

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 101

April/May 1988

In this Issue : -

Page 1 Editorial	Brother and Sister Linggood
Page 1 Letter to the Nazarene Fellowship	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 3 Behold The Lamb	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 5 Letter to Brother P. Parry	From a Christadelphian
Page 8 Reply to above	Brother Phil Parry
Page 13 Poem	
Page 14 Jesus My Substitute	Brother A.L.Wilson

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Reader Friends, Warm Greetings in the name of our Redeemer.

We thank all those who have communicated with us during the past two months, it is always heartening to hear news from those of like precious faith whether from near or far and especially in these days when most of us are scattered and in small numbers but yet closely bound together in spirit.

We have some interesting matter from Bro. Russell Gregory with a covering letter. A letter from a Christadelphian friend to Bro. and Sis Parry and Bro. Phils' answer. An exhortation by Bro. Leo Dreifuss "The use of the tongue". Another instalment from "Jesus my Substitute" by A.L.Wilson.

We pray for the welfare of you all and for the early return of our dear Lord from Heaven.

With sincere love in the Masters Service. Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

Dear Brother and Sister Linggood,

It has been a pleasure receiving the Nazarene Circular Letters regularly for the past two years and I have looked forward to reading them through again and again. Now sadly, I will have to wait a little longer between each issue and realise that this decision to publish bi-monthly was not of your choosing and I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation to yourselves and to all who made the Circular the success it is.

The enclosed letter may be suitable in full or in part to use in the Circular Letter as you see fit.

Yours sincerely in the Masters Service, Russell Gregory.

Dear Brethren and Sisters,

In November 1985 I let it be known to the Managing Brethren of Erdington Ecclesia that I was "sitting on the fence" until I was able to understand both points of view regarding whether or not Jesus Christ had to die for Himself, and now this objective has been achieved and my thanks are due largely to the great kindness of someone sending me a batch of several dozen letters written long ago, some as far back as 1911, by some fourteen or fifteen well known Brethren and Sisters freely discussing their views on the subject of the Atonement. These letters gave me some insight into the great difficulties surrounding the orthodox Christadelphian view now embodied in the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith.

Many and complex are the arguments adduced from the scriptures attempting to explain the reason for Christ's crucifixion and some at Erdington may well recall a lengthy talk on this subject a few years ago when the speaker finished by saying that this was a very difficult subject to understand and not to worry too much if one felt unable to! However, this difficulty of understanding is brought about by anomalies contained in the arguments advanced in support of these traditional views, which we believed to be true simply because some of our elders and teachers taught them as true, and we thought that this is what the Bible said.

But there is need for watchfulness against deviations from the straight line of simple uncompromising truth and the first question we must ask of any statement is - is it true? In this connection I mention, by way of example, the insistence of some, in the continual use of the misrepresentation of Paul's letter to the Romans, chapter 8 verse 3 where the translators made a known and accepted grammatical error.

Another point to mention is that much harm has been done in ignorance to quieten doubt, if indeed doubt has been quietened, for it is quite wrong to suppress inquiry supposing it to be expedient. As each new generation comes along and studies scriptures afresh, the question will always keep arising and should be discussed openly and in a spirit of love. This can only then lead to a greater sharing of our knowledge of God and increase our understanding of His ways. Discussion is good and right and honourable. Suppression is not. A study of this subject of our redemption has convinced me that the true explanation is the simple one and in sending these notes on the two points of view of whether or not Jesus Christ died for Himself I have in mind those who are seeking in simplicity for the Gospel truths, and let us note here the four basic foundation blocks on which the subject of redemption is built:-

1. Adam was offered immortality as a reward for perfect obedience, but failed.
2. Adam was then offered immortality as a reward for faith.
3. We, too, are offered immortality as a reward for faith.
4. Jesus Christ, our Redeemer, was offered immortality as a reward for perfect obedience, and He did not fail.

Let us hold these observations secure in our minds as we build, for there is no scripture which contradicts these facts. Turning now to the Second Point of View there have been incorporated here many assumptions and misapplied scriptures and naturally numerous questions will be raised by the enquiring mind and here are just a few questions together with suggested answers:-

Q. If we are forgiven a debt then we are no longer required to pay the debt and if we are required to pay the debt then it follows that we have not been forgiven it. How then did God forgive Adam his sin and still require him to pay the price?

A. Adam's death was not his punishment. Natural death is due to being made mortal, i.e. natural.

Q. What other state was Adam made in if he was not made mortal nor immortal?

A. There is no other state mentioned in scripture besides mortal and immortal, and we do not need to invent one.

Q. Where in scripture is mortality shown to be the punishment for sin?

A. Nowhere! Where death was inflicted as a punishment for sin it was always a violent putting to death.

Q. How could anyone who had no right to his own life give it as a ransom price to buy himself, let alone others?

A. To say Jesus Christ had to be His own Redeemer is to deny the scripture teaching of Redemption which requires one should take the place of another. (Gen. 22:15)

Q. How can Redemption be still future?

A. To be forgiven is to be saved and that is here and now. “God hath saved us and called us with a holy calling”. 2 Tim 1:9. “We have now received the Atonement”. Rom 5:11. But eternal life is the gift of God. It is the fulness of our redemption,” our deliverance from corruption.

There are so many more questions which must be asked and answers must be found, but surely it isn’t enough just to know the answers. Real satisfaction comes from knowing why it is the right answer.

Christadelphian theologians are not infallible and the doctrines not in keeping with the scriptures will be set aside by many and only open discussion can clear away the fog of unreason and lead to mutual understanding.

So “let us be of those who grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

Sincerely your brother in the One Hope of our calling, Russell Gregory.

Explanatory Foreword: When this article was first written, in 1988, I was unaware of the different understandings of the word ‘mortal.’ I have left this article as originally written but would ask readers to read ‘corruptible’ wherever they see ‘mortal’ and ‘incorruptible’ where they see ‘immortal’ as I now believe this would be more acceptable. – Author. (Sept. 2015)

Behold The Lamb Of God

A Synopsis of the Two Points of View Regarding The Atonement

First Point of View

Adam was created a mortal being and placed in the Garden of Eden with one commandment which to disobey meant death. It is reasonable to say that to obey meant life, and as he was a mortal being this would mean a change, at some time to immortality. “It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.” 1 Cor 15:14.

Adam disobeyed God and lost his opportunity of the reward of immortality for perfect obedience and now one of two things could happen:

- 1) Adam could be put to death (“in the day thou eatest thereof”...) or,
- 2) Adam could be released from the death sentence.

If Adam had been put to death for his sin there would have been no offspring of his to people the earth, so God released Adam from the sentence of death and gave him further opportunity of life eternal, but on other terms than for obedience - in short, it was by faith. Hebrews 11.

However, this release for Adam was only possible by an obedient person voluntarily offering himself to be put to death in his stead, and in due time this is what our Lord and Saviour did. “The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.” Rev. 15:8.

Now that Adam was released from the death sentence there was again one of two things which could follow:

- 1) Adam’s offspring could each in turn be given the same opportunity of eternal life as a reward for perfect obedience, or
- 2) Adam’s offspring could be rewarded with eternal life for showing the required faith.

If Adam's offspring were to be rewarded with eternal life for perfect obedience and failed in that obedience as did Adam, it would mean someone, an obedient person, would be required to die in place of each and every sinner-in order that the sinner be given further opportunity of reward for faith. Quite clearly this would be most unsatisfactory, so Adam's offspring were born into the same condition as Adam now was, requiring faith as the basis of their reward. Hereby is sin imputed to all born of the will of the flesh, i.e. counted as though sinners.

Now it was necessary for God to provide someone who was not under this condition of imputed sin but under the same condition as was Adam before he sinned, where perfect obedience was required ... and because "God so loved the world... He gave His only begotten Son" (John 5:16) to die in Adam's stead. Our Lord and Saviour, unlike the rest of the human race, was born of the will of His Father and never lost His inheritance of life for evermore. However, immediately before receiving immortality from His Father He offered Himself as the Lamb of God, without spot or blemish, to take Adam's place. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." John 12:24.

Jesus Christ, by taking Adam's place in death became the Saviour of all men, the entire human race, but not as Saviour providing eternal life for all, but providing our present mortal life, which we could not have had if Adam had not been released from the death sentence. Now, by the grace of God, we have the opportunity of immortality, thanks to Jesus Christ our Saviour. It is into this understanding we need to be baptised. Our present mortal life is our redeemed life and eternal life is the deliverance from mortality for the faithful when "this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor 15:55) at the resurrection.

Second Point of View

When Adam and Eve ate of the forbidden fruit -

"they were immediately aware of a change. They were defiled, alienated from God by their wicked works; the process of mortification commenced . . . That change which they immediately noticed as they took and ate of the fruit in disobedience of God's command was to be confirmed in their subsequent daily experiences, seeing on the face and in the body of their companion the unmistakable signs of decay" - (Extract from the Editorial of the Christadelphian Magazine June 1987).

"Sin then, became and physical property of the flesh of the human race and mortality, that is eventual death, whenever and however it occurs is the punishment, for sin. (it also follows that the death of the innocent child is the result of this imputed sin of Adam for in Adam all die".)

Adam and Eve were cursed and the ground was cursed for their sakes and the struggle for survival began. Their bodies suffered aches and pains and their hearts suffered sorrow and disappointment. Their progeny also were likewise afflicted for all these passed upon them until each in turn perished and returned to the dust of the ground from which the Lord God had formed them. Thus the breach of God's law commenced the train of inevitable consequences for every member of the human race. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin..." This sin of Adam now became the imputed sin which passed upon all for "the scripture hath concluded all under sin ..." Perfect obedience, even if it were possible, cannot give life because of imputed sin which requires the death of the sinner and perfect obedience is not possible because our mortal bodies are the cause of sin driving our natural tendencies against the will of God. Our flesh is unclean, filthy, defiled and in need of purging and requires atoning for.

However, in His great love for His creatures God formed a plan of salvation which would break this awful train of events which leads to oblivion and by sending His Son into the world He provided the means of escape for those with faith, for whosoever believeth in Him might not perish but have everlasting life. And so it was that Jesus was born of a woman and made in the likeness of sinful flesh.

He bore all our infirmities and was tempted in all points like as we are yet, as Son of God He was specially equipped to overcome every temptation to sin and He lived, a life in perfect harmony with His Father and thereby overcame sin in the flesh.

Jesus came in the same condemned sinful flesh as is common to all and was under the law as were all the Jews and because He too was of defiled flesh it was necessary for Him to die for Himself as well as for all the faithful. He who knew no sin was made sin for us by being obedient unto the death on the Cross for had not Jesus died on the Cross He would have died at some time as an actual transgressor never to rise again, and we too would have no hope. But Jesus lived a life of perfect obedience and it was because of this that His Father raised Him from the dead without allowing His body to see corruption and then changed His body into a glorious body after the resurrection.

Furthermore, Jesus death on the Cross was representative of the death we all deserve in the sight of God for we are all sinners and this we acknowledge is our position when we associate ourselves with Jesus death in the waters of baptism in obedience to His command. We are thus buried with Him in symbol and like as Jesus rose again from the dead we rise from the waters of baptism to newness of life in Him with the hope of sharing in His glory upon His return to establish His Kingdom on earth."

Letter to Brother Phil Parry:

Dear Phil and Rene, Thank you for your letter of 16th with the news of the death of R. Cox a school mate of ours. We hear too that Sister E. Latham died recently, the one unfortunately without hope of resurrection but the other with the sure and certain hope of rising again.

You certainly spent some time in writing those letters of 11/10/87 and of 16/1/88 trying to convince us of your interpretation of Scripture, but to no avail for you start from a false premise that Adam was created mortal. If this were so then death could not be a punishment when he sinned - disobeyed the commandments of God. Yet the Bible tells us the wages of sin is death the gift of God is eternal life thro' Christ Jesus. You state that the providing of an animal to clothe their naked bodies was a substitute, it doesn't say so, what it does say it was to cover their nakedness instead of their fig leaf covering; a camouflage, of their own making. It was provided by the angels and not by Adam as a sacrifice for Sin - disobedience. The animal would have to be consumed with fire with the fat thereof as an offering (sin) to God. It was killed by the angel not by Adam as Mr. Andrew Wilson states in your booklet page 31. I was recently speaking to Bro. John Harley of Lincoln meeting and he asked to see your booklet, "Too true to be new" which he has now returned with the following note.

"It follows the pattern of all their writings, attacking persons rather than examining the Scriptural evidence. This only expresses the weakness of their doctrine. When Bro. Fred Barling wrote his "Redemption in Christ" there was never a name mentioned, only the passages carefully examined and refuted."

John has a relative who is of the Nazarene Fellowship and has had discussions with her over many years without, converting her. So Phil I cannot accept that death for the human race is natural, that this was the purpose of the Almighty in the beginning, the evidence of scripture is that by man came death, and that it is man's greatest enemy finally to be eradicated at the end of the Millenium.

I would rather believe the words of Paul's 'wholly inspired word of God' when the prophecies of Christ handing over the Kingdom to His Father, a Kingdom of immortals like the angels to die no more, sin and death passed for ever. And when he tells us by one man (Adam) sin entered into the world and death by sin and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned. For by one man's disobedience many were made sinners (Adam) so by the obedience of one (Christ) shall many be made righteous.

You say that if Christ was not a substitute then he ought not to have risen - Christ by his sinless life, his willing obedience to His Father even to the death upon the cross put there by sinful men was accepted by God as the perfect sacrifice for the sins of all those who had and have faith in him. God giving us the assurance by raising him from the dead and setting him at His right hand in Heaven as the Mediator and Great High Priest on behalf of believers. You read Acts chapters 2 and 3 and you will not find the idea of substitution mentioned once, nor of any legal transaction, but obedience, faith, repentance, baptism into the saving name, breaking of bread, waiting for the promised time of Jesus' return.

Again you say Adam was made son of God at his creation - where might you find evidence for this? There is only one Son of God, Jesus the only begotten Son of God (John chapter 3).

Adam was created not begotten and born in the usual way. What do you mean by Jesus' blood came direct from God? God is a Spirit not flesh and blood. Jesus was born of Mary a virgin by the power of God acting upon her seed in her womb; Joseph had no part in the begettal. The birth of Jesus was as any normal baby and under the Law of God through Moses had to provide a burnt offering and a sin offering for her cleansing because of the blood which was shed during the birth. His mother being poor could only afford a pair of doves or pigeons. Her genealogy is traced back to Adam and Abel the son who was begotten after the fall, a Mortal being energised by blood. Blood in the Bible is used for 'life' for this maintains life and thought in a person. I don't think we are told in Scripture that Jesus' blood was different from anyone else. It was precious with regard to the life it sustained, a life governed by His mind always in tune with the purpose of God his Father.

He had direct communication with His Father in a way none of us can, even though we have the privilege of prayer. He could communicate and have an answer direct as He did when raising Lazarus from the dead, and in the Garden of Gethsemane where an angel strengthened him.(Luke 22). In His prayer in John chapter 16 v 17 where, as He contemplated the crucifixion before Him, could say:- "Yet I am not alone because the Father is with me". No man could say this but He who was the Son of God. Although He was mortal as other men and could be tempted in all points as we are, and beyond what we can be tempted for He had the Holy Spirit gifts beyond measure and was tempted to use them for His own benefit. But He was strong in His resolve to do His Father's will and answered the great trial with words of Scripture, "it is written". The desires of the flesh was repulsed so he could say which of you convinces me of sin. But we must remember that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God and so in Jesus' case He had to die, or have His nature changed. He had identified Himself with mankind by being baptised of John "thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness". But he had a real, not only symbolic, death to die that He might be obedient unto His Father even to the death on the cross, that God might exalt Him and give Him a name above every name the Saviour Christ.

As I wrote before Jesus had to die, we don't necessarily so if we have undergone the symbolic death of baptism into Christ, but we must all be changed (I Cor. 15) for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God". I think you are all at sea in your next point - point and I would ask you to whom did God offer up the crucified Jesus? The devil with a capital D? for if so you are very much astray from the Truth. God allowed wicked men to take and wrongfully convict Him of blasphemy because He said he was the Son of God, and when that failed to convince Pilate, changed to the charge that He said He was a king and therefore a challenge to Caesar. And although Pilate knew that Jesus at that time was no threat to Caesar and said "I find no fault in Him" yet to appease the crowd he released unto them Barabbas and delivered Jesus to be crucified.

Here is the first reason for Christ's death. That might be manifested the evil of mankind, the sinfulness which is inherent in mortal man - in human nature that it would fail to recognise a good and just person and have him put to death as an animal. This they did to the sinless Son of God and shows what they would have done to God if it were possible. This is the result of knowing good and evil, Adam and his descendants choose evil, and the sentence of death was their just deserts. When we read and stop to think of the evil that was done to Jesus - the taunts, the blasphemy, the cruelty of hanging Him on a cross, the humiliating position of His nakedness in full view of the people including the women, His friends, unable to relieve Himself without making a spectacle, we wonder at the cry of forgiveness "Father forgive them for they know not what they do".

We join with the Gentile centurion in glorifying God and saying certainly this was a righteous man. Not a bone was broken, but His side was pierced, His body saw no corruption, but was carefully laid in a rich man's tomb, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled. On the third day He rose from the dead by the power of God. Showing that it was "impossible for the grave to hold him" Peter's words.

For He was righteous, and God triumphed over wicked men - there was nobody there. God raised Him. Jesus had risen from the dead, given everlasting life and a place at God's right hand in Heaven where He is our Mediator and Great High Priest, one day to return to this earth as a priest after the order of Melchizedek king/priest to rule from David's throne.

By faith we are saved, as we believe what God accomplished in Jesus our Lord and Saviour, and our faith is counted to us for righteousness - Christ's righteousness imputed unto us - even as Abram's was and the worthies and true believers of all ages. Without faith it is impossible to please God.

Abraham believed God (His promises etc.) and it was counted to him for righteousness. "Blessed are they whose 'iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered.'" Romans 4 and many, many, many more references which you must know. By His death and resurrection He took the Law of Moses out of the way, "nailing it to his cross" as Paul dramatically puts it. The veil of the temple at Jerusalem was rent miraculously from the top to the bottom so that the services of the Holy Place could no longer be operated. Jesus has entered into the Holy of Holies, into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; High Priest and mediator. Hebrews 9.24. But He didn't take His blood into Heaven, but His perfect obedience in "life and His sacrificial death." He entered in once into the Holy Place having obtained eternal redemption.

In any case He could not have taken His literal blood into Heaven. That was shed on the ground at Calvary. So your idea of a ransom is buried in the dust! Jesus was cursed by the Law of Moses in the manner of His death being hung upon a cross and the prophet Isaiah 55 v 4 "He was bruised for our iniquities" and taken up by Peter 1st epistle 2 v 24. "By whose stripes we are healed".

Those men you mentioned Abel, Seth, Abraham etc. were upright men but not perfect as was the Lord Jesus, but by their faith in the promised all righteous One they died in faith not having received the fulfillment of the Promises from God (but will one day) that they without us should not be made perfect - granted immortality.

Well Phil I am bringing this to a close. My advice to you is do what those believers at Ephesus did. Brought their books and burned them. Acts chapter 19. So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed. I shall in any case keep praying for you both.

Your sincere friends, Elsie and Cyril.

In reply to the foregoing letter Bro. Parry wrote as follows: -.

Dear Cyril and Elsie,

Greetings in the Name of Him who died, the Just for the unjust, to bring us to God. You will notice I commenced my letter to you by using the terms of the Apostle which describes the very substitutionary death of the Saviour and its important significance and mission - the Just for (in place of) the unjust, to bring us to God. Acceptance of this fact on your part would not necessitate any more explanation from me except to thank you for your reply to my former correspondence. Sad to say, I am fully aware of the perverted ideas and interpretations which have been made out of this term "Substitution" because of erroneous doctrines both in the Apostate Church of Rome and her daughters, and in Christadelphianism which has erred on the side of the former, in thinking the Apostate view is held by us and is not.

Regarding both the deceased people mentioned, the one having the Hope of resurrection and the other not, as you say I would add that according to the B.A.S.F. idea of the judgment-seat, every

Christadelphian will rise from the dead because of his or her professed responsibility to judgment to determine acceptance for eternal life in the Kingdom of God. So I would not consider this apparent uncertainty as a Lively Hope - and it is not the Resurrection Paul strived to attain with those also of whom he spoke who had suffered much the same as our Lord, that they might obtain a better resurrection, (The dead raised incorruptible as Jesus was and the living faithful changed).

If natural death is the penalty for sin and personal offences, why another judgment and another of death for personal offences? Add to this the symbolic death of Baptism and you have the three deaths to explain if you are to harmonise with Scripture. The mistake, as we have always maintained, is the universal and mistaken view that natural death came by Adam's sin and that this was Paul's teaching in Romans chapter 5 when in fact it is not.

Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts formerly believed Adam was created corruptible and capable of dying (but not by reason of breach or violation of Divine Law). You refuse to believe their testimony - your own Pioneers! Why? Because of the Christadelphian Apostasy which entered in before Edward Turney's lecture opposing it, even as the Roman Apostasy entered the early Church founded by Jesus and His Apostles. Have you never wondered why all the divisions have occurred throughout Christadelphian history since Dr. Thomas' time? It is because much of the truth he held was corrupted by people with invented theories of defiled-nature and changed flesh causing a bias and increased tendency toward disobedience when in fact Adam sinned while in the very good nature of his creation without any of the additives or alterations that are so unscripturally stated in Christadelphian doctrine and literature to mean a literal element or sin-compound, as if the penalty of the Law was not sufficient; you have to make Adam and his consequent posterity inevitable sinners, unable to do the will of God even when brought under it by enlightenment. Not even Dr. Thomas was immune from some of these fantasies, but we do give him credit for some important truths he expressed and which Christadelphians reject.

Well Cyril, there was no need for all the labour you have spent in writing things I already knew after 17 years as a Christadelphian zealous of the doctrines, so I would not regard them as altogether wasted because I have a more knowledgeable background of what you believe than what you and your members have of what the Nazarene Fellowship believes and teaches, because of the suppression in your ranks of our literature which may have been personal in some instances because those persons have asked for it and deserved it. In the Christadelphian Intelligence section the reports in many cases are dishonest and subtle in regard to disfellowship; I could quote you a very glaring one but I will refrain for the time being, but you have already read of one in "Two True to be New" of two Arranging Brethren of diverse beliefs - one in opposition and ignorant of his qualification to judge righteously, and with no desire to that end - the other in complete agreement, and had been over a period of 30 years, so the verdict (reason) had to be a lie - reason for disfellowship - absence from the meeting and consequently the rank and file in total ignorance of why?

In our own case at Ellwood we resigned, not being permitted to give a reason for our decision to Arranging Brethren or the whole Ecclesia but we would not have resigned if all that was believed and taught was Truth, especially the generally accepted doctrine of Natural death as the penalty for sin and the Christadelphian confused diversified doctrine of the "Atonement" which it still is.

We did not renounce The Faith, we renounced the errors in Christadelphian doctrine taught by the precepts of men. Therefore I am not trying to convince you of my interpretation of scripture, but as the Spirit teacheth, comparing Spiritual things with Spiritual. You say, "if Adam was corruptible at creation (Dr. T. and R.R. say so), death could not be a punishment when he sinned". Why Not? Would not the shedding of his blood have caused death? Of course it would, and this was the mode of death he had incurred and which by God's Love and Mercy he was spared (not forgiven) or the life-blood of the type and the antitype (Jesus) would then have been unnecessary.

Adam recognised this by taking off the fig leaf covering and exposing the figurative nakedness of his sin and putting on the coats of skins provided by God through the shedding of the blood of the animal of His choice. The description of that choice was taught evidently to Cain and Abel onwards, in the

giving of the Law to Moses – the significance pointing to one who was never amenable to The Law of Sin and Death - God's Lamb, God's Possession, God's Gift; that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

To be “in Adam” is by enlightenment (not by physical descent) an awareness of being sold under sin and consequently under the Law of Sin and Death, through the federal principle God has introduced whereby at the stage of enlightenment men can avail themselves of His Provision of transferring from the One Federal constitution of Sin to the Federal Head of the Constitution of Righteousness in Christ. There is no change of nature involved in this operation of obedience and Faith, as Paul teaches in Romans chapter 5 where he speaks of the Death that came by Sin which is removable as a sentence, by association with that death Jesus suffered, the Just for the unjust to bring us to God, - reconciliation does not and never has in God’s Book required a change of nature but a change of relationship - “Now are we the Sons of God” I John 5:2. We must understand that a corruptible human race of people were in Adam’s loins before he sinned but the reign of death Paul refers to in Romans chapter 5 did not start until he sinned and this reign was an imputed and legal one God concluded all members of the Adamic body as involved in, but not guilty of his sin, so that all had the opportunity of being involved as the members of the body of Christ through his one righteousness, and taken out if his side, a Bride to be presented unto him from God, as Eve was to Adam. But as Paul says “First that which is natural then that which is Spiritual”, “The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a life giving Spirit”. (At his resurrection).

You say the Bible teaches this and the Bible teaches that, certainly - but if we take it out of its context it can teach us anything we want it to. Example, when you quote from it, “The wages of Sin is death etc”, it was Paul who said this, but it applied only to the servants of Sin and neither Paul or the believers he was addressing were in this category; it cancels out therefore that he was speaking of natural death common to all because even the righteous are partakers of natural death and Romans chapter 6 states clearly and definitely that they were no longer serving Sin and could not expect Sin’s Wages but God’s free gift of Eternal Life through Jesus Christ and not of works but by faith. Paul was faithful to the words of Jesus “No man can serve two masters,” it cannot be true therefore that Paul taught or meant such a thing in Romans chapter 7 and even Dr. Thomas admitted that in this chapter Paul was talking retrospectively of himself as an unregenerated Jew under the Law unconverted to Christ. We have quoted Dr. Adam Clarke who writes in the same vein to those who have wrested this chapter out of context in support of the doctrine of changed flesh. Sin in the flesh, condemned nature, by the Apostate Rome and her supporters including Christadelphians. and he states it is shameful that these theories should have crept into the Church or remained there. But crept in they did even into the minds of Dr. Thomas and R.Roberts the Christadelphian pioneers and these were some of the false theories that Edward Turney endeavoured to eradicate against much opposition from Robert Roberts whose members in various districts were beginning to see the Light.

You should read “The Sacrifice of Christ” by E. Turney if you have not already, I can supply it to prove who is misrepresented. I presume you would agree that the old Testament was written in the Hebrew language. Why not accept then what “Surely Die” really means after reading Genesis chapter 20 verse 7; I Kings chapter 2 verse 9 and verses 56-46; Ezekiel chapter 18; Numbers chapter 26 verse 65 and many more in the concordance? There are several kinds of death in the Bible but they have to be qualified and identified from the context; for example, there are two deaths mentioned in the statement of Jesus, “Let the dead bury their dead” one was physically dead and the other “legally dead” (by the offence of one) although physically alive by reason of descent from corruptible parents. We are taught in Numbers 16 v 29 and Num. 23 v 10 the difference between natural death or the common death of all men, and the death by sin or opposition to God.

In regard to the gainsaying of Koran, Dathan and Abiram, Moses declared to the people, “if these men die the common death of all men etc., then the Lord hath not sent me.” You know what happened, they died the death of the wicked, an inflicted death. Now compare Balaam’s statement in Numbers 23 v 10, “Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.” Adam’s debt to the Law he had violated, was his natural life or existence in the day of that violation, there was no provision in that Law for forgiveness and neither could Adam redeem himself - his natural life was the Debt to the Law

but God had foreseen One who would not only justify God's Righteousness in condemning Adam's Sin, but in paying Adam's debt to the Law, would uphold the justice appertaining thereto. Jesus in willingly laying down His life on the Cross (by the shedding of blood) gave the equivalent life forfeited to the Law by Adam, but Jesus did not sacrifice His character; this was perpetuated after His resurrection in Spirit Nature for the commencement of His work as High Priest in Heaven an impossibility without character. It was life Adam forfeited (not character) and it was life Jesus laid down. "The Son of man came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a Ransom for many." You ask me "To whom was the ransom paid - to the devil with a capital D"? I answer in harmony with the scriptures and in Dr. Thomas's statement of the scriptural meaning of Redemption (Eureka vol. 1 pp. 20,21) "Redemption means to Buy Back. Hence it is Release for a Ransom. All who become God's servants are therefore, released from a former Lord by Purchase. The purchaser is God and the Price, or ransom paid, is the precious blood of Christ: as of a lamb without Blemish, even without Spot."

The Apostle Peter confirms this - "Ye have been bought with a price." Now let the Highest speak through His Word. Isaiah 53, "The Lord hath laid on him (not in him) the iniquity of us all." "For God so loved the world that He gave His Only Begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life." Ask yourself or your own members as to whom God Gave His Son, was it not to the very Master or Lord of the Constitution of Sin personified in that rabble you have described and rightly so, as wicked men and false witnesses and mockers, delighting in this spectacle of shame of a righteous man? Did not Adam sell himself to 'Sin' as personified in all that is contrary and opposed to the will of God - so that all in his loins were also alienated from God and sold under 'Sin' as a Bond--master, therefore needing to be purchased also?

Why do you emphasise all this wickedness of men and condemn them in crucifying Jesus yet accept the writings of men such as W.F.Barling, A.Norris and many others plus Clause XII of the B.A.S.F., which teaches that there was no injustice in His death, when at the same time (if He had prayed for them), His Father would have given Him twelve legions of Angels to deliver Him from these wicked people? Why do you state that the Law of Moses cursed Jesus when it did nothing of the kind? Certainly He was made a curse, but He was not cursed as a law-breaker.

Jesus accepted willingly the Sin of the World to be laid on him in order that he might take it away - in the words of John the Baptist. That sin was laid on Him before He was nailed to the tree, for He had prayed to His Father if it be possible, let this cup pass from me (but He was willing to drink it for you and me) because this was God's scheme of Redemption for the human race, nevertheless, not my will but Thine be done. It was a prayer with strong crying and tears to Him that was able to save Him from death. God does not suffer any of His children to be tried above what they are able to bear and will always make a way of escape in the course of the trial that they might exercise their own free will either way they choose. Jesus chose to die for us, the Just for the unjust to bring us to God.

It is foolish to take Paul's words at their face value in Galatians chapter 3 verse 13 for it is obvious from his words, "As it is written" he expects people to know and understand where he is quoting from and what is written. He was quoting from Deut. 21:23, "And if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be to be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree: His body shall not remain all night (upon the tree, but thou shall in any wise bury him that day; (for he that is hanged is accursed of God) that thy land be not defiled.....etc." Did Jesus commit a sin worthy of death? Was He the passive criminal you and your leaders have tried to make Him out to be in taking the Scripture and Paul's statement out of context?

Allow me to quote the words of one of your deceased Brethren who had sought by much labour to correct the errors among his members contemporary with him but to no avail. He was tired of the manipulation and juggling that was going on in reference to Jesus being hanged, as follows, "He was (Dr. Thomas wrote) brought under the curse by an act of obedience; or by what was done to him, and thus Cursed by the law without transgressing it." He was evidently disgusted himself with such absurd juggling and declared, "it does not necessarily follow that hanging on a tree was a breach of the law. It does not say that. If it were so, the law would be broken, and in that case it would place Christ in the same position as those who were guilty of all." It is well known that Christadelphian writers have

manipulated and juggled with scripture in an endeavour to put Jesus under a Double Curse – the curse of Adam's so-called condemned nature, and the curse of the Mosaic Law, and it is all due to their false premises and building on the doctrine of original-sin. God does not need anyone to juggle or manipulate His Word in order to justify or excuse Him in allowing Jesus to die when Jesus Himself offered Himself to God as the Lamb to take away the Sin of the world, "I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." He had no power to lay down His life for others if He was cursed by the Law - but the power was in Himself - His life was free of Adamic alienation and Sin Penalty. He honoured the Law, how then could it curse him? It could not.

Paul speaking to former Jews said, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law by being made a curse." In the same way Paul said of God's offering of His Son at 33½ yrs. of age, "He who knew no sin, He hath made to be Sin (sin offering) 'for us', that we might be made God's Righteousness in him." It was the curse of our alienation by Adamic-Sin and the curse of those who continued not in all things written in the book of the Law to do them and whose sin could not be taken away by the blood of bulls and goats, - that was laid on Him when He was lifted up to draw men unto Him for healing and life as with the brazen image of the serpent There is life for a look at the crucified one. But not if he was cursed - for there would be noRighteousness of God in being 'in him'; we would still be in Adamic alienation and Bondage.

Consider the following: -

Jesus, Made a curse for us Jews no longer under the Law, but redeemed

Jesus, Made a sin-offering for us. We are made Righteous "in him".

Jesus, Made me free from the Law of Sin and Death through the Law of the Spirit, of life in Christ (Paul).

Please note the use of the word 'Made', three times, and "a threefold cord is not easily broken", and nowhere is the flesh changed – only its ownership.

In concluding my comments on the above points (I could write more), I will quote the words of the same deceased member of your Body though he rejected your doctrine at the latter end but was too exhausted physically and mentally to do anything more about it. **Listen** : - "Bloodshedding has no mechanical effect upon the nature, and to talk of Christ's Sin-Nature being cleansed by His own blood, is to talk phrases, a mixture of things that differ." What a glorious pronouncement against such erroneous theories. It was this false theory expressed by the speaker on a Sunday afternoon meeting that hurried our resignations.

Listen again: - The same writer "Make His death a penalty due to Himself, personally, and you destroy both aspects of this loving obedience, for there can be no virtue whatever in submitting to a penalty legally due to oneself." This brings me to the points you raise about Jesus not carrying His blood into Heaven. I do not believe such a thing and I hope you are not inferring that I do. Your statement reads -

"But he didn't take his blood into heaven but his perfect obedience in life and his sacrificial death. He entered in once into the Holy Place having obtained eternal redemption,"

(I note you leave out 'for us'. You then continue),

"In any case he could not have taken his literal blood into Heaven, that was shed on the ground at Calvary. So your idea of a Ransom is buried in the dust!"

Poor Dr. Thomas. Thus speaking you reproach him also, your own pioneer; I must correct you here. Jesus took into Heaven the character developed in life for his Priesthood for us, but He did not, and could not take His sacrificial death (natural life in the blood) into Heaven. It was the Sin Power who took this life, and this was 'Sin' exacting its penalty, LIFE, from One who was sinless. Why? Because one who was guilty had gone free (Adam). Jesus was an innocent man receiving voluntarily the wages of sin - death. Why? Because the one who had earned them would have perished (and us with him) if he had received them himself. Certainly those wicked men had no further use of the body of Jesus, they had

deprived it of life and He, to their minds, could not heap any more scorn and condemnation upon them, they knew not the expediency of His death, they thought eternal life was possible by the works of the Law without faith, and without Christ's death to confirm the promises to the fathers.

I seem to detect that you are trying to draw a parallel between the High Priest under the Law and Jesus, but if you get your priorities right and remember what Jesus said "I am the Way - no man can come unto the Father but by me," you will realise that access into the Holy of Holies was through the vail and not without blood, which the Priest had obtained outside the Tabernacle from the victim; previously having offered a sacrifice for his own sins before being a fit person to offer for the people. Two sacrifices here - not one. The High Priest was not the victim, he himself needed a conscience cleansing through the type. Jesus was not a Priest, for as the writer says in Hebrews chapter 8 "if he were on earth he could not be a Priest." No, Jesus was the antitypical victim, the Lamb of God, who suffered without the gate and in so doing abolished the vail and opened the New and Living way into the presence of God for us both Jews and Gentiles that Way, nevertheless, having to be acknowledged by faith in His shed blood, and thereby both Jews and Gentiles may have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

This is beautifully expressed by the Apostle in Eph. ch. 2 vss 11 P 2. We must always bear in mind that God could have spared His Son the suffering and the death of the cross if Jesus had willed it otherwise. So the Apostle declares in Rom. ch. 8 vss. 51 and 52 "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His Own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall He not with him also freely give us all things"? You may probably have read the booklet "Redemption in Christ", or at least the articles with that title in the Christadelphian, February to October 1946, but perhaps you have not read the reply to them by E. Brady and F.J.Pearce entitled "My Life for the Sheep", where you would find much of what W.F.Barling wrote not only refuted from Scripture but exposing the weakness of his and your doctrine contrary to what your friend John Harley has stated. It seems quite probable to me that he has not read "My Life for the Sheep", or he would have been better informed and better equipped to form a judgment.

We only attack persons who are responsible for what they say themselves, but in doing so, we use the Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God, which does not destroy the person but the errors he is teaching in the Name of God. Paul attacked people by name and condemned them. I have spoken to the person John Harley refers to, with whom he has had discussion without convincing her, she is his niece and I am not surprised that he cannot convince her. Why does he think he ought to convince her when she discarded such false theories to which I have drawn your attention?

I would like you and John Harley to read an Article by her late father (he wrote many) and if neither of you are convinced of the Truth he states, then all I can say is that you are satisfied with your present state of society and confusion and have no intention of changing it. Our judgment of God is now, for what we believe as Truth, not what others say is Truth. Think on these things Cyril and Elsie.

I shall write no more unless requested.

Yours in Sincerity. Phil and Rene Parry.

Use Of The Tongue

Bro. Leo. Dreifuss,

When we study the Scriptures we find that people who lived at very different periods of time have had things in common. There comes to mind Hoses, Ezekiel and perhaps Jeremiah. Apart from each being a prophet, each one suffered at times for the inability to be able to speak, or to speak properly. Let us take the case of Moses first.

He was at the age of eighty, after having been a humble shepherd for the previous forty years, when God's call came to him to lead his brethren, the children of Israel, out of Egypt. He did not want to take on this task willingly. He tried initially to get out of it and to leave it to someone else. He said (Ex. 4:13) "O my Lord, send, I pray Thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send", but just before then, he said (Ex. 4:10) "O my Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore, nor since thou hast spoken unto thy servant, but I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue". But God did not accept this excuse. He first assured Moses that he would be with him, saying "Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shall say." And after Moses continued wavering God appointed his brother Aaron who, we are told, was a gifted speaker of a fluent tongue, to be his spokesman.

Let us next consider the case of Ezekiel. He was a symbol to the rebellious house of Israel, and as such had some seemingly very strange and disagreeable tasks to perform. And in the course of executing some of these tasks God actually caused him to be dumb, but when he had to speak, gave the power of speech back to him as long as required.

Now what can we learn from all this? We see that God controls the lives of his servants, and this includes us. How often do we shrink from a task which we know is our duty to do? And how often do we try to excuse ourselves by saying that we are not really gifted in this or that direction, so we don't mind somebody else having a go at it? We often, though on a smaller scale, put ourselves in the position of Moses when he was called. But note the reply of God. When God intends us to carry out a task. He creates circumstances that make it impossible for us to wriggle out of it. When the time arises he gives us the necessary strength and guidance, even to the point of overruling our handicaps.

And what of Jeremiah? When God called Jeremiah he like Moses, was not over keen to take on the mission. He said: (Jer. 1:6) "Ah, Lord God! behold, I cannot speak; for I am a child." If is not revealed whether like Moses he had an impediment of speech, or whether he merely meant that he was rather young, immature, and not a gifted speaker. It was a case very similar to that of Moses. "There was no escape. God promised to give him strength when he said "Behold I have put my words in thy mouth". (Jeremiah 1:9).

And there is the similar assurance of Christ to his disciples when He said: (Luke 21: 14-and 15), "Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer: for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay or resist".

So let us take heart and have faith that God will give us of his strength and guidance in times of need. We have been considering cases where people had to perform tasks for which they thought they were not suited, and how God at the time overruled their impediment to enable them to perform them. But let us not overlook to use our abilities and gifts in the service of the Master, and in helping our fellowmen. We all have our gifts, don't let us forget, as well as our weaknesses. Having just considered cases of speech impediments let us who can speak, use our tongues. We can use them to say a word of comfort to those in need, to introduce God's word as the opportunity arises, to mention just these.

In conclusion, let us mention Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist. His case was rather different from the others under consideration, in that his dumbness was brought on by his own disbelief of God's ability to perform what he said he would, though natural conditions were against it. But let us also note that his speech was restored as soon as he showed obedience to God by insisting that his son's name was to be John, against all traditions then in force. No doubt his dumbness proved a great lesson to him. And we can be quite sure that when his speech was restored, he most certainly used his tongue to praise God.

So let us do likewise in speaking up for God's word when necessary, able to give an answer for the hope that is in us.

Hope on. Hope on. Oh troubled head,
If Doubt and Fears o'ertake thee,
Remember that the Lord has said,
He will never forsake thee.

Have faith in God, the sun will shine,
Though dark the cloud may be today,
His heart hath planned your path and mine,
Have faith in God; have faith alway.

Continued from March

Jesus My Substitute.

This use of life in the abstract is objected to, from the fact that life in the abstract is all one. We freely grant this, and that God is the fountain. But we also recognise the fact that God has been pleased to distribute Life in portions. Hence we read of the ‘bundle’, and of those, His enemies whom He will ‘sling out’ (I Sam. xxv. 29).

Then C.C.Walker asks, “Could God be said to forgive sin, if He exact the utmost penalty? We answer, truly not. But we think we shall be able to prove that God is not the exactor. Even Wm. Grant is in advance of C.C.Walker on this score. He says, “It is not God who requires to be satisfied, but man.” We cherish this, coming from the other side. No; God is not the exactor, but ever the supplier of man’s needs. If He should mark iniquity, who should stand? God so loved the world that He gave, etc. (John iii. 16).

God was in Christ reconciling the world, not imputing or exacting. God commendeth His love towards us, etc. What manner of love He hath bestowed, etc. Even the late Dr. Thomas, the founder of Christadelphianism, exhibited a more rational conception than this. He says: “Redemption means to buy back, hence it is release for a ransom; all who become God’s servants are therefore released from a former Lord by purchase. The purchaser is God, and the price or ransom is the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot.” We defy the logical world to deny substitution from these premises.

Then Messrs. Walker and Grant ask: “Does justice substitute the innocent for the guilty?” We reply, not for an evil purpose, but in a case of redemption, by divine mercy it does. “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 towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. The Just for the unjust. Justice could not substitute the “guilty” for the guilty. Hence the weakness of the argument. Next, in spite of C.C.Walker’s attempt to refute substitution, on page 32 he says: “The command of the Father was, that Jesus should lay down his life by crucifixion as an exhibition for all time of what was due from God to man for sin.” We say this is substitution to the hilt, and we regret the orthodox wrath of God with a vengeance. We think we have shown that God is not the party who nurses wrath to keep it warm, not the party who is due man anything. The party due man is “that Lord on the other side,” of whom Dr. Thomas speaks.

When man became the servant of the Diabolos, he ceased to be the “servant of God,” consequently God was due man nothing. Seeing man left God, and preferred Diabolos for his master, he must expect the wages of the Devil. Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto righteousness? Well then, in C.C.Walker’s own terms: “If Christ endured what was due to man for sin, what shall we term the principle involved?” The only escape Christadelphians have from substitution here is that they say

Christ was under condemnation to death on His own account. Does this reply benefit their cause? Let us see. If we grant that Jesus had to be executed to pay His own debt, then we leave absolutely no balance with which to pay the debt of Messrs. Walker and Grant. What is the result? A complete dilemma. They are either false witnesses regarding Christ's debt, or they are themselves defrauders of the Law by wriggling through without payment. C.C.Walker seems cognisant of this, and attempts to escape the second horn. But he resorts to an ambiguous middle term. He says truly, when the substitute dies, the survivor escapes the penalty and lives; but he says - "It is not so with Jesus," and to support this denial with the semblance of Scripture, he says, "We have yet to do with the death of Jesus, so much so, that an apostle has said; I am crucified with Christ, buried with him in baptism." But one little question will expose the fallacy. Does every believer require, as Christ required, to undergo literal crucifixion? Now you see the blunder. C.C.Walker uses two totally distinct things as if they were identical and of equal legal value, viz., Christ's literal crucifixion, with Paul's symbol of it, thus clearly confounding the literal with the figurative. What a destructive argument it is, then, to deny substitution by trying to make it appear that we require to go through identically what Christ went through, when, on examination, we find that the symbol is all that is required at our hands! The very fact that the symbol is all that is required of the believer is of itself a sufficient proof of substitution. If Christ did not die the death I was due, then my baptism into that sacrificial death is a pure absurdity. But seeing that it is imperative I should be baptised into that death, then Christ is my substitute. Indeed, it is on this principle alone that animal sacrifice can be explained. From Eden to Gethsemane the sinner died symbolically in the death of the animal slain. Hence baptism into the sacrificial death of Christ has been indispensable from Gethsemane to the Kingdom of God. God has made an individual recognition of this fact, an indispensable preliminary to our acceptance of Him. But after this stage is reached it is incompatible with God's justice to allow any to become partakers of the Divine nature who shall wilfully persist in sin; such shall, at the tribunal of Christ, have merited the "second death." They were mercifully allowed to pass the "first death" in symbol, but for those who shall have merited the second death, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries. This is the death Jesus did not die instead of any one. (Hebrews chapter 10).

Is it matter for surprise then that as the dreadful hour approached, the lowly, sinless Jesus should sweat as it were great drops of blood, and pray: "O My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me?" Let us follow Him into the Garden of Gethsemane, where He was betrayed by one of His apostles, then denied by another, and forsaken by all. Now He is accused as a rebel and false prophet by the Jews, evil-entreated by the soldiers, hurried from the Chief Priest to Pilate, thence to Herod, from him back to Pilate again. Now He is blindfolded, buffeted, scourged, crowned with thorns, spit upon. Now He carries His own Cross through the city to Calvary. Now He is crucified naked. Is He not now in the condition of Adam after rebellion, and being clothed with the coats of skin? But for the joy set before Him He endured the Cross and despises the shame. Now God forsakes Him. Now He groans - "It is finished!" Now He bows His head and becomes silent in death. Now He is borne to the rich man's grave in the olive garden at the foot of Mount Olivet, where the dread silence of death is unbroken for three days! This is matter about which we ought rather to weep and pray than quarrel and denounce.

"JESUS MY SUBSTITUTE" - THANK GOD.

We are now confronted with a carefully selected list of passages, by both editors, where "for" means "on account of," and not "instead of." Thus, as they think, disposing of substitution. Now it is a simple matter to give instances where our English preposition "for" does not mean "in place of," from the fact that it has to do work for several Greek terms. But does this fact dispose of substitution? Let us see. How came it about that Jesus had to die "on account of" our sins? Why could not Messrs. Walker and Grant die "on account of" their own sins, seeing they reject a substitute? But if they could not, with redeeming effect, die "on account of" their own sins, have they strengthened their argument? The very reverse. Substitution is indisputably proved, not only in a different form of words. Now I Tim. ii.6 says, "He, having given Himself (the Greek word here) an equivalent, a corresponding price, a substitute, on behalf of all." Can Messrs Walker or Grant deny this? They cannot.

Well, Matthew xx. 28. "The Son of Man came, not to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many". Can they deny this? Listen. C.C.Walker says the Greek word may, indeed mean "in

place of'. Why then does he reject substitution? Then he goes on: "But it may also mean 'on account of, and is so used in Matthew xvii. 27. A piece of money, take that and give unto them for thee and me'".

Now we shall show that C.C. Walker could not possibly have selected a stronger Scripture against his contention, Jesus knew what He was saying when He used the appropriate word to represent it being as a ransom. If C.C.Walker will turn to Exodus xxx. 11-16, he will be furnished with painful confirmation of this. But there is something more in Matthew xvii. 27 that has not yet dawned on Christadelphians. The Master asked: "What thinkest thou, Simon? Of whom do the kings of the earth take tribute? Of their children, or of strangers?" Peter said unto Him: "Of strangers." Jesus saith unto him: "Then are the children free." What a powerful refutation of the Christadelphian doctrine: "That Jesus was under condemnation to death on His own account." "Then are the children free." Glorious news! How conclusively Jesus demonstrates here that He, as God's Son, might justly have claimed exemption from the payment of this ransom for His life. How Peter cherished this may be gathered from his subsequent reference: "Knowing that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold (Jesus' words 'That give unto them for thee and me'), but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot (Jesus' words : 'Then are the children free'))." We submit then, that this very Scripture from which Mr. Walker seeks support to refute substitution, proves substitution in a most remarkable manner.

When the premises are false, the best logician is the least safe guide.

There is a Greek word which means "in place of". This word is used in Matthew v. 8, an eye in place of an eye, and a tooth in place of a tooth. If the reader will examine the following list after the above example, he will be satisfied of the truth of this; Matt. xvii. 27; xx. 28; Mark viii. 37; x. 45; Luke xi. 11; Rom. xii. 17; I Thess. v. 15; I Tim. vi. 20; Heb. xii. 16; James iv. 15; I Peter i. 19; iii. 9. Indeed the original word used still retains strong substitutionary force, except, however, when it means "before" when used as a Latin prefix, it means "against", "opposition", "contending".

to be continued
