad to do so.

29. You would say - I am correct in stating your views? - that Christ died to save men from violent death?

A. No, I haven't said that.

30. Well, could you express for yourself "saved from violent death" in some way?

A. You agree "the second death" would be a violent death?

31. You understand what I am getting at? You would say that when we become enlightened we become subject to violent death?

A. No, I haven't said that.

32. Well, as near to it as doesn't matter.

A. I do not believe that when we become enlightened we become liable to violent death.

33. Can I borrow one of your booklets?

A. Yes, which one?

34. “The Questions Christadelphians Cannot Answer.”

Mr Brady hands Mr Barling the booklet. Mr Barling reads extract:

You say; (b) Figurative death is the condemned position of living men and women who are alienated from God. Adam and Eve were in this position for the few hours between the commission of the first transgression and their typical redemption. It ‘passes upon’ people when they are enlightened by the Word which required us to recognise that God regards us as included in Adam on the federal principle; it can be “put off” by accepting Christ as our ransom and typically dying the death in baptism. One whose probation ends, either by natural death or the return of Christ, leaving them in this spiritually dead or condemned condition, will have earned sin’s wages, in other words:-

Death as a penalty, the execution or carrying into effect of the above in an inflicted or violent death; this is what Adam incurred and which, if he had suffered it, would have ended the human race there and then. He was delivered from it by the mercy and forbearance of God, and it was suffered in Adam’s stead by Jesus on the cross. . .”

You have admitted your inability to prove this!

“ . . . This is the death that salvation is concerned with, and those who knowingly and wilfully neglect the way of escape will themselves bear the penalty in the second death.”

A. Oh, yes, I stand by that.

35. So you agreed that Christ died in order to save men, in that sense, from violent death?

A. Yes, in that sense.

36. Now support that by Scripture.

A. Well, is it not true that those who are guilty of rejecting Christ will eventually die a violent death? John 3:16 - because “perishing” implies a death by destruction.

37. True, but does it imply a violent death in the sense you are using here?

A. In the sense of ‘blood-shedding,’ yes.

38. That there is a resurrection to judgment and solemn condemnation resulting in violent death - did Christ mean that by “perishing,” by that expression?

A. No. I mean that.

39. But Jesus did not mean it?

A. I couldn’t say that. I cannot answer that.

40. This is the point I want to make quite clear to you. We have now gone through five basic doctrines in your theological system - I wish to stress this, five basic doctrines; and you cannot support one of them with clear Scriptural proof.

A. No, I don’t admit that at all. I am perfectly ready to admit that, off- hand, I cannot produce passages to substantiate every one of these, and I admit that many of our doctrines are the results of reasoning; but on a Scriptural foundation of facts that are basic.

41. That will suffice. If you met a Christadelphian arguing on the doctrine of the immortality of the soul who could not quote any Scripture to prove that man is mortal, what would you think of him?

A. Well, there are a good many people who don’t believe in. . .

42. What would you think of it?

A. I should say he would need a little time.

43. You would not take a dim view of him?

A. Yes, as a Christadelphian I would.

44. Would you not consider it somewhat peculiar?

A. Yes.

45. You do not think it a bit peculiar that you cannot support your five basic doctrines?

A. I can support all these.

46. I beg your pardon! You have told me on five occasions that you are unable to do so.

A. Off-hand, yes.

47. You couldn't give accumulative evidence in the case of any one of them. Now don't you think it most peculiar on issues like these – and yet cannot, in debate, produce one shred of Scriptural proof?

A. I don't need to produce Scripture evidence off-hand, like that.

The Chairman announced a break for tea until 5.55pm.

EVENING SESSION

Chairman: You will no doubt know the order of the debate and are fully acquainted with it. There are to be six periods of fifteen minutes each, during which time the two Brethren will question one another. A ten minutes interval is then followed by four periods of fifteen minutes, in which, during the first two, our Brethren will question one another, and then, during the last two, will decide for themselves whether they will question one another or give concluding addresses.

I now have pleasure in asking our Brother Brady to occupy fifteen minutes questioning Brother Barling.

Mr Brady: I want to continue my categorical questioning, and I want you to answer 'yes' or 'no' or in one word, or, if not, we'll pass the question.

97. You concluded on the note: "So death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Did death 'pass upon' Jesus?

A. Yes.

98. Did Jesus sin?

A. No.

99. Did Jesus receive special strength to overcome temptation?

A. Yes.

100. Was the death of the animals in Eden the result of Adam's sin?

A. Not a result in the sense that I understand the term.

101. Did the death of those animals take place after Adam's sin?

A. We are told it did.

102. Was their death the first occurrence of death recorded?

A. Presumably.

103. Could you agree that their death represented the death which entered into the world by sin?

A. No.

104. Were they innocent, harmless creatures?

A. Presumably.

105. Was their death an inflicted death?

A. They were put to death as sacrifices.

106. Were they in any way responsible for, or involved in, Adam's sin?

A. No.

[**107.** Was Adam unjust? *

A. When he sinned he became unjust.]

(* Question 107 and answer were written on the original manuscript after printing).

108. Was Jesus an innocent and harmless man?

A. Yes.

109. Did Jesus die an inflicted death?

A. He died as the victim of God's agents, in the furthering of the work of salvation.

110. Did Jesus die an inflicted death?

A. As I don't fully appreciate the significance of 'inflicted' we will pass that one.

111. Very well, we'll pass that one. Was He in any way responsible for, or involved in, Adam's sin?

A. Of course not. Not responsible for, but involved in the consequences.

112. Did Jesus deserve to die?

A. No, not in the sense that He died because. . .

112a. Did Jesus deserve to die?

A. No, not as a morally responsible person.

113. Was Jesus just?

A. He is called the Just One.

114. Did Jesus give Himself for us - the Just for the unjust?

A. Yes.

115. Did Jesus redeem us to God by His own blood?

A. Yes.

116. Did He redeem us from our physical body, or from our sins?

A. He redeemed us from our sins, and that is consummated in the redemption of the body.

117. Did Jesus need redemption from His physical body, or from His sins?

A. He needed redemption from His physical body; but He had no sins.

118. From His sins?

A. He had no sins.

119. Did Jesus rise with the same body?

A. I don't know - the same nature, you mean? I don't know.

120. My conclusion is that if He rose with the same body (which Christadelphians affirm) He did not need redemption from sin, and He did not need redemption from His body. Do you recognise any difference between 'natural death' and 'judicial execution'?

A. There is frequently a difference, but natural death may be judicial execution.

121. If men are born sinful can they help sinning?

A. In one sense, no, but in another, yes. “To will is present, but how to perform. . .”

122. Is it just to punish men for sins they can't help?

A. No.

123. Are ignorant or innocent people sinners?

A. Yes.

124. Is it just that innocent people receive the “wages of sin”?

A. We will leave that because there is obscurity in the form of your questioning.

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

A. No.

126. Dr Thomas was wrong?

A. In that respect.

127. Under the law, were sins laid upon the victim by confessing them over its head?

A. Would you repeat the question.

128. Were sins laid upon a victim by confessing them over its head? A Jew had to place his hand upon the head of an animal and confess his sins. Did that, in effect, lay his sins upon the animal's head?

A. The Scriptures do not justify your using that form of words. I would say that the offerer identified himself with the offering, and, in that sense there was transmission.

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

A. I don't know.

130. I can tell you he did. Were the animals offered in sacrifice to be without blemish?

A. Yes.

131. Were they to be legally clean?

A. I do not understand.

132. You understand the difference between a pig and a lamb?

A. Clean, in that sense, yes.

133. Would an unclean or defiled animal have been acceptable?

A. There was one occasion when a blemished animal was offered.

134. In the sin-offering would a defiled offering be acceptable?

A. No.

135. Is sin-in-the-flesh a blemish?

A. Yes, a distinct blemish,

136. Is sinful nature unclean?

A. It depends on the term ‘unclean’.

137. I mean unclean legally or morally.

A. If you mean legally. . .

138. I will use it morally. Is it in the sight of God?

A. If you sin legally in the Mosaic sense, the answer is, yes. Man is classed as unclean in Numbers 18:15. The firstling of man and the firstling of unclean animals are associated together.

139. Did they have to be redeemed?

A. Yes.

140. How did it condemn sin to put Jesus to death?

A. What is it?

141. Did the putting of Jesus to death condemn sin?

A. Yes.

142. Had Jesus sin-in-the-flesh?

A. If you mean was sin in His flesh (as in Romans 7), yes.

143. Then the answer is yes?

CHAIRMAN: You are saying sometimes things which your opponent presumably does not always say. "Yes" will not exactly fit what he said.

144. Do you affirm that an unclean Saviour was an acceptable sacrifice?

A. I don't understand the term "unclean Saviour."

145. Well, you admit that sin-in-the-flesh is a blemish?

A. Yes.

146. So Jesus had a blemish? Therefore a blemished Saviour was an acceptable sacrifice?

A. He had a sinful nature: He intimated that in citing the raising of the serpent in the wilderness.

147. Is the answer yes or no?

A. Within the limitations of that explanation and of the analogy which He draws, yes.

148. Was Jesus the seed of the woman?

A. Yes.

149. Was Jesus the seed of the man?

A. I have never heard that expression.

150. Was Jesus the seed of the man?

A. I don't understand.

151. Do you think there was any point in the statement "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head?"

A. Yes.

152. Whose Son was Jesus?

A. The Son of God.

153. Does not that also answer the question "Was Jesus the seed of the man?"

A. Jesus said that in His capacity as the Saviour He died as "the Son of Man." His humanity was the basis of His effectual offering.

154. Was Jesus born by the will of the flesh?

A. He was born by the operation of the Spirit. You are quoting John 1 in the wrong way.

155. I am not quoting. I am asking you a categorical question. You know what the will of the flesh is. Was Jesus born by it?

A. You are committing me to an interpretation which I refuse to be committed to.

156. Had man, as man, anything to do with the birth of Jesus?

A. No, except that the Mother represented Man.

157. Could Jesus have been born without the intervention of God?

A. No.

158. From whom did Jesus receive His life?

A. As we all do; from God. "In him we live and move and have our being."

159. Was Jesus the son of David according to the flesh?

A. We are told so.

160. Whose son was He according to the life?

A. I do not understand that language.

161. Do not understand! Did Jesus have the same nature as we have?

A. Identically.

162. Did He have natural desires?

A. I gather if you mean that He was tempted in all points like as we are, yes.

163. Do you suppose Jesus was the same as Adam before he sinned?

A. No. There was not that identity of experience.

164. Was He tempted in all points like as we are?

A. Yes.

165. He must then have had natural desires I And yet you answer. . . I won't go back. Did Jesus succeed in living a perfect life?

A. Yes.

166. Was there any legal difference between Him and us?

A. Again, the term 'legal' is unfortunate. He was the Son of God by birth.

167. You are the son of your father. He was the Son of His. Do you recognise any difference between 'flesh belonging to sin' and 'flesh belonging to God'?

A. Both of those expressions are unscriptural. I won't express an opinion.

168. Was Jesus holy from birth?

A. Holy, in character,

169. Are infants capable of manifesting holiness by their behaviour?

A. I should like a definition of "infants".

170. A babe, a month old child. Is such a child capable of manifesting holiness?

A. No.

171. Then was Jesus holy from birth in another sense than character?

A. In character, because He himself says in Psalm 22 that God caused Him to trust in God from His mother's womb.

172. An infant cannot trust in God.

A. This one did. It says so in the Scriptures. Shall I quote?

173. No, I'll take your word for it. In what did the holiness of Jesus consist?

A. In character and conduct.

174. Character and conduct and not in nature? Did Jesus need adoption?

A. No.

175. Do we need adoption?

A. Yes.

176. Is there then a legal difference between Him and us?

A. Manifestly! So long as I am not committing myself to your interpretation of the word 'legal.'

177. Is there not a legal difference, irrespective of character?

A. Well, again, I must have a definition of the term 'legal.'

178. Yes. Had He been Joseph's Son, could He have lived a perfect life?

A. No.

179. Could He have redeemed us by His death?

A. No.

180. Was Jesus born in sin?

A. In the physical sense, yes.

181. Did Jesus sin?

A. The proof of the latter statement is the offering by His mother of a sin-offering after His birth.

182. Did Jesus sin?

A. No.

183. Did Jesus break any law?

A. No.

184. Did the law curse Him?

A. Yes.

185. Could a just law curse an innocent man?

A. Yes.

186. Was Jesus 'unclean'?

A. I must pass that. I don't understand that question.

187. Was He 'defiled'?

A. He was undefiled in character.

188. I am asking you, was Jesus defiled?

A. I can't distinguish between Jesus' character and His nature. He was a man of sorrows; He took our infirmities. In that sense the answer is yes. He was defiled. . . But I do not want to be misrepresented.

189. Was Jesus in bondage?

A. Yes, in bondage to death.

190. Could Jesus offer freedom to others if He was himself in bondage?

A. Scripturally, yes.

191. Was His death necessary for His own salvation?

A. The question is unfortunate here, because you are asking me a question in legal, Mosaic, language which is capable of being wrongly construed. I will answer it if you will give me the opportunity of using the Scriptures.

192. Pass on. If Jesus had not suffered crucifixion, would He have perished?

A. The question seems absurd.

193. If Jesus' own eternal life depended upon His death, is it true to say He laid down His life for His sheep?

A. He laid it down and was received by His Father. . . And He gives that as an example of laying down one's life in order to take it again.

Mr W.F.Barling Questions Mr E.Brady:

Now I want, first of all, to fulfil my promise, and ask if you would like me to recapitulate the points we went over this afternoon. If so, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr Brady: Yes, I would like that.

48. Well, then, we had five points. I want your best proof that Jesus' life was offered instead of Adam's.

A. I produce 2 Corinthians 5:14, "For if one died for all, then were all dead," and I produce Romans 5:18, "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."

49. So that if you read those two Scriptures to a person whom you were instructing in your faith you think that person would see at once that the life of Jesus was given instead of the life of Adam? Is that your best proof?

A. Those are my immediate Scriptures which come nearest to the point. The conclusion is based on a wide basis of Scriptural argument, commencing with Adam and what he incurred, and ending with what Jesus suffered.

50. So we have this position then: that Paul says "by man came death" – which superficially, suggests that mankind is mortal because of sin. But it doesn't, you say, actually say so. You have a verse which is so simple, so precise, which you say doesn't say what it seems to say! But when have to establish a basic doctrine of your theology you give me two verses which, not by the wildest interpretation, suggests at all that Christ's life was given instead of Adam's

A. Well, what about 2 Corinthians 5:14?

51. Expound it.

A. "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead."

52. Do you accept the Revised Version translation, "one died for all, then all died"?

A. Yes.

52. Expound it with the alteration, please.

A. The alteration is this: All died 'in Adam,' as I showed in my opening remarks. When Adam forfeited his life, he forfeited the life of the race. And in Romans 5 we are shown. . .

53. Yes, but who 'died' in that verse?

A. Christ.

54. Did 'all' die when Christ died?

A. Yes, but not literally.

55. So 'all' of us were involved in His death?

A. Yes.

56. You call that substitution?

A. Oh no, I call that representation.

57. How do you square this substitution with this verse (remote idea in it of Christ's life) which, far from proving that, substantiates completely the thesis I presented in my opening address? "If one died for all then were all dead." Then all died when one died. That is, when Christ died all died. But you want this verse to prove that when Adam died, all died.

A. Yes, it proves it.

58. It says, When Christ died all died.

A. If one died for all, it says all died

59. Yet you said a moment ago when Christ died all died.

A. True, but the death that Christ died was the death that Adam incurred.

60. Purely gratuitous assumption

A. It may be. But it is logical reasoning.

61. You are giving me this as your best Scriptural evidence that the life of Christ was given instead of the life of Adam.

A. No.

62. In the process you discover that far from supporting your own thesis you are in every way vindicating mine!

A. I maintain that the verse stands. The text is there, and it proves my case and disproves yours, because you say that both Christ died and we all must die, literally.

63. If you were expounding your faith to one who was becoming initiated into it you would draw this verse as proof that Christ's life was given instead of Adam's. In actual fact there is not a shred of evidence to support that!

A. I also produce Romans 5:19. But I am not expounding my faith to the uninitiated; I am reasoning to a Christadelphian.

64. I want you to support your Scriptural theology with clear Scriptural proof.

A. I'll start, then. Adam incurred a violent death. Christ suffered an inflicted death upon the Cross. Argue how you will, Christ died for Adam

65. By a process of deductive reasoning solely, which may be misguided. But can you support the fundamental doctrines of your faith? That is the only form of evidence you can produce?

A. No, I say the evidence is in Scripture itself. Adam incurred a violent death.

66. We can now conclude that for this basic doctrine of yours you have singularly little Scriptural evidence to offer? in fact, none. I want your best proof that the purpose of the Virgin Birth was to confer upon Jesus a legally free life.

A. I should turn first of all, I think, to John 5:26, "For as the Father hath life in Himself; so hath he given to the son to have life in himself."

67. And that verse means that Christ's Virgin Birth gave Him a legally free life?

A. No, I base my — that is my confirmatory proof that Jesus had life in Himself. How did He get that life in Himself? The answer is, by the Virgin Birth.

68. Is this verse proof that He had a legally free life?

A. Yes.

69. Will you listen while I read? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth. . ." The idea there is that the Son 'has life' in the sense that He can raise from the dead all those in the grave and bestow upon them eternal life

because He has the authority delegated to Him from God to do so (by virtue of the fact that he is the Son of man and can judge with sympathy and understanding) and confer his blessing upon them by virtue of His death.

A. It is not my view.

70. Instead, verse 26 means, in effect, -that “the Virgin Birth gave me a legally free life which I could offer instead of that forfeited by Adam.” Well, I think that is singularly thin evidence.

A. We have got the Virgin Birth to dispose of. You say God gave Jesus strength. I say, if Jesus received such strength the case is gone.

71. It is utterly irrelevant. Your best proof is no good. It is no proof. Where are your facts to prove that the Virgin Birth gave Jesus a legally a free life?

72. Question three: redemption and forgiveness of sins are two different processes. I want your evidence for that.

A. I shall, first of all, say that the ignorant and unenlightened are in the position of beasts that perish and are not responsible; and they neither receive forgiveness nor judgment, nor punishment.

73. I want your best Scriptural evidence for that basic proposition.

CHAIRMAN: Could you give it to us in one word? (laughter).

A Scriptural distinction between forgiveness of sins and redemption? Can we receive forgiveness of sins? You answered that we can. I am waiting for your answer, for your Scriptural evidence. You are not going to cross-question me now.

A. I am giving you reasons.

74. I have asked you five questions and you have not been able to give any Scriptural proof for these five basic fundamentals of your theology. I have quite generously given you an opportunity during the interval to find proofs. Your first two proofs are no proofs at all. In answer to the third question you are proceeding to give a lengthy explanation which is utterly irrelevant. But we are still waiting for your Scriptural proof. Have you any to give me?

A. Yes, I have a Scriptural argument - unequivocal Scriptural proof.

75. You cannot give me verses to support your view, as I can to support my views.

A. Yes, I can, but you must allow me to give it in my own words. You cannot give me support that man is mortal because of Adam’s sin. Can you support the idea that there is sin-in-the-flesh?

76. While we are waiting for your evidence will you look at the first chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and an exposition of verse 7? “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.”

A. Unless we receive the redemption through His blood, we could not have forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace.

77. It doesn’t define because we have “redemption through his blood” as “the forgiveness of sins.” It is entirely a different thing.

A. They are not.

78. According to you, but although they are placed in apposition. . .

A. They are not.

79. They are. I happen to be a teacher of language, and they are in apposition.

A. You a teacher. Then what about ‘sin-in-the-flesh’ and ‘sinful flesh’?

80. I am not pretending to have any learning: I am stating simple facts. These two statements are in apposition.

A. I say they are different.

81. The next question. Christ said that “the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give his life a ransom for many.” Would you say that this is a parallel Scripture to “This is the blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins”? Do they mean the same thing?

A. They apply to the same thing; they refer . . .

82. When Christ says He is giving His life as a ransom for many in one Scripture, is He saying the same in another, where He says that the wine is the symbol of the blood which was shed for the remission of sins?

A. Yes, I agree.

83. So redemption, according to the Bible, is the same thing as the forgiveness of sins?

A. No, I don't agree.

84. But you have no proof to support your contention.

A. Yes, the proof lies in the fact that we need, before we have forgiveness of sins, to be redeemed - to receive redemption.

85. According to the exigencies of your own theory, but not. . .

A. No, according to the facts that until a man is enlightened he is neither a sinner nor responsible.

86. That is all very interesting, but you are not producing proof, “Men begin to be ‘in Adam’ only on enlightenment” I want your best Scriptural proof.

A. Yes. I take the words of Christ, “Except I had come they had not had sin.” Now, then, does that not say that there are people who could not have had sin unless Christ had come and enlightened them?

87. Does it say that when they become enlightened they become ‘in Adam’?

A. No.

88. One more question. Did Christ die to save men from violent death? Is that your best proof?

A. I don't say that He died to save men from violent death. I say that Christ died in Adam's stead and He confers upon us natural life, and we have the opportunity of receiving life more abundant, because of that. Those who reject Christ will receive a violent death in the second death, in the form of Judgment

89. Oh, you make statements you cannot verify.

Chairman: That is the end of your time.

Chairman: It is your opportunity now.

Brother Brady now the Questioner.

193. Do you agree that, if Jesus had not died in obedience to the command of God, he would have perished?

A. Yes, He would have been disobedient.

194. Then if His death accomplished, or was contributory to His own salvation, is it not a gross misrepresentation when He says He gave Himself for us?

A. The sole purpose of Christ's existence — His death included — was for our sinfulness.

195. Then why do you say that He died for Himself?

A. I do not say it in an isolated way — that He had to die for Himself. My view was misrepresented in your opening address. I do not believe that God said to Jesus “You must die for yourself.”

196. But you are defending the Christadelphian point of view.

A. I have given you plenty of opportunity to answer my questions. I ask you, too, as a gentleman, to accord me the same fair rights to express myself. This is a fundamental matter. There is associated with it so much prejudice and misunderstanding that I do wish to clarify it.

197. You have your time to utilize to the best advantage. Use it in explanations in your own time.

Chairman: Would it be an advantage if you could take that time now?

Mr Barling: If the Chairman is agreeable.

Chairman: I shall take it off your time, of course.

Mr Barling: When you accuse me of saying and preaching that Christ had to die for Himself, you are putting an altogether false accent on aspects of my teaching in my introductory address. The fact that Christ was born was due to the fact that we are sinners; the fact that He lived a sinless life had the same reason and cause; His death — more than His death, His resurrection too was fundamentally essential to our justification, and therefore it is an incorrect way of expressing the truth to say that He had to die for Himself. First, there is no question of an historical sequence of events where Christ had to die for Himself and God said, ‘Now you can die for other people.’”

Mr Brady: If Christ was under condemnation, it follows that He needed redemption. Then was not His death for Himself?

Mr Barling: I accept the Scriptures and try to base all my teaching on Scripture which says, “The God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant.’ If you mean, does that prove that Christ died for Himself? I should say Yes, categorically — provided you appreciate that I’m using legal language in discriminating.

Mr Brady: You don’t think that that is in the same sense that I say that one died for all others’ sins?

Mr Barling: This verse says to me that God brought our Lord Jesus from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant. I don’t see that that is. . .

Mr Brady: Well, you see, you are defending the Christadelphian case that ‘He abrogated the law of condemnation for Himself;’ and that is the root of our objection to Christadelphianism; that is why we left and have been re-baptised, because we believe that people who hold that view will have to answer to Christ when He returns. Now are we redeemed with a price?

Mr Barling: Yes. Jesus purchased us.

198. He did? Did Jesus pay the price?

A. Yes.

199. Is there any real sense in which Jesus purchased us?

A. Yes.

200. Was the blood of Jesus in any way different from ours?

A. No.

201. How then, was His blood precious?

A. Because He had come to be a propitiation for our sins. God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself. The shedding of blood was the means whereby God could be just in crediting to sinners the righteousness of His Son, who died for them.

202. Was the flesh of Jesus condemned?

A. I want to know what you mean by condemned.

203. Is our flesh condemned?

A. Condemned by what?

- 204.** Condemned under the bondage of sin, condemned in Adam?
A. We are in the bondage of corruption.
- 205.** Was Jesus in the bondage of corruption?
A. Yes.
- 206.** His flesh, then, was evil; would you say that?
A. Yes, His flesh had evil propensities, such as ours.
- 207.** Was that sin in His flesh, or His blood, or both?
A. I have no idea.
- 208.** Did Jesus receive back the price that He paid?
A. I have read nothing of the kind in Scripture.
- 209.** Was His death a penalty due to Himself, personally?
A. I have explained already, the term ‘penalty’ is quite incongruous in this context.
- 210.** Was Jesus the Good Shepherd?
A. Yes.
- 211.** Did He give His life for the sheep?
A. Yes.
- 212.** Was He one of the sheep?
A. In what sense do you use that term?
- 213.** Flock of sheep. Is the shepherd one of the sheep?
A. In Isaiah, the figure is of Moses, and figure of God coming up from out of Egypt. So from the bondage of. . .
- 214.** We are not dealing with Moses; we are dealing with “I am the Good Shepherd, and I lay down my life for the sheep.” Now, was Jesus one of the sheep?
A. The allusion in Hebrews 13:20 is the prophecy which is drawn between the redemption of Christ and with His brethren, and the salvation of Moses and the people. In that sense, yes.
- 215.** Did you say that He was one of the sheep?
A. In that sense, yes.
- 216.** Did Jesus give His life a ransom for many?
A. Yes.
- 217.** Did Jesus ransom Himself?
A. Yes.
- 218.** Did Jesus offer first for Himself?
A. Remembering that we are using the legal and technical language of the law, yes.
- 219.** Did Jesus lay down His life voluntarily, ‘or had He no choice?
A. He had the choice to refuse, but He laid it down in obedience to a specific command: “This commandment have I received of my Father.
- 220.** Do you believe that Jesus was specially strengthened to overcome sin? If so, was He tempted like as we are?
A. There is no ‘if.’ He was strengthened, and tempted like as we are.
- 221.** You can harmonise the two?

A. The Scripture does.

222. But can you? Suppose I gave a man a load to carry up a hill, and I say to another man; All right, you carry the same load up the hill, but you are much stronger. Is there any credit to the strong man in carrying up the load?

A. The credit is to the one who gives him the strength, and that is the one to whom Jesus gives the credit.

223. Was Jesus the seed of the serpent?

A. No.

224. Was Jesus of serpent-nature?

A. Yes. He had a serpent-nature. He Himself indicated as much in the raising of the serpent in the wilderness.

225. Did Jesus belong to God?

A. Yes, and so do I, I trust.

226. Are we sold unto sin?

A. Physically, yes.

227. But we belong to God?

A. Yes.

228. Was the wrath of God upon Jesus?

A. I don't understand that language.

229. Is the wrath of God against sinners?

A. Against those who are morally sinners.

230. Was the wrath of God against Jesus?

A. Jesus was not morally a sinner, so I must deduce, "No."

231. Was He a physical sinner?

A. That is unscriptural language.

232. He was, in some sense?

A. He had a sinful nature.

233. Which required His death?

A. You are giving ideas which I do not propagate.

234. Was the purpose of His death to destroy His flesh?

A. His death condemned sin in the flesh.

235. Therefore He had sin in the flesh?

A. Yes.

236. But you agreed that sin could be put upon the head of the animal; but you don't agree that any sin was transferred?

A. I am not committing myself to that view; I am simply saying that when you asked me the question, I did not agree. I wanted to make myself clear.

237. Now I want you to suppose, on your view, that Jesus had to die for His own salvation. You agree that He did, but you admit that His death was necessary for His own salvation?

A. It is an entirely false emphasis. His free release was our release. He died to sin, and we died to sin in that sense. We must identify ourselves with Him, and He is the representative of mankind; and I think I can give a beautiful analogy.

238. If you will suppose, on our view, that Jesus did not have to die for Himself, but voluntarily took the sinner's place, can you conceive of that? Do you think that would have shown a superabundant love towards us, if He loved us and gave Himself for us? He said, "Greater love hath no man than this; that a man lay down his life for his friends." Now if Jesus was free from condemnation to make His choice, do you think that when He chose to die for us He showed the love of God and His own love towards us?

A. I am glad you quoted the words of Galatians 2:20, because in that scripture Paul says two things which you make the basis of attack upon us, which can be reconciled: 1. "I am crucified with Christ;" 2. "Who loved me and gave himself for me." Those are the two sayings which explained the death of Christ. We are crucified with Him, and yet He gave Himself for us.

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

A. I don't. The Scripture does.

240. You've just said that Paul was crucified?

A. Paul said that we are crucified with Christ, in symbol.

241. Was Paul literally crucified with Christ?

A. In symbol. Not literally.

242. Did Jesus suffer the reality of a literal death, and do we require to go through it in symbol 7 both morally and spiritually, in baptism?

A. Yes. And the symbol of the new life is baptism.

243. Is baptism a symbol of crucifixion? You give your case away completely. If Christ suffered literally, and we require to go through it in symbol, did He not do for us what we don't have to do for ourselves?

A. I'm afraid you are demolishing your own case in this evidence; you are forgetting that Paul said, in Romans 6, that we are buried with Him by baptism into death, that the body of sin might be destroyed. The more strongly you argue that Christ suffered the reality, that the body of sin was destroyed in our case, then you have to admit that the body of sin was destroyed in Christ. You are completely demolishing your own case.

244. It destroys yours. You affirm that the body of sin is our literal physical nature; is that destroyed in baptism?

A. Precisely. In Romans 6 Paul says that we are destroyed, in our sense. You know that as well as I do.

245. You said that our members - our limbs, our flesh, serve sin, did you not?

A. I don't say it, Paul does.

246. Can those same members serve God?

A. Yes.

247. Well, where is your case? You argue that we, by nature, are evil; you admit that the same members that can serve sin can serve God (or that Paul says it). Did they serve God in the case of Paul? Show me where Paul committed a sin after he was in Christ.

A. I'll use one scriptural figure; "Receive with meekness the engrafted word." Out there are apples trees, the basic stock is a wild apple; on the top of which is a cultivated shoot. The purpose of our life of discipline is that the cultivated shoot should take the strength of the native evil stock, and make it bring forth fruit to righteousness. And so there is conflict within us; the members naturally tending to serve sin, but ourselves being called upon to compel them to serve righteousness.

248. If a man brings forth the fruits of righteousness and serves God, has he still sinful flesh?

A. Oh yes.

249. Can he help sinning?

A. In the absolute sense, no. But he has also to say that when he does good, he does it, not himself, but “by the grace of God which is in me.”

250. You quote the example of Jesus who, you admit, was made in all points like as we, and yet was without sin.

A. Yes.

251. Then what is your explanation in how He succeeded in overcoming sin, when you say that it is impossible for us to overcome sin?

A. I shall answer your question. . .

252. Did Jesus do for us what we cannot do for ourselves?

A. Yes.

253. Dr Thomas says that Jesus was the same flesh as sinned in Eden. Do you agree that the implication is that Jesus, when He came, was the same flesh as Adam before he sinned?

A. Is the interpretation valid?

Chairman: Where does that appear?

F. J. Pearce, in audience: In the Christadelphian Magazine, August 1873, page 364.

254. Did Dr Thomas say that the ram offered on Mount Moriah was a substitute for Isaac?

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

Brother Barling now the Questioner:

90. Paul says; “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin. Kindly define the term “death” in that quotation,

A. I don’t define it; I accept it, as death by sin.

91. Yes, but do you know that we disagree in our interpretation of that which terminates our ordinary human life? How, exactly, do you interpret it?

A. I understand that death is a penalty for sin, and I don’t regard natural death as a penalty for sin.

92. What is the penalty? What does Paul mean — what is he referring to when he says, “death by sin”?

A. I think that death was illustrated by the violent death of animals, by sacrifices under the Law, and finally, by the death of Jesus on the Cross.

93. I was correctly interpreting your belief; that ‘death’ is a violent death?

A. Or inflicted death; death as a punishment.

94. Not if you are referring to the death which normally terminates life Will you turn to 1 Corinthians 15? I want you to be particularly careful when you answer my preparatory questions. Verse 21; “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.” “By man came death;” what does “death” mean in that verse? Is it the death which normally terminates life?

A. No.

95. Now verse 26; “the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.” I: that the death which normally terminates human life?

A. It is difficult to answer that question, because death is spoken of as an enemy.

96. Which enemy is it, the one that will take you to the grave?

A. No, it is not that, because that is not an enemy. That will be no bar to eternal life to anybody who accepts Christ.

97. So you are quite explicit that that verse which says “the last enemy is death” is not another way of saying that mortality will be brought to an end?

A. Yes, I should say so.

98. It doesn't mean that eventually the earth will be populated with undying people?

A. It results in that, because when. . .

99. Does it specially refer to it?

A. No, I don't think so.

100. Now verse 54. “Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written. Death is swallowed up in victory.” What ‘death’ will that be?

A. That is death in the wide sense — all death, death, whether it is by sin, or death as the result of natural corruption, or death of any kind.

101. It can therefore refer to the death which terminates our human life?

A. Yes. I would say so, off-hand, in a general way.

102. “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin.” You have said that the ‘death’ that is to be swallowed up comprehends the death which takes us to the grave. When it says that “the sting of death is sin” (to explain the quotation from Isaiah and from Hosea), why does it say “the sting of death is sin”? Where is the connection between Adam's sin, and death which takes us to the grave, according to your theology? Why should that connection be made which you say is unscriptural and an artificial one?

A. Well, the second death ends in the grave just as much as the first death does it not?

103. This is referring to the return of Christ and to that time when a transformation will take place in our natures.

A. No; there will be those who will be corruptible.

104. In this verse, at the return of Christ, when there is a change in our nature, “death is swallowed up in victory.” You agree that that is the reverse of our natural condition of being subject to death?

A. No. I said it comprehends death in all its forms.

105. You have committed yourself. Does it include that aspect of death that takes us to the grave?

A. Yes.

106. Very well. Does that statement “the sting of death is sin” apply to that aspect?

A. No.

107. Now we will retrace our steps. Verse 17, “And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.” Paul is referring to believers. They are “in Christ.” Now they “have fallen asleep;” What sort of death have they suffered?

A. A natural death.

108. In this life all men are most miserable. What terminates life?

A. Natural death.

109. “But now is Christ risen from the dead.” What does the term ‘death’ mean in that verse?

A. From the state of death. Jesus has risen from among those who have suffered a natural death.

110. “And become the first fruits of those that slept.” Now you appreciate that that is an illusion to the “first fruits” of the law?

A. Yes. The first fruits of them that slept.

111. And the first fruits of the harvest?

A. Yes.

112. So that Paul is saying that Christ is part of the harvest — the harvest of salvation from death?

A. Yes, the harvest of the resurrection which is. . .

113. Which is salvation from death?

A. No, I don't agree.

114. “Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept.” What has happened to “them that slept” at this stage?

A. They are dead.

115. And the emphasis that, he supports it, he sustains it, by saying, “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.” Is there a connection between those two verses - verses 20 and 21?

A. Yes. In the. . .

116. Those in Christ are dead?

A. Yes.

117. Why?

A. Because the time for their deliverance has not come.

118. They have naturally died; which Paul explains by saying, “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.” Can't you see the perfect balance? You, yourself, admit that, in verse 20, they are dead because they have suffered natural death; therefore they ‘sleep’ because of that. And to demonstrate that Christ is the first fruits of “them that slept,” Paul says, “For by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.”

A. But this is the point; that the resurrection did not come by Christ, the death that naturally ends our life would have ended our existence as certainly as it would have ended Adam's.

119. You are compelled to hold that view — but let us look at the first clause; “By man came death.” You are now arguing, from the second part of the verse, that, unless Christ had redeemed us, that death normally terminates life — that, and ‘natural’ death — would have meant the end. Now, the first part of the verse says about that ‘death’ which He suffered. But it came by man. How did it come by man? How does ‘natural death’ come by man?

A. Let us suppose that Adam had not sinned. . .

120. No supposing. Death has come — has death come by man?

A. Death passed upon all men.

121. How has it come by man? What sort of death is being mentioned in verses 20 and 21?

A. This is natural death.

122. Verse 21 — is that natural death?

A. No, not natural death, because it wasn't natural death that came by sin.

123. Is there any connection between verses 20 and 21? If there is, what is it? What is the connection between these two statements?

A. Because had Christ not come and paid the price, had he not been raised from the dead, the death that ends our natural existence would have ended our existence, because Christ. . .

124. That is a purely gratuitous assumption, which is not at all relevant to the cogent argument developed by the Apostle. Answer my questions please. We will recapitulate here. Verse 20, “Now is Christ risen from the dead.” What have they suffered?

A. They have suffered nothing.

125. They have fallen asleep?

A. Yes.

126. “Become the firstfruits of them that slept.” “For as by man came death. . .” All the rules of logic require that that death which has come by man is the death mentioned in the previous verse which, on your own admission, is natural death; and you are now asking me to accept some purely unrelated explanation and to throw all logic overboard — the cogency of the argument which demonstrates, beyond all doubt that natural death came by man?

A. No, it doesn't, because death is all one. However death comes to take place, whether natural or violent — the man who dies is in the death state.

127. Does the natural aspect come by man?

A. Had Adam not sinned. . .

128. There is no hypothesis; it is a reality, this experience of natural death. Does it come by man?

A. No.

129. Paul says it does: “By man came death,” which is quite clearly the death mentioned in the previous verse which, on your own admission, is natural death. Did natural death come by man?

A. No.

130. Therefore the word ‘for’ is incorrectly used and there is no sequence in this argument? There is no sequence of thought to be established by using it?

A. The sequence of thought is this; that Christ having risen from the dead, death now has no dominion.

131. Now sir, I will ask you one or two quick questions. Would a superficial reader come to the conclusion, from this argument, in this verse in particular, that natural death comes through Adam's sin?

A. A superficial reader might have reached a false conclusion from any passage.

132. Would he draw that conclusion in the first interpretation?

A. No, you would not draw that division, having that idea in one's mind.

133. If a man read this, what general impression would he get from it?

A. He would get the impression that by His resurrection from the dead Jesus had opened the way out of death; but he would not conclude that the death that ends the life of animals and plants and irresponsible people was the penalty of sin.

134. Would he be a logical person in drawing that conclusion?

A. No, he would be utterly illogical to draw such a conclusion from 1 Corinthians 15, because Paul is there proving the resurrection of the dead.

135. “Christ is risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept,” and he illustrates that; “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.” You can see readily that in verse 20 ‘death’ is a natural death. When Paul connects that with the next statement by the word ‘for’ you are asking me to say there is no connection between the 20th and 21st verses, and it does not prove that natural death comes by man. “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” What does “Die” mean here?

A. It means all in Adam suffer the penalty of death for sin.

136. “In Christ shall all be made alive.” When?

A. When Christ shall come to raise the dead.

Brother Brady now the Questioner:

254. Producing this argument knocked your case to atoms; that Christ, by His resurrection, has destroyed death. Now He hasn't destroyed natural death, as there are those who still die a natural death, not death as a penalty, because there will be those raised from the dead who will suffer the penalty of sin.

A. Is that so?

255. Yes, the second death.

256. Now then, if those who have died naturally have suffered the penalty of sin, how can a just God raise them from the dead to punish them with the second death?

A. As I explained, you are attributing to me an idea of ‘penalty.’ You are arguing in the terminology of your own theology. I say that the bondage of corruption is the unhappy inheritance that we have from Adam. It is an indication that our flesh is under the bondage of sin; and that ‘bondage’ will be vanquished in the glorious resurrection.

257. You have affirmed that sinful human nature is the result of the sin of Adam and the corruptibility which came by Adam’s transgression.

A. I am using your own language. The ‘bondage* of corruption is to be vanquished of the body. I am using your own terms.

258. I don’t accept that the bondage of corruption is a physical principle of flesh or that it brings about natural death. It is a law, a rule, that is passed upon men when they come to enlightenment. As it says in Romans; “Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Death reigned from Adam to Moses — even over them that had not sinned, and death is still reigning in the same sense as the law of Britain reigns over us. When we become amenable to that law, then we’ve got, by the sacrifice of Christ, to transfer ourselves from bondage of that law to the freedom which is in Christ. Then Christ says we have “passed” from death unto “life.” Now what death have they passed from?

A. Well, Paul tells me, “In Adam all die;” it’s a present experience, “but in Christ shall all be made alive.” Your theory requires that all men die “in Adam,” but that as soon as they become ‘in Christ’ they are made alive.

259. Men who live their lives on probation and remain in the Adamic relationship will be held responsible. An Apostle says, “How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?”

A. You say that when a roan is enlightened he becomes in Adam?

260. On the basis of all just laws of judgment. Yes. Can God hold men responsible for sins they are ignorant of?

A. No.

261. How do you hold that He can punish the whole of mankind with the penalty of death, or with death however you regard it, because Adam sinned? You admit they are not sinners?

A. He is not ‘punishing’ them. That question does not require an answer.

262. But you admit there is a punishment?

A. In the case of Adam the punishment was; “Unto dust shalt thou return.” We have inherited that physical condition.

263. We’ll go back to Genesis 3:17. “Cursed is the ground for thy sake.” Did that make any change in Adam’s physical condition or nature?

A. Certainly in his condition.

264. “Cursed is the ground. . .

A. it wasn’t Adam. . .

265. In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat of the herb of the field.” Did that change his physical nature? Did it implant sin?

A. It subjected him to entirely new physical conditions.

266. Did those conditions change his nature? Did they cause him to become corruptible?

A. These verses undoubtedly establish that. They have a symbolic significance also, inasmuch as they describe the spiritual significance of the physical experience of man,

267. Do you agree that “the animal nature of man shall dissolve. It was not constituted to continuing life independent of any further modification. We admit the corruptibility and consequent mortality of their nature, without saying that they are mortal”?

A. I could counter it with others.

268. We recognise that Dr Thomas has contradicted himself and made mistakes, and we are pointing out why those mistakes occurred, because they have, basic in their belief, the idea that human nature is inherently evil. I want to read you the ninth article of the Church of England Prayer Book; “Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam, but it is the fault and corruption of the Nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam: whereby man is very far gone from the original righteousness and is of his own nature inclined to evil.” You will agree with that?

A. I would like notice of that.

269. It is in the ninth article of the Church of England Prayer Book, defining the doctrine of Original Sin. It is identical with the Christadelphian doctrine.

A. That may be correct; but I am not going to make a rash statement.

270. In Genesis 3:19 it says; “In the sweat of they face shalt thou eat bread.” Was this the change in Adam’s nature?

A. Clearly something occurred to him within that. . .

271. But don’t you think that he could sweat before he sinned?

A. Quite probably, but there is a measure that is quite irrelevant. You have started with “because thou hast done so-and-so, these are your experiences;” You are asking me to say that these experiences are nothing to do with the clause.

272. No, I am not. But I disagree with your interpretation of what these experiences mean.

A. I have not said that they involve a change in his nature or condition, but there is a change here involved, of some other character.

273. But you can’t define it?

A. In this case it is the conditions under which he lives legally.

274. You would admit in effect that he was corruptible beforehand?

A. I made no. . .

275. You admit that he was the living soul, “of the earth, earthy”?

A. Yes.

276. Would you admit that he was corruptible — capable of dying before his sin?

A. I would say, speaking out of my own convictions, that it was the nature that is called the body, to rescue in a state of equilibrium before he sinned, and his sin determined which way the bias would be set in motion which would cause him to decline.

277. You don’t think a miracle took place?

A. I must say that, from the fact that they ate and their eyes were opened something fundamental happened within them (that is scriptural evidence) but the actual mechanism, or ‘modus operandi,’ I cannot attempt to explain.

278. Now God said; “Dust -thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.”

A. Yes.

279. Now Adam was dust before he sinned; we have Dr Thomas’ admission that this must have been corruptible at his creation,

A. What Dr Thomas says doesn’t commit me at the moment. I am answering from my own convictions.

280. You stated that there were two natures?

A. Yes; I accept, in general, the body ‘celestial’ and the body ‘terrestrial.’

281. Now if Adam was in that state of equilibrium, was his a different nature?

A. No, not necessarily.

282. Then his nature was not changed?

A. It would be a kind of condition. May I give you an illustration? There is one mediator between God and man: He is the man Christ Jesus. If you ask me ‘What kind of nature had Jesus Christ?’ I could say (with your peculiar kind of logic) that because He is a man He has a corruptible nature. He is the same individual, but quite clearly He has undergone a change. You can use the term ‘man,’ or ‘Adam.’ In this condition you are agreed that His is an incorruptible nature, because of the conditions of his life and being.

283. Was His being changed? In this you profess a belief in the implantation of a physical law of decay; I am bound to bring you back to the Christadelphian point of view. That is why we are here tonight. Now then, how did the sentence justify a sentence which defiled and became a physical law of his being? I want to know if you believe that.

A. The body is dead because of sin. There is a similar paraphrase in the New Testament. . .

284. You admitted that when a man is in Christ he can be obedient?

A. Yes.

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

A. At this stage your statements lack sequence. It is, of course, for you to accord me the time to point out that you have just said that you agree that all this is contingent upon the term ‘because;’ the cursing of the ground, eating in sorrow, the thorns and thistles, in the sweat of the face — you cover all these expressions by the term: but when you come to the expression “dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return,” you say, quite airily, that that was true Of Adam before the curse.

286. I take that as the time limit set, during which Adam was going to suffer under these conditions. He goes on to say “For out of the ground wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” Doesn’t that prove that he was not changed? He was out of the ground; why not return to the ground in the natural course?

A. But it was his sin which determined that he should return because of the curse. When you come to this statement you say this is a gratuitous statement and has no relation to the sin; all the previous statements in the sequence, you say, are due to the sin, but quite capriciously and arbitrarily you say this is nothing to do with it.

287. If you say so-and-so there is a limit; and this limit was set when God said, ‘Thou shalt suffer these things until thou return to the ground.’ Now I quite admit that, had Adam been obedient, he would have required a change in nature; He would have required deliverance from His corruptibility before He could have lived for ever. You admit the same?

A. I have made no such admission. We have got the record of this debate for the purpose of publication, so that we can have the thing straight and see where the contradictions are in our views. If there are contradictions in our views, well, we will have them out,

288. I wasn’t able to justify what you said were four or five of our fundamental beliefs. They are not fundamental points. The fundamental of our belief is that Jesus gave Himself for the ungodly: the Just, for the unjust; and we can justify that on the basis of sustained scriptural argument — reasoning and Scripture together.

A. Singularly unscriptural.

289. Well, that is your view. We have got the record now, and it will be for the public to read and come to the conclusion where the truth lies. We maintain that Jesus was not under condemnation, and had He been so He would have been unable to redeem the world; the purpose of God would have been a failure.

God would have been convicted of fraud, because He paid to sin what already belonged to sin, according to your theory. Jesus, because of His virgin birth, received His life direct from God, and therefore He was in a position. . .

A. And yet you have given me not one scriptural proof to attribute this significance to the virgin birth.

290. What more significant than the message to the Virgin: “That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.”?

A. But there is nothing there about free life whatsoever.

291. I don’t care about ‘free life’ at all.

A. I’m glad of that, because you should; you are quoting the Virgin Birth now.

292. I don’t require that phrase ‘a free life;’ I am quoting it to prove that Jesus was free and the Son of God.

A. That is an interpretation. There is nothing in that quotation to support the idea of ‘free life.’

293. It is a statement of fact.

Brother Barling questions Brother Brady:

137. Corinthians 15:22. As I now see it, then, on your own admission, it says that the dead are dead because they have suffered natural death. They that sleep have had the same experience. But the use of the conjunctive ‘for’ to connect the following verse with the previous verse is irrelevant, because the ‘death’ in verse 21 is an entirely different sort of death. Verse 22: “For as in Adam all die.” The audience is well familiar with your understanding of that statement. It is connected with the previous verse. When do they all die “in Adam.”?

A. They either die symbolically in baptism and therefore pass into Christ, or they die in the Day of Judgment.

138. When he says, very precisely; “In Adam all die,” using the present tense, is there any significance that with equal precision he uses the future instead of the present, in contrast? Can you explain why “all die in Adam” now, by “in Christ shall all be made alive”?

A. Because it is in the present that we need to die to the old man, ‘in Adam,’ and it is in the future that we shall be made alive in Christ in the resurrection. There is a sense in which we are made alive in Christ now: we have passed from death to life; but we have to wait for the resurrection.

139. But note the context; “For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.” How is that demonstrated? “Even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” It is the physical experience of men that is being described, without a doubt. “In Adam all die;” I say that it is clearly understandable; it means that men go to the grave because of Adam’s sin. Logic demands that.

A. I say No, it doesn’t. “All die;” it’s a matter of present experience. I don’t agree.

140. It’s a matter of present experience based on the preceding argument by the double use of the conjunction ‘for,’ but it says that in Christ shall all be made alive.

A. I don’t agree; all die in Adam when they are buried in symbol, and rise unto Christ.

141. You notice, following this verse/ ideas which are irrelevant to the theme of the Apostle in this place; and yet earlier in the debate you admitted that the superficial reading of this verse would suggest that we go to the grave in the normal course, because of sin. In other words, we have again the peculiar position of what may be called, the obvious meaning which isn’t the real meaning; it is always something else.

A. The obvious meaning is often not the correct meaning,

142. In the case of my reading of the scriptures that seems a peculiar thing to say. The scriptures are for men’s enlightenment, and they are able to enlighten without divination, and you are here to explain the connection in the Apostle’s argument.

A. If you jumble the death which came by sin with the death which is natural corruption (and which existed before Adam was culpable — before he sinned) then you are jumbling up things that differ. “Death came by sin” and “death passed upon all men.”

143. The simple issue is this: Paul says “By man came death” in a context where he has just explained that “in Adam all die;” he is using the term of present experience. Then he demonstrates that in the mercy of God there is hope of something better, because “Christ is the first fruits. . . In Christ shall all be made alive.” “But every man in his own order.” Now then, we will go to the end of the chapter, to verse 53; “For this corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality.” 54; “So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written. Death is swallowed up in victory.” You will agree that that is a change from a corruptible condition to an incorruptible one, and that it will fulfil the scriptures “death is swallowed up in victory.” What ‘death’ will that mean for those in Christ?

A. Repeat the question please.

144. What ‘death’ is swallowed up in victory?

A. It will mean the death which would have held them eternally, had Christ not come.

145. When will corruptible put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality? When will it be brought to pass? Will that happen to men in Adam?

A. No. Obviously not

146. Only to men in Christ?

A. Yes.

147. For those already in Christ — they that are fallen asleep in Christ — the scripture will be fulfilled, “Death is swallowed up in victory.” What sort of ‘death’ is that?

A. The death that they are going to be raised from.

148. They die a natural death.

A. They are asleep in natural death.

149. For them, it can be one death only?

A. No, because from the first death, the death that came by sin, they passed in symbol, in baptism.

150. So they are now ‘in Christ’ and they shall be made alive?

A. Yes.

151. This is described in detail?

A. You haven’t come yet to those who haven’t died,

152. I’m not concerned with them who are changed by nature. “Death will be swallowed up in victory.” What death? They died a natural death’ Is natural death swallowed up in victory?

A. No. It says “When they shall have put on immortality” we come to a certain time when Christ is returned and we are raised from the dead. Then shall be brought to pass the saying which is written: Death is swallowed up in victory. That death is the death which reigned from Adam.

153. Will you agree with this: that it is the change of nature that will be the victory over death?

A. No. It will be the resurrection.

154. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written. When he says that, he is not intimating that the change of nature is the swallowing up of victory. On the other hand, he is intimating that death o? a legal kind that came by Adam will be repudiated?

A. Yes.

155. Again, the verse doesn’t say what it seems to say, but what you consider. . .

A. You are taking the chapter which is proving the resurrection and you are applying it to prove what Paul proves in the Epistles to the Romans

156. You will agree that the resurrection is the reversal of natural death, because natural death only takes you to the grave and the resurrection brings you up?

A. No, I do not say so, because some will receive eternal life that don't receive a resurrection.

157. Christ calls it "the resurrection unto condemnation," for some. In John 5, He says; "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." 26; "For as the Father hath life in Himself; so has He given to the Son to have life in himself;" 27; "And He hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." 28; "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice," 29; "And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." What does the resurrection do to the good and evil?

A. Brings them out of the tomb.

158. That resurrection is the reversal of going into the tomb?

A. In the case of the resurrection of life.

159. In the case of those who have the resurrection of life, it will involve a transformation of nature?

A. No. They have come forth.

160. It will involve a transformation of nature; the time doesn't matter.

A. They will come forth.

161. It doesn't matter when it will happen, whether then or after judgment; will it be a fundamental transformation of nature? Will this corruptible put on incorruption?

A. Yes.

162. When the transformation has taken place, that saying will be –brought to pass: Death is swallowed up in victory? That is the death which takes them to the grave? We will continue. "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin and the strength of sin is the law." And now will you turn with me to Hosea 13? I want you to answer a very important question: What does 'ransom' redeem us from — sin that comes from Adam, or the 'death' which terminates life?

A. It redeems us from bondage.

163. So that where redemption is involved, sin is involved?

A. No. It is a state of bondage. The very use of the term 'redemption' implies sin and its consequent slavery.

164. What brings about that state of bondage?

A. Adam's sin.

165. So bondage is an indication of the presence of sin and its consequences?

A. No. People who are not necessarily sinners by their own actions are in bondage, and by ransom and redemption escape from. . .

166. Where the terms 'ransom' and 'redemption' are involved is the sin of Adam and its consequences involved?

A. Yes.

167. Now let us look at the 15th chapter of the 1st of Corinthians, verse 54; "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" This is a quotation from the latter part of Hosea 13:14; "O grave, I will be thy destruction." It is a quotation, I think you will agree?

A. Yes.

168. Why does God say, in verse 14 (in the early part); “I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death”?

A. Because they needed redemption from that power.

169. Where are they at this time; the people involved?

A. They are in the power of the grave.

170. In the grave itself?

A. No, not necessarily in the grave.

171. Why, then, does Paul apply fulfilment of this quotation to the time when the dead come out of the grave and are transformed in nature, if it is nothing to do with going into the grave?

A. I didn't say it wasn't anything to do with going in, as death (as death), is all one. If death comes as a penalty of sin, that is one thing, but. . .

172. Is this the death that takes us to the grave that is reversed when there is the resurrection and transformation of nature? This is the death, the natural death that is involved in Paul's arguments?

A. No, I should say not, because this death that takes us to the grave is not necessarily final. Those who are responsible are to be brought forth to give an account; which proves, you see, that the death which you regard as sin's penalty is only one thing. . .

173. That is pure quibble. When the change of nature occurs, then shall be brought to pass the saying. Therefore, it can only concern people who go into the grave.

A. But it also concerns people who are living.

174. This transformation will occur in the case of both living and dead, so that Paul is indicating quite clearly that the living in Christ are likewise in the power of the grave and of death. But when the transformation of nature takes place, the scripture will be fulfilled, “O death, where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory.” The living and the dead will experience that, and the scripture will be fulfilled. Therefore the redemption, according to Hosea, does concern the nature which takes them to the grave.

Tea Interval.

Evening Session

Brother Brady questions W. F. Barling:

294. Will you give me your strongest scriptural proof for Christ having to die for Himself?

A. Hebrews 13, verse 20. “Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant. . .”

295. That verse is construed (I don't know whether you know) to read “Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, make you perfect through the blood of the everlasting covenant.”

A. You cannot give me a version that supports you in that.

296. Off-hand I can't, but I can give you the key, though. Hebrew is a disjointed language, and it is necessary to construe in harmony with the rest of the Scriptures.

A. I have here the versions which occur in the American Revised Standard Version, Moffatt, the Revised Version, Weymouth, Rotherham, Conybeare & Howson, and Young's Literal Translation; and they are all against you.

297. All right. Will you turn to John 8:34? I want to draw the contrast between Jesus and ourselves, and show you how the Scripture nowhere supports your view that Jesus was in condemnation. “Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.” Was Jesus the servant of sin?

A. No.

298. Is there a distinction between a son and a servant? “And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever.”

A. It depends on the particular context in which the contrast is set, of course. You say that the distinction between a son and a servant is based on the first century practice of slavery. Quite obviously there is a difference.

299. Verse 36: “If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.” Was there any sense in which Jesus was free?

A. Yes.

300. Was it as a result of His birth?

A. His perfect life of obedience.

301. But still under condemnation as the penalty of this physical sin?

A. Physically, yes.

302. And He had to pay the penalty?

A. I must object to the language, which doesn't account for our belief, as I have shown already.

303. Verse 38: “I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father,” Do you recognise the distinction between Jesus' Father and our father?

A. Jesus Father and the sinner's father?

304. Who is the father of sinners?

A. The principle of evil in the flesh.

305. Verse 44: Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father will ye do.” Who was the devil?

A. Jesus clearly indicates that it's that which possesses 'lusts,' which is one thing only in the case of man - the nature which he bears.

306. Does the Apostle James say: “Resist the devil and he will flee from you”?

A. No, but sinful and evil impulses can be subjected and brought into harmony with the will of God. I've given an analogy of the tree and. . .

307. Verse 46: “Which of you convinceth me of sin?” Do you convict Jesus of sin?

A. No, He was the only person ever to live who has not offended morally.

308. John says, “in Him is no sin.”

A. John is not referring to the physical body of Christ, but to the fellowship with the Father that we have in Him and “with the Father.”

309. Will you give me your strongest proof of sin in Christ?

A. Romans 6, which is based on your own insistence that if their reality lies in Christ, there is the symbol to our case. Do you insist – do you urgently commit yourself to the view, that in symbol (in baptism) “the body of sin” is put to death. Then in reality it was with Christ.

310. Do you admit Jesus rose with the same body as the body that had to be put to death?

A. I said, I do not know.

311. Verse 49: “Jesus answered, I have not a devil.” Do you agree with that? Do you believe He had a devil in His flesh?

A. You appreciate the different wording? He is referring to something quite different; the 'diabolos,' not 'daemon.'

312. I am quoting from your book “Redemption in Christ Jesus.” Page 28 paragraph 4; “The Scriptures leave us in no doubt where the true Diabolos resides and operates. In order that by his death he might destroy Diabolos Jesus partook of flesh and blood. . . It is abundantly clear that Diabolos must be located in man’s physical constitution.” Was the devil in Jesus?

A. Hebrews 2:14 says it was.

313. Now we turn to John 10: 9, “I am the door. . .” Can a door go through itself, or can a door be confused with those who go through it?

A. The question is so facetious that I can’t answer.

314. Verse 10: “I am come that they might have life,, and that they might have it more abundantly.” Did we receive our natural life because Jesus came and paid the price of Adam’s sin, thus redeeming us?

A. We are in the position (as a result of this operation) that, whereas the inheritance from Adam takes us to the grave, Christ brings us back. And God does not merely raise the dead but quickens them; and there will be, in the case of those who on that occasion, transformation of nature when we are “in Christ.”

315. Have we life now, in the sense other than natural life?

A. Yes.

316. And do we hope to get that life more abundantly in the future?

A. Yes, certainly.

317. Verse 11: “I am the Good Shepherd. The Good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.” I ask the question. Can the Shepherd be one of the sheep?

A. You must not base on one figure the whole teaching of the Scriptures.

318. No, and you mustn’t base on one verse, in dealing with the resurrection the whole teaching of Scripture concerning that from which man needs redemption.

A. So far I’ve used three verses.

319. Verses 17-19 “Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again.” Now if Jesus had no choice about laying down His life, or was required to submit to ceremonial condemnation of His nature, could it be said “I lay it down of myself”? And could there be any sense or reason why His Father should thus love Him? “No man taketh it from me. . . I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. Your affirmation was that, in effect, ‘He had no choice because He was under condemnation

A. When God asks me to observe His law, I have a choice, although God tells me that I must obey. That was the way in which Christ was “obedient” unto death, even the death of the Cross.

320. If Jesus’ death was required of Him, was His act of obedience a part of duty? Was He not in the same position as those He spoke to in Luke 17:10, “So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do”?

A. You see, here again, you are confusing the matter. As I have explained, Christ would not have been born apart from sin. Christ came with a unique mission, and therefore it is mere confusion to try and square Him by a statement which governs the status of His servants.

321. But unless you can contemplate the opposite view. . . Jesus said His Father loved Him because He did it out of love. It was that which He was neither called upon to do nor obliged to do for the ungodly, and to be a propitiation for our sins.

A. God sent Him to be a propitiation for our sins.

322. I want to ask you a question on Romans 5:18, “Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation.” Is that the same condemnation as in Romans 8:1, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.”?

A. I should say it is more comprehensive than the other.

323. One is more comprehensive than the other?

A. The first is a general legacy from Adam, whereas in Romans 8:1. . .

324. Condemnation came by one, and ‘condemnation’ is a legal term, you will agree. Now it says that “there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus.”

A. Those who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

325. But if we walk after the flesh we prove that we are sinners. But you say it is impossible to walk after anything else, it is impossible for men to live in obedience.

A. I have said nothing of the sort! I have said that if a man strives to the best of his ability to be obedient he can say ‘I have done it; yet not I, but the grace of God which is with me.’ with the help of God’s grace, even to this..

326. So it is possible?

A. With external help from God

327. Romans 5:1, “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Was there ever a moment when Jesus wasn’t at peace with God?

A. No

328. This is proving, you see, that His death was not on His own account. It was not for Himself, it was for us. In verse 2; “By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand.” Was Jesus ever in a state of disgrace?

A. Disgrace isn’t the opposite of grace.

329. Was He ever in a state when He needed to be restored to grace?

A. Again, the language is incongruous. The language is not scriptural.

330. Did Jesus need access by grace?

A. Access was by His own blood.

331. Verse 6; “For when we were yet without strength. . .” Was Jesus without strength?

A. In the sense of the term used here (namely, that we were sinners), no.

332. But He was without that strength in some sense?

A. He acknowledged that the works He did were not His, but His Father’s Psalm 80 said He was the branch made strong for us.

333. Verse 6; “Christ died for the ungodly.” Was Jesus one of the ungodly?

A. The position here is that the ungodly are those who are ‘sinners’ in literal sense that they are ‘transgressors’, and in that sense He was not among them.

334. He was not among those for whom He died?

A. Don’t put words which I have not said.

335. “For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Is that substitution?

A. That is the death of Christ for sinners, not to redeem them from some legal bondage, but from the literal spiritual bondage to which we, being sinful persons, are condemned. Christ died “for us,” to liberate us from it; and we have that liberation and justification of life in that if ‘we are crucified with him we live with him.’

335a. Verse 9, “Much more, then, being now justified by his blood.” Did Jesus need justification? Was the wrath of God ever against Jesus?

A. Would you define ‘justification’ for me?

336. No. I'll go on. Verse 10, "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God," Was Jesus ever an enemy?

A. Not in the sense we are, because we are sinners.

337. Did Jesus ever need reconciliation?

A. Not in the sense we do.

338. "Reconciled by his death" and "saved by his life." Is that a parallel to Romans 4:25, "Who was delivered for our offences and was raised again for our justification"? Now this answers your point, in Corinthians, about the resurrection. Jesus was "delivered for our offences," which would have bound us in eternal death, and "raised again for our justification," in order that we might rise from the state of death - which would have the end of all mankind, if Christ had not given Himself the Just for the unjust.

A. You have asked a question; I would like to answer it.

339. No. I don't want that question answered. "And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ by whom we have new received the atonement." Where and when did Jesus need atonement, making Him at one with God?

W. F. Barling now questions E. Brady:

175. Well, we will return now to Hosea 13, and I will recapitulate the position partly. In 1 Corinthians 15, Paul is refuting a false idea that there is no such thing as resurrection. Therefore the whole terms of reference of the chapter are man's nature, which takes him to the grave, and salvation, which has come by Christ. That is -the beginning of the argument, and, in the course of developing it, he shows that "now is Christ risen from the dead" (in accordance with God's purpose) "and become the first fruits of them that slept." He is the first stage in the harvest of redemption from death. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." You have admitted that we are disputing the interpretation of those four verses. Now I ask you frankly, do you still adhere to the view that when Paul says, "by man came death" he is not referring to natural death?

A. Yes, I do, certainly.

176. When in the latter part of the chapter, he explains that the transformation of nature is the fulfilment of Hosea 13.14, is he indicating 'natural' death or this 'legal' death of which you spoke?

A. If you will allow me to say so, the Old Testament is often quoted in the New, without a precise fulfilment of the prophecy.

177. Paul says, "Then. . ." with absolute precision, "then will be brought to pass the saying that is written."

A. I haven't disputed that.

178. Very well. What is the death that is swallowed up in victory?

A. It is death, in the whole sense of death.

179. Does it include natural death?

A. Yes. All death will be swallowed up in victory

180. So that natural death will be swallowed up in victory?

A. Yes.

181. When, in the prophecy which we have here. God says, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death," does that include natural death?

A. Yes.

182. And does that, to some extent, concern natural death?

A. No. I should say. . .

183. But you are contradicting yourself. You have said that in 1 Corinthians 15 ‘death’ involved natural death?

A. Yes.

184. When I ask you the question whether the ransom covered that.

A. I say it covered it, in the sense that a ransom was necessary in order to get salvation for life of any kind.

185. That isn’t Paul’s argument. Paul says that when this physical transformation takes place the prophecy will be fulfilled.

A. That will be at the time when the consummation of God’s purpose will come, when mankind will have been redeemed and saved as a whole.

186. But it isn’t mankind as a whole; it is “those who are alive” in Christ at His coming.

A. There will be those alive, and there will be those in the grave.

187. That is all you need, as even in the case of the living this change to immortality will be brought to pass. “O death, where is thy victory?” What death has victory over me when I am in Christ? Well, why does death have victory when the transformation takes place in me? Paul says that death concerns a living person: “And the scripture will be fulfilled. . .”

A. It hasn’t any victory, because Christ has paid for the sin; He has paid the price.

188. Well, why does Paul say explicitly that “when” the transformation takes place “the scripture will be fulfilled”?

A. Because I have explained to you, at that time, the time of the resurrection, is the consummation of God’s purpose. When all these things. . .

189. But this concerns living people, as well as dead people: “and when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption,” And what is so damaging to your case is that the actual context is the context of ‘ransom’ and ‘redemption.’ You perceive that and quickly retreat and withdraw from what previously you have conceded - that this comprehends natural death. Now please turn to Psalm 49. This is quoted extensively in your literature, is it not? You frequently quote “None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him.” Am I correct in taking it that you use this to prove that unless Jesus had had a free life. He could not have redeemed us? But that is by the way. Let us read verses 6, 7, and 9 straight through: “They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches; none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him:.. that he should still live for ever and not see corruption.” Can you tell me why the ransom is paid to God?

A. It says that none can give to God a ransom: there is no ransom.

190. This is the verse in which you said Jesus could, and did, do it, but nobody else could? Did He pay the ransom to God?

A. No.

191. Why does the Psalm use that language, then?

A. Why, of course, because God is the supreme power. God has established the constitution of things under which we live. And God has inaugurated the law which requires the recognition of the purpose of redemption.

192. In other words, when you are insistent that God redeems man, you are only saying that God insists that His own law is upheld. You can’t have both these things: one must be metaphorical. The metaphor, in this case applies to the ransom; but the literal truth is that God was “a just God and a Saviour.” When you appreciate that you are building your theory on a misapplied metaphor you will see the light. If you insist that it is literal why, then, is the ransom paid to God?

A. This ransom here is not paid to God. The ransom that Jesus paid was paid to the ‘Sin power,’ the personification of sin; which is not what you say.

- 193.** This scripture says that no man can redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him. Now why, in this verse (this is scripture, now), why is the ransom paid to God?
- A.** This ransom is not paid at all. It says that no man can give to God a ransom.
- 194.** But why do you quote this verse to prove that Jesus did?
- A.** Because no man can pay a ransom, to God or anybody else.
- 195.** You use it in an attempt to prove that if Christ was involved in the scheme of salvation He couldn't have saved us. When it suits your purpose you use the verse, but when the difficulties implicit in that verse are pointed out to you, you hastily drop it.
- A.** We stand by it, and we stay by it.
- 196.** If you stand by it; whether a man could or couldn't, is the ransom paid to God?
- A.** I would say the ransom is not paid to God; in this case it is spoken of as "none of them can by any means redeem his brother."
- 197.** Why should the very idea of the ransom being paid to God be mentioned?
- A.** Because God is the supreme power in the organisation of things; but God didn't receive the ransom that Christ paid.
- 198.** You are trying to get out of obvious difficulties. You have no explanation to offer. Now, can you tell me why he is unable to redeem his brother; or to give God a ransom for him; that he should still live for ever and not see corruption? The ransom is paid for a living person, and that ransom is paid, if it is paid, that a man should still live and not see corruption. Once more, 'ransom' is used of liability to 'natural' death, as you call it, which in your theory is impossible. Why is the language used, then?
- A.** Corruption comes as a result of death, of whatever type. If a man suffers death by execution for sin, he enters into corruption. If a man reaches the end of his natural life, he similarly enters into corruption. Death which is the wages of sin would make life impossible, because he has paid the just penalty of his deeds, but natural death. . .
- 199.** But that isn't what the Psalm is concerned with. No man is able to prevent another man going to the grave.
- A.** We are not arguing about that.
- 200.** Why, then, is the term ransom used? What relevance, according to you, has the term ransom to the idea of going into the grave?
- A.** It proves this: that ransom is a scriptural principle which had to be paid for every creature to God.
- 201.** You are insistent that ransom is legal, but in Hosea, and in Psalm 49, it is not concerned with a legal situation, but with a very literal physical condition.
- A.** It may not be concerned here with the legal situation
- 202.** Yes, that suffices; it may not be concerned with a legal condition. Is it concerned with the physical condition?
- A.** No. not necessarily.
- 203.** Why, then, does the Psalmist say, "nor give to God a ransom for him, that he should still live for ever and not see corruption"? We will leave that. I think you have proved your inability to deal with that difficulty. Now turn to Job 33:23, which you quoted in your opening address. Job 33:22, "Yea, his soul draweth near unto the grave, and his life to the destroyers. If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter, one among a thousand, to show unto man his uprightness: then he is gracious unto him, and saith. Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom." What pit has Elihu in mind?
- A.** The grave.
- 204.** "Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom." Is that natural death from which man is bought by ransom?
- A.** I couldn't say it is the death. Going down into the pit is the result of death.

205. Yes. And man, according to this communication, is, by the graciousness of God, saved from that by a ransom found by God?

A. Yes.

206. So once more we have ransom and redemption related, not to a legal condition, which you favour, but to a physical state of man; a bondage to death of a very literal, material kind. Now, you can't have it both ways It is. . . You can't insist that it is legal, and then insist that it is physical. It over-rides. . . If it over-rides, comprehends, and concentrates, the other is included?

A. Yes, I have admitted that.

207. Does ransom save us from -this natural condition of corruptibility and mortality?

A. Of course. Because the victory over death is the victory, whether it is over the death which is the wages of sin. . .

208. But it does include natural death, so that the ransom by Christ impinged on that great problem we all face? It concerns this problem of being subject to death in the physical sense?

A. Yes, obviously.

209. That is a big admission on your part?

A. It is no admission. The death that would exclude us from eternal life is not natural death

210. Yet you just admitted natural death is not. . .

A. Unless ransom is paid.

211. The very verse quoted to support your legal theory is concerned with a physical condition, pointing out the perfection of God's purpose. When this ransom has its effect, as Paul points out, his nature is changed; "His flesh shall be fresher than a child's: he shall return to the days of his youth. He shall pray unto God, and he will be favourable unto him and he shall see his face with joy: for he will render unto him His righteousness" (Job 33:25-26). Going into the pit of corruption. . . "shall all be made alive. . ." God gives a ransom, and says, "Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom." Therefore we are redeemed from the bondage of corruption, and that redemption is what Paul calls "the redemption of the body."

Ernest Brady's Closing Address

We affirm that the penalty that Adam incurred was a judicial death, and we are told that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. "The life is in the blood," and when the blood is shed the life is taken. Natural death is not a punishment; neither can it be a sacrifice. It was a specific principle that that which dies of itself was neither to be eaten nor offered. Why? Because the whole purpose of the sacrifice, under the Law, was to impress the lesson that the wages of sin is death, an inflicted death and not natural corruption - the violent cutting off, in any form of execution. If an Israelite broke the law, he was required to bring a lamb to the tabernacle, lay his hand upon its head, and confess his sin. The lamb was then killed,

Now no one denies that the Mosaic sacrifices were substitutionary; no one would be so foolish, for it is self-evident. And no one denies that Jesus is the anti-type of those sacrifices, and shows the substance of which they were a shadow. How, then, can anyone be so perverse as to deny that His sacrifice was, in the same way, substitutionary, or to present the argument that His death was for Himself?

We affirm that the sacrifice of Christ took away sins upon precisely the same principle as was foreshadowed in the Mosaic Law, by transfer of the penalty from the guilty transgressor to the innocent victim? who bore it in his stead. Sin cannot be transferred, because it is an act which is past; neither can

guilt be transferred. But the penalty can be transferred, and was transferred, and for the act of obedience and the expression of repentance and confession, in offering the typical sacrifice, permitted an escape from the penalty, which was transferred to the innocent victim. Where the typical sacrifices fell short was in that they were involuntary; the animals offered were unreasoning creatures. The sacrifices under the law could not take away sin, because they were not of the race that sinned; they could only serve as a type to provide a covering for the time then present. The law was weak through the flesh, not because flesh could not keep it, but because the whole race born of the will of the flesh was under condemnation because of sin. So the ceremonial of the law could not finally take away the power of sin; but Jesus could, because He could voluntarily meet the claims of the law, and pay its claim with His own blood.

The prophet says: "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, and the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all." Why is there such a horror of the idea of Christ dying in our stead? I will tell you: it is because it is wrongly believed that the Cross was an act of revenge; that God was punishing Jesus with death because Adam sinned. Now, if Jesus were wholly righteous that obviously would have been unjust, and no right thinking person could accept it. Therefore, the theory is advanced that though His character was perfect. His nature was defiled and sinful and had to be destroyed. Not only is this teaching utterly unscriptural, but, when examined, it does not even remove the difficulty. For if it would be unjust to punish a man for someone else's sin, it would be equally unjust to punish him for his nature, because he could no more help that. The answer is, of course, that God was not punishing; He did not even instigate the death of His own Son; He was giving, saving, redeeming, by the surrender of His own beloved Son to the power of sin, to bear voluntarily the penalty of sin for us, to receive the wages of sin, which He did not earn, so that they might not be paid to us, who did.

The idea that Jesus was under condemnation not only makes His death unjust, but it would also make it impossible for His sacrifice to accomplish its purpose. The most vital principle in the law of sacrifice was that the victim had to be legally clean and physically unblemished. An imperfect offering would have been unacceptable, and was, in fact, legally unfit to be offered.

Now we go to the great anti-type, the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world," and ask: If Jesus was legally unclean, condemned, or in any way defiled, how could He have borne away the sins of the world? No wonder Mr Barling was so reluctant to meet the questions I asked him on that point! Not only were the plain and precise injunctions on the law being reversed, an anti-type made inferior to a type, but - the whole purpose and intention of the type would be destroyed. If, to take away the sins of the world, Jesus had to be unclean, then the true type of Him would have been an unclean beast - like the swine --not a lamb without spot or blemish. Morally, the swine is on the level with the lamb; neither has any morality, good nor bad. If, in order to redeem us, Jesus had Himself to be under condemnation, then He would have been more fittingly typified by a dead carcass. What would have been the result, if an Israelite had made such an offering? "Cursed be that deceiver who sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing."

Now you will have noted that, in this debate, I have been tactically at a disadvantage. I had the first speech without knowing the line my opponent would take; and when I have finished he will have the last word; but I am quite happy for him to have the tactical advantage, knowing that truth and weight of evidence is on my side. I am convinced that one who has the truth can put to flight ten thousand. Mr Barling is a clever advocate and he reasons well on the scriptures advanced in order to try and justify his case/- but you cannot justify a case for Jesus' being under condemnation, or needing to be sacrificed for Himself. It destroys the weight and purpose of God's plan. The more closely one examines the theory that Jesus' death was for Himself, the more unthinkable it becomes.

Now if Adam was changed from the very good original of his creation to a compound of physical sin, so that we have all to be born sinful (for -that is the implication of the Christadelphian theory), what sense or reason is there in God's setting before us the choice of good and evil? Who else but God could have made the change? And, having made it, how could He justly condemn and punish those who are sinners as a result? To propose that God expects us to see justice in creating men incapable of righteousness and then punishing them for being sinners is to charge Him with foolishness. The matter, in relation to Jesus, is nothing short of an "abomination that maketh desolate," for the contention that God engineered the slaughter of His innocent, sinless, obedient Son, to stage a ritual exhibition of that supposed sinful flesh ceremonially destroyed, is an abomination, and the position in which it places those who believe it is, truly, one of

desolation, for they, in effect, reject the Holy One and the Just and desire one under the condemnation of a murderer to be given unto them.

I say to Mr Barling: I have no ill-will or unkind feeling for him or his community, but I truly hate the teaching that Christ was under condemnation and believe it is a doctrine of devils. He has done the best he could, with the tools and the material that were to his hand, and he has raised a structure which, no doubt, he sincerely believes is a fit dwelling for the Holy One of God; the One born to be a Prince; the future King of the whole world; “the chiefest among ten thousand;” the “altogether lovely” One. But he that hath eyes to see can penetrate the whitewash. I say that palace is a tomb; a white sepulchre, and inwardly full of uncleanness and deceit and rottenness, and dead men’s bones. If he had succeeded in concealing the true ugliness of his case, he might have made it appear plausible that God’s Son could have been born under condemnation; but he would still have to explain how it pleased God or benefited man to put Him to shame, torture, and ignominy of a criminal’s death. And even if he could have done that, he would still be left with the impossible task of altering not only the whole weight of the scriptures’ testimony, but also the inference from it which proves to a demonstration that Jesus paid for Adam’s sin; that He died for the ungodly; that He gave Himself for us; He died in the stead of sinners - why do you tie yourselves up in knots to explain that it doesn’t mean what it says? The plain scriptural testimonies are there; what are you afraid of? I say, cast aside the remnants of priest-craft, and apostasy, with the idea of original sin defiling human nature; accept it, and believe it. We confess to the glory of God, that the life we now live in the flesh we live by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who loved us and gave Himself for us, and it is our constant joy and rejoicing, and our “song in the night.” And I say to Mr Barling: Although you may succeed in drugging yourself with your medicine, we know that the majority of the ordinary members of the community have the same views in regard to the sacrifice of Christ as we have. Time and again, when we have explained our views, they said “but I have never believed anything else.” They have a superstitious dread of the word “substitution,” but they either believe that Christ died for them and in their stead, or they believe nothing at all. And that is the position to which you come when you teach that Christ’s death was for Himself? It utterly destroys its purpose and meaning, and you come to the point where a book like this Mr James has written (Why Christ Died) sets out to prove that it was no more than a bloody crime. It was that, certainly; and here, I think, he is in advance of Mr Barling, who says it was just and right for Jesus to die, but it is the keystone of God’s revelation and purpose with man that Jesus gave Himself, the Just for the unjust.

And now a final word to those of you who have listened. If anything I have said has seemed offensive or unkind, I ask your pardon; put it down, if you will, to mistaken zeal or anything else. But no-one realises better than I how much the Christadelphian name and association mean. I believe there was a time when Christadelphians had all the light that was then available, and in their day and generation they were faithful people who will, in due time, receive their reward. But I believe that that time has gone. In the last seventy years truth has unfolded a little further, and I think that we are probably on the last stage. The issue which faces us is a test of faith. If you are satisfied with the Christadelphian Statement, that “it is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,” well, I say let us part friends, but let the strife continue. We shall continue to spend ourselves and be spent to defend what we believe to the honour of our God and Saviour. And we await in confidence -the day when He will be here to defend His own. And if you have a suspicion (and I know there are many) that things are not as they should be, then you have to choose either the community or the truth; you cannot retain both. I say: Dare to be a Daniel. Dare to stand alone. Put your faith beside Abraham’s. Go forth - if necessary alone. It is doubtful if you think more of your community than the Apostle Paul did of his, yet it turned out that he, a persecutor, was yet a true follower of Christ.

There has not, perhaps, to-day been a blinding light from heaven nor a voice of thunder. But I confess that I hope that some of you have seen a glimmer, maybe, and heard, perhaps, a still small voice: “It is Jesus whom thou condemnest and it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.”

MR BARLING'S CLOSING ADDRESS

Those who heard my opening remarks will know that the extreme and extravagant statements attributed to me, in the words which you have just heard, have not been expressed; that I have been said to say things which I did not say, and to hold views which I do not hold. And I leave it to the record of this debate (when it is perused carefully by the independent reader) for what I did say at; the outset and what I have said in answer to the questions. I know the impartial reader will reach the verdict which must be reached by everyone.

Rather than concern myself at this stage with answering fresh points in the speech you have just heard, I would like to recapitulate the debate.

As far as I see it, one has come to present a theological system in which the term "cursed Christ" is used disparagingly. The basic doctrines of that system have not received the support of the scriptures. It has been a characteristic of that which we have heard from my opponent that much assertion has been made and very little proof has been put forward. When verses have been examined in detail it has been frankly admitted what they seem to say, but it has been insisted that although they seem to say they do not say it, and that what they don't appear to say they do, in fact, say. There has been an evasion once it has become obvious that the course adopted up to that point has become impossible. Airy assumption has taken the place of reasoned scriptural proof. I think that is a fair summary of the attitude that has been shown by my opponent and I say it in all modesty and sincerity. What, then, is the position? There is no scriptural proof.

I think, myself, that the error lies in the assumption that what is a metaphor is literal fact. When Paul wrote to the Corinthians, he said, "Ye are washed," they knew what he meant. When he said, "Ye are clean," and "Your bodies are the members of Christ," they knew what he meant. When he said, "Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit," they knew what he meant. In that sixth chapter of the first Epistle he uses impressive metaphors. They had washed away sin, not literally, but symbolically; they had become part of Christ's body - not literal members and limbs, but nevertheless in a very real sense, which the symbol indicates, part of Christ. Also the grace of God had come to them, and they were, in that sense the "temple of the Spirit." Paul goes on to say, "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price," but not as slaves were in the first century, as those familiar with their redemption would very well know. That is, he was using a metaphor there also.

When Paul spoke to the Ephesian elders and told them to take heed unto themselves and to the flock of God they knew what "the flock" meant; they knew it was not a flock of literal sheep but those in their spiritual care, over whom they were "overseers." When he said "After my departing shall grievous wolves enter among you, not sparing the flock," they knew what those "wolves" were. They were not literal wolves. Therefore, when he said that this was the Church of God which he had "purchased with his own blood," they knew what that "purchase" was.

The truth is that there are many metaphors in scripture to describe our new state, and "ransom" is one of them. This has been perverted and misapplied in the system which is advocated by the Nazarene Fellowship, and if they can only see that the "true ransom" is "the forgiveness of sins," then they are nearing the light. And hasn't it struck us all that the emphasis, in this theory, is not on personal transgression, but on a legal condition for which we are not responsible? When we rapidly review the quotations in the scriptures, what do we find?

"Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins;" "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;" "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;" "He was manifested to take away our sins." In the verse that has been quoted; "He was delivered for our offences;" "Repent and be baptised, every one of you," said Peter, "for the remission of your sins;" "We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins."

And so we could continue, and the list could be made longer. What is indicated in the scripture is not the condition in which we are born, but the sin that results from that condition, and our failure to observe the law of God. These terms of "punishment" and "penalty" which have been bandied about have been grossly

misapplied. The “punishment,” if the term could be used, is on account of personal transgressions. “So death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” One only did not sin, and so the way was opened up for those who had sinned to escape from the consequences of their transgressions. “Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures.” Therefore this postulate, this hypothesis, of legal alienation, just does not square with the scriptures, it is foreign to the Word of God. It is the device of man which has resulted from an extreme application of that beautiful metaphor, “redemption for a ransom.”

There was much slavery in New Testament times, and many of those who came into the truth were slaves. Paul was indicating their condition when he said that they were “dead in trespasses and sins.” They were, under this other figure, slaves to sin; but slaves could be redeemed in the first century days by a purchase. Deissman, in his “Light from the Ancient East,” points out that the money deposited in the temple of the god by the slave himself was from his own savings. If this figure of redemption is to be taken literally, then it should be used against a background where the slave himself paid the money. Paul was not concerned with the fact that the slave paid the money; he was concerned with the fundamental transformation in the slave’s relationship to his God. Before, he was the slave of sin; he observed sin; and sin, for his service, paid him wages - death. But God, in His grace, gave him eternal life, “By man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.” The whole wonderful scheme of redemption was wrought out in the experiences of one man.

Instead of that, we have, on the other hand, the altogether capricious application of a metaphor; and confusion results. We have seen it on the physical plane: “redemption,” in the scriptures applies to natural death, as it is called, just as much as to a literal “free ransom” from the grave. God will be “the plagues” of death. “Thanks be to God,” says Paul, “who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.” What is that victory that he has in mind? Namely, the victory that will result when death itself “is swallowed up in victory;” when, in the expressive words of the eighth chapter of Romans, as he says, “the redemption of the body.”

Much time is needed to expound fully all the aspects; but I would suggest in all modesty, that, in the opening address there was a sound scriptural argument presented which contrasts strongly with what we heard before it, wherein was very little scripture and much explanation. We have heard it said by my adversary, when we examined his fundamental doctrines, that he reaches his conclusions as a result of reasoning from the scriptures. I think it is a sorry state of affairs for anyone that he has to make a statement of that kind and to admit that he has not precise and explicit and unambiguous texts in the scriptures to support him and his beliefs. And so the impartial reader, or those of you here to-day, can examine both sides; can examine them with the Bible near at hand, to check the references to see if the interpretations suggested by Mr Brady or by myself accord with the Word of God. “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” That must be the test. Our faith must be built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone.

What, then, is the sum of the matter? All of us are sinners. There is none righteous; no, not one. “The scripture hath concluded all under sin;” but in the mercy of God there is “redemption in Christ Jesus.” God, in His forbearance, extends to men the remission of their sins. He was “in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto thorns So we have the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works. Paul takes up the significance of David’s story, so beautifully described in the language of the Psalms: “Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile.”

We have iniquity, every one of us; we are morally guilty. It is no question of a legal state. We are all sinners, and God commended His love towards us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; so in Him and in His blood we have redemption, even the forgiveness of our sins. That is the simple Bible story. “Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses,” it says. He was the beautiful sheaf waved before God at the beginning of the harvest. There was only one sheaf; there was only one Christ who rose from the dead; but in that sheaf there were many blades of corn, and in each ear many seeds. There was only one sheaf waved before God, yet all the believers were involved. That is the beauty of the figure: He was part of the harvest: we are in Him, in His death and in His resurrection. He is “the first fruits of them that slept,”

and since He was born and lived, and died, and rose again from the dead, and ascended, all for us, it is right that every man should receive redemption in his own order. "Christ is the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." "Christ. . . the first fruits." Because, when that sheaf was waved a burnt offering was offered. His own death had efficacy for Him, it has efficacy for us, too. "Every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." And also that great end of the harvest will have its counterpart in the Kingdom, which will have come to its end when the final resurrection takes place. The world will be populated with those who are not subject to death: "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

And so the wonderful story of the harvest of redemption will be complete. Beginning in Christ, with us involved; then ourselves at the coming of Christ, if it be God's will; and eventually the time will come when God will be all in all.

The faith which is dear to me is not one which debases man; it is one that offers to him, in his strivings, the offer of forgiveness. It is one that inspires him to succeed where he has failed before, to be grateful to God that He has sent Jesus to be "a propitiation for our sins." The resolve can be made, and it must be made continually, as it was made by Paul: "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."

Yes, "I am crucified with Christ. . ." and yet, despite that "He loved me and gave Himself for me." There is room for both aspects, and let us not forget it. It is because there are those two aspects that there is hope for us.

And so I end with an appeal. Many years ago David Handley of Maiden, began the sad story that has continued this evening. He propagated these views, but before he died he renounced them. He went back to the towns and villages where he had preached them. He went back to refute them. I call upon my adversary to-night, in all sincerity, to do the same as David Handley - to find his way out of the fog. I make an earnest appeal to Mr Brady to do the same.

CHAIRMAN: Sisters and Brethren.. I would like to thank the two speakers in your name, who have come here this evening, for the way they have conducted themselves, for the restraint they have used, and the way they both endeavoured to put before us the views in which they both sincerely believe. I would like to thank you all for the help you have given the Chairman in carrying out an exceedingly difficult task. I would like you please, to thank God.

The Netherton Debate

A Personal Statement by Ernest Brady

Many people know that in 1949 I engaged in a Public Debate with Mr. Barling of London, sponsored by the Netherton Christadelphian Ecclesia. For some months past I have been receiving enquiries about the verbatim report which was to have been published, and I have had to explain that the delay was solely on the Christadelphian side and not due to any neglect or obstruction on my part.

It has come to my notice, however, that a rumour is being industriously spread in Christadelphian circles that I am responsible. I should not think it we the trouble and expense to defend myself against false accusations, to which I am well accustomed, but as the purpose is to discredit what I believe to be the Truth concerning the Name of Jesus Christ, I have felt impelled to publish the gist of the letters which have passed between me and the Recording Brother of the Netherton Ecclesia.

NOTE. In explanation of one or two passages which might otherwise seem obscure, the following facts are recorded. The Debate was reported independently by writers attached to Stenotype Ltd., at a fee of £20, which was to have been shared by the two parties. In the event, a collection was taken during the meeting from members of both communities, but was devoted by Netherton Ecclesia towards their share only, and we were afterwards called upon for the full £10 of our share. This minor financial transaction should have prepared us for what was to come later. The Debate took place on May 7th 1949 and early in June I received from Stenotype Ltd., a full transcription, an original and two carbon copies. I immediately read it through and made on the original such corrections to my portions of the debate as I considered necessary, and on the following day I personally delivered that and one of the copies to Mr. R. W. Dudley at his home. Take note that this was within a month of the actual debate, and within three days of my receiving the report. Also note carefully the dates of the letters from which the following extracts are quoted:-

22nd June 1949. Mr Dudley to Mr Brady.

“ . . . I should like to have a further talk with you regarding the revisions which will be necessary to the manuscript. Will you let me know which evenings you are free.”

In reply I wrote and proposed an evening in the following week.

6th July 1949. Mr Dudley to Mr Brady.

“ . . . I regret I shall not be able to come and see you during the present week, and suggest if you are free that you call at the above address next Monday evening, July 11th, when I hope, God willing, to be home after 7.30 pm.”

8th July 1949. Mr Brady to Mr Dudley.

“ . . . I am not impressed by your attitude (in reference to using the money collected jointly for their own expense) and in future will keep our financial affairs very distinct. You proceed with your own arrangements for publication and we will do the same. With regard to your summons “to the above address,” you will remember I waited on you on the last occasion we met. I regret will not be convenient for me to get to Dudley in the near future, and I think it would be nice if you called on me as proposed in yours of June 22nd.”

I heard nothing more for several weeks, during which I sent a letter and a postcard urging them to get on. I also asked for a copy of Mr Barling’s speeches, as it had been arranged beforehand that the opening speeches of the Debate should be written in full for accuracy and to save the reporters labour, and these were to be handed in for the purpose of completing the report.

29th July 1949. Mr Dudley to Mr Brady.

“I am now in a position to reply to your letters of the 8th and 10th July postcard of the 20th inst.

“Our final decisions on the points raised were made on Wednesday last. We are sorry that you have made up your minds to publish a report of the Debate independently. This is a further (sic) breach of the original proposals to which you agreed. Clause 5 lays down that “Netherton Ecclesia should be the publisher.”

“We do not propose letting you have, for the time being, copies of Mr W. F. Barling’s opening speech, or our own stenographer’s report. . .”

Note this last paragraph. What was the purpose of their refusal?

3rd August 1949. Mr Brady to Mr Dudley.

“I fail entirely to understand your letter of July 29th. It has been fully understood and agreed from the start that Netherton Ecclesia is to publish the Debate, and I have never questioned the matter.

“As soon as I received the report I submitted to you the corrections I considered necessary and asked you to get W.F.B. to approve them and submit his own to me. Many weeks have elapsed and I have neither received these nor replies to my enquiries regarding them.

“There is need for neither discussion nor co-operation; the report is substantially correct and so far as I am concerned can be printed as it stands; the few points where confusion has arisen can easily be adjusted if you will kindly do as I asked in my letter in June.

“Kindly send me a receipt for £10 and also inform me in what particular I have broken the original agreement.

“I am frankly amazed at your refusal to supply me with a copy of W.F.B’s opening speech, or to let me see your stenographer’s report. I suppose that as the same thing happened after my debate with Mr P. Handley at Portsmouth and in view of your unjust appropriation of the money collected I should not be surprised, but it never occurs to me until too late that people making a profession of Christianity could act so dishonestly.”

10th August 1949. Mr Dudley to Mr Brady.

“We notice that you express amazement that we have refused to let you have copy of W, F. Barling’s opening speech. We again respectfully ask you to consult our letter of the 29th July, and you will notice that we said “for the time being,” which is not a blank refusal, but a qualified one.”

11th August 1949. Mr Brady to Mr Dudley.

“It has been understood from the start that the Netherton Ecclesia is to publish a verbatim account and they are indeed under a moral obligation to do so, having already published a tendentious report in ‘The Christadelphian.’ Had your side attended to the business instead of bickering it could have been in print by now.

“Again I have to ask your answers to the following:-

- (1) Have my tentative corrections been submitted to Mr Barling?
- (2) Why have you not complied with my several requests to submit his to me in accordance with Clause 5 of your letter of January 5th 1949?
- (3) What is the purpose of your refusal to supply me with a copy of his opening speech, when I have supplied mine to you?

“I am sorry to say that in these needlessly protracted wranglings you are acting more like a firm of shyster lawyers than men seeking to establish the Truth.

“I can well understand that the verbatim report by “an approved secretarial bureau with no knowledge of the subject” came as somewhat of a damper to your childish glee, and I expect that when one of your less bewildered members discovered that Barling was neither representing Netherton Ecclesia nor defending the Christadelphian Statement of Faith and that he abandoned both Dr Thomas and R. Roberts, you had a few shocks, but jibes at my mental gymnastics come ill from you at present”

9th September 1949. Mr Dudley to Mr Brady.

“Now that we have your assurance that you do not intend to proceed with your own arrangements to publish the report we have pleasure in enclosing a copy of Mr Barling’s opening speech. . .

“Mr Barling, you will appreciate, is a very busy man. . . A copy of the text of Stenotype’s report, together with our own report, and the emendations from both parties, will be submitted to Mr R. A. Overton for consideration. . . We shall expect you then to discuss with W.F. B. and the writer. . . Our report would then be available. . . I shall be away for the next two weeks on holiday.”

28th September 1949. Mr Brady to Mr Dudley.

“. . . With regard to the part of Mr Barling’s speech which he did not actually give, while I personally should have no objections to these being put in, as it is to be a verbatim report it would be bad in principle for either party to ask for the insertion or deletion of anything which was or was not actually said?

“In reply to the other points I must draw your attention again to Condition 5 of your letter of January 1st. ‘Report. To be published verbatim (except for minor grammatical corrections to which both parties must consent) by the Netherton Ecclesia.’

“Your proposal to bring in the Chairman does not meet with this condition, and while you are fully at liberty to consult whomsoever you please, I would prefer that we adhere to your original proposal. I made such minor corrections as I consider necessary and submitted them to you nearly four months ago, and while I understand, of course, how busy Mr Barling will be, I cannot account for all this delay. If it is causing him undue trouble I have already proposed that the report be published as it stands; the few instances in which confusion has arisen will be evident to the careful reader.

“I cannot, of course, pass an opinion on your independent report, as you have so far refused to let me see it. Is the writer a Christadelphian? If so, you will appreciate the application of your sixth condition and the obvious and correct course is to follow the report of ‘an approved and independent secretarial bureau with no knowledge of the subject.’

2nd November 1949. Mr Dudley to Mr Brady.

I am not yet in a position to give you any further information regarding the progress of Mr Barling’s revision of the two reports of the Debate. . . Mr Barling’s wife has been seriously ill. . . (he) had already arranged, earlier this year, to give a series of ten addresses in London. . . I enclose a programme. . . you will appreciate the difficulties. . . be prepared to exercise a little more patience. . . We hope you will not interpret this delay in terms of any desire on our part to avoid publishing an accurate report. . . trusting you will give your sympathetic indulgence to this delay,”

19th December 1949. Mr Dudley to Mr Brady.

“You will no doubt be pleased to learn that W. F. Barling advises me he has commenced work again on the remainder of the report. . . He is very hopeful of having this completed by the end of the year.

“Mr Barling will be in Birmingham on the 8th of January 1950, and has suggested. . . meeting you at your house. . . to discuss his emendations to the report.

22nd December 1949. Mr Brady to Mr Dudley.

“I informed you in a letter several months ago that I saw no occasion for a discussion with Mr Barling, and much less with you and Mr Overton, and I have not changed my view.

“In accordance with the conditions, I made my proposed corrections on the original copy of the only report I have seen, nearly 7 months ago, and submitted it to you for Mr Barling’s approval. When he has done the same you should let me have it back with any comments or objections he wishes to make,

“In the meantime I would like to ask you again why you have not let me see a copy of the other report you spoke of. I am getting many enquiries for copies of the report and some I have referred to you. I trust you have made it clear that this prolonged delay has not been due to my neglect and I hope that you will now proceed at once to get it printed in accordance with your advertised intention.”

9th January 1950. Mr Dudley to Mr Brady.

“ . . . I have had an opportunity of talking this matter over with Mr Barling, and my Committee and we have decided that after Mr Overton has reviewed. . . they shall be passed on to you. . . We hope to let you have these manuscripts during the next month or so. . . In the meantime, would you be good enough to enlighten me as to why there are so many corrections in your closing speech compared with the rest of the manuscript?”

11th January 1950. Mr Brady to Mr Dudley.

“I am pleased to hear that Mr Barling hopes to let me have his corrections during the next month or so. As he has apparently not yet completed these I am at a loss to imagine what we could have discussed supposing I had agreed to a meeting.

“With regard to your final paragraph, as it is now something like 8 months since I saw them I fear I cannot help you, but I should suppose that the corrections I have proposed are due to mistakes in the transcription. As you have the advantage of a second report you will no doubt draw my attention to any discrepancy between my tentative corrections and what was actually said. May I say that for one so precise on some points you have a singular facility in overlooking others; could I have an answer to my request for a perusal of your other report.

16th January 1950. Mr Dudley to Mr Brady.

“ . . . we are surprised you have not apparently kept a record of the corrections you submitted to us. . . When we return our copy, together with Mr Barling’s compiled report, and Miss Sinnett’s report, you will be able to observe that you have only submitted some 40 corrections on the question and answer section. . . compared with over 80 to your final speech. Mr Barling had by that time completed roughly 80% of his corrections. . . to form a basis of discussion.”

This is the last communication I received and the complete correspondence can be perused by anyone who is interested.

At the date of writing - the 14th April 1950 - we have heard nothing further, and it will soon have been a year that this business has been hanging fire. It should be quite clear who is responsible for the procrastination, and when it came to my ears that A.D. Norris is going about the country spreading the falsehood that I have obstructed the publication of the report I felt it necessary to put the facts on record.

[This same A.D.Norris wrote to me anonymously some years ago, under a Monomark address BM/KBOY London W.I., and proposed a written discussion. When I refused to correspond with a man who could not sign his name he threatened me - still anonymously - with public exposure! I discovered his identity a year or so later by comparing the characters of his typewriter with another communication made in his own name.]

Thus from early June 1949 to April 1950, ten months has elapsed during which periodic proddings have produced a variety of excuses and promises but no action. Compare this with the promptness with which they got the report of a more recent debate into print. At Netherton the Christadelphians were highly elated at what they thought was the success of their champion. Although any average Bible reader knows well enough that comparatively few truths are categorically stated in Scripture, Mr Barling made much of the fact that I made no attempt to produce precise passages to prove certain of the beliefs I hold. But why have they not been more anxious to exploit their victory by publishing the report?

I think the reason is that when they came to study it in black and white they discovered that in the course of answering the 300 odd questions which I put to him Mr Barling had contradicted himself over and over again and so stultified himself and the Christadelphian position that his smart tactics probably sicken even himself now. The Netherton Committee knows that when the report is eventually published, it is our intention carefully to analyse these questions and answers, and this is a very different kettle of fish from a cheap success on the platform.

One can understand them deciding that it could do Christadelphianism no good to publish the report and determine quietly to stifle it. But how are we to account for men like Norris and Barling and a whole ecclesial committee behaving so badly? They must have two entirely different standards of honesty. When it is a question of refuting the Clean Flesh Heresy anything goes. If they conducted their business affairs on similar lines they would be shunned by decent people.

Note that in their letter of July 29th, when, desiring to put together a complete record for the information of our own members in other places, they refuse even to let me have a copy of Barling's opening speech. This was later forthcoming, but to this day I have not seen the report which is supposed to have been taken down by a Miss Sinnett.

We must sympathise with Mr Barling's domestic troubles and can understand him being busy on more important tasks, though we note from the programme that the ten addresses referred to in the letter of November 2nd were only "planned at a meeting on July 22nd," at which date he had already had the report before him for six weeks - surely time and to spare for the "minor grammatical corrections" provided for in the conditions which I was required to accept and to the letter of which I have been held: but I cannot understand what appears to be a deliberate policy of lying to cover their own unworthy behaviour.

F.J.Pearce Comments on W.F.Barling's Closing Address.

The first thing to be remembered is that W.F.Barling was not representing Christadelphian belief. "My view was misrepresented," "My teaching in my address. . ." "My teaching on Scripture. . ." etc. Hence while professing Christadelphian belief, he could say that E. Brady's statements were "sayings attributed to him he never made;" yet they are statements from their own works, a man-made constitution which he was supposed to be defending.

In regard to his saying that "very little proof has been put forward," this can be compared with the view obtained when he (Barling) is put to the test in the article "Haman Hung With His Own Rope."

If what E. Brady has said is foreign to the Scriptures, this test will prove that W.F.Barling had not the "clear, crisp proof" that he wishes others to give and it will show that he has more "airy assumptions" than E. Brady. Anyone listening to, or reading W.F.Barling would think that it was only a one-sided affair, that there was no room for controversy, and that the reason for this debate was not on "Controverted Aspects."

Why did he complain, on more than one occasion, that he was “not having a fair chance,” and that “much time is needed to explain fully all aspects”?

It will be seen on every occasion that Scripture used for proof must not be ambiguous, and Barling says, in his book “Redemption in Christ” that “it is therefore clear that in appealing to the Word we must seek other pronouncements on this subject which are not susceptible in this way of double interpretation” (page 11). That the proof he has advanced must have a dual application is evident, as others of his Body have said the opposite - “Jesus died for us and for Himself” (See “Contradictions,” with a dual application)

When Barling thinks we place more emphasis on the legal than on personal transgression, we ask who recognises this most - the person who cannot help sinning because of his sinful flesh or the person who knows that if he sins he is responsible? Again, when W.F.Barling can get rid of Romans 5 and the use of the word legal, as used by him in this debate and by others in their writings, then will be the time to cast stones, and not before.

We have shown in another place (“Enlightenment and Responsibility) and from Dr Thomas’s writings, that we uphold what we have received from him, and of what Mr Barling is ignorant. When the latter says “Paul was not concerned . . . that the slave paid the money, but with the fundamental transformation in the slave’s relationship to his God.” Is not this first a legal transformation - passed from death unto life; from darkness to light; delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the Kingdom of the Son of His love?

When W.F.Barling asked for an “elucidation of the wages of sin,” anyone could see that this was an evasion. Here, in his closing address, he says, “Before, .he was the slave of sin: he observed sin; and sin, for his service paid him wages - death.” According to him, we should not reason from the Scriptures, as “it is a sorry state of affairs,” but he “needs much time” to explain his view of the Scripture, the meaning of which his leaders have decided long ago.

We need not put up again the argument in the article “Haman Hung With His own Rope” but we will point out that when Barling says our faith must be built upon the foundation of the Apostles, Prophets, and Jesus Christ, it should be for him to put a clear, crisp and unambiguous Scriptural proof by the side of the questions we ask.

While he has made some beautiful statements, he has failed to see their beauty because he looks through a condemned looking glass. “One Sheaf all the believers were involved.”

One Sin, one sinner - Adam. One Act, One Righteous - Christ. Each of these Federal Heads are the means of One involving all in being constituted under the Sin by a rule or Law - Scripture. Jesus extricated all who will accept Him; hence we see the goodness and justice of God, and not, as Christadelphians believe, that we were redeemed by a sinful flesh Redeemer who needed to sacrifice for Himself.

What weight Mr Barling thinks he carries by speaking of D.Handley we fail to observe because if it is a sad story for him it is not so for us. If the renouncing of anything is of any account, why, people have been doing this since Adam; but it is no criterion as to Truth. We earnestly pray that all lovers of the Lord Jesus will accept Him as the Unspeakable Gift of God, and renounce the man-made traditions of the Constitution of an unclean Saviour. Renounce it and accept the Unblemished Son of God who shed His blood as a ransom for many: He whom we have not seen, except through the eye of faith, and whom we love. We rejoice greatly with Joy Unspeakable and full of glory

Brother F.J.Pearce.

Phil Parry Comments on W.F.Barling's Closing Address

One obvious and great betrayal of his Christadelphian Brethren and Sisters was the statement Barling made in answer to E.Brady's question, 'Did he believe what Dr Thomas stated, etc., etc.? His answer was "I am not defending what Dr Thomas said, but my own individual faith and what I believe," Yet he had been appointed to defend the beliefs of Dr Thomas and R. Roberts, the pioneers of the Christadelphian Faith as contained in their Statement of Faith document. No wonder they declined to publish the Debate as promised. Yet these same people expected God to fulfil His Promises.

In opening his address Barling denies expressing the things E. Brady had said of him, but I know Brother Brady spoke the truth, for I have read the extracts from what Barling stated in articles printed in The Christadelphian - February to October 1946; "My Life For The Sheep" booklet being a reply to them by Ernest Brady and F.J.Pearce, men I knew personally to be honest and sincere.

I must draw notice to question 294 (C.L. 149, page 17) and Barling's answer to it by quoting Hebrews 13:20, which appears ambiguous but can be understood if the reader understands that the emphasis of the Apostle is for the God of peace to make them perfect through the blood of the everlasting covenant shed by the Great Shepherd of the Sheep, Jesus.

It is ironical that on page 29 of this C.L., third paragraph down, Barling confirms this interpretation in the quotation "He has sent Jesus to be a propitiation for our sins." Is not this the purpose of Christ's death and His resurrection? Did not God raise Him because He had done nothing to forfeit His "Free-born" state and had done nothing worthy of inflicted death? Now at top of page 27 he says "much assertion has been made, airy assumption has taken the place of scriptural proof. I think this is a fair summary of the attitude that has been shown by my opponent. What then is the position? There is no scriptural proof." Further back in the Debate Barling was asked if the nature of Adam was corruptible (capable of decay) and he replied, "I don't know." Why did he not say "There is no scriptural proof" in this case? The man who asked him the question could show it to him in 1 Corinthians 15:45-49, yet Barling said "I don't know," and Brady who did know, and could produce -the proof, both in Genesis and 1 Corinthians 15: 45-49, concerning the first man, is accused of lack of scriptural proof!

In the fourth paragraph down on page 27, Barling says that the emphasis in the Nazarene theory is not on personal sins or transgression, but on a legal condition (he should have said, position), for which we are not responsible This is true. But he tries to refute this theory by quoting some scripture out of context, for they applied to the Jews who were responsible under the Mosaic Covenant for their transgressions. Peter accused them for these and told them to repent. Barling destroys his argument by saying "What is indicated in the scripture is not the condition in which we are born, but the sin that results from that condition and our failure to observe the law of God. . . The punishment, if the -term can be used, is on account of personal transgressions. So death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Barling is therefore saying that God has passed the penalty of death upon all men even before they became responsible to His law - in fact, before Adam was placed in the garden of Eden as a living soul - a natural body of life of the dust of -the ground, and placed under God's law, the continuance of this natural existence being contingent on obedience. The Barling assumption being that natural death is the penalty for sin. LISTEN - Were you, the reader, a sinner in the personal sense when Christ died on Calvary's tree? How could you have been, when you were not even alive and responsible? Paul says "God commendeth His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8). There must be a different concept in the way Paul declares this - it cannot mean personal sin, and therefore must be in the Federal position under Adam's sin that God chose to place all men, so that through the righteousness of one man, Jesus, the free gift of Grace and justification of life could come upon all men by belief and faith.

Barling has certainly supported the apostate false doctrine of 'Original sin' almost universally held, yet refuted by Dr Thomas and Robert Roberts when David Handley sought immersion by them with that very doctrine in mind, then when E. Turney supported the views of Thomas and Roberts that Adam's nature was not changed to physical decay and a bias and tendency toward sin and finally natural death, Roberts went

over to Handley's error and falsely accused and misrepresented Turney's views by stating that Turney was a Renunciationist and did not believe Jesus Christ came in the identical physical flesh of his brethren.

I must give Mr Barling credit for admitting to Brother Brady that he knew the Nazarenes believed the physical flesh of Jesus was the same quality as all men. Yet this misrepresentation has continued by the Christadelphian community and must be partly due to the fact that they have not read the copies of the Debate, neither the literature that has been sent out to them.

It can be seen that Mr Barling missed and ignored the fact that we are all "constituted" sinners for a Divine Purpose centred in Jesus, but we do not come under the sentence for personal sin until we are enlightened to both aspects, i.e., alienation from God by Adamic sin, and personal sin under law to God. Barling has aptly stated and demonstrated the general Christadelphian view that because we are human nature and descendants of Adam, we are sinners by physical descent and have a compulsive tendency to sin on account of a miracle whereby God defiled Adam's nature after he sinned, and caused that defiling element to be transmitted by reproduction into Adam's posterity thus making God the Author of sin and injustice, by giving man laws impossible for him to keep. Mr Barling, when alive, was asked in a letter from Brother Brady if he had changed his views on these matters but he received no reply. They are now both off the scene but not their writings. It is for Christadelphians to correct their untenable position.

Mr Barling's belief is that we are not the subjects of Redemption until the second coming of Christ, yet he contradicts himself on this by saying, on page 29, "We are all sinners (present tense), and God commended His Love towards us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; so in Him and in His blood we have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins. That is the simple Bible story." Either Dr Thomas was right or Barling was wrong on this subject of redemption. Dr Thomas said (and it was quoted to Mr Barling in the Debate), "Redemption is release for a ransom, all who become God's servants have been released from a former Lord, the Purchaser is God and the Ransom paid the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without spot and blemish."

Barling now says of Jesus, "His own death had efficacy for Him." We agree in the sense of Isaiah 53 - "He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied - my righteous servant shall justify many," But we do not accept that His death was necessary for Himself as Barling implies, that is, to remove by the shedding of His life-blood him that had the power of death in His body (Hebrews 2:14) the Devil. He continues, "It is right that every man should receive redemption in his own order, Christ is the first-fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming." This is not redemption he is talking about, but the glorification of the bodies of God servants in Christ at His coming. Dr Thomas got it right here and Barling terribly wrong. Take your pick but follow neither. Follow the Lamb whithersoever He leadeth, for His own sheep hear His voice. A final word from Mr Barling; "The faith which is dear to me is not one that debases man. . ." What hypocrisy! In his writings he has debased man and especially the Lord Jesus of whom he stated, "There was no injustice in his death," when, in fact, Peter said to the Jews "Ye killed the Prince of Life."

I hope something of value will be gained by the Debate and some of the points raised. I have only touched upon a few, but it would be profitable to read the booklet "My Life For the Sheep" if available."

Brother Phil Parry.

Fact And Figure

Having read the Netherton Debate I was aware of the gap in communication between the disputants, which reveals the doubtful use of this form of witnessing.

However, the most revealing misconception of the Gospel message was illustrated in W. F. Barling's summing up when he said (C.L.149, page 27, paragraph 4):

“The truth is that there are many metaphors in scripture to describe our new state, and “ransom” is one of them. . . “true ransom” is the forgiveness of sins,”

This elementary misuse of language is so apparent that it may have been one of the several reasons why the Netherton ecclesia went back on their word and refused to allow the publication of the whole debate.

Two serious grammatical errors are evident; no rules of grammar will allow a ransom price to be confused with the results of the ransom, which is redemption. The use of metaphor in the context of ransom, according to its dictionary definition would remove the reality of the price paid, and the reality of the ransom for that price to be met, also the reality of redemption.

The definition of metaphor being: “A figure of speech in which a word or action is applied to an action that it does not literally denote, in order to imply a resemblance.”

Are we dealing with resemblances, or facts? Were we in bondage because of Adam's sin, or not? Did our heavenly Father provide a ransom price to pay for a release from that state, or not? Did our Lord Jesus give His literal life as a true ransom, and did He really accomplish all that He strove for?

Have we in fact, a covenant of redemption through the giving of His life as a ransom?

Where is metaphor or figure of speech?

When our Lord suffered in His body before and on the Cross it was to make an atonement for our sins, and when He allowed His blood to be shed it was the giving of His life as a ransom price to redeem us.

When we go through the waters of baptism, we accept a covenant based on a figurative washing to take away our sins; as we are immersed, we are buried as He was, but only in figure, to die unto sin. Then we are raised up out of the water unto a new life, washed from our own sins and freed from our old life in Adam.

Although we die in figure in baptism, we have a real covenant; although we are figuratively washed in the waters of baptism, our sins are removed in fact; and as we rise from a figurative grave, we do in fact enter a new life.

There is a place for metaphor, but it is real and practical that counts in the work of God in Christ Jesus.

Ray Gregory

IN APPOSITION-?

Ref: Fred Barling's Questions Nos, 77 to 79 on page 25 above.

One passage which can cause confusion is Colossians 1:14, “In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.”

The word “even” is not in the Greek, leave it out and the implication that the terms “redemption” and “forgiveness of sins” are synonymous disappears.

Ephesians 1:7 helps us here, though misused by this teacher of language, "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace." - Redemption through the shedding of His blood, i.e. His life; and forgiveness of sins, according to His grace, i.e. loving favour. Forgiveness can only follow redemption.

Ray Gregory.

"Art Thou a Teacher and Knowest Not These Things?"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

for a rotten cause, especially where its subversion would break up all vested interests and pecuniary emoluments.

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

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

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

Answer: "Yes."

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

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

Answer: "No."

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

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

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

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

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

Answer: "No."

If there is precise and explicit scripture for this answer we have never seen it. On the contrary, scripture is full of exhortation to perfection and obedience, and if it is impossible such passages would be a mockery. In "Redemption in Christ Jesus" page 29, Barling says, "Must in the same way admit of offences of some kind." Is this precise scripture, or gratuitous assumption? If he is right in affirming that it is not possible for a man to live a perfect life, then we are asked to do the impossible in Matthew 5:48. The

Apostle Paul, in Galatians 5:16 is a liar. His commandments are grievous (1 John 5: 3), and there is the difficulty of explaining of how Jesus succeeded in doing the impossible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question 13: “Did Adam have free will?”

Answer: “Yes.”

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

Question 14. “Have we free will?”

Answer: “The will is present, yes.”

Why could W.F.Barling not reply simply “Yes” instead of” in this and questions 15 and 16, refusing to commit himself to the only answer possible to a reasonable being? Because he knew that the doctrine of

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

Question 17 “Was all creation reproductive?”

Answer: “Presumably, yes.”

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

Question 28 “Is sin the transgression of law?”

Answer: “Yes.”

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

Question 30 “Are natural desires sin?”

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

Question 64 “Did Adam sell himself to sin?”

Answer: “Not in the sense you mean.”

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

Question 79 “Is original sin the sin of Adam?”

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

Question 80 “Is ‘sinful flesh’ (used in Romans 8:3) the same as sin’s flesh?”

Answer: “Yes and vice versa.”

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

Question 81 “Can we have forgiveness of sins now?”

Answer: “I should readily say. Yes.”

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

Question 85a “Do you think that we believe or teach that human flesh is either ‘clean’ or ‘unclean’?”

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

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

Question 95 “Was Jesus’ life His own, or forfeited in Adam?”

Answer: “I would like a definition.”

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

Question 97 “Did death pass upon Jesus?”

Answer: “Yes.”

From the context, W.F.Barling includes Jesus in the “All men.” From a syllogistic test he cannot produce a shred of Scripture to prove this. The only death that Jesus died was an unjust, violent death upon the Cross by wicked men. (Acts 2:23). Now I want you, as you so glibly asked with an air of boast, to give in words that cannot be disputed, that death passed upon all men including Jesus. If natural death of corruption was the sentence, then Jesus did not have it passed upon Him to release those who are supposed to be under it, without the other items that W.F.Barling agreed was necessary for our redemption; blood-shedding, etc.

Question 98 “Did Jesus sin?”

Answer: “No.”

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

Question 99 “Did Jesus receive special strength to overcome temptation?”

Answer: “Yes.”

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

Question 120 “Do you recognise any difference between ‘natural death’ and ‘judicial execution’?”

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

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

Question 124 “Is it just that innocent people receive the “wages of sin”?”

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

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

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

Answer: “No.”

While we appreciated anyone who is not afraid to say that another person is wrong, so long as there is proof to the contrary, we have, ourselves said that Dr Thomas was wrong - and we equally say that he was right also, as in this case (“Echoes of Past Controversies” pages 42,44 & 45). Let us give W.F.Barling the benefit for the sake of examination. Where have we such phrases as “sin nature,” “serpent nature”? Have we such phrases as “an offering for sin”? (Romans 8:3 Revised Version); “Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin” (Isaiah 53:10). Plenty of writers agree, and so does the Emphatic Diaglott. Now we ask for explicit, crisp Scriptural proof that Jesus was made sin by being made sinful flesh.

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

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

Answer: "I don't know."

E.Brady: "I can tell you he did."

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

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

Question 150 "Was Jesus the seed of man?"

Answer: "I have never heard that expression."

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

Question 167 "Do you recognise any difference between 'flesh belonging to sin' and 'flesh belonging to God'?"

Answer: "Both of those expressions are unscriptural."

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

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

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

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

Answer: "Yes, He would have been disobedient."

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

Question 202 "Was the flesh of Jesus condemned?"

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

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

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

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

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

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

Answer: "No."

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

Question 226 "Are we sold unto sin?"

Answer: "Physically, yes."

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

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

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

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

that had the power of death, that is, the devil. The power and strength of sin is the law. This is an offering by a sacrifice for sin, and not for sinful flesh.

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

Answer: “Is the interpretation valid?”

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

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

Question 254 “Did Dr Thomas say that the ram offered on mount Moriah was a substitute for Isaac?”

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

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

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

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

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

Answer: “Yes.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Behold the Bridegroom cometh.

F. J. Pearce.

Hebrews 13 : 20

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

We reproduce the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nearly like the last is Weymouth’s translation:

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

Another, and third sense is as follows:

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

Fenton’s translation also comes under this heading:

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

A.L.Wilson renders the passage as:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dr A. Clarke:

“Through the blood of the everlasting covenant. Some understand this in the following way; God brought back our Lord from the dead on account of His having shed His blood to procure the everlasting covenant. Others that the Lord Jesus became the Great Shepherd and Saviour of the Sheep, by shedding His blood to procure and ratify the everlasting covenant.

The sense however, will appear much plainer if we connect this with the following verse: “Now the God of Peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep; make you, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, perfect you in every good work to do his will.”

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

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

It was promised to show in the same Epistle the same Greek words used in the same connection. The Greek words referred to are “en aimati” (“with blood”). “With” has been chosen as the equivalent of “en” here, in accordance with the rendering of the R.V. To show the meaning which is attached to that word

“with in Hebrews 13:20, we will refer to another verse where it occurs thrice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hebrews 1:1 “By the prophets.”

Hebrews 1:2 “By His Son.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A.H.Broughton and others.

HAMAN HANGED BY HIS OWN ROPE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Here are a few of the charges against us:

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

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

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

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

F. J. Pearce.

* * * * *

W. F. Barling's Five Basic Principles Answered

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Have all died in Adam that are in the grave?

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

Are the irresponsible in Adam? Will they be raised?

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

Which is the death in Adam?

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

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

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

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

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

1 Corinthians 15:22?

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

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

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

E. Brady: No, I haven’t said that.

It is easy to get confused by either side on such a question. When E. Brady said “No,” he meant so in a general way, as explained in a separate article on “Enlightenment,” and which he saw when further

questioned. Jesus did not die to save the ignorant from a violent or Judicial death. They are like the beasts that perish. When a person is enlightened and -then rejects Christ, he “will die a violent second death, and in this sense, if the enlightened person accepts Jesus he will be saved from a violent death.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Brother F.J.Pearce.

1. Scripture Teaching On Death

Have you considered the word “death” in the Scriptures? Just take up a concordance and see how many times it is used and how applied. It is for this reason this short article is written, to bring to mind the various uses, so that a more enlightened view in general can be seen and so help the Bible student to a better understanding of what is not generally considered.

1. Natural Death

The Scriptures plainly teach that God’s creation was first natural, with the purpose of developing character through the Grace of God - dust, earthy (Genesis 2:7; 1 Corinthians 15:46,47). The natural order was not made to last for ever - it would sooner or later decay.

We will give the best definition that we have which agrees with Scripture: -

“Death and corruption, then, with reproduction is the fundamental law of the physical system of the six days. Adam and Eve, and all the other animals born of the earth would have died and gone to corruption if there had been no transgression, provided there had been no further interference with the physical system than Moses recorded in the history of the six days. The life and death of Adam and Eve were predicated, not upon any peculiarity of their animal constitution, but upon the relation they might come to sustain to the two

trees in Paradise. From this we learn that they pleased themselves under the law which sentenced them to death. From these premises it will be seen that we dissent from our correspondent's notion that 'all creation became corrupt,' by which we understand him to mean, constitutionally impregnated with corruptibility at the fall. We believe that the change was moral, not physical." - Dr. Thomas, "Herald of The Kingdom," Volume 5, page 159.

The fifth chapter of Genesis repeats "and he died." This is natural death.

2. Judicial or Inflicted death

This death is distinguished from natural death, whichever way brought about, by law: whether a calamity such as a flood (Genesis 7); or fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 19:23, etc.), or upon individuals such as is described under the Law of Moses, "shall be put to death" (Exodus 21:12-17). This is judicial death, as in the present day case of a murderer; death by execution for breach of law. There is a second death for those who are responsible at the second coming of Christ for those who have died in their sins. The wages of sin is death (Romans 6:23). This is not natural death - it is Judicial, as was the case under the Law of Moses (Hebrews 10:28), or by being raised and suffered by infliction of the second death by Christ (Revelation 21:8; Luke 19:27).

Many incidents could be put, but it is quite evident to those who have eyes to see,

3. Federal Death, while Alive Naturally

"By the trespass of one many be dead"	- Romans 5:15.
"Then were we dead"	- 2 Corinthians 5:14.
"Ye were dead in trespasses and sins"	- Ephesians 2:1.
"Dead in your sins"	- Colossians 2:13.

This death can be termed a legal death, but it must not be confused with the violent death by execution for breach of law.

Adam is the father and the federal head of the human race. All federally died, or were dead, in Adam. "They were made sinners" (Romans 5:19); "Sold under The Sin" (Romans 7:14). Without God, Christ and Hope (Ephesians 2:12). God and Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that He might have mercy upon ail through faith in His Beloved Son (Romans 3:9; 11:32; Galatians 3:22).

Though the federal law concludes all under the one sin of Adam, it has to be recognised individually before any one can be doctrinally in Adam. (See No. 5 below).

4. Symbolic Death

This death is associated in two particulars. Under the Edenic and Mosaic laws the sacrifice of the animals pointed to the death of the Lamb of God. The offerers had to put their hands on the head of the animal. They understood that the death the animal suffered was their due. Thus they died a symbolic death in the death of the animal.

Under the Christian dispensation the believer must be associated with the sacrificial death of Christ in the waters of Baptism. "Buried with Him by baptism into His death" (Romans 6:4). They thus die in symbol or a figurative death and acknowledge the literal death of their Redeemer on the Cross. "Now if we be dead (died) with Christ (verse 8), likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin. (verse 11).

5. Spiritual death

A person cannot die this death who has not been made alive unto God through Christ Jesus: they must be born again, from above; of the incorruptible Seed, the Word of God (John 3:3, margin; James 3:15-17; 1 Peter 1:23).

“But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth (naturally)” (1 Timothy 5:6). “I know thy works. . . that thou livest, and art dead (spiritually)” (Revelation 3:1).

These are those who say they are Jews, and are not; and will suffer the second death as wages. (They have trod underfoot the blood of Christ, and crucified the Son of God afresh) (Hebrews 6:6).

The parable of the Sower explains this very clearly. Endure for a time, pleasures, riches, temptations choke the word, so that no fruit is brought forth. They will be cast away (Luke 8).

* * * * *

2. Legally Dead To Sin Legally Alive To Christ

We feel that this subject could be enlarged and that we should not conclude it without mentioning the Blessed Hope - the Unspeakable gift - so we put a few passages for your consideration.

“Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus.”
- Romans 6:11.

“For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ.” - Colossians 3:3

“For if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him.” - 2 Timothy 2:11.

“That we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness.” - 1 Peter 2:24.

These had become enlightened and recognised that they were as “dead” in Adam under the federal principle and had individually obeyed from the heart the doctrine of baptism. They became alive to the fact that they were dead, and responsible, so they died to the Sin and became alive. Rose in Newness of Life; passed from, or out of, the death sentence into the life sentence. Again:

“Let the dead bury their dead” - Matthew 8:22.

“God is not the God of the dead” - Matthew 22:32.

“Ye are become dead to the Law” - Romans 7:4.

“I through the law am dead to the law” - Galatians 2:19.

Try and put these in their respective places. Study Romans 5 and see how the One Sin of Adam brought legal condemnation, and how the One Act of Jesus removed the legal condemnation.

“As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive” - 1 Corinthians 15:22.

“For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that One died for all, then were all dead” - 2 Corinthians 5:14,

“Put off the old man (Adam) and put on the New man” - Colossians 3:9,10.

Where the offence abound, grace did much more abound. Let us rightly divide the Word of God, which is able to make us wise unto Salvation, and is able to give us an abundant entrance into the Kingdom of God through faith in the blood of the Lamb who died that we might live.

Read and study the Scriptures, because if we speak not according to these oracles there is no light in us.

“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned” (“in whom” - margin) - Romans 5:12.

“For this reason - as through one man (the) Sin entered into the world (in whom all sinned) and through (the) Sin (the) Death; so also (the) Death passed upon all men” - Emphatic Diaglott - (the word “the” shown in brackets is in the word for word translation).

This twelfth verse of Romans 5 is generally understood and brought up to prove that natural death was the result of sin. We know of none other than ourselves who disagree with the majority. We say that it was a Violent Death. It is because of this disagreement that this article is written, in order to investigate which of the deaths is meant. The word “death” in the Greek, or in the trans-lations, of itself proves nothing, as a study of the following examples will show;

John 5:24.	John 11:4,13.	Rom. 5:10.	1 Cor. 15:56.	James 1:15.
James 5:20.	1 John 3:14.	Rev. 1:18	Rom.5:12 (twice)	Rom.14:17.
Rom. 6:23.	1 Cor. 15:21,54.	Rev. 20:6,	Rev.21:4.	Rom. 5:21
1 Cor. 15:55.	1 John 5:16,17 (4 times).			

Before we study the 12th verse of Romans 5 we feel sure that none will dispute that such passages as Romans 6:23; James 1:15; and Revelation 20:6 are quite decisive as to what kind of death is meant. Each proves that it is judicial as the result of sin as wages, and is none other than the Second Death.

There is no difficulty in seeing this second death at the end of the age by Christ as being executed upon sinners, as they are corruptible. “Bring hither, and slay them before me” (Luke 19:27). Hence our meaning of a violent death. I must confess that when I first studied the truth, as I understand it now, the 12th verse was a very obstinate difficulty. Therefore I can sympathize with all who, through the generally preconceived idea which is universally believed, experience the difficulty of not believing that natural death is meant.

The general way of interpreting any verse is by the context in which it is set. If this is unsatisfactory other Scripture must then be compared with the general teaching of the whole subject.

It is plain that Adam is the man referred to, who was created out of the dust of the ground (Genesis 2:7); or, in the words of Paul, “The first man Adam was made a living soul. . . The first man is of the earth, earthy” - 1 Corinthians 15:45,47.

Let us now consider the evidence of Scripture and reason with a view to ascertaining without any preconceived ideas. Adam was called a “living soul,” What is a living soul? The answer to this should be sufficient; the Hebraist words means all creatures - man, beast, fish and fowl wherein is life. Who will say that the nature of all these creatures was different from what it is now? How many natures are revealed in Scripture? Two: corruptible and incorruptible. Are not the words “whose seed is in itself. . . be fruitful and multiply.” Green herbs, and fruitful trees, meat for man and beast prove the necessity of a natural creation needing food to eat and reproduce?

A law was given to Adam “thou shalt not eat. . .” (Genesis 2:17). Why was a law given? It was given as a test to prove two things: free will, and a natural desire to do the contrary. This point should be uppermost in our minds; without law there is no transgression (Romans 4:15), Adam disobeyed and by so doing committed the first sin on record. We have no difficulty in knowing what sin is. “Sin is transgression of Law” (1 John 3:4). It should be remembered that whatever nature Adam had it was in this nature that he committed his sin, so there was no need to give him another nature, to make him of a sinful character, to do that which he had already done with the nature he then possessed.

These are the facts of the case which prove that there was first a natural creation. There is no more difficulty here than in our own case as natural creatures. It is no use denying these facts, and making such statements that are pure assumptions, without any proof from Scripture nor reason, such as these:

“Adam’s nature was changed,”

“God infused in Adam the germs of corruption.”

“The Tree of Life was to keep corruption away.”

“It needed a miracle to reduce Adam to the nature of the beast.” etc. . .

So the preconceived idea that Adam and creation was not corruptible before he sinned, in the face of all evidence, must be thrown to the four winds of heaven. This accepted and all is plain, that the sentence of the law could be carried out; as in present day hanging.

Without going into the study of the Hebraist words “Muth Temuth” and “B’Yom,” another proof in itself, let us continue to examine verse 12: Adam was the first man. He committed sin. Death is by sin. The animal was slain in God’s mercy instead of Adam - which is the explanation of the violent death of Jesus (Revelation 13:2; Genesis 22:13; Matthew 20:28, etc.).

“So death passed upon all men. . .” As there are no plain words in Scripture to prove that this death is what others would have us believe, they have had to invent the above phrases. Let us see if these words are capable of being understood in harmony with the facts. “Passed upon” surely cannot mean either of the man-made ideas. Without any words of ours let us go to the same chapter which proves that it was, and is, a sentence passed upon us by Law, and does not mean a physical change or any of the above assumptions.

“Therefore, indeed, as through One Offence, Sentence came on men to condemnation, so also through One Righteous Act, Sentence came on all men to Justification of life.” - Verse 18. - “Emphatic Diaglott.”

This verse alone proves (not contradicts) the meaning of those words. Will John 5:24 help you to see it? “But has passed out of the death into the life.” Is this not a present legal fact that the death that was passed upon all men can be removed now? Is not this in harmony with the fact of the other half of this verse that the sentence of life came on all through the sacrificial death of Jesus?

Again;

“There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus” – Romans 8:1.

If the sentence of death or condemnation means either natural death or infused corruption, to suit preconceived ideas, we have no hesitation in saying that these Scriptures are useless.

“For all have sinned” or, as in the margin “in whom all have sinned.” We know that the marginal rendering is not acceptable to the natural death theory, but a little further thought, seeing that it in no way interferes with the sense of the verse, chapter, nor the whole Scripture that Adam and Jesus are two federal Heads, the Emphatic Diaglott has got in brackets. We ask, can these words “for all have sinned” mean that every soul born of Adam has literally sinned - transgressed law? No one will be so foolish as to say this. The non-responsible question proves it. Again let the chapter explain it.

“For as by One man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous - Verse 19.

This verse, like the previous, gives the sense how all have sinned in a federal head - made sinners by law or constitution. While the many cover the ail, we can see that strictly speaking it is only many, not all, are doctrinally in Adam, though all are under the law of sin and are corruptible.

The same can be seen and applied in the next half of the verse. By the sacrificial death of Christ - shedding of blood - the one act made many righteous. This gift is free to all, but it is only the many who will accept it, though corruptible.

Let us take another verse, which cannot be understood but in the sense we have tried to explain it in harmony with the whole factual evidence.

“For if through the offence of one many be dead (or, died. R.V.) - verse 15.

Ask yourself this simple question; Are we literally dead, or have we all literally died? The answer should be enough for you to see that apart from the federal law, put into operation by God, there is no solution. Again, if natural death is the meaning of the 12th verse, we ask, Why should Paul say, “nevertheless The death reigned from Adam to Moses”? There is no sense in making such a statement if

natural death is meant. Is not natural death still with us? Will natural death affect the saints at the coming of Christ? Can we make you think by adding another verse?

“The Law entered that the offence might abound” - verse 20.

The sin and The death entered into the world by Adam. The law of Moses entered into the Mosaic world or economy that the offence of Adam might abound in two particular ways; the first that they by transgression of that law would be sinners, as was Adam, and second, it was to teach them the need of Redemption, as in Adam’s case- Eden and the whole sacrificial law was to bring them to Christ. There is no need to say much on this verse from the Emphatic Diaglott, but we do ask you to study it, as no solution to the problem can ever be had from the writings of man-made creeds based on the Romish doctrine of the 9th Article of the Church of England. God would leave us in no doubt if He intended us to believe in His injustice.

Much more could be said but if what we have written is not enough to convince the reader, we will just use these strong words as a last resort to make you realize that it is pure blasphemy to uphold such a false doctrine which makes God renounce His Moral Law. Here are the words: God is punishing every creature for the one sin of Adam. After the suffering they, with Adam, pay his debt. Then you provide Jesus to pay the price of sin in a violent death, to release all those who have paid it already!

“The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father” - Deuteronomy 24:16; Ezekiel 18:20.

Being Justified freely by His Grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom. God hath sent forth. . . through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness, that He might be just and the justifier of him that believed in Jesus” - Romans 3:24-26-

* * * * *

3. In Adam and In Christ

**“For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.”
1 Corinthians 15:22.**

This passage is very little understood because the general statement of Scripture is left out of account. The foremost reason is the preconceived idea of the fall of Adam which according to the 9th Article of Faith in the Church of England, is a physical change of nature:- “Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, but it is in the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam”. Hence the following list of principles: the Justice of God’s Law; The Federal Principle: The Death that came by man; the Death that Christ died; these and the first quotation are left to the confusion of each other.

Of course there are many ways of getting round the difficulties. Here is one:- That all in Adam is like a large circle which includes every soul from Eden to the end of the 1,000 years; that all in Christ is like a small circle within the larger one.

While we agree that in comparison with the whole of the descendants of Adam the called, chosen or enlightened are few in number, we have no fear in saying that this idea does not meet the case.

If “in Adam” means the physical nature which is the condemnation passed upon all men, then we are in Adam when we are in Christ, because the condemnation is with us so long as we live and even after resurrection, as we are supposed to rise with it. Here we are faced with a flat contradiction of Romans 8:1 which states that, “there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,” and the words of Jesus recorded in John 5:24, “He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation but is passed from (or out of) death into life.” Two passages which prove the justice of God’s Law.

It is a general idea that natural death is the result of Adam's sin and that he paid the price 930 years after he had been typically forgiven and redeemed. Also that irrespective of his death all have to pay it individually. Then, the greatest stumbling block of all is that our Beloved Master went through such an awful and dreadful ordeal to pay the price of sin, which could have been avoided if natural death would have sufficed, and each had a part to pay before Redemption could be accomplished. Thus the death of Jesus is made to be a mere side issue in comparison with the love and Justice of God and the necessity of such a loving sacrifice which Jesus so willingly gave for the sin of the world.

Referring to the context of the chapter (1 Corinthians 15) we read "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." Not to save us from dying. First natural; if natural death is the condemnation Christ died in vain and all have perished.

Is there a difference between "dying in Adam" and "the soul that sinneth it shall die"? (Ezekiel 18:20).

Is there any difference between:

1. The results of the death of the ignorant (Psalm 49:20; Isaiah 27:14; Romans 2:12; John 3:21),
2. The enlightened responsible (James 4-17), and
3. Those who die in Christ (1 Corinthians 15)?

How does a person get "in Christ"? Is this a physical change of nature? Can a person be in Christ before being made incorruptible after resurrection?

Here we give some evidence in harmony with Scripture:

"For an individual cannot be in a federal person unless introduced into him" - Dr. Thomas in "Elpis Israel" page 134.

"Baptism is the means of the present (legal) union with Christ, There is a passing out of Adam into Christ" - Robert Roberts.

Are we unreasonable to think that there is a legal union with Christ and Adam as federal heads in contrast to the physical? How does a person become "in Adam"? Is it not upon the same principle of enlightenment and realising that we have been introduced into him by law? Have we not got to die by law to Adamic relationship, just as the Jew did to the law? (Romans 7:4). Did not Paul recognize that he was alive without the law, though a Pharisee and that (the) sin revived and he died? (Romans 7:10; Romans 8:2; Galatians 2:19). While the Laws of Death and Life are over all they are not operative until we are introduced or enlightened and responsible to such laws.

Adam and Jesus are our "Doctrinal Fathers," and only when we are cognisant of the facts are we related to the respective laws and consequences. The ignorant are not in either of these categories, and we have full confidence in the Justice of God as to His requirements. We have no doubt that no man dies because of Adam's sin, or responsible for it (Deuteronomy 24:16; Ezekiel 18:20). Cannot we now see that there is a big difference between God "winking at the ignorant," who perish like the beasts, and the just punishment of those who know and obey not His commandments (Mark 16:16; Luke 19:27).

To sum up; all in Adam die as the wages of sin is the second death and natural death will not be taken into account. All in Christ shall be made alive (*Zoe*) irrespective of being naturally dead. The "all" in each case is the "all" in their respective category, with the exclusion of the ignorant. So it should be plain from all angles that this verse means exactly what it says, without any confusion or contradiction.

"Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness and His wonderful works to the children of men"
- Psalm 107:8.

What wonderful wisdom and Divine justice in Mercy and a glorious solution to a problem so simple which the babes can see, and yet is hid from the wise and prudent of this world.

Brother F.J.Pearce

* * * * *

Further Comment on the W.F.Barling / Ernest Brady Debate.

By F. J. Pearce.

As a result of the misrepresentation and slander by the Logos Committee which has arisen from the above debate, we print these further comments to clarify the Truth thereof. They, although without the knowledge of the facts by an independent reporter, have commented from hearsay the usual misrepresentations one derives from such sources, to their own confusion. We would welcome, if they had the courage, to approach us in writing, any comments so that we could reply to any point raised, to show to the unbiased reader on which side the Truth lies. We will leave questions alone that we have already commented upon other than in order to emphasise that which we have to say, upon a re-examination of the Debate.

In answer to No. 2 question – “Are you satisfied you understand the Nazarene Fellowship?” - W.F.Barling replied “Yes.” I rewrite it as found in W.F.Barling’s “Compiled Report” - “Are you satisfied that you understand EXACTLY THE DOCTRINE OF THE NAZARENE FELLOWSHIP?” W.F.Barling, “Yes.” The words in capitals are in addition to the independent report, most probably added to show the superiority of one who is a teacher of languages; nevertheless this makes it no better for his conception of Truth, for this is revealed unto babes. If any, having not examined the Debate, wish to do so, in order to confirm what is herein stated, it can be obtained on loan from the writer. There were about 300 questions asked, (quite simple ones) and out of these there were 30 to which W.F.Barling replied, by using the following evasive phrases – “I want a definition,” (more than six times) “I don’t know,” or “I don’t understand,” (more than six times). “It depends what the question means,” “I do not fully comprehend,” “I do not understand that language,” “I will not express an opinion,” “I cannot distinguish between Christ’s character and his nature,” “I don’t fully appreciate the significance of ‘inflicted’.” Is not this appalling when we recall the affirmative answer he has given to the question which he corrected with capital letters? Especially so when we think of him as a teacher of languages. Does not this amount to boasting? Do not those 30 answers definitely prove that he fails to comprehend the substance of the Nazarene Fellowship’s belief? I do not know how those who asked W.F.Barling to debate the matter felt after such statements, but my own reaction was one of sorrow for him. He failed to perceive that by these good and right simple questions, he was undermining the very foundation upon which he stood, and we now proceed to prove it by his answers.

Question No. 7. – “Was Adam created from the dust?” - W.F.Barling – “Yes.” This answer is correct according to the scriptures, but the amazing fact is, that Christadelphians who preach this simple truth and describe what a living soul is, cannot see that this living soul, if it was to continue like all the other animal creation, was dependent upon food. Genesis 1:23. Food was as essential before transgression as it was after. Seeing that Mr. Barling answered in the affirmative to Adam having a free will and that creation was reproductive, to be fruitful and multiply, we ask, is this not evidence against his belief of a change in the quality of Adam’s flesh at the transgression? This mistaken theory is entirely false, mere assumption.

In answer to question 21, “Could Adam live for ever without a change of nature?” W.F.Barling replied “I cannot answer, we have no information.” Why does he not apply this answer to Adam’s ‘changed flesh’ assumption, for here he would be speaking truth, but to the question “Could Adam live for ever without a change of nature,” we have the scriptural proofs of “dust thou art,” “The first man is of the earth - earthy,”

“Living Soul,” etc. The scriptures prove the contrary to his answers, as we perceive in question No. 22 – “Did Adam sin with the very good nature of his creation?” – W.B.F. – “Yes.” Is it not obvious, therefore that there was no need to change Adam’s nature. Adam became a sinner with the nature he already possessed, and to change it is also changing The Word.

There are several questions from Nos. 22 to 65 that have been dealt with in previous comments; by these the same story is told, right answers to questions that condemn his belief, such as No. 49 where he agreed with Dr. Thomas re redemption - Eureka, Vol, 1 page 20. Dr. Thomas wrote some very wonderful things, but he was by no means infallible, as shown by a comparison of some of the theories he put forward which made others of none effect, but how W.F.Barling agrees with them in opposition to scriptural and common sense proofs is beyond comprehension, unless admitting that their whole theory is a mixture of Truth and error, or that they do not really understand it. He agreed that Adam did not need redemption prior to his sin, and that he could not redeem himself. Quite true, but when asked if a person in bondage could redeem another, he answered “Yes.” How any reasonable person can believe this, we are unable to understand, yet this question to a believer of the changed flesh bogy must be answered with a “Yes” to make it harmonise with a mistaken and an unjust theory. If any in the same bondage can redeem another, why could not Adam redeem himself or his wife? If this were true, then God’s plan of salvation or redemption in Christ is of no avail, and is without justice, law or order. Next were two questions the answers to which no one can comprehend, if consistency is to be a governing factor.

No, 35. “Does ‘Sin in the flesh’ imply that a physical principle of sin pervades the constitution of man?” Answer – “Sin dwelleth in me, says Paul.” The question was asked again, and answered with the reply:- “I would prefer the term ‘Sin in the flesh’ in the sense Paul used it in Romans.” Here Mr. Barling again resorts to evasion of the question, yet he readily ought to have answered in the affirmative, seeing that he does nothing to deny the B.A.S.F. - Clause 5, but rather, fellowships believers of the same. That statement declares that “Adam broke God’s law, and was adjudged unworthy of immortality, and sentenced to return to the ground from whence he was taken - a sentence which defiled and became a physical law of his being, and was transmitted to all his posterity.”

Again we say that we are amazed at any person not having the courage of his convictions to answer the Question in accordance with his Statement of Faith, with a straightforward “Yes.” What is the meaning of these two answers? We know they seem to confirm their belief, having at one time been beguiled by the same assumptions, but now thanks be to God, we have no doubt whatsoever that the sinful flesh theory is nowhere to be found in the scriptures. We have written enough on these two references for any person who has eyes to see, but if you are blind, then we pray God may open your eyes. How can sin dwell in a person? Answer from the scriptures, not from The Constitution. How can a person be free from sin as the scriptures very plainly say we are? How simple is the answer when you remember the Sin of Adam, and how Jesus offered Himself a Sacrifice for Sin, and not the supposed sinful flesh.

W.F.Barling agreed on questions 59 to 63, that God provided skins, - that there was a sacrifice, - that the blood of the slain animal was a condition, or redemption, and that Jesus was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; all this was because of Adam’s sin, of which W.F.Barling previously agreed, was committed with his very good nature. Is it not obvious that sinful flesh, ingrained sin, is a myth? As John informs us – “Jesus was the lamb of God which took away The Sin of the World,” not the Sinful Flesh of the World. After debating about the slain animals, question 87 was asked:- “Was their death an inflicted death?” Answer:- “They were put to death as sacrifices.” This answer was correct, but when E.Brady asked, “Did Jesus die an inflicted death?” W.F.Barling answered “As I don’t fully appreciate the significance of ‘Inflicted’ we will pass that one.” This was nothing more or less than an evasions again. He agrees to the first question, as being put to death as sacrifices, but evidently was not prepared to say the same regarding Jesus Christ. Surely everyone else could give a definite “Yes” to the Question. We will say this about W.F.Barling - he could see where these questions would bring inconsistency even to ridiculous proportions concerning the doctrine of Sinful Flesh which he upholds, and he evaded accordingly. From questions 106 to 121 we see much of this, e.g. “I don’t understand,” although he knew “If you mean this,” “It depends upon the term unclean,” “If you mean legally,” etc, and then to cap it all when asked the question “Would an unclean or defiled animal have been acceptable?” he answered “There was one occasion when a blemished animal was offered.” So then he was asked “In the sin offering would a defiled offering be acceptable?” Reply, “No.”

W.F.Barling complained he was not given a fair chance. In what way I know not. If asking questions was deemed to be unfair, then it certainly proved by his answers that it was, so much so that even the Chairman thought it was not fair. The questions revealed to those who can discern, as intended, the fallacy of the sinful flesh theory, a theory which unites the Devil and Christ in one person. W.F.Barling can talk a lot and say nothing, but when it comes to simple questions of which he was supposed to “exactly understand” it amounts to the same. The answer “No” to the last question rules out the evasion in the previous one. We should like to know “The one occasion” which he referred to, when a blemished animal was offered. We realise that many legally clean sacrifices were a stink in God’s nostrils instead of a sweet smelling savour; to what effect, therefore, would the corrupt, the torn, the lame and the blind, have? By the answer to these two questions, cannot it be perceived that W.F.Barling was in a very sorry plight? We have dealt with the question 121 – “Was Jesus the Seed of man” to which Mr. Barling replied – “I never heard of such an expression.” Seeing, therefore, that this was the first time we hope that it may have caused him to think upon it; he could say “Yes” to the question that “Jesus was the seed of the woman” which rules out “Jesus being the seed of man,” but Mr. Barling could not answer with a straightforward “No” because of the repercussions which would have arisen to his doctrinal detriment. E.Brady then asked “Was Jesus born by the will of the flesh?” W.F.Barling “You are quoting 1 John in the wrong way. When told by E.Brady that he was not quoting W.F.Barling said “You are committing me to an interpretation which I refuse to be committed to.” Yet when asked if man had anything to do with the birth of Jesus, he could say “No” but note the bit he added – “Except that His mother represented man.” By this addition it will be observed that Mr. Barling, along with the sect he represented, are never satisfied until they have labelled the Son of God as being a representation of degenerated, impregnated, polluted flesh, which is full of sin, in opposition to the Word of God which informs us that “In Him is no sin” - 1 John 3:5. Also “Who did no sin” 1 Peter 2:22. Briefly, they would have us believe that Almighty God who is too pure to behold sin, manifested Himself in a body of it. Have you ever heard so much quibbling and answers which could be answered with a “Yes” or “No”? Dr Thomas used these very words underlined which shows what a good student Mr. Barling was of his works. Yea, and this is not all; if he had studied John 1 and read the Emphatic Diaglott’s foot note he would have from an outsider that it can apply in the physical generation of Jesus as well as to the regeneration of believer. So much for such a teacher who answered questions which condemned himself and the Body he was supposed to uphold in the debate.

In the consideration of Jesus as an infant (baby a month old). To the Question “Is such a child capable of manifesting holiness” W.F.Barling answered “This one did; God caused Him to trust from His mother’s womb.” What a construction, considering other like scriptures referring to Israel 15A. 6-3, - 48-8. E.Brady then asked “Did Jesus need adoption?” - W.F.Barling – “No.” E.Brady – “Do we need adoption,” - W.F.Barling – “Yes.” Here he speaks the truth, but in the very next question “s there then a legal difference between Him and us?” W.F.Barling – “Manifestly - so long as I am not committing myself to your interpretation of the word legal.” Now why do we need adoption? Is it not because we were all alienated from God by the One sin of Adam? Without God and hope? How is it Jesus did not need adoption? There is bound to be a reason even according to W.F.Barling’s answers. Adam sold himself to sin and left the house; Jesus retained His Sonship and remained in the house but, if it were true that His flesh was sinful, then we say He was never in the house. “Which of you convinced me of sin?” “In Him is no sin.” Is it not obvious that our redemption is dependent upon a legal transaction? Adam by his disobedient act (whilst his constitution was very good) sold both himself and us unto another owner, SIN. Jesus by His miraculous birth and righteous life redeemed us from this captivity and restored that which He took not away. Adam and Jesus are seen to be the two Federal Heads. In Adam - death, in Christ - life, and we, if enlightened to this fact, are removed from the one to the other by faith in the efficacy of Christ’s blood, “For the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the Law of Sin and death.” Romans 8:2. It is all a matter of Law, and cannot be satisfactorily understood apart from the legal status of Adam and Jesus. This word legal is a stumbling block to some people, but if you prefer Truth to Error and realise that no little part of salvation is dependent on a change of relationship, then there is no difficulty. Did not W.F.Barling qualify one of his statements by the same word? Is it wrong to use it because it is not found in the Bible?

In the next question Mr. Barling said “I must have a definition of the word legal.” We will leave this to the reader to form his own conclusion, adding that “There is none so blind as those that will not see,” remembering also the boast of the Logos Committee that W.F.Barling had the best of the Debate.

Mr. Brady asked the question 148 – “Did Jesus break any law?” W.F.Barling – “No” “Did the law curse Him?” - W.F.Barling – “Yes.” We would here remind him that “No man by the spirit calleth Jesus accursed” 1 Corinthians 12:3. Evidence that such an utterance is not spiritual, but rather one which arises from the God dishonouring theory of flesh full of sin. This brings to mind the question (No. 25) “Can we have sin apart from law?” - W.F.Barling “Yes.” Is it possible to agree with this in view of the scriptures that “Sin is the transgression of the Law” and “Where there is no law there is no transgression.” This is the product again of a wrong theory, (Sinful flesh). God forbid that we should boast of our knowledge in an endeavour to ridicule this devilish theory; the issue is far too precious to allow any such insincerity. We have said we were truly sorry for him, and that we mean. We admit that what we have learnt has been from what his leaders have written, with a comparison of scripture, that which he cast to the four winds to say this is my view, my personal belief, my personal teaching, etc. Better for him if taught to rightly divide the Word of Truth as we have from the wheat and chaff subscribed by his leaders. Can any person who knows Jesus say He was defiled? To this question, instead of a clear cut “Yes” or “No,” when asked the second time, W.F.Barling replied – “I cannot distinguish between Jesus character and his nature.” Have you ever heard such an answer? Surely this question should have produced a resounding ‘NO.’ But instead we got an explanation that Jesus was a man of sorrows and took upon Himself our infirmities, so that in that sense He was defiled. Here you have the distinction not of Jesus character or His nature, but rather the proof that He became a SIN OFFERING FOR US. The 53rd. Chapter of Isaiah is dead against His sinful flesh theory. So to this question which W.F.Barling could not distinguish between Jesus character and His nature, we see that he did distinguish in order to label Jesus as being defiled, and that also from wrong premises. It had nothing to do with either His character or the nature He bore. Very little is heard now of the sinful flesh assumption, in comparison as to when H.Sulley and the like were alive. When I used to read the awful statements taken from the Psalms which they applied to Jesus, I was appalled. Neither do we read so much now that Jesus, who was our High Priest, had to offer for Himself and for the people. We see from the following question that it did not make a good impression with the previous members.

Question 160. E.Brady – “Then why do you say Jesus died for Himself?” W.F.Barling – “I do not say it in an isolated way that He had to die for Himself; my view was misrepresented in your opening address. I do not believe that God said to Jesus you must die for yourself.” E.Brady – “But you are defending the Christadelphian point of view.” The Chairman then thought W.F.Barling could explain the matter, and asked if it would be an advantage if he took the time now. W.F.Barling – “When you accuse me of saying and preaching that Christ had to die for Himself, you are putting an altogether false accent on the aspect of my teaching in my introductory address. The fact that Christ was born was due to the fact that we were sinners; the fact that He lived a sinless life had the same reason and cause; his death - more than his death, his resurrection too, was fundamentally essential to our justification, and therefore it is an incorrect way of expressing the Truth to say that he had to die for Himself. First there is no question of historical sequence of events where Christ had to die for Himself, and God said, ‘Now you can die for other people.’”

I must confess that I do not see where this explanation is in harmony with the Christadelphian belief which W.F.Barling was defending, that Christ who was to be raised up in the condemned line of Abraham and David, and who through wearing their condemned nature was to obtain a title for resurrection by perfect obedience and by dying, abrogate the law of condemnation for Himself and all who should believe and obey Him. If W.F.Barling means anything, he agrees with us that it was an impossibility for Jesus to die for Himself and for the people. The conclusion we arrive at, therefore, is that W.F.Barling’s personal views and belief are quite different to the Constitution which he was supposed to uphold and defend. In his own words, “What he (Dr, Thomas) said is irrelevant.” E.Brady then said “If Christ was under condemnation, it follows that He needed redemption. Then was not His death for Himself?” W.F.Barling – “I accept the scriptures and try to base all my teachings on scripture, which says ‘The God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant.’ If you mean does that prove that Christ died for Himself, I should say Yes, categorically – provided you appreciate that I am using LEGAL language in discrimination.” E.Brady – “You don’t think that that is in the same sense that I say, that ONE died for all others sins?” We refer you to the last scriptural quotation Hebrews 13:20 in our comments, no matter how W.F.Barling evaded the substance of the Christadelphian theory that Christ had to die for Himself, the writings of their leaders emphasise this point by their sinful flesh teaching and belief, that Christ condemned Sin in His flesh, or the Devil in Himself. This is the awful climax reached from the mistaken imaginary calculation that Adam’s flesh was impregnated, or injected, at the

transgression, with the vitriolic poison of sin, an altogether God dishonouring theory, which implicates The Altogether Lovely One, as having partaken of a body whose substance could not possibly merit anything but death. Does not this jargon fire one with any love for His Father, to shout “Blasphemy!” especially when one knows that God would not suffer this same substance to suffer corruption, but rather raised it and revitalised it with Spirit? W.F.Barling had to resort or try to explain these scriptural facts away, Christ, when raised, could say “A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have.” Did not Job affirm that he would see God in his flesh? Denials of these truths are a very sad thing, the implications are Devilish; they are not from above, but from mistaken and biased ideas to uphold the bogey which deludes millions of people, namely sinful flesh.

Then followed questions 163 to 173 to which W.F.Barling answered in the affirmative, that we are redeemed with a Price, and that Jesus purchased us in a real sense. Now note;- When W.F.Barling was asked question 123 – “Did Jesus receive back the price that He paid?” he said “I have read of nothing of the kind in the Scriptures.” We were very pleased to hear this answer, for although evasive, neither did it affirm the Christadelphian theory that Christ rose from the tomb corruptible or sinful flesh. That which Jesus sacrificed ceased forever, if He received it back it would not have been a sacrifice. This, if words have any meaning, is sensible reasoning and deductive evidence from scripture. If you remember, W.F.Barling’s answer to the Question “Did Jesus rise with the same body?” – “I don’t know.” Add to this what he wrote in “Redemption of Christ Jesus,” page 22, “As he rose from the dead exempt from all association with sin,” then we can only assume what is implied by “I don’t know.” I was talking to a well known Christadelphian who asked me not to mention his name, but who told me he “believed as W.F.Barling that Jesus rose incorruptible.” There are several of the not so well known, who believe the same, but are afraid to converse upon it because of the results, yet W.F.Barling can apparently believe it without the fear of excommunication. You will have noticed that Mr. Barling answered yes, and no, to questions, but added “Provided you appreciate that I am using LEGAL language,” etc. It appears that it is alright for them to reason this way, and we agree that there is nothing wrong in deducing Truth from sound reasoning in harmony with the Word; even Dr. Thomas resorted to it, yet we are always asked for a “Thus saith the Lord” and if not given in words to suit them, then we are told as W.F.BARLING inferred, gratuitous assumptions, etc. When we state “and were by nature the children of wrath” we know what we are talking about and although to the shallow thinker this is in harmony with the polluted flesh theory, he fails to realise we can be reborn. “Now are ye the Sons of God” 1 John 3:2. E.Brady asked the question “Is the wrath of God against sinners?” W.F.Barling – “Against those who are morally sinners.” E.Brady – “Was the wrath of God against Jesus?” W.F.Barling – “Jesus was not morally a sinner,” so I must deduce ‘No.’ Here you see a Black and White Christ. A Jesus morally perfect, and a Jesus of Serpent Nature. Remember, W.F.Barling had said he could not distinguish between Jesus character and His nature. Is this explaining, deducing, or what? This is a type of Jesus that can be used just how they want to use Him. A Jesus who was borne to the sepulchre as the Devil, but one (with the same flesh, for this did not see corruption) that emerged with the same substance as that which He was supposed to have destroyed, for they erroneously bring Him forth mortal. Such is the confusion of W.F.Barling and all who believe in the sinful flesh theory, in deducing His character to be holy, but His flesh full of sin. We ask you to believe us that such evidence is nothing more or less than gratuitous assumption, the words “sinful flesh” are nowhere to be found in the Greek M.S. nor in the Emphatic Diaglott. This term should be rendered “Flesh of Sin” denoting ownership.

Now we repeat what W.F.Barling said to E.Brady - “You cannot give me verses to support your view, as I can to support mine.” We think of Proverb “Every way of man is right in his own eyes,” you may say the same about us if you are biased, but we will leave it for him or one of his supporters to do what we have, and then we will reply.

I am sure that the Logos Committee will not be so confident in giving such rash judgment in future, but think a little deeper before uttering words that they are ignorant of.

We close with the Proverb, “He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him.” That they have done this is amply shown. We pray God may give them the Light of Life.

F.J.Pearce.