

# Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 166

## May 1997

In this Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 9 Christ was perfected. Wherein lay His previous imperfection?	Brother A.H.Broughton
Page 9 Brother Phil Parry writes;	
Page 13 A Christadelphian comments on our booklet “The Usage and Meaning of Muth Temuth and B’Yom	Brother Paul X
Page 14 Reply to above comments	Brother Ray Gregory
Page 15 A few thoughts from an early Circular Letter	Brother A. Hodges
Page 15 Letter to Dr. Thomas	Lancelot Burrus
Page 16 Reply by Dr. Thomas	
Page 19 Ecclesias and the Body of Christ	Brother Ray Gregory
Page 20 Excerpt from “A Christadelphian Lifts The Curse”	Brother Ernest Brady
Page 20 Freedom or Bondage	Brother G. Reeves

---

## Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Friends, Loving Greetings to you all,

Usually Sister Helen Brady writes the Editorial but having read my contribution to the Circular Letter she asked that I use it as the Editorial on this occasion.

In these jottings I have given free rein to some thoughts regarding correspondence, articles and events over the past year.

A little over twelve months ago we sent out invitations to many of our Christadelphian friends to request copies of The Netherton Debate. It was decided to do this because Christadelphians by and large have forgotten there are serious differences between some of their accepted doctrines and the Scriptures, and to persuade them to look again at the Gospel they preach. All who responded were put on our mailing list and have received copies of our Circular Letters and a few of our booklets.

Many wrote to us in due course and several letters were published in the Circular Letters with our replies but other letters were not answered in this way and I now wish to go through some of the points raised in these as well as commenting upon other literature which has come our way recently.

Several of you are in agreement with our understanding of the Atonement but others were not sure and asked for more information to study the subject in greater detail. Others sadly were hostile and even rude in their condemnation of our “trash,” one writing that “It is a matter of regret that your Fellowship is founded on unscriptural grounds.” Not surprisingly these writers made no attempt to give any form of support for their gratuitous statements. The attitude of such people makes it very difficult for those who may wish to discuss the subject in their own meetings as they immediately rouse the ire of the few who take authority upon themselves to be watchmen of the ecclesia and would do other peoples thinking for them. The most effective way these people have to foil our efforts is to tell lies about us.

Our objective as always is to put forward The Atonement in all its truth and honour; the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow (1 Peter 1:11), things angels, prophets and righteous men desired to look into, that we may rejoice in the light and be glad. There are not many things which God has asked us to give special attention to. Of course good Christian living is essential and this is emphasized by every shade of Christian sect and denomination and church; but God has specially invited us to reason with Him upon The Atonement when He said “Come now, and let us reason together... though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be made as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” This invitation to

understand the Atonement was given through the prophet Isaiah (chapter 1, verse 18). The importance of forgiveness cannot be overestimated. Before Jesus Christ sins were covered over, in Christ they are taken away, and the Atonement was the means of doing this. These matters we can and ought to reason out as God has invited us to do, but there are some who have said this subject is hard to understand or that it takes long spiritual experience; others that we are not meant to understand it. Such people doubt the word of their Creator, and without right knowledge and understanding of the Atonement we cannot preach the Gospel but a mere shadow of it at best. Our main purpose then is to set before our readers those things for which we should offer to our Heavenly Father the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving He so desires of us - things wherein we have good cause to worship God for His great love and longsuffering to us-ward.

We have spent much effort in refuting Christadelphian views on the Atonement and put forward what we believe to be Bible truth in its place. They claim to preach the Bible but upon this subject there can be no free discussion and Paul's words to Timothy "that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified" (1 Timothy 3:1,2) is disregarded. The word of the Lord does not have the free course in Christadelphian Ecclesias of which they would boast.

One of the concerns common in several letters we have received is that we are seen to enter into controversy - as if controversy was something wrong and to be avoided. But we say no, for it was and is the common lot of all who would put God first in their lives. Controversy for its own sake would be foolish but we will oppose wrong teaching for the sake of truth wherever and whenever we have opportunity and if this means entering into controversy, so be it. False teachers make controversy inevitable. Others have asked if it is possible to forget controversies and rather use our efforts in preaching the Gospel? Very well, but we ask what Gospel do they preach? Are they able to explain how the crucifixion of Jesus Christ saves the redeemed? Can the Gospel be preached without confronting false teachers? Are there not many false versions of the Gospel? We wish it were possible to preach the gospel without having to point out and correct the doctrines of men. So again we look at the life of Jesus Christ and how He was constantly at variance with those around Him, except for the few who received Him gladly; also the Apostle Paul and the other apostles and how they argued endlessly in order to advance the Gospel message. We can expect the same today. The alternative is to make ones message so watered down as to be ineffectual for its purpose. Consider for a moment how vapid are the T.V. programmes of worship. Where is the Gospel message in them? It is utterly lost. We must always be ready to give a reason for the hope within us and this includes disputing with false teachers. Prove all things and hold fast that which is good.

One correspondent who had never heard of the Nazarene Fellowship noted with dismay the general tone of our writings in reference to some Christadelphian beliefs. No doubt he was convinced Christadelphian's were right in all aspects of their teachings and it came as a bit of a shock to find that there are scriptural reasons for challenging some of them. There are very good reasons indeed and we are happy to enlighten any inquirer. Another correspondent said that our beliefs should be investigated and by this I believe he meant at an official level. I would assure all who feel as this writer, while we agree wholeheartedly that this longstanding controversy be dealt with openly and honestly in The Christadelphian Magazine and The Testimony Magazine and every other magazine published amongst Christadelphians, that all aspects be thoroughly investigated without prejudice, they are heading for a tough battle with the powers that be. The only way we see it is for each individual to let nothing stand in the way of finding the truth for him or herself.

The notion that we do not believe that Jesus Christ came in the flesh keeps cropping up. This lie was first devised by Robert Roberts and has been parroted ever since. Michael Ashton, in his essay "The Saving Work of Christ" (p 41 "Studies in the Statement of Faith") writes:

"Jesus' descent from Mary enabled Him to bear our condemnation, as Clause IX of the Statement of Faith declares. Six important scriptures are cited in support of this declaration making it even more amazing that so many who claim to be followers of Christ should deny its truth. This heresy was anticipated by John, who said categorically that the "spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh... is that spirit of antichrist.""

What is amazing is that any one can construe the passages cited to show that Jesus Christ or anyone else had condemned flesh. The mistranslation of Romans 8:3 is the starting point for this erroneous belief and Michael Ashton should not be in ignorance of it. Of the “six important scriptures” cited this is the only one which apparently gives any credence to the idea that Jesus Christ bore condemned nature and once this is supposed, three of the other five quotations can be misconstrued to lend support, namely Romans 1:3,4 and 2 Corinthians 5:21 and Hebrews 2:14-17 but should be understood for what they say. But what’s all this silliness that there are many today who do not believe Jesus Christ came in the flesh? I know of no one. Can Michael Ashton name a group or even an individual?

The Nazarene Fellowship has been confused by two correspondents, one from the U.S., with the Nazarene Church which is fairly numerous in the U.S. and who have a few churches in this country. This Nazarene Church dates back about a hundred years or so but I have no knowledge of their doctrines. The Nazarene Fellowship, however, has existed under this name for about fifty years though our beliefs go back to Dr. Thomas in the 1860’s and I suppose there have been Christadelphians in every decade since then who have shown that the doctrine of changed flesh at the fall is an unscriptural myth. A letter of Dr. Thomas’s dated 1855 is reproduced elsewhere in this Circular Letter.

“It is not that I am entirely opposed to all the views set out, but I find that the abrasive nature of the language of your contributors does not sit easily with your claim in your letter that you are mailing in the spirit of love.”

This sentiment has been expressed by two or three readers and we can understand their view, but please believe me when I say that we do all for the Love of God and Jesus Christ and this means loving our neighbours as ourselves. We are perhaps more aware than most that we make mistakes and may we be the first to admit to ours, and we take to heart the words of the hymn “They who fain would serve Thee best are conscious most of wrong within.” However, I am not about to alter other peoples writings and all I ask is that those who feel we have used hurtful language is please read and absorb the message and do try their utmost to avoid taking offence. I also ask them are we to be soft on false teachers?

Ought we not to “cry aloud and spare not.”? We are aware of the type of language some of our contributors use but feel it is in general well used and it is hard to avoid offending some. “Rebuke a wise man, and he will love thee” - Proverbs 9:8. “Faithful are the wounds of a friend” - Proverbs 27: 6. But “a scorner heareth not rebuke” - Proverbs 13:1. We are genuinely distressed to see professed followers of Christ feeding stones instead of bread to their followers. The Great Whore of Revelation 17 has many harlot daughters. All the denominations of Christendom without exception hold some of the false doctrines introduced by Rome, the doctrine of sin-in-the-flesh held by Christadelphians is one of them. Roman Catholics deny any connection with Revelation 17 of course but that doesn’t make them right and neither are the Christadelphians right in their doctrine of changed flesh. “Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues” – Revelation 18:4. This is not just a message to the true followers of Christ who are yet in the Roman Catholic Church but to true followers in all the offspring Churches also. If we use abrasive language it is for the good of others, not their hurt; we never use it in a malicious manner.

“There would be more hearing for and willingness to discuss views if you dropped emotive personal criticism.”

Emotive personal criticism is answered above but willingness to discuss the Atonement has never been my experience whilst for nearly forty years a member of the Christadelphian community. The Robert Roberts potted version of The Atonement alone is allowed to be discussed and however it is discussed agreement with it at the end of the day is expected of everyone. Any attempts to modify it are severely dealt with by attitudes of disgust that it should be doubted and if continued doubts are expressed then threats of excommunication follow; but willingness for meaningful discussion? Never in a hundred years.

My present position as editor of this Circular Letter is due to a chain of circumstances which I could not have foreseen following on from when, at a Questions Evening, I asked why Christ had to die for Himself. “The question should never have been put,” said one. “I am a watchmen of the ecclesia, and you are causing trouble” said another. “This subject has caused so much trouble I will not look into it,” said a third.

“Greater minds than mine have worked it out and I accept what they say,” said a fourth. “We should be addressing ourselves to more profitable spiritual matters to edification,” said a fifth. A sixth refused private discussion with me and answered that “all I want to hear from you is that you have come down off the fence into my field.” And all these people were responsible for turning me out. God forgive them for they know not what they do.

And was my question ever answered? No! No one attempted to put forward any Scripture teaching, though some feebly pointed me in the direction of the Christadelphian founders or even Christadelphian tradition. And then it was announced to the ecclesia that no one was to talk to me on the subject of the Atonement unless one of the managing brethren was also present! My duties as a presiding brother and organist were suspended and I was not even allowed to read on a Sunday morning, yet I continued to attend regularly for over six months until my resignation was demanded of me. I have heard of two brethren who have committed suicide as a result of being withdrawn from, and it does not surprise me in the least. When those you have always believed to be your closest friends for all your lifetime, to suddenly say they do not want your company any more is an evil of the Christadelphian system which it is hard to forgive. So much for willing discussion!

Another wrote, “The Nazarene Fellowship make it clear what they do not believe, but leaves what they do believe unclear and unexplained.”

This statement surely cannot be true. I can only think that this correspondent has glossed over our writings too quickly. We are at great pains to put forward the truth regarding Redemption, the reasons for it, and why those reasons are so important to our salvation, but we do not need to write volumes as do the Christadelphians who are believed for their much writing, for the truth can be expressed in few words because the subject matter is simple and short.

And another, “Thank you for what you have sent me but please don’t send any more as I don’t have time to read them.”

But it is a matter of priority. One cannot afford to miss out on the best things, and nothing comes better than a right understanding of why Christ died and how this tragic event brings us hope of salvation. One can spend one’s life ever learning and never able to come to an understanding of the truth.

Yet another, “Clearly there are problems about which you are deeply concerned and which generate controversy.”

Indeed, our great concern is that so many are not concerned about how the sacrifice of Christ saves them and assume He died as a Representative and not instead of us. As we have said, controversy does not worry us - it is to be expected and no follower of Christ can or should try to avoid it. Apathy kills the Spirit.

Again, “Can any of us say that we are completely free from error in what we believe? Clearly not. The Scriptures contain so many things there are bound to be some we misunderstand (How can we be sure of every symbol in Revelation for example?) In view of this, how much of the Gospel must we know correctly in order to be accounted a disciple of Jesus? Probably not as much as is listed in the B.A.S.F. and list of doctrines to be rejected.”

There is a twist in the last bit of this statement which makes the B.A.S.F. as powerful as the Scriptures. We do not dispute the various views expressed upon the Book of Revelation as if our salvation depended upon a right understanding of every symbol; we are considering weightier matters of the law; how Christ overcame the law of sin and death and has given us the law of life in its place. But the B.A.S.F. is the direct cause of so much trouble. In a recent note to me Brother John Stevenson pointed out that the B.A.S.F. was of course unknown to Dr. Thomas and he would certainly not have condoned it. I think the letter of Dr. Thomas printed in this C.L. shows this. We write extensively countering the errors inherent in the B.A.S.F. and list of doctrines to be rejected. It is my personal view that any creed or statement of faith is a fig-leaf covering as used by Adam and Eve. Genesis 3:7 – “And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sowed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.” Christadelphians,

along with all other denominations can say that their eyes were opened and they knew that they were naked so they “sewed together” a creed, which in the case of Christadelphians, the B.A.S.F., and made themselves aprons (margin - things to gird about), none of which are acceptable to our Creator. We know very well there are many Christadelphians who do not subscribe to the Statement of Faith and there are others who have grave reservations about parts of it; but those Christadelphians who proudly fly the B.A.S.F. as their flag and look up to it seem unaware of the shame they are exposing!

Footnote seen in the Logos Booklist – “Logos Books are recommended reading, providing sound instruction in accordance with our Statement of Faith.” Why not in accordance with Scripture?

In the same Logos magazine there was a letter from Tasmania under the heading of “Importance of Sound Doctrine and Fellowship,” from which we quote:-

“We wish to place on record our concern at the publication of the “Small Voice” magazine which challenges Christadelphian teaching on the nature of man and the nature and sacrifice of Christ. It is with dismay that we have read of the repudiation of doctrines which have been accepted unreservedly by the Ecclesias of the Central Fellowship since the days of Brethren John Thomas and Robert Roberts... It is of particular concern that some Brethren claiming the name “Christadelphian” whilst openly repudiating the basic doctrines forming the basis of our association... We believe the Truth is exclusive. We cannot associate with those who have renounced essentials of the One Faith nor can those who have ceased to share doctrines enjoy the blessings of fellowship... We would appeal to Brethren everywhere to reject the unsound teachings of the “Small Voice” magazine and to decline fellowship with them.”

John Nicholls, one of the editors of The Testimony magazine, is in favour of everyone believing that God created the heavens and the earth in six literal days of 24 hours. He wrote ;-

“The danger in believing as Brother Walker suggests is that evolutionary and philosophical ideas of man can be accommodated, and our conviction about God as the Originator and Creator of the universe (in six days) may be weakened.” (“The Testimony,” November 1996, page 418).

O blind faith! What is John Nicholls afraid of? He should be told that the truth sees no lion in the path.

Another correspondent criticized me for what I wrote at the end of the Netherton Debate Book regarding the way W.F.Barling used an example of secular life to counter an argument based on Moses writings. It was considered unfair of me to criticize W.F.Barling as the writer has long since past from the scene and cannot answer for himself. He had his chances. So let me turn to one still living.

When in my 20’s at a Youth Conference I eventually had the opportunity to ask A.D.Norris if he could explain to me why Christ had to die for Himself. I say eventually because he was always surrounded by an entourage and as we were staying at the same hotel I had to wait until he was retiring to bed before I could approach him. The reason he gave is that if Jesus Christ died instead of us then we should never die and He, Jesus Christ, should stay dead. I found later of course that this was what Dr. Thomas had said and A.D.Norris had copied it without thinking. The shallowness of this argument didn’t occur to me in my youth - it was not eternal life which Jesus gave up in order for us to have eternal life, but His natural life which He gave so that we could have our natural life, for our natural life is our redeemed life. It is strange that the simplicity of this view should so confuse an educated man; but to repeat an argument which had long ago been devised above all reason to show that Jesus Christ died as a Representative reveals poverty of understanding of the Word of God even to the extent of using the Word of God deceitfully, as of Romans 8:3, and the worst result of all is that it makes God a cruel monster. How can anyone be preaching the Gospel when they use such theorisings? I would plead with A.D.Norris to reason it out according to Scripture before it is too late.

There is a distinction to be made between God’s will and God’s purpose and this I believe has not been fully appreciated in Christadelphian circles. When Jesus Christ gave His life on the Cross for us He did His

father's will but it cannot be said of the Jews and Romans who put Him there that they did God's will. They did not for they were evil men. It can be said that God used their evil deed to our blessing and thus used it in His purpose.

If you or I were to use some instrument such as a knife or gun to kill someone we should be guilty of murder, but Clause XII of the B.A.S.F. states that Jesus Christ "was put to death by the Jews and Romans, who were, however, but instruments in the hands of God..." So the Jews and Romans were God's instruments with which He killed His own Son. No wonder Christadelphian leaders are forced to say that "There was no injustice in His death," "it was not wrong for Him to die," and "there hung the devil dead." What monstrous nonsense this is and a disgrace and shame to all who accept it. The crucifixion was a heinous crime and God did not do it - we did - Jesus Christ died to take away the sin of the world and is now our High Priest through whom we have forgiveness. God allowed His crucifixion because of His love for us and His desire to forgive us in order to give us the chance of life eternal through Jesus Christ. The twenty-seven passages of Scriptures referred to in Clause XII do not show flesh to be full of sin nor condemned nor that Jesus body was offered because of it. Clause XII must go.

I had occasion recently to recall many years ago listening to a promising and capable young Christadelphian speaking at a Suffolk Street Youth Gathering. Shortly afterwards he was excommunicated for marrying a young lady who was not "in the truth." This young couple never again attended any Christadelphian meetings and were duly forgotten by the ecclesia. A few years later, in the same ecclesia, a sister of similar age married "out of the truth" and she was not excommunicated. Her husband became well known to all members of the ecclesia but he was never baptized, in due course he died. The majority of the ecclesia attended his funeral which was conducted by one of the brethren. Of the former brother and his wife, when she dies will they care? Will a brother conduct her funeral service? Will most of the ecclesia attend? Will they even know or care? God is no respecter of persons, but what of Christadelphians?

I remember reading in a Christadelphian publication purporting to prove that Jesus Christ did not die in our place that the Greek word "*huper*," most often translated "for," is never translated "instead of." This type of reporting is either very careless or deceitful. I wish I could remember the source. If any reader can enlighten me I would be grateful. The expression "instead of" occurs twice in the New Testament and each time it is translated from the Greek "*huper*." We expect Christadelphian writers to tell the truth but they fail all too often when they have tradition to uphold. We should listen to God rather than try to justify Christadelphianisms. Only Jesus Christ could buy us back from the bondage of Sin. God made Him strong by placing Him in a unique position which enabled Him to purchase the whole human race, and with any purchase there is the substitution of the price paid for what is purchased. One thing instead of another. Jesus Christ paid the price - His life in the blood to purchase the life of the world. Here we are talking about natural life. Jesus Christ did not lay down His life so that we would have eternal life but that we should have the opportunity of eternal life - if we do all things whatsoever He commands us. But Christadelphians say that Jesus Christ did not die as a Substitute but as a Representative. Where then the purchase of His blood? There is no purchase without substitution.

I had been a Christadelphian for many years before I discovered that there were some who seriously believed that the saints were not to rise immortal. Such a contradiction of Scripture was hard to comprehend. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ and shall reign with him a thousand years" is quite sufficient for any believer. Almighty God knows beforehand who to raise to reign with Jesus Christ; He does not decide such matters in a court of law. Oh how some would dare to abase God's methods to our own!

The meanings of mortal, immortal, corruptible and incorruptible are continuing to cause argument amongst Christadelphians. Eric Phipps misses the meaning of Dr. Thomas when in writing in The Testimony Magazine for April 1997 he quotes from Elpis Israel under the heading "Man in his Novitiate" where Dr. Thomas said:-

"The truth is in few words, man was created with a nature endued with certain susceptibilities. He was capable of death; and capable of endless life; but, whether he should merge into mortality, or by a physical change be clothed with immortality, was

predicated on his course to do good or evil... In the Paradise of Eden, mortality and immortality were set before the man and his companion. They were external to them.”

Dr Thomas used the words mortality and immortality correctly as distinct from corruptible and incorruptible. Adam “was created capable of death,” that is, he was created corruptible, but could “merge into mortality.” He was not created mortal. Dr. Thomas understood this and Eric Phipps missed this meaning when he continued with

“But if we believe that Adam was created inherently mortal, (here he should have said corruptible to be in keeping with Dr. Thomas) then the death as a punishment for sin pronounced by God must have been other than the outworking of a natural process, otherwise it is no punishment. It must therefore involve a premature, violent death. This line of argument was precisely that used by Edward Turney in the last century. Inherent mortality possessed by Adam was the main plank in his heresy. It was the point of divergence from the truth leading to the theory of a “free life” possessed by our Lord, who gave it as a substitute for us in His violent death upon the Cross to save us from it. This heresy is still with us today in the Nazarene Fellowship founded by the late Ernest Brady, who upholding the teaching of Turney, and are presently very active. It emphasizes the importance of getting our foundation correct; otherwise we are in danger of going astray.”

It is we who follow Dr. Thomas in this matter and not the Christadelphians. Edward Turney did not claim that Adam possessed inherent mortality, neither did Dr. Thomas and neither do we. We agree with Dr. Thomas that Adam was created corruptible but later became mortal; mortal being a legal term and applies to the legal position in which God placed him after the sacrifice of the animals as a sin covering for breaking the law. Corruptible is a physical condition and mortal is a legal position. It follows that natural death is not the punishment for sin but a rest from ones labours until our Lord returns. Hebrews 11 is convincing.

While considering the meanings of corruptible and mortal there is a correction to be made in our booklet “The Usage and Meaning of Muth Temuth and B’Yom.” The first paragraph reads “Contrary to widespread belief the Bible does not teach that Adam and Eve became subject to death because of their sin; they were in fact, created corruptible, that is, they were subject to death at creation, as were all other creatures which God made “very good”.” This is very badly expressed to the point of causing confusion and will be changed for future reprints. I suggest a better wording would be “Contrary to widespread belief the Bible does not teach that Adam and Eve became corruptible because of their sin; they were created corruptible, as were all other creatures which God made “very good”.” The arguments put forward in the booklet are in no way affected by this alteration. I am grateful to Paul X where, in his letter to Ray Gregory reproduced on page 13, he has drawn attention to this in his opening paragraph.

Recently, upon looking through some papers left by my father I came across an article written perhaps around the 1970’s but my father had taken care to cut out the writers name so I do not know who it was. This article contained some condemnation of my father’s booklet “The Work of God in Christ” and the unknown writer, following his argument that the Clean Flesh errorists are the Antichrist of today wrote:

“Thus the great Monotheistic doctrine of the supremacy of the Father over the Son was eroded and finally lost; all stemming from this basic error that “human nature is not a defiled thing” (Turney). We can see this same development today following the same pattern as in the first century declension. It is plainly seen in the closing sentence of the typescript “The Work of God in Christ” by O.E.H.Gregory. Please read carefully:- “May the love of Christ constrain us to honour the Son even as we should honour the Father, and worship them both in the beauty of holiness.” There you have it – equal honour and equal worship! But what does Paul say on this? “When he (Christ) shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father... then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him” (1 Corinthians 15:24-28). The word subject means subordinate. Of course Christ is worthy of honour and acclaim but not “even as” we should honour and worship the Father. “Even as” expresses equality, sameness, without difference or distinction.”

Perhaps the writer has now read what Jesus said, as recorded in John 5:22,23 – “For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.” Great care is needed when opposing Scripture based argument.

Another point this writer criticized centres around sacrifice. He writes:-

“Such a perversion of the truth is bound to give rise to other contradictory ideas. For instance, in “The Work of God in Christ,” O.E.H.Gregory writes on page 3, “Abraham saw God as the Redeemer and Christ as God’s Lamb whom He offered to “sin” to buy us back...” Please note, he is saying that God offered Christ to “sin”! One error begets more errors. The Scriptures are not only repudiated here - they are reversed! To whom were offerings made then? In Genesis 4:3-5 the first offerings recorded, of Cain and Abel were offered “unto the Lord”.”

When God slew the animal in Eden it wasn’t slain “unto the Lord.” It was slain to satisfy the law in order for Adam and Eve to continue to live. When the sacrifices for sin were made under the Law of Moses they were offered for the same purpose, to satisfy the requirements of the Law. If we consider for a moment someone who has been sentenced to death for a crime worthy of it and that person is duly executed, we say he has paid the ultimate price. If we ask to whom was the price paid we are bound to say that it was paid to no one but to satisfy the demands of the law. Jesus Christ was thus offered to the “Sin power.” Jesus Christ was not offered to God but He was God’s offering for man’s redemption from sin.

The writer quotes Ephesians 5:2 in support of his view:-

“Christ... hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God...” But he has misunderstood what Paul was saying; Jesus did not give Himself a sacrifice to God but gave Himself to God for a sacrifice - to redeem us, or purchase us from Sin’s power. Had Adam been put to death in Eden we would never have lived, but because Jesus Christ took Adam’s place in death we owe our present life to Him.”

It has been very encouraging to receive letters from enquiring minds and a fair number have shown a keen interest in our literature. Such requests as, “I would be most grateful for any literature that differs from the opinion of the main Christadelphian body;” “I have never questioned Christadelphian beliefs but your Circular Letters make me wonder if I do have the correct meaning;” while one who is corresponding with other Christadelphians says “I am rather fed up with Christadelphian teachings and attitudes.”

“The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much” - James 5:16. Prayer is the most powerful means of finding truth and we must first of all seek earnestly and diligently for our heavenly Father’s guidance without which we can never come to an understanding of The Atonement. To reason with Him is to gain in knowledge, understanding and wisdom. I like to associate these with the words of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, “Ask, and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you.” (Matthew 7:7). Seek knowledge of both God’s will and His purpose from the Scriptures; knock on the door of understanding and it will be opened; ask for God’s wisdom that we may live to His honour and glory.

We sympathize and share the feelings of another who wrote that he feels he is not doing enough to help sort things out. How we wish there were many more like him. We feel there is much to be done but we must not forget it is God’s guidance we seek continually and every good result is to His honour and glory. The battle is not ours but the Lord’s. Paul may sow and Apollos water, but it is God who gives the increase. And not just increase in the number of disciples of Jesus Christ but increase in knowledge, understanding and wisdom and zeal of those disciples. We are all taught of God. So what are they afraid of who would refuse to discuss Nazarene Fellowship views in their journals? Truth has nothing to fear.

I quote the closing words from “The Work of God in Christ” –

“In God’s work in Christ we see how God so loved the world when He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting

life. May the love of God constrain us to honour the Son even as we honour the Father, and worship them both in the beauty of holiness.” Amen.

Brother Russell Gregory,

---

## **Question - Christ was perfected? Wherein Lay His previous imperfection?**

I would rather say He was previously unperfected than that He was imperfect. A cracked vase is imperfect; an unfired one is unperfected. The answer to the question, I submit, is in Hebrews 2:9-17:- “made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death... to make the Captain... perfect through suffering... in that He Himself hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted.”

Hence the perfection of Christ in this chapter, is the being tempted as we are, suffering the same trials and troubles as we do and thus being able to succour those who call upon Him, knowing by experience what human nature and its circumstances are. He took not on Him the nature of angels (verse 16) else He could never have done this. Or take Hebrews 5:8,9:- “He learned obedience by the things which He suffered, and being made perfect. He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him.”

There is another sense in which the Lord Jesus Christ was unperfected in His earthly nature - that referred to in Philippians 3:12 (and perhaps in the verse just quoted) - “Not as though I..were already perfect.” Paul here refers to the resurrection of the dead, I take it (Verse 11). But there are various ways in which the Scriptures refer to perfection. “Be ye perfect” (Matthew 5:48); “If thou wilt be perfect” (Matthew 19:21); “Till we all come unto a perfect man” (Ephesians 4:13); “As many as be perfect” (Philippians 3:15); “For by one offering He hath perfected for ever” (Hebrews 10:14); and see also Colossians 1:28; 4:12; John 17:23; 13:10; and other places, all from the same Greek word, TELEIOO, and all translated as “perfected” in the A.V.

Brother A.H.Broughton. (From a 1954 Circular Letter).

---

### **Brother Phil Parry Writes:-**

Dear Brethren and Sisters, As beneficiaries of the freedom, through Christ Jesus and not Jews of the Mosaic covenant, we have the option of reading and feeding upon the Holy Scriptures whether written under the old Covenant or the New Covenant, for it is necessary to read the Old Testament or Covenant and gain understanding of its message by a reading of the New. “For this cause, I Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward: how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery (as I wrote afore in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ): which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel: whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.” (Ephesians 3:1-11).

This whole epistle is in fact devoted to those who make up from certain dispensations the members of the Body of Christ Jesus as where Paul concludes chapter 3, verse 21 of Ephesians - "Unto God be glory in the church by Jesus Christ throughout all ages, world without end. Amen."

In effect, the Body or Ecclesia of Christ Jesus is motivated to glorify God throughout all ages through its Head, Jesus the Christ, and in confirming this Paul speaks of a world without end. What world can he be speaking of here? Peter speaks of a world that perished, which could not be the material or literal heavens and earth, but the world of ungodly in the days of Noah (2 Peter 3:5-7). Here in verse 7 Peter speaks of the literal heavens and earth which still exist since Noah, a mixture of good and evil people dwelling upon the earth which has been kept in store reserved unto fire against the Day of Judgment and perdition of ungodly men. This time a judgment by fire not water.

While this judgement will affect the ungodly unto destruction, it will not destroy the literal heavens and earth, though these will be involved in some way even as the literal earth was in the days of Noah by being covered where necessary by the flood.

Peter is mindful of some who are waiting in the anti-typical Ark of God's provision (Jesus), impatient of the time of waiting to be rid of those who are opposed to God's Way, and he reminds them of God's longsuffering in giving men warning and opportunity to repent and accept the true way of salvation. Therefore God is not slack concerning His Promise as some count slackness, and it is not His Will that any perish, but nevertheless He fore-knows who will accept His Gracious Gift, and then the door will be shut by Him alone. Remember the Ark? God shut the door, not Noah.

As members of the Body of Christ we should not be anxious for God's judgment upon a world of ungodly that will perish, but for a world without end" of which Paul speaks in Ephesians 3:21, and of which Jesus also spoke to the Sadducees, a "world" that must be pre-obtained by the worthiness of their faith in Him and His Father and which qualifies a resurrection of Life Eternal as the Children of God, equal in nature to the angels neither can they die any more. (Luke 20:34-36).

This brings to mind what Martha said to Jesus regarding the death of her brother Lazarus. "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died - I know that he will rise at the resurrection at the last day." Jesus had informed her "Thy brother shall rise again." But He did not have in mind the resurrection she spoke of but the resurrection to a continuance of natural life which proves the fact of there being two kinds of resurrection and though meaning a rising from the dead, do not involve what Jesus termed "The resurrection and the Life," for many will rise from the dead, some with the nature of Angels to die no more and others unworthy of obtaining the world to come, with a nature they had before dying, in order that they experience the death Adam was spared, "the death by sin" the second death; having rejected God's gift of His Lamb without spot and without blemish, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious (1 Peter 2:4).

If an Israelite was capable under Moses of choosing a special lamb from the flock to save by its blood from the Angel of Death passing over the house, surely the Lord God Himself should not be questioned in His own choice and provision of the anti-type; even by Jew or Gentile professing knowledge and understanding of the Scriptures. Yet sadly this was the case and is certainly the case today.

The Jews and their corrupt rulers finally rejected the Messiah of Israel and handed Him over to Pilate to be crucified. When Jesus expired on the Tree the veil of the Temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom signifying that the Way into The Holiest of All was open, but no longer to the Levitical Priesthood; the Way to God was to be through another Priest after the Order of Melchizedec and therefore under a new Covenant. But I wonder if any noticed the significance of this rending of the veil? It is possible that an attempt was made to repair or replace it but I have read nothing to confirm this. But one thing is certain from the words of Jesus to the Samaritan woman at the well, John 4:21, "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father." If the Jewish priest-craft had in mind any replacement of the veil of the Temple and their continuance of the Mosaic Covenant, the prophetic statements of Jesus to this woman and to His own disciples when they looked in awe at this marvellous work, were confirmation that no Temple would be left in which to hang another veil inasmuch as He Himself would be its replacement as recorded in Hebrews 10:16-22 ["This is the covenant that I will

make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; 17. And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. 18. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin. 19. Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, 20. By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; 21. And having an high priest over the house of God; 22. Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.”] and please note, the writer of verse 22 in explanation of Baptized believers of the Gospel of Salvation leaves no place for sin-in-the-flesh; the conscience is clean, and the body is clean, legally and morally.

The contrast with this position and the Mosaic Law is pointed out by the writer in Hebrews 9:11 to 15, taken from Numbers 19:1 to 10. Neither can it be a reference to the physical flesh when by adherence and good conscience toward God’s Law the person can revert to the former position of legal cleanliness and moral relationship without a change of nature being necessary.

As Brethren and Sisters of Christ under a New Covenant we have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and it should be noted that His flesh was never a bar to the indwelling of His Father, for as Jesus said, “As the Father hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the Son to have life in himself “ - John 5:26. No other man could say this. None throughout history from Adam’s sin had the right of direct approach to God; this was why Jesus could affirm at all stages of His existence in preaching the Gospel of Salvation, “I am the Way, the Truth and the Life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me.” But for that Way to be opened the veil that typified His flesh must be divinely removed even as it was divinely authorized to be placed, first of all in the Tabernacle of Witness and afterwards in the Temples of wood and stone which replaced it.

What exists now is the Spiritual Body of Christ, His Bride to be the Temple of the Living God in which God dwells. Ephesians 2:11-22. (See also at this point my opening quotation from Ephesians 3:1-11).

Paul also makes it clear in Romans 3:23-31 where he says, “For all have sinned (federally - or ‘by one man’) and come short of the glory of God;” this could not include Jesus because Paul continues “Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.”

What then is this belief in Jesus? Is it to believe that Jesus had condemned sinful flesh and in allowing the mockery and spectacle of Calvary of this flesh of an unblemished Son, God could declare His righteousness and be just and the justifier of him that could believe such a thing? Jesus said “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day and he saw it and was glad.” Did Abraham rejoice to see this horrible exhibition on the tree of Calvary, of the One who was to confirm the promises made to him? Not likely, when God even withheld Him from slaying Isaac. How much more then the Son of God whom Abraham knew would willingly confirm in His blood the promises and the covenants that God might justify the nations through faith!

Our justification is indeed free, but it cost God the life of His Son. He need not have caused His birth; He need not have allowed Him to die on the tree. The alternative was that Christ be born and pay the debt of Adam to the violated law or Adam suffer inflicted death in the day he sinned and all in his loins perish.

“God so loved the world.” When? Was it in Eden when Adam sinned? Or was it when Jesus was born? If the latter, then all who lived B.C. have perished. Why not then accept the teaching of Paul in Romans 5 on Federal Sin = Adam, and Federal Righteousness = in Christ? We who are called Nazarenes understand and accept it and regard ourselves as servants of a God who is just, and the justifier of him who believes in the teaching of Jesus who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life (not character) a ransom for all. Matthew 20:28; 1 Timothy 2:6. This bought back natural existence, first for Adam, then for us, who would never have existed had he been put to death. But it did not give us unconditional Eternal Life, for we need to acknowledge by belief, faith and works, through a knowledge of the Truth, why God so loved

the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish. See 1 Timothy 2:3-7.

I commenced my remarks about a world without end and of which world Jesus said we must be counted worthy to obtain. So in considering Abraham we should be aware of what world Jesus spoke of. In Romans 4:13-18 Paul says, "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end that the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all (as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations).

In this context we must take into account Paul's words in Romans 9:1-8. Also Galatians 3:11-18, verses 26 to 29 are most important and why people should disregard the facts I cannot imagine, unless they have been brought up in a doctrine which is biased in favour of Jews who have rejected, through their ancestors' boasting in the law to give life, the Messiah of Israel, Jesus, who brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.

We should accept the fact that Jews by natural descent and not in Christ, are not the children of God even though they have descended from Abraham (Romans 9:7,8). Paul knew what he was talking about on this subject and if we choose to make unregenerated Jews the most important focus of our attention rather than the Abrahamic Covenant of heir-ship to the world to come in which we can share through Christ, His coming could be a snare to us even, because we are looking at the wrong places for the signs of His coming, and the wrong events.

God is interested in His people, His children, Abraham's seed of promise in Christ of all families of the earth. We have read the proof in the Old Testament books such as Numbers and Deuteronomy that the twelve tribes of Israel under Joshua received the land or lot of their inheritance but the tribe of Levi had no inheritance of land by lot for the Lord was their inheritance, but what of the Abrahamic inheritance by faith through Christ wherein all are considered as One? Reading from Revelation chapter 7 we find that Levi was among the twelve tribes which were sealed, which indicates equality with the others, not a separate inheritance as with the priesthood.

But under the new covenant when this sealing took place the Levitical priesthood was ended in Christ so that inheritance was in Him and His Kingdom which would be world-wide, not by the law but by faith where there is neither Jew nor Gentile.

I am not interested in the present modern State of Israel whose policies are temporary meat and drink and the assumed right by fleshly descent from Abraham, to the Promised Land, even by carnal force. God holds the Spiritual Deeds of right for those who inherit the promises of The Kingdom of God through His Son, for as Paul said, "The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

In Deuteronomy chapter 30 we read that God set before Israel the blessing and the curse, life or death, under the conditions of His Word, but as a nation blessed of God they failed as Moses said they would. Worse still they got to the degradation of rejecting their Messiah though there had always been a remnant according to faith and God's election of grace. The final blow to them as a nation represented by the corrupt mixture of sectarian tradition, was struck when Jesus related the parable of the Vineyard and their rejection of Him as the Messiah and Heir of all things (Matthew 21:42,43), "Therefore say I unto you, The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." See Matthew 22:11-14. Also 1 Peter 2:1-10 which clinches the whole object of the New Covenant in Christ "World without end" Amen.

Brother Phil Parry.

**A Few weeks ago Brother Ray Gregory gave a copy of the booklet “The Usage and Meaning of Muth Temuth and B’Yom” to a Christadelphian friend, Paul, with the request that he would give it his consideration and then comment on it.**

**Here is Paul’s response:-**

Dear Brother Ray, Those comments you asked for concerning the booklet “Muth temuth and B’Yom”:-

1. In the first paragraph of the preface the statement is made that Adam and Eve “were created corruptible, that is, they were subject to death at creation as were all other creatures which God made very good.” This is not true. Man was created neither mortal nor immortal. He was a special creation, for “God (Elohim) created man in his own image.”

This was not the case with other creatures. It was only man who was given the one commandment, this law, as a test. Failure to obey this law would bring death. If they continued to obey it then they would live.

Adam and Eve had the potential for eternal life; this is alluded to in them being prevented from taking of the tree of life and living for ever. This was not the case with the other creatures. So man’s death, his mortality was as a consequence of sin. (Genesis 3:17-19, Romans 6:23, Romans 5:12, 18). Failure to accept this basic, fundamental scriptural principle will create all kinds of erroneous ideas.

2. I would question the “Muth temuth,” the very title of the booklet itself. On checking the Hebrew, neither “Strong’s” nor “Youngs” give a word “surely;” it is not in the Hebrew. The phrase “thou shalt surely die” is a translation of the Hebrew word “muwth” which is used 697 times in the O.T. where it is used of both violent and natural deaths. In fact it is this same word that is used in Genesis 5:5 to state that Adam died after 930 years. So to pick out those 14 passages where the translators have decided to put in a “surely” where they see fit, carries no weight in this argument, when the Hebrew in Genesis 2:17 does not indicate that it should be there.

3. Likewise the Hebrew for “in the day” is just one word “yome” not “B’Yom.” “Yome” is used some 1811 times in the O.T. Admittedly it does more often than not refer to a literal day, but interestingly it is this word that is translated as “Yet his days (Yome) shall be an hundred and twenty years” in Genesis 6:3. But even if it is a literal day, I see no problem because it is in this day that the sentence is passed upon Adam and Eve and they begin to die.

4. To state that the animal that was sacrificed died as a substitute for man, that it died instead of him is completely contrary to the principles laid down in Scripture. If the animal was a substitute then why did man die? If the death of the creature extended the life of man then why did Paul say in Hebrews 10:4 “It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin,” having established that death is a consequence of sin?

Likewise, carrying this type through to Jesus Christ, if He died as a substitute for us then we shouldn’t die. But even the graves of Christadelphians bear witness to the fact that this is not true! Admittedly we have the certainty of resurrection but until Christ returns we are as dead as the next man! To say that Jesus Christ died instead of us would infer that there would be no need for us to make sacrifices. If that is the case then why did Paul say that we are to “present our bodies as a living sacrifice,” if Christ has already done that for us?

No, all these sacrifices were not a substitute, but a representative.

These are the main points in this booklet that I am not happy with, and show, I believe, an underlying error in the author understands of Scripture.

Sincerely your brother in Christ,

Paul.

**In reply to Paul, Brother Ray Gregory wrote:-**

So what then was the purpose of God in slaying the animal if it was not to provide protection for Adam from the consequence of his transgression? If Adam had not been provided with a covering for sin surely he himself would have been put to death as the result of his sin.

When at the command of the Lord God Abraham was about to offer up his son Isaac He (God) apparently changed His mind and provided a ram caught in the thicket in his stead, i.e. as a substitute.

I am amazed that anyone can say that the animal sacrifices were not substitutionary and marvel at one's incomprehension of the Mosaic Law, most especially with regard to The Passover. At the original Passover in Egypt, it was either the life of the first-born or the life of the lamb. No one can possibly say this was other than substitutionary; and no Jew would agree with the notion that the sacrifices were not substitutionary. There were of course thank offerings and peace offerings but the sacrifices for sins were substitutionary and Jesus Christ is our Passover as Peter said.

I quote Dr Edersheim for the Jewish view:-

“As the Jewish tradition taught that the object of a sacrifice was its substitution for the offender, so Scripture and the Jewish fathers also teach that the substitute to whom all these types pointed was none other than the Messiah.” (Page 123, “The Temple”),

We have been bought with a price and that in itself is substitution - a price paid for anything means that one thing is given in exchange for something else. We are the purchased possession. Jesus Christ bore our iniquities so that we don't. See Isaiah 53.

The sacrifices we are asked to offer today are “sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving,” not the giving of our lives to a violent and cruel death at the hands of wicked men as a ransom price, though some have been asked to lay down their lives for Christ's sake.

Corruptible relates to physical nature; mortal is a legal term relating to the effect of law, i.e. to be made liable to judicial execution for the breaking of law. We being created corruptible die because this is the natural man, not the Spiritual or changed man. “First the natural then the spiritual.” 1 Corinthians 15:44-46, and the Scriptures mention only natural and spiritual natures; to imagine any other is adding to Scripture.

We agree that failure to obey would bring death to Adam and Eve and if they obeyed they would live, and as this was a period of probation (we have no idea how long) the Lord God would give them a spiritual body as is our hope.

Adam and Eve had the potential for Eternal Life if they had access to the Tree of Life but this was denied them. We too have the same potential to eternal life through Him who is the Tree of Life. This has been restored to us through the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus. Man's mortality (legal not physical) was a consequence of sin and Dr. Thomas puts this very well in his letter to Lancelot Burrus in 1855. This is too long to quote here but a copy is enclosed. (C.L. readers please see pages 17 to 20 – Ed.)

Muth Temuth (however spelt) is in the Hebrew Bible at least 14 times and is always correctly translated “surely die,” because this is the meaning of the phrase. There is no dispute in this matter, all Hebrew scholars agree and when the phrase (not word) is in the margin as “dying thou shalt die” both of the words are translated but the meaning is the same. It is a recognized Hebrew idiom.

Since Muth Temuth is to be an act of execution it follows that B'Yom can only be the day set for that execution and not an unknown period of time, and for this please see all of the passages where these phrases are used in the Scriptures. Context reveals all.

There is no problem if you use a Hebrew Bible,

Brother Ray Gregory.

## **A few thoughts from an early Circular Letter:**

Have you ever sat down quietly and meditated on, in detail, as far as you could, the great and wonderful power of God? To do this now and again is I find a great help. It greatly strengthens our faith and gives us great confidence for meeting any trouble or temptation.

We know for instance, that all the clever and wonderful things that man had built and done on the earth would return to dust if God withdrew His power. We know that life itself is the Spirit or Power of God, and if God withdrew His Spirit all life would cease (Psalm 104).

These instances and numberless others in the Scriptures bring before us the marvellous and mighty power of God.

With these things in mind we can truly say "I will not fear anything that man can do to me." So long as we strive to serve and obey our heavenly Father in Spirit and in Truth we know that this great Power works to our good. This should give us great comfort and confidence in whatever situation we may find ourselves. We know and believe these things and they will keep us from all the apostasies and insane ideas of the present day.

"What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" "Do this and thou shalt live."

Brother A.Hodges.

---

## **Correspondence between Dr. Thomas and Lancelot Burrus - 1855**

In diverse places in our literature we quote Dr. Thomas's understanding of the Fall in which he states categorically that there was no physical change in the nature of Adam and Eve. We are grateful to a Christadelphian friend for locating an early reference to this in the correspondence section in "The Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come" for July 1855 and which we reproduce below. The first letter is dated May 6, 1855:-

"Doctor John Thomas:- Dear Sir, - I am pleased with your writings, and believe them scriptural. I can say, Sir, you certainly have the law and the testimony on your side.

My friend, Mr. A. Anderson, was kind enough to send me Elpis Israel, which I think is a book of books. You have therein displayed more close study and research than any commentator I have read, either ancient or modern. You have certainly, Sir, brought forth the light out of darkness, though you will not understand me to say that I sanction or agree to every part; for in the propagation of the world I take issue. You will understand me - there is no past or future with God. Now, Sir, it seems to me, according to the arrangement that it was impossible to re-people the world without transgression. Consequently, the order of arrangement was made accordingly. My notion is that all creation became corrupt at the fall, even to the elements; and that all created things below man, both animal and vegetable, partook of the nature of the curse; therefore they became corrupt, and propagate.

Again, you say all are raised from the dead; now, I can't exactly say "amen" to that. I don't conceive that the Gentiles have ever had a law since the transgression; therefore, partaking of the nature of Adam, and dying in that state. I can see no necessity for a resurrection. The great apostle to the Gentiles says that both the just and unjust are to be raised. Well, I agree very well to that; but, I think a man must lay claim to something that does not belong to him, to make him "unjust," or, at any rate, that which he is not entitled to. Well now, Sir, let us look around us, and we find about eight hundred sects, all claiming an interest in the blood of Christ; and according to the law and the testimony, not one is right. They, I consider, are the unjust ones, and will be raised in order to their justification, could they do it. But no; they are doomed to the

second death. I think you leave your readers rather in the dark as regards the creation of systems of worlds, filling eternity, filling immensity, and co-eternal with the great God who fills all, and in all; and those systems of worlds being perfected and going to perfection forever and ever.

I am not in the habit of scribbling my notions, and you will find they are not made quite so plain as might be to suit many; but, Sir, I know a hint to you is enough to understand what I mean, or the idea intended to be conveyed.

You certainly, Sir, have sealed the mouth of the Great Supervisor upon David's throne, and the promises of the fathers, the Coming of the Lord, the Settling of Palestine, etc., etc.

Can you possibly believe that he believes what he pretends to teach? Don't you think sinister motives have their influence? Well, my dear Sir, on the day of reckoning we shall find who will be justified, and who will not.

You will accept assurances of regard from

Lancelot Burrus. Orange Co. Virginia.

**Dr. Thomas replied as follows:-**

Our Terrestrial System Before The Fall. Our friend says, that his notion is that all creation became corrupt at the fall, even to the elements. This is the general idea. Moses tells us very plainly, that when the terrestrial system was completed on the Sixth Day, that God reviewed all that He had made, and pronounced it "very good." But, in what sense was it very good? In an animal and physical sense; for it was a natural and animal system, not a spiritual one. Such a system is essentially one of waste and reproduction; and was organized with reference to what God knew would come to pass. This is implied in the placing of the earth in such a position with respect to the sun, moon, and stars, that there should be a diversity of seasons, etc. Thus, fall and winter, seasons of decay and death, were institutions existing before the Fall; and presented to Adam and Eve phenomena illustrative of the existence in the physical system of a principle of corruption, the extent of which, however, they might not have been fully apprized of.

Death and corruption then, with reproduction, the characteristic of spring and summer, is the fundamental law of the physical system of the Six Days. Adam and Eve, and all the other animals born of the earth with themselves, would have died and gone to corruption, if there had been no transgression, provided that there had been no further interference with the physical system than Moses records in his history of the Six Days. Let us, by way of illustration, confine our attention to the two animals at the head of animated nature, called Adam and Eve. Concerning them, it may be inquired, "If they would have died under the proviso above stated, how can Paul's saying be true, 'that Death entered into the world of sin'?" True; the death principle was an essential property of their nature; but as they did not die till after their transgression, death did not enter in till after that event. But, the inquirer means. "If they would have died anyhow under the proviso, how can death be said to be the consequence of sin?" Death is not the consequence of sin, sin being the original physical cause - but the physical consequence of a moral act. If thou doest thus and so, "dying thou shalt die;" but just reverse this saying, and let it read, "If thou doest thus and so, "dying thou shalt not die." Here are moral acts with diverse physical results. Now, if these results are ordained upon two essentially dying creatures, because animal creatures, what is implied? Why, that in the one case the dying process shall not be interrupted, and therefore death would follow; while in the other, the process should be interrupted, and therefore life should be established. In the former case, all that would be necessary would be to let things take their natural course; but in the latter, this would not do; and therefore it would be necessary to bring into play a transforming force which should change the very good animal nature into a very good spiritual, or incorruptible nature, which latter formed no part of the system of the Six Days.

Now, these conditions were fulfilled by the arrangements in Paradise, where sin first made its appearance. There were there two trees; the one styled "the Tree of Lives;" the other, "the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil;" and which, because of the penalty attached to the eating of its fruit, may be

styled “the Tree of Deaths.” The lives and the deaths of Adam and Eve were predicated, not upon any peculiarity of their animal constitution, but upon the relations they might come to sustain to those two trees in Paradise. Moses has given us the history of their case, and from this we learn that they placed themselves under the law which sentenced them to death by eating of the fruit they were commanded not to eat. Now, all that was necessary for this sentence to take effect was just to allow the laws of the animal economy to take their course, and the result would be death and corruption, or a return to the dust from whence they were taken.

But, the inquirer wants to know, Suppose they had lived in the obedience of faith all the time that might have been appointed for their probation in Paradise, would they not have died? Certainly they would, if there had been no arrangement divinely interposed to prevent death. This arrangement existed in connection with the Tree of Lives. We learn from the Mosaic account that the eating of that tree would impart immortality or deathlessness; for we are told that they were expelled from Paradise that they might not eat of that tree and live for ever. It is certain, therefore, that the animal nature they possessed was essentially a mortal nature, and required to be physically operated upon by the power transmissible through contact with the Tree of Lives to change it into a nature constitutionally capable of enduring forever; which the animal nature is not.

We have an illustration of what would have happened to Adam and Eve if they had continued in the obedience of faith, in what we are taught is to occur in the case of the obedient believers belonging to the generation contemporary with the appearing of the Lord Jesus in power and great glory. These, designated by Paul as “we who are alive and remain,” he declares “shall not sleep, but shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet.” This was not revealed till he communicated it; for he styles it “a mystery,” or secret, which, says he, “Behold, I show you.” Here then are persons found living in the obedience of faith at the Lord’s appearing. Everyone admits that they are constitutionally animal and mortal, though, it is revealed, that they should not die, if they be of the living remnant contemporary with His appearing. Their not dying is conditional, as in the case of Adam and Eve - if they be found in the obedience of faith, and if contemporaries of the advent; otherwise not. But in not dying into death, as with Enoch and Elijah, the dying process which commences with birth must be interrupted and terminated by the interposition of divine power; even by that power that rebuilds the bodies of the dead upon new physical principles; in other words, by the Spirit of God that would have changed the eaters of the Tree of Lives in Eden; that raised up the mortal body of Jesus; and that will raise up and change the saints by Jesus, when in their case “mortality shall be swallowed up of life.”

There was no miracle wrought in executing the sentence under which Adam and Eve placed themselves. That is to say, there was no new physical principle infused into their nature that was not there before they transgressed. The introduction of miracle would have been in the instantaneous transformation of their mortal animal nature into the immortal spiritual nature on their eating of the fruit of the Tree of Lives. But there was no scope for the exercise of extraordinary power; for it is only obedience that gains access to that tree, whether in the Paradise of Eden, or in the Kingdom of God. If they had continued obedient, death, though lurking within them, would not have been allowed to enter into the world; it would have had no victims; but they transgressed - their thinking became perverse, or contrary to the letter of the Word of God, and their practice like it, - they sinned; and the physical tendency of animal nature to dissolution became “the law of sin and death” within them, because its abolition was prevented on account of sin.

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 consequent upon that calamity was moral, not physical. The natural system was the same the day before the Fall as the day after. A palace, though destructible by time or any other cause, may nevertheless be “very good” when its building is completed: so also our terrestrial system, though susceptible of deterioration, was physically “very good” after its kind. Adam and Eve were innocent and undefiled but without character. Thy became immoral; and the practice of vice has made their descendants what we see.”

Resurrection Not Universal. Our friend in Orange is under a mistake in supposing that we maintain, that the resurrection of every man, woman, and child of Adam’s posterity, is the doctrine of Scripture. His words are, “You say, all are raised from the dead: now I can’t exactly say ‘amen’ to that.” Nor can we. We

believe, that the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the just and of the unjust who have died under times of knowledge, whose knowledge they have accepted: and the resurrection, a thousand years afterwards, of "the rest of the dead" who have intelligently rejected it. Of the former were the contemporaries of the Lord Jesus who lived under the times of the law. To some of them he said, "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets in the Kingdom of God, and you yourselves cast out." This testimony proves, that when the Kingdom of God is established, these victims of despair will be there; and secondly, like Adam and Eve from Paradise, they will be expelled from it; so that, while Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, all the prophets and the saints, will be permitted to eat of the Tree of Life, they will be driven forth to misery and death. Besides these unjust there will be those who, placing themselves under law to Christ, run well for a time, but become weary of well-doing, and turn like washed hogs to their wallowing in the mire. These all rise from the dead at the coming of the Lord to receive according to their demerits. The rest of the dead are those who never came under a constitution of righteousness; not because they did not know how, but because they refused to do so. Having been enlightened, but preferring darkness to light, they will arise to judgment at the end of the millennium.

Besides these three enlightened classes, there is a fourth which returns to the dust forevermore. This class is very large, and consists of all whom God from whatever cause has left in helpless ignorance. He is not a hard master reaping where he hath not sowed, and gathering where he hath not scattered. Men who do not come to the knowledge of the truth, not because they will not, but because they cannot, are like the old Athenians under "times of ignorance which God winks at." He winks at their ignorance in not raising them to Judgment as the others. But though not raised to judgment, neither are they raised to life, or saved in any sense; for "they are alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them." Though I do not pretend to define the boundary line between "times of ignorance" and "times of knowledge," I am very much inclined to conclude that the "eight hundred sects" our correspondent classifies as the unjust, may belong to the "times of ignorance," and be winked at as the old Athenian idolaters were. They are "sinners of the Gentiles," very pious in their way, well-intentioned, and fair-spoken; but still ignorant of the truth, and hopelessly so, because of the blinding effect of the several Gentilisms imposed upon them by their tutors and guardians. They believe their systems to be God's, and they have a zeal for them as though they were embodiments of the truth. But alas! No mistake could be greater or more fatal. As our correspondent says, "according to the law and the testimony, not one is right," and it is by this testimony all things are to be adjudicated when the Lord appears. As Paul said of Jews and Gentiles in his day, so we may truly affirm of the pious sectarians of our's, "There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth... they are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Paul's contemporaries may have deemed him to be very uncharitable in speaking thus; but he regarded that no more than we: he declared the truth of the matter, which is now as thoroughly reproduced as if no interval or change had elapsed since he wrote. The "eight hundred sects" neither believe, preach, nor practice the things taught and commanded by Jesus and his apostles. Let a man acquaint himself with these, and proclaim them to either of "the orthodox four," not to mention the others, and he would find that if they heard him once, they would not repeat the "indiscretion" a second time. "There is none that understandeth, they have all gone out of the way;" and there is none but God that can divorce them from their traditions, and translate them into light. If He do it not, their case is hopeless. They cannot deliver themselves, for they are bound hand and foot by their systems "as they happen to be led." Shall such born-slaves of human folly, trained into it by scholasticism while their minds were incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong, or the false and the true, "made subject to vanity not willingly," - shall such be raised from the dead that their "hidden things may be judged according to Paul's gospel? Can they be regarded as under times of knowledge? I should think not; for Isaiah teaches us, that when Jerusalem shall arise and shine, because her light is come, and the glory of Jehovah is risen upon her, "darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people." This is the condition of all "Christendom" at the present time; as all must perceive who understand the truth. The clergy teach the people to consider this century as gloriously enlightened! O foolish and blind! If the nineteenth be light, what must the first have been! Compare the two and note the difference. The "eight hundred sects," the farthing rushlights of today through which its glory blazes, were unknown to the apostles and their brethren; who were, nevertheless, "light in the Lord," and "shone as lights in the world." Where is that pre-existing non-sectarian light? Who knows? Not one of them; for by their flickering rushlights they cannot pierce the gloom; their eyes are blinded, and they cannot see, however bright the true light might burn before them.

It is most charitable to hope that they may not be held responsible; but as there is no eternal life in the Kingdom of God but through the obedience of faith, and as they have all wandered off and lost the way, that they may “remain in the congregation of the dead,” upon whom the sentence rests, saying, “they are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; for thou hast visited and destroyed them, and caused all the memory of them to perish” - Isaiah 26. There are no scripturally recognized substitutes for the truth and its obedience. If men honestly desire salvation, let them seek these with their whole heart. Gentilism in whole or in part, can save no man. It is mere rhapsodized mythology, perverted of the truth. Let us be contented with “the simplicity of Christ” unadulterated in the apostolic and prophetic word; and pray earnestly for his return, that all sects may be abolished in the enlightenment of their adherents; and that henceforth, in returning to the dust, they may die in the Lord, and their works follow them to a resurrection unto life at the end of the Millennial Reign.

Dr.Thomas.

---

“By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep His commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments: and His commandments are not grievous. For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear record, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which He hath testified of His Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” - 1 John 5:2-12.

---

## **Ecclesias and The Body of Christ**

In response to the articles by “Kohleth” and Brethren Wille and Stallworthy printed in recent Circular Letters I am prompted to express a few thoughts on the subject of Ecclesias.

The position of Ecclesias is one of definition. The Ecclesia of Christ is a spiritual one for those who walk after the Spirit. Those who assume to form an ecclesia, that is a man made ecclesia, find they have inherent weaknesses because they are not formed by the Spirit; their weaknesses are made apparent by the behaviour of their members who assume the right to have power over its membership; however this is agreed by vote or ballot.

The fact of having power over members and membership may appear unavoidable but a Christ-like fellowship should exist without it.

If any group of people attempt to control others this automatically leads to power seekers, autocracy and imposition.

If all membership were to be left to voluntary offers of help and guidance with a bias toward being led by Elders who are not appointed but are Elders in the Spirit of Christ by virtue of experience and trust; which is one of service only, and trust in God through prayer, it would then be possible for the fellowship to not only service its members but become rich in spiritual doctrine freely sought and exchanged.

This is in contrast to the so called Ecclesias of today where members are not able to speak freely in discussion except on mundane matters nor seek help from their elders. Freedom of speech would lead to an

enrichment of any Fellowship of baptized believers where faith, hope and love were paramount. The fact that these conditions do not abound is because these virtues are not exercised, that so called Ecclesias today are not the true Ecclesia of Christ is evidenced by the fact that some members of one would not meet with another. This is a common condition and is proof of its non scriptural basis - to say we love the brethren but we will not meet with them because we do not agree with them.

Why should agreement be a matter of acceptance into an Ecclesia when we are all so different in our knowledge, understanding and wisdom- We must accept divergence in these areas because they are the condition of mankind. The area we have in common is in our efforts to be like Him and appreciate all that our heavenly Father has done for us and recognize that His love is revealed in all that Jesus Christ did for us to the saving of our souls.

When we see the faults in the Christadelphian community we do not seek to destroy but to suggest that they would be stronger and richer if they avoided their bigotry and had more courage and less obduracy and were more open with each other, without fear.

Many members of the Nazarene Fellowship have experienced most of these failings in the Christadelphian community and would pray for them to be more open and more honest by presenting their understanding of the nature of man and the true scriptural nature of our Lord Jesus Christ and the true nature of sacrifice without recourse to man made creeds adduced by the mind of man.

Brother Ray Gregory.

---

## FORGERY

“We had occasion recently, in a letter to F.J.Pearce, to mention the passage in “Elpis Israel” where Dr. Thomas refers to “The death of the substitutionary testator,” and he replied saying he had never noticed it. It occurs on page 213 of the original edition in my possession, but we found that in later reprints the text has been tampered with and the words “substitutionary testator” have been deleted and replaced by the word “mediator.” It seems likely that this alteration is of comparatively recent date: it was certainly not made in the Doctor’s lifetime or with his consent, and surely, to remove words having a clear and precise meaning and replace them with another having a different meaning is nothing short of forgery. Our comment would be to quote the footnote in “The Declaration” referring to the notorious Trinitarian fabrication in 1 John 5, “It is evidently spurious...but by whom forged is of no great moment, as its design must be obvious to an.”

Excerpt from “A Christadelphian Lifts The Curse.”

---

## Freedom or Bondage

“Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed in him, If ye continue in my word then are ye my disciples indeed and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.” John 8:31,32,36.

### Truth versus Tradition

Tradition blinds the eyes and prevents investigation and search into matters – the Scriptures - and this tradition is upheld by the threat of being “Cast Out” of the Church or Ecclesia.

This booklet is written as a protest against such procedure by those of the Birmingham Constitution of Amended Statement of Faith of Doctrines to be rejected, page 13, Nos. 15, 16, 17. In the first place, those

who have recently been withdrawn from or cast out of fellowship (results are the same) would like to qualify those three items numbered as above.

No. 15. That the works of the saints are tested and they are rewarded or suffer loss. (This proven later).

No. 16. That at the coming of Christ only those asleep in Him will be resurrected.

No. 17. That the dead in Christ rise in an immortal state.

It is undoubtedly true that this question of immortal resurrection is continually cropping up. Why? Because brethren are not satisfied. It would be interesting to get the statistics of how many have voluntarily or otherwise left the Birmingham Fellowship over this question.

The two little books recently reprinted - viz:- Extract from Grattan Guinness's "Approaching End of the Age" and William Richmond's "Resurrection and Judgment of the Saints" have stirred matters up and we believe put before the brethren the truth on these subjects.

We know what it is to fear this curse of being threatened with excommunication if we dared to say, to speak, or make known that we did not believe in the tradition as set forth in the Constitution concerning the Resurrection of Jesus Christ and of His Brethren at His coming. We, in days of youth in the Fellowship, feared that possibly it would mean a cutting off from the Salvation that God offers in Christ Jesus. That Birmingham had the Keys of the Kingdom.

It may be there are some who still feel that way, for although some don't approve of these actions against brethren they dare not say that they are in sympathy out they go. We speak from experience - when my own case and others were judged, "The Constitution" had been violated and this must be kept intact.

In the second place an Article had just appeared in the Magazine on this very subject. There was little or no appeal to the Bible on this important doctrine, but judged by tradition they were charged, and it appeared in the Intelligence - they were holding False Doctrine-

But assertion is not proof.

Now we read that the Scriptures are of no private interpretation. This neither rests at Rome nor Birmingham, And in John 7:16,17 we read:- "Jesus answered them and said, "My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me. If any man will do His will, he shall now of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." Here then is the opportunity for individual knowledge, with prayerful search.

I believe it can be proven that Dr.Thomas changed his mind on this subject of Immortal Resurrection to mortal resurrection, and this latter idea has been maintained through the works issued from Birmingham.

Now we propose to criticize (or review) the penny pamphlet entitled, "Raised Incorruptible" by C.C.Walker.

Whilst we are charged with belittling the Judgment Seat and robbing Jesus of His honour as Judge (which God forbid we should) surely the Editor treats as of little value the reward by using the word "merely." The parable of the Talents and the rewards given were of great importance to the recipients; and Jesus says, in Revelation 22:12, "And behold I come quickly and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be."

That the dead in Christ rise in an immortal state, the writer in page 1, paragraph 1, admits that this is apparently countenanced but is superficially construed. Most emphatically we say it does not destroy the sense of responsibility or circumspection, but on the contrary increases it, especially when we realize the motive power behind all our actions - Love. Not Fear.

We would refer you to the case of the man who was saved, yet his works were burned; they were evidently then bad - wood, hay, stubble. 1 Corinthians 3:12-15. This man loses his reward but is himself

saved. So it is a judgment of works and not of the man. Why? Because Christ has already borne that for him.

Paragraph 2 - The Judgment Seat robbed of its terror. This savours very much of Hell fire torments, which used to make our knees knock together in mortal dread by the old-time Evangelists of Christendom. Surely the Editor doesn't mean so! While we read, "As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." (Fear to offend).

Further, in their own houses, yes, or in the field, one taken and the other left; changed in the twinkling of an eye. So it will be (worse than all) if the wicked are not there, but there is no record that they will be there.

The gathering when the King sits on His Throne of His Glory is not the Judgment for the Saints. The word "mere" bestowal of gifts is unworthy of a Brother of Christ.

Page 3. Paragraph 1. Thessalonians 4. We do not so misconstrue this. We believe it is the righteous dead and the righteous living. But you destroy the comfort of these words by teaching a mortal resurrection. Paul "simply" means to teach the same as in 1 Corinthians 15; why leave out "and so shall they ever be with the Lord."?

Paragraph 2 - Part, portion or lot, does not alter the matter a jot. In a community an individual is a part, portion, of the whole.

Paragraph 4 - Here we go back to "sprout body process," which is absolutely foreign to the Scriptures. To quote the Sadducees here is poor proof, because they only ridiculed the resurrection. Quite true there will be a resurrection of the wicked, but "when?" is the question at issue. The two states are raised immortal and raised mortal - as was the widows son, Jarius' daughter, Lazarus, etc.

The "mere" act of rising - Jesus thought otherwise, even of mortal resurrection did He not say to Martha that she should see the Glory of God in the resurrection of her brother? John 11:39,40.

Page 5. Paragraph 2 - John "merely" sees certain persons etc. It was a glorious revelation to him. We don't read in Scripture that the living will have a resurrection; what sense is this? Changed is more scriptural.

There will be wise and foolish virgins; those who are left will no doubt be ashamed, not that they are called away to Judgment, but left behind.

The obstacle: the rest of the dead. It is easily understood, if not Jumbled up with tradition. The passage proves clearly to the uninitiated in this jumble that certain ones rise and the rest are left dead (rise not). This harmonizes, not violates, the whole testimony, and gives us the common interpretation, and the judgement as proven still remains.

Paragraph 3. This plainest of all inspired words concerning the method of resurrection.

1 Corinthians 15:42,44,52 is made void by tradition. Did the Apostle know what he was writing about? Did he not write in answer to the question, verse 35, "How are the dead raised up and with what body do they come?" And is not this chapter a complete answer; could he have spoken any plainer?

No, nothing lies between; to suggest that anything does is to practically tell Paul he has forgotten some thing of great importance. Let such that say so have the opportunity of telling Paul that he led us astray in this chapter on resurrection.

Page 6. Paragraphs 4-5 is side-tracking. Drawing a red herring across the trail.

Page 7. Paragraph 1. Why cast a blur over this plain enlightening and glorious news, this gospel of our salvation which agrees perfectly with all the Apostle's statements? True wisdom lies in accepting that which

is written, neither taking from nor adding to. The responsibility for so doing is realized by the writer of these notes.

This judgment continually is so prevalent that it comes into the thanksgiving for the Bread and Wine. In fact the Judgment Seat. We have heard such - until the thanks is clean forgotten by brethren. That Christ rose "mortal" is a word destroying doctrine. True, Christ was a living soul born of a virgin then begotten by the Spirit of Holiness in resurrection.

2nd Psalm and Peter's interpretation thereof - Acts 13:33; Hebrews 5:5 (quote this - Romans 1:4) He is now the Lord, the Spirit.

Paragraph 2. The Editor is forced against his will, seemingly to confess that "coincidentally" and "elliptically" this immortal resurrection is true.

Paragraph 3 - Very difficult to find a place for 1 Corinthians 15 - a place unseen by the unacquainted reader. Those unacquainted with tradition believe the truth on this matter. Christendom is less astray on this than some acquainted ones suppose.

There must be something seriously wrong when such words, viz:- "We have endeavoured to find a place for 1 Corinthians 15." What a confession of utter failure to bolster up a tradition. Is it not putting Paul out of harmony with himself, to make void his most emphatic declaration or answer to the question, "with what body do they come"?

Again:- "The future is a sealed book," says C.C.Walker. We would refer him to that well-known and often read passage in 1 Corinthians 11:31,32. Is this not plain enough that we are judged now daily. Whilst we remember the warning, "Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall," it is not presumption to hold fast to that which is written of those who believe and are baptized and walk after the Spirit; that we are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. He that believeth in the Son hath the witness in himself." 1 John 5:10.

Page 8. Paragraph 1. This declaration of Paul to the men of Athens who were idolaters, and whom the Apostle would turn them from such idolatry, but surely brethren of Christ do not need this "sobering fact." This again would be fear. "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath torment." 1 John 4:18.

"Fear not little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom."

C.C.Walker comments on Wm. Richmond's pamphlet:- "If Wm. Richmond had said otherwise he would have been accused of setting himself up to be the Judge." This comment of C.C.Walker's reminds one of what Jesus said about the Pharisees concerning John the Baptist and Himself; they were like children sitting in the market place, etc. Neither John nor Christ pleased them.

Paragraph 2. As far as C.C.Walker goes and views 1 Corinthians 15 it is a trouble to him, and the New Testament would be well rid of this chapter.

Paragraph 3. The Doctor, C.C.Walker, nor Wm. Richmond need be followed unless they prove all things.

Paragraph 4. The word used "raised" is quite appropriate for Lazarus and Jesus and the Saints.

Page 9. Paragraph 2. Why add ascent to the Divine Nature. No proof of this; it is all theory and tradition. An error has occurred here, is it chapter 28, not 29, and this record destroys what is left of the flimsy argument upon which so much is based - that law of uncleanness had been nailed to His Cross.

Knowing Christ no more after the flesh. Why? For the obvious reason that He rose a Spiritual body.

Page 10. Paragraph 1. The word "Resurrection" is applicable to both classes with a thousand years between.

Paragraph 2. David's hope is in perfect harmony with the much abused 1 Corinthians 15. Simultaneous resurrection is not proven by Matthew 25:41. There are three parties here. Resurrection of the Just is always put first. And because the two are mentioned in the same verse is no proof that there is not an interval. For we remember the interval in "the day of vengeance" of 2,000 years which Christ did not read in the Synagogue at Nazareth.

We rejoice with David in his exultation and hope to awake with His likeness, which is the portion of the children of God who have been redeemed, not with corruptible things such as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ. To accuse those who believe this, of wresting the Scriptures, is untrue and we are content to await the verdict of the Judge.

No one that believes what is written can deny the resurrection of the unjust, but the question at issue is "when do they appear?" But the rest of the dead live not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.

Revelation 20:6, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection." And this is the resurrection that Paul strove to attain unto.

Re "*exanastasis*" - ex, out of, as in Exodus - a standing forth again most emphatic and quite in accordance with Paul's desire, and with those in Hebrews 11:35 "That they might obtain a better resurrection." The better is most certainly an immortal resurrection, for nowhere in Scripture is a mortal resurrection for the Saints recorded.

And so according to C.C.Walker, we have David at variance with Daniel. Surely this is not the work of one who declares the Scriptures infallible.

And every word of God is true. But we are dealing with the Children of God.

According to the idea put forth by C.C.Walker here in Matthew 25:31, we have Christ enthroned in Jerusalem before the Judgment takes place. This is not in accord with Christadelphian tradition but a reversion of it. The reference to Daniel 12:1,2, with the fuller revelation of Christ in Revelation 20:5,6, given to the servants to understand, the interval of 1,000 years is clear.

The pre-millennial lake of fire, yes, the nations are preparing for that. The last war was termed "Hell with the lid off." It is a pity to make void (or attempt to) the words of Paul in Philippians 3. "If by any means I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

Yes, "the vile" will be left behind in the grave and the vile bodies of the living will be changed in the twinkling of an eye. 1 Corinthians 15:52.

Page 11. Paragraph 1. Never mind what "Christendom Astray" said, We believe that "Christendom Astray" is astray on some things and this is one of them.

We accept Paul as previously stated in 2 Corinthians 5:10 and also 1 Corinthians 3:13-15. Verse 16 is a matter we may write further on, God willing.

"The Spirit of God dwelling in you." We fail to see that Mr. Richmond has in any way wrested Isaiah 26:19, but brings it in beautiful harmony with the hope and striving to attain which Paul expresses in Philippians 3.

Paragraph 2. There is no need to quibble over the fact that righteous judgment will be meted out by the Judge of all the earth. But the children of God are Judged now and chastened now - 1 Corinthians 11:32; "But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord that we should not be condemned with the world."

The world will be brought into subjection, no-one attempts to deny. But the Kingdom must be set up before Abraham can be seen in it.

Paragraph 3. We think this has been covered. “When he shall come,” yes, but it doesn’t follow it is one of the first acts of Christ, because His judgement or rule extends in time and extent.

Page 12. Paragraph 1. It may be quite easy to assert that Mr Richmond wrests the Scriptures, but let the reader be perfectly convinced whether this assertion is true or not. As far as we know Mr Richmond had no organization behind him and if he did, comparable to Birmingham, it was quite insignificant. But has it not been said that truth is found with the minority?

Paragraph 2. There is no need to “imagine” Christ blessing a nation because of its blessings to the Jews. For is not this a general belief by God’s promises to Abraham? “Blessed is he that blesseth thee.” Genesis 12:3.

In conclusion we would exhort the reader to search the Scriptures on this important subject. “What is written - How readest thou?” “Understandest thou what thou readest?” Not in “Anastasia” but in the Bible; belief in the written word of God is enjoined upon all those who are brethren of Christ.

Christadelphians believe they are the Spiritual Israel (although they had no spiritual birth). We read in Hebrews 4:1-9, that Israel entered not into their rest because of unbelief. We charge the Birmingham fellowship with unbelief of 1 Corinthians 15.

There are many who, as previously stated, some voluntarily, others forced to leave this body or organization which as one prominent member of it declared publicly at a Fraternal Gathering, “Is a recognized body of religious people and has its place in the sun.” There are dangers in this position. And the powers of such are very often abused. As previously stated as R.Roberts wrote; “If you are in isolation thank God for it, otherwise you will be subject to others and find your freedom restricted” (or words to that effect).

Christ Himself suffered at the hands of those whose traditions had made the word of God of none effect.

And even in His own little company they forbade one who was casting out devils in His name, because as they said, he followeth not us. Forbid him not, says Christ.

Now we would earnestly commend the reader to 2 Corinthians 1 to 10. The tenth verse is made so much of, while the first verse is almost unnoticed and in this Paul, says “For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved we have a building from God, a house, not made with hands eternal in the heavens.”

In 1 John 1 we read, “But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.” And this is a daily judgment, see verse 9.

And in chapter 3 verse 2 we read, “Beloved now are we the sons of God and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him for we shall see him as he is.”

Going back for a moment in conclusion to “Raised Incorruptible” page 7, paragraph 3, the writer says, “Prior to this (i.e., tribunal), the future is a sealed book excepting in so far as it is reflected in a man’s conscience.

For we know, says Paul and John. Hebrews 12:11. Not to Sinai but Zion ye are come.

G. Reeves. (1910)