

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 201

May/June 2003

In this Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Sister Helen Brady
Page 2	“They Shall Be All Taught Of God”	Brother Phil Parry
Page 6	“The Archbishop of Canterbury on The Soul” Comment by	Brother Edward Turney
Page 7	Query regarding Hebrews 9:27	Brother Allon Maxwell
Page 7	1st Reply	Brother Phil Parry
Page 9	2nd Reply	Brother Eric Cave
Page 11	3rd Reply	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 12	Extract from a letter	Brother John Stevenson
Page 13	Letter to our Readers from	Brother Phil Parry
Page 15	1st of two Editorials from old Circular Letters	Brother Ernest Brady
Page 17	2nd Editorial	Brother Ernest Brady
Page 19	Letter to Brother Richard Pursell, Editor of “Shofar”	Brother Phil Parry.

Editorial

Dear Sisters, Brothers and friends, Loving greetings.

Almost the only thing I knew about Isaac Newton was the story of the apple falling on his head and that this led to his discovery of the laws of gravity. Recently however, items in the press and a program on television alerted me to some interesting facts about the man whose dates were 1642-1727. He was born in Lincolnshire near Grantham at whose grammar school he got his education. He is considered to be Britain's greatest scientist and his “Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica” is thought by some to be the greatest scientific work. yet written. A friend tells me that Isaac Asimoff wrote that Isaac Newton became eminently famous in his lifetime as no other person ever has, with the exceptions of Archimedes before him and Einstein after him.

Isaac Newton is described in biographical dictionaries as a scientist and mathematician. He studied the moon and the stars and was convinced that such arrangements could only proceed from an all powerful creator- He also had a consuming interest in alchemy which was illegal at the time. He became a professor at Trinity College, Cambridge and in order to do this he should have taken holy orders which he found impossible because he was convinced that both the Catholic and Anglican Church were based on a corruption of God's word as set out in the Bible. He avoided taking holy orders through an intervention by the Monarch.

He said that the idolatry of the Catholics, the belief in the trinity and the divinity of Christ were all blasphemous and he called the early church fathers “murderers.” Isaac Newton could not speak of his beliefs in these matters as they were heresies and he would have been imprisoned for such views; but he left ample written evidence of his convictions from handwritten manuscripts that have been unearthed in a library in Jerusalem.

Apparently these thousands of pages show Newton's attempts to decode the Bible which he believed contained God's secret laws for the universe. He predicted that the Second Coming of Christ would follow plagues and war and would precede a 1,000 year reign by the saints on earth - of whom he would be one.

In between fruitless experiments with alchemy he spent 50 years and wrote 4,500 pages trying to predict when the end of the world was coming. The most definite date he set for the apocalypse, which he scribbled on a scrap of paper, was 2060. In Newton's days nearly everyone believed in the catastrophic end

of the world, however when he wrote of the end “in the year of the Lord 2060” he went on to stress “I mention this period not to assert it, but only to show that there is little reason to expect it earlier, and thereby to put a stop to the rash conjectures of interpreters who are frequently assigning the time of the end, and thereby bringing the sacred prophecies into discredit as often as their conjectures do not come to pass. It is not for us to know the times and the seasons which God hath put in his own breast.”

Isaac Newton believed that the Temple would be rebuilt when Christ returned and that there would then be one thousand years of pure Christianity. There were 30 Bibles in his possession when he died, Greek and Hebrew, etc. He also left what is called a “remarkable” MS on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation, and a history of Creation.

He is described as having a suspicious and quarrelsome temper and was evidently something of a trial to his friends and in 1693 he suffered a mental breakdown but he recovered and became the Master of the Mint until his death.

At the time of writing the war, or more properly, the invasion of Iraq has recently begun. No one knows where this will lead. It would certainly be extraordinarily apt if the end of all things came to pass in the places where God placed His first son and so began the complex relationship between Himself and humankind. al-Qarna a town at the southern tip of Iraq is said to be the site of the Garden of Eden. There is even a tree known to locals as Adam’s Tree. The Jews were exiled to Babylon in the south of Mesopotamia (to the south of Baghdad) after the capture of Jerusalem in 586 BC. Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers played a key part in Old Testament history. The ancient city of Ur, on the Euphrates, was home to Abraham before his wanderings to the promised land.

God is working His purpose out as year succeeds to year,
God is working His purpose out and the time is drawing near;
Nearer and nearer draws the time, the time that shall surely be,
When the earth shall be filled with the glory of God as the waters cover the sea.

Love to all. Helen Brady.

“They Shall Be All Taught Of God”

“No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him”

John 6:44,45

Having read these words of the Lord Jesus it is plain to me the reason why certain people never learn of the Father but prefer to believe the teaching of men, a teaching which draws them and sticks like glue. Why then do they never learn? Whatsoever was written aforetime was written for our admonition and learning upon whom is come the end of the age (Mosaic?). “The law of Moses was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.” -- Words of the Apostle Paul.

Who then are the people who obstruct the very purpose of God in the law’s teaching of “substitution” by the shedding of blood for the remission of sins? They are the people who do not read the Bible effectively and cannot discern the real teaching in Genesis and the following books, of what “substitution” means in regard to the sacrifice of Christ. They do not even realise that when Adam and Eve sinned, no sentence of death passed upon them verbally; in fact Adam knew that he was legally under sentence of death by violation of God’s law though capable of dying under the natural appointment of his created substance of flesh and blood. How then can such a created corruptible substance become the penalty for Adam’s sin? Adam knew when he ate of the forbidden tree that he was guilty and subject to inflicted death which was shown later to be by the shedding of blood to take away his life which was in it.

This legally inflicted death, as Paul teaches in Romans chapter 5 was the death that came by sin, not the death Adam would experience if unchanged to the nature of angels. "Dust thou art" God said to Adam, "and unto dust shalt thou return." No need of any change here. "Left to himself as God made him, and seeing that Adam had become a transgressor of Divine Law, there was no need of a miracle for the infliction of death;" - Dr. Thomas, "Eureka" Vol.1 page 248. Though this be true of Adam's created nature, Dr. Thomas is not in agreement with Paul's statement in Romans 5:12, neither with God's statement in Genesis 2:17, "for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." From the foregoing comments it can be seen that there is a difference between the two deaths. Paul speaks of the death-by-sin which also passed upon all men, but Dr. Thomas implies it was already in operation by inheritance of Adam's corruptible nature before sin entered, and also in consequence of his errors he regards "the law of sin and death" as a law of the physical nature ending in natural death, while Paul says he had already been delivered from "the law of sin and death" through the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." (Romans 8:1,2).

The erroneous teaching of natural death as the penalty for Adam's sin is the obstacle to the acceptance of the death of Christ as substitutional for the death Adam incurred by disobedience, yet substitution is taught in Genesis 3:21, the blood of the lamb shed as a type of the atoning work of God in His Son, why should Abel have offered a slain lamb out of the firstlings of his flock if it were not an acknowledgement of what God did for his father Adam in providing a substitute which also involved himself? A summary of what I have said proves that what God said to the serpent, to Eve and to Adam was not the inflicted death-by-sin, but a result of its remittance, yet losing his own right to the Tree of Life in the garden of God and becoming dependent on the antitypical Lamb of God in his probationary period of life ending in natural death common to his created substance. This was shown by Abel, Seth, Enoch, Noah, Abraham and all of similar faith and further made to abound in the Mosaic Law and its ritualistic sacrifices and offerings. (Romans 5:17 to 21). All such faithful as the above mentioned, recognised what Abel recognised in contrast with Cain's evil works.

My reason for the foregoing introduction is in the correspondence between Esleigh Feltham, an ex-Christadelphian of Leamington Spa back in 1994, but in regard to his views and comments there is very little ex-Christadelphian to find in them. Take for example the following, "When Christ of his own free will allowed himself to be crucified he was publicly recognising that the mature he wore had been justly condemned to death; and because he himself had lived an entirely righteous life God was able, on the basis of that recognition, to raise him from the dead."

This is the Robert Roberts doctrine at its worst and if faced with anyone supporting it in person I would hardly be able to contain myself, so imagine how Jesus Himself felt when convicted falsely by the Jewish Priesthood and Rulers. How could Jesus, the Lamb of God, without blemish offer unto His disciples the unleavened bread as a symbol of His body if His body of flesh was condemned to death? How can a condemned body be sacrificed or made a Ransom to purchase people from under the bondage of Sin? It is an abomination in the sight of God to exhibit so much ignorance and profess to be taught of Him!

"Condemned flesh and body" may be representative for Esleigh Feltham and the R. Roberts followers, for in fact they believe this to be their status at the present time. How can Esleigh Feltham and others entertain the false conception that Christ's resurrection alleviated the enormous pain He suffered before and after His being hanged on the tree? In fact any sensible person should know that physical resurrection from the grave does not remove the experience of death in whatever way it happens. Nowhere in the Bible will they read that God condemned the nature He created, and not only so, and despite the false view that He did. Jesus in that same nature lived a sinless life, neither by His death was He publicly recognising that the nature of Adam or His own had been justly condemned to death, not even the Jewish rulers gave such a reason for putting Him to death, the reason they had for doing so is printed in Clause 12 of the B.A.S.F. which is a contradiction of Christadelphian teaching with that of Esleigh Feltham's blasphemous statement that it was "in recognition of his nature being condemned to death."

In his reply to our Brother R. Gregory on the matter of Muth Temuth, Esleigh disagrees that the term necessitates immediate judicial death and he can find no support in Young's concordance, but I must say that the Holy Scriptures were available before Young's Concordance and the evidence in Genesis is quite clear on the matter, but Esleigh's own reasoning is based on the assumption that Adam died and therefore this must have been the penalty for his sin. His following two statements land him in his own trap and convicts

him of believing Adam's death was final and no hope of resurrection. 1. "The penalty for sin was death, which apart from remission, was final." Did Adam have remission? Not if natural death was the penalty - he died that death. 2. The next statement infers that there was no resurrection for Adam. He says, "The fact that Christ

was raised from the dead shows that he was not a substitute for man." In other words Adam died the death of a sinner; the sentence having not been remitted and was final.

Esleigh goes on to teach that Christ was indeed a substitute, not for the death he believes in, but the inflicted judicial death by bloodshedding incurred by Adam. He says "Those who acknowledge Christ's work in the appointed way obtain deliverance from death as forgiven sinners, not as debtors whose liability has been met by someone else... The animals sacrificed under the law were an acknowledgement of sin - not a substitute." How then are sinners forgiven and yet die?

As I have pointed out, if Esleigh Feltham believes natural death to be the penalty for sin which Adam experienced and we also, then we have not obtained deliverance from it, and mark you, Esleigh and all of the same viewpoint, resurrection from the grave is not deliverance from death but the sacrifices of animals under the law foreshadowing the death of Christ inflicted by bloodshedding was.

The first part of Esleigh's statement - "Those who acknowledged Christ's work in the appointed way obtain deliverance from death," is what we believe; this is the 'death by sin' Adam did not experience as a sinner in the day he ate of the Tree. Esleigh must therefore acknowledge Christ's work in the appointed way as did those who by faith offered sacrificial animals for sin under the law, not knowing their benefactor apart from God Himself, though Abraham was shown it in some way which resulted in the statement Jesus made to the Jews, "Abraham rejoiced to see my day and he saw it and was glad."

As Brother Russell followed up with letters of reply to those of Esleigh Peltham's; replies that would or should convince any but those type of people who believe the natural death which is common to all animal species was the same as that imposed upon Adam as the penalty for sin, could not be true.

If Esleigh had put his statement more correctly to read "become subject to inflicted death," it would have been nearer the truth of what Bro. Gregory had been stating in regard to "surely die." I will quote Esleigh's statement - "My understanding of God's words in Genesis may be a little different to that of others, "dying, thou shalt die" means, being of a dying nature thou shalt indeed become subject to death."

Now I ask you, what is 'being of a dying nature'? Is it not being of the same nature as all animal life at creation in whose nostrils was the breath of life? And is it not then subject to death apart from a change to spirit life?

An animal or a human being of corruptible nature can only become subject to inflicted death for a certain reason - the animal, for sacrifice or for eating; the human, as in Adam's case, by reason of committed sin.

As I pointed out at the beginning, how can the penalty for sin become the very nature Adam is already in possession of before sinning?

Esleigh says in one instance, "I could not agree that Christ paid the penalty imposed on Adam. Rather God provided a remedy..." But it is obvious that Esleigh believes the penalty imposed on Adam was a just condemnation to death of his nature and Jesus, being of that nature recognised that He also was under that same condemnation and allowed Himself to be put to death. So therefore Esleigh implies that a man of condemned nature can please God in all things and be regarded as Righteous and God on the basis of a 'dual' Christ was obliged to raise Him from the dead in a body that saw no corruption, which can only imply that His blood was faulty, and all that His flesh needed was Spirit life without the blood - that very blood through which was remission of sin. Where is here any logical scriptural reasoning in such views?

Like many in the Christadelphian community Esleigh rejects that the substitutional death of Christ was for Adam and all in his loins, yet have no answer for the reason for His death other than 'condemned nature'

and ‘martyrdom’ neither of which meet the case, yet he is willing to accept Jesus wholly righteous conduct as being a “substitute” for his own failing and weakness and inability to obtain redemption from under the law of sin and death, under which all men, Jew and Gentile, were concluded. (Romans 3:9)(Galatians 3:22).

Esleigh, with the many Christadelphians, have stated that God forgives us for the state in which we find ourselves, and on the basis of the sinless character of Jesus. If this were true Jesus need not have died for He was sinless to the point when He offered Himself without spot to God, that God might offer Him up in the place of Adam to the law Adam had violated; the claim to his natural life hanging over him until fulfilled by the antitype of the lamb in Eden.

It may also surprise many that Robert Roberts was forced to accept this latter part of my statement when faced with the dilemma of the position of the faithful living at the time of the resurrection of the dead in Christ. If the penalty of death passed upon all men how could those alive and remaining be changed to incorruptible life without experiencing death? He then gives the example of Enoch in his book “The Visible Hand of God” of Enoch associating himself with a sacrificial lamb as a type of Jesus and thus dying unto Adamic sin; and in like manner the faithful living had died in symbol in Baptism into the death of Jesus. Thus Roberts admits that Jesus died the death by the shedding of blood and released them from Sin’s claim. If this is not an admission that Christ’s death was substitutional for the death due to Adam in the day he transgressed I do not know what can replace it.

Dr. Thomas in the original edition of *Elpis Israel*, page 213 wrote of Jesus as “The substitutionary Testator.” In a later edition (1910), the Editor of *The Christadelphian*, C.C.Walker, altered it to read “Mediator,” because he and his members did not preach Christ crucified as St Paul did, because they understood not The Atonement.

I do not know whether Esleigh was aware of what Robert Roberts wrote in regard to the position of a Jew under the Law of Moses but in his reply to Brother Russell he appears to have a similar and nonsensical view. Esleigh writes, “I do not agree that animal sacrifices were substitutional. Were this so, surely any man could have obtained redemption by sacrificing himself. (Hebrews 10:11). The animal simply pointed forward to God’s appointed Redeemer.” Well, well, and now how does Esleigh explain a man under legal sentence of death in Adam could commit suicide and obtain his own redemption and follow this with the statement, “The animals simply pointed forward to God’s appointed Redeemer”? If God has appointed a Redeemer, then all Esleigh has said is without foundation in regard to self-redemption, but what he says of the animals pointing to Christ is true only if one accepts they were substitutes pointing forward to His death.

Reading from the booklet “The Lamb of God” by A.L.Wilson, he quotes from “Echoes of Past Controversies,” page 52, Robert Roberts says: “If there had been a Jew who had kept the law in all things, he would have been in the very position of Jesus. It would have been in his power by dying, to cleanse himself from the Adamic condemnation.”

But it is demonstrated by Esleigh and by R.Roberts that the dying is the penalty due to the person under condemnation after he had kept the law in all things. The Apostle Paul says, “If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.” The position of Jesus was that He was not born under Adamic condemnation and lived a life of continual obedience to the will of His Father, His voluntary death was therefore not for Himself but was the Ransom price for all. (1 Timothy 2:5,6). It appears that Esleigh and those of like-mind tend to frustrate the grace of God in echoing the absurdity of Clause 8 of the B.A.S.F. where of Christ it is said, “by dying to abrogate the law of condemnation for himself and all who should believe and obey him.”

Mark then the words of Paul in Galatians 2:21, “I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.”

To God be the Glory.

Brother Phil Parry.

Extract from the Circular Letter for July 1956. It's thought that this article was first published in the 1870's -

The Archbishop of Canterbury On The Soul

“Who should tell them whether the soul, according to the material hypothesis, did not reside in any of those which no known power of nature had ever been supposed to be capable of dissolving? How could he know that the soul which had been in him ever since he was a baby, which had passed with him through all the changes of his changeful life, which seemed altogether independent of the outward organisation of his frame, was altogether to go out like the flame of a candle when he had come to that part of his existence which they call death; and if it were so, that the soul and mind were to live, how was their conviction of that strengthened by the fact that all the great intellects that had ever lived had recognised the immortality of the soul - that the poets, the philosophers, the theologians, all the men who had given themselves to that great subject, all who had influenced the human race in the highest stages of its civilisation, had been convinced that there was that within them which death could not destroy!

He was not a true philosopher who had told them they need not trouble themselves as to what would happen when they came to that great event which they called death. There was every reason to believe, as a matter of science, that death was not the end; and if death was not the end, the man was mad who did not make preparations for that which lay beyond death.”

This same “venerable prelate,” we were credibly informed a good while since, ordered his secretary, in answer to the following question put to himself personally by one of his servants: “which is the strongest passage in proof of the immortality of the soul?” - to write the following answer:- “that text in Corinthians in which St. Paul says this mortal shall put on immortality.” (!!!)

On reading the above extract from the archbishop's speech at Margate, we were reminded of this extraordinary answer. It is lamentable indeed to observe the incorrectness of his statements, as also the total absence of Scripture proof. Did the Archbishop of Canterbury reflect upon what he was saying, when he told his hearers that “All the great intellects that ever lived had recognised the immortality of the soul”?

Surely not. It would be altogether superfluous to refresh such a memory as the archbishop's with a long list of names, including great poets, philosophers and acute theologians - to bring to his remembrance the names of Macaulay, Whately, Locke, Milton, Tillotson, etc., etc., - great intellects, indeed, who repudiated the unfounded dogma so blandly insinuated by himself in his speech.

But, logically, of what value is the fact that certain great men have held certain doctrines? There are other men, equally great, who have held the contrary. This counterpoise leaves any question as though it had never been put into the balance. And, beside this, what is truer than that hundreds of great intellects in all times and in all countries have held that which afterwards has been demonstrated to be false? Great intellects are, merely as such, not a satisfactory court of appeal. The Creator of the human soul has defined its nature; has made a provision for its future existence; has declared it mortal in a hundred testimonies; has promised it LIFE; has threatened it with DEATH; therefore, what is the use of such baseless speculation? One line of the Inspired Oracles would have infinitely out-weighed all the supposition arising out of what great intellects have believed. Why did not the head of the English Church quote that one line? We do not intend just now to expound this subject, but cannot refrain from quoting the Apostle to the Gentiles; “All have sinned; DEATH hath passed upon all men;” to which we could the Almighty's first denunciation, “The SOUL that sinneth it shall die.”

Edward Turney. 1873

Hebrews 9:27

“And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment.”

Brother Allon Maxwell writes:

“I can recall, quite some years ago, reading an article by a Christadelphian author (I think) on the above passage in Hebrews, which explained that the context of the verse is not “ordinary” mortality, but the symbolic death of the High Priest, who once each year entered the Holy Place with the blood of the offering, which represented that of Christ.

It went on to say that after the offering had been made, the High Priest returned from the Holy Place to announce the “judgment” that sins of the nation had been forgiven for yet another year.

And the comparison was then made with Christ, who had entered “heaven itself, to appear in the presence of God for us,” verse 24, from whence He will return, “not to deal with sin” (RSV) or “not to bear sin” (NIV) i.e. by making another sacrifice - but to announce salvation to those who are awaiting His return.

I have recently had occasion to need the reference, if it can be found... but have been unable to locate it. Have you heard this view presented previously? Hope you can help.

Allon Maxwell.

Upon receiving this letter I asked some of our regular readers if they knew where this article could be found and their answers follow. One Christadelphian friend located the following from “The Christadelphian” magazine for December 1922, page 545, written by C.C.Walker in answer to a question:

Question: Does this expression apply to the Priesthood in particular or to men in general?

Answer: Without doubt primarily to the Priesthood in particular, but this, of course, without prejudice to the fact that many other men have it “appointed unto them once to die and after this the judgment.”

The whole argument of Paul in this place is the superiority of the Priesthood of Christ to the Priesthood of the Levitical order which was passing away. This is, of course, perfectly obvious in chapter 9 verse 15 to 28.

It has been remarked that the article in verse 27 ought to be translated; literally the reading is “it is appointed unto the men once to die...” This preserves the point of the comparison between the Aaronic and Melchisedec Priesthoods. We remember that in the law of the city of refuge the death of the High Priest was the occasion of the liberation of the slayer (Numbers 35), which was, of course, but a shadow of the substance in Christ.

C.C.Walker.

Brother Phil Parry writes:-

In response to Alton Maxwell’s enquiry in connection with the statement in Hebrews 9:27 and an article on it by (he thinks) a Christadelphian Author, whose name he cannot recall, I must confess that I have never read anything directly on the subject by anyone in particular. However, on the back cover of “Visible Hand of God” two booklets are advertised - “The Letter to The Romans,” and “The Letter to the Hebrews?” (by the late John Carter, Editor of “The Christadelphian”) the former I have, but not the latter but I would not think either to be very reliable. However, I can see a serious and glaring mistake at the outset by the Christadelphian Author in his reference to a “symbolic death of the High Priest,” who once each year entered the Holy Place with the blood of the offering, which represented that of Christ.

It was the Sacrificial Death of Christ which was typified - as the victim, not the Priest - it does not say that the High Priest died, but that he offered first to legally cleanse his own sin to be fit to offer for the people.

I also fail to see that the blood of the animal offering represented that of Christ when it was life in human blood of Adamic begettal that had been forfeited to the Divine Law in Eden. And as the Apostle said, "It was impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin."

The life in the blood of Christ was not forfeited as was other men's through the sin of Adam, so also the blood of animals offered according to the description and demands of the Law was not life forfeited to sin for God does not give 'forfeited life' to make Atonement for the soul.

I can agree that the animal sacrifices were typical and substitutional or in the place of Christ the true substance.

How could a dead High Priest enter the Holiest with the blood of the sacrificed animal? He must be alive to go in and return to the people, and he could continue the same office for succeeding years. It was a living High priest who offered for the people and it was a living God who offered up His own Son freely for all after that very Son offered Himself to His Father first, willingly and without spot or blemish. As it is written by the Apostle Paul, Romans 8.32, "He that spared not His own Son but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things,"

Edward Turney in dealing with the Sacrifice of Christ says that He offered Himself without spot to God when He entered Heaven after His resurrection, but my own view is what I have already stated in the above paragraph for the special reason of being the antitypical lamb without spot or blemish in both flesh and character, with also the qualifications of High Priest at the Right Hand of God to judge righteously and to make intercession for His own household.

I had looked for something in Turney's lecture dealing with Hebrews 9:27 but he had mentioned all the relevant matters on the subject of the priesthood but not that very statement (of Hebrews 9:27). I can only write what I think the Apostle means. The key word seems to be "appointed" which does not convey the idea of adverse judgment for wrong doing necessarily, but of some event which is to take place. For example, Acts 17:30 (R.V.), "The times of ignorance God overlooked, but now he commands all men everywhere to repent, because he has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed, and of this he has given assurance to all men by raising him from the dead."

This speaks of a fixed day to do what he has appointed His Son to do, that is, to rule in righteousness. The previous verses 26 & 27 read thus: "Since he himself gives to all men life and breath and everything. And he made from one every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their habitation that they should seek God, in hope that they might feel after him and find him. Yet he is not far from each one of us, for in him we live and move and have our being."

Continuing Hebrews 9:27, Revised Version, "And just as it is appointed for men to die once, and after that comes judgment, so Christ having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time, not to deal with sin but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him." This could apply to those faithful who have fallen asleep by reason of their corruptible nature while eagerly awaiting for His return, and those faithful alive at His coming.

It refers to living people awaiting the return from the Holiest, in the case of Jesus from Heaven, they live unto God.

I cannot see this "Appointment unto men to die once," can mean the "death by in," for this death is for those who are enlightened and can be released from it through the redemption which is provided in Christ. The enlightened believer can pass from the legal death to life in the way Jesus taught it, but not from the experience of death through corruptible nature which God at the creation appointed for Adam with all other animal life dependent upon food and oxygen; what took place with Adam later as a result of Divine Law is another story which necessitated the sacrifice of Jesus to bear the sins of the many. Hebrews 9:27.

So, saith the wise man, To everything there is a season, and a time for every matter under the heaven. A time to be born and a time to die... Also that it is God's gift to man that everyone should eat and drink and take pleasure in all his toil. I know that whatever God does endures for ever; nothing can be added to it, nor anything taken from it; God has made it so, in order that men should fear before Him... I said in my heart, God will judge the righteous and the wicked, for he has appointed a time for every matter.' (Ecclesiastes 3).

I may not be correct in all points and would welcome wholeheartedly a clearer meaning of Hebrews 9:27 for indeed the Apostle Peter said that Paul wrote some things hard to be understood. However I have made an effort in the absence of any other matter available.

Sincere Love in the Name of Jesus,

Phil Parry.

— — —

Brother Eric Cave writes:- -

Dear Russell, Hebrews 9:27: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die (aorist infinitive), but after this the judgment." (Strong's 2920 '*krisis*').

Further to the request from Brother Alton Maxwell, I have not been able to locate the quotation on Hebrews 9:27 in any of the works of John Thomas I possess, to the effect that the context of this verse is not "ordinary mortality" but the symbolic death of the High Priest, who once a year entered the Holy Place with the blood of the offering, which represented that of Christ who has entered heaven itself to appear in the presence of God for us, from whence he will return, "not to deal with sin" (RSV) or not to "bear sin" (NIV) but to announce salvation to those who are waiting his return! Nor have I heard of this particular exposition previously, having always understood that our Lord was "The firstfruits of them that slept, i.e. the immortal firstfruits as others such as Lazarus etc., had earlier been raised from the dead in a mortal state.

I do have a note in my Bible re the three different words rendered 'appear' in verses 24, 26, and 28, of this chapter: *emphanizo* in verse 24, meaning the presence of Jesus before God for us; *phaneroo* in verse 26 of his past manifestation for "the sacrifice of himself;" and *optomai* in verse 28 of his future "appearance" for his saints, according to "Vine's Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words."

However, I am enclosing a study which considers the Day of Atonement through the exposition of Leviticus 16 in this 9th chapter of Hebrews by Brother John Adey: -

Type and antitype in Hebrews

Hebrews' opening contrast introduces a framework within which the Epistle measures the nature and value of Christ's sacrifice- The expression "God...spake in time past...by the prophets" (1:1), is contrasted with; "God... hath in these last days spoken...by His Son" (1:2). It is helpful to assess this framework because of the bearing it has on later issues. The structure it exhibits is antithesis coupled with a common underlying thesis: God's Word is the agency common to both contrasted epochs. Despite this common influence there is a radical discontinuity: previous modes of manifestation are eclipsed. God's revelation in His Son secures the ultimate purpose. All former revelations of God are but as shadows compared with "the express image of His person (or substance) in Christ" (1:3)

Hebrews develops the concept associated with 'shadow' and 'substance,' and employs an order of 'types,' supported by the modes of antithesis and thesis, when proving the superiority of Christ over the Law of Moses. Applying the idea of 'shadow' and 'object' within this framework yields an important insight. A shadow is different from, but related to its object. It is different in nature, and for its form it depends on the object from which it is cast- Similarly, the Law of Moses is God's Word shadowed off Christ. God's Word in Christ (1:3) is "the true" (object): the identity of God in the New Covenant.

This relation between Old and New Covenants entails that the Levitical institution as a shadow could prefigure, and demonstrate the necessity for, the “good things to come” (10:1), fulfilled in Christ. Thus, just as ‘object’ is to ‘shadow,’ so Christ must be the archetype for the Law, although identifying with it in fulfilment (13:12). The significance of this point was appreciated by John the Baptist, who, standing at the end of the epoch of “the Law and the prophets” (Luke 16:16), stated: “He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he was before me” (John 1:15). In short, the installation of the Law was the manifestation of concepts which had a prior dependence on the concept of Christ, “whom (God) hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds” (1:2). The archetypal precedence of Christ over the Law is emphasised when Scripture explains that his service and atonement are not of the same order as “the example and shadow of heavenly things” (8:5); nor, like his earthly counterparts, did he merely purify “the patterns of things in the heavens” (9:23). But his sacrifice relates to “the heavenly things themselves” (9:23), of which he is “the very image” (10:1); “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (9:24).

This difference of levels forms the antithesis between the orders of Aaron and Melchisedec, and grades the status of the Law as a representational medium tutorial of Christ’s redemptive accomplishments (Galatians 3:24,25). The Levitical institution, incorporating the Day of Atonement, was a scheme of temporary merit, enforcing the dilemma of a sinner’s separation from God; but in itself it was unable to repair this breach. Nevertheless, the solution to this problem was translated, through the ‘type’ shown to Moses in the Mount (8:5), into the functions and forms materialised in the tabernacle ‘antitype.’ The underlying relation of ‘typifying,’ between the ‘archetype’ (or, “the true”), the ‘type’ and the ‘antitype’ is transitive both ways: from Christ to the Law and from the Law to Christ. This means that either way there is an interdependence, yielding explanatory possibilities.

For the burdened sinner under the Law, his redemption lay in what it typified, or made accessible, of Christ’s day of rest from sins - a theme at the heart of the Day of Atonement. Like the baptism of John, the Law always stood in the shadow of “him which should come after” (Acts 19:4). Reinstatement with God would be conferred retrospectively on those who, as Christ’s seed under the Law (Romans 4:16), had identified with his sacrifice in spirit. The Law, like John’s baptism, could not in itself accomplish for the repentant what the one it heralded would achieve. Its instrumentality was effective only in virtue of its pointing to, and its association with, Jesus Christ. Hebrew’s exposition, as the foregoing highlights, is the Holy Spirit’s means of signifying the ultimate magnitude of Christ’s sacrifice. For such was the scope of his achievement that it took multiple forms of representation to account for it.

Language of the Atonement

Hebrews 9 epitomises the exact identificatory relations which obtained between the atonement day of both Old and New Covenants. Accordingly, Levitical ritual terminology is employed to describe Christ’s role in his own act of Atonement.

Proof that the chapter is concerned with the Day of Atonement and its redemptive object - access to God’s presence at the mercy seat - comes from the mention of “the golden censer” already within the veil (verse 4). Without this information verses 1-5 would include the altar of incense, placing it outside the most holy place. Instead, the altar is replaced by its function: to provide “burning coals (Leviticus 16:12) for the censer’s use within the veil. This act was only performed on the Day of Atonement. Therefore this prefatory detail anticipates the alignment of the ‘parabolic’ enactments (AV “figure” in v. 9 is *parabole* in the Greek) of the high priest with Christ’s own entry into the “holiest of all” (v.8); “But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people” (v.7). The parallel, and ensuing, contrast is then drawn between the Melchisedec priest and his Aaronic precursor, in verses 11, 12: “Christ being come an high priest of good things to come.-neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption.” The apostle’s commentary states (v.22): “almost all things are by the law purged with

blood.” Christ and the Levitical priest entered the most holy by the same means; purging with blood. Thereby, in both cases, remission of sins was achieved- The representation at this level coordinates with fulfilment; the vocabulary is interchangeable. The principle “it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul” (Leviticus 17:11), is satisfied.

For summary convenience, the defining title “The Atonement” is used in this special issue to refer to the concept embracing Christ’s redemptive sacrifice. It is also applied to its foreshadowings in the Law. However, this term is not found in Scripture. Instead, as in Hebrews 9, acts which fall under what was termed ‘making atonement’ (see Leviticus 16:6ff.) are discussed. These comprise what ‘making atonement’ was to be. It is actually called “the day of atonements” (Hebrews *yom hakippurim*, Leviticus 23:27). At least seven atoning rituals were performed, thus accounting for the plural formulation “atonements.” The Greek counterpart of ‘making atonement’ does not occur, interestingly, in Hebrews 9 – a significant omission which may relate to the presence of its cognate term “mercy seat.”

— — —

Although this essay continues we will leave it at this point as enough has been said to satisfy anyone that Hebrews chapter 9 compares and contrasts the events which took place on Day of Atonement under the Law of Moses with the work accomplished by Jesus Christ on our behalf by His crucifixion.

What I find most interesting is that the writer, John Adey, makes no mention of Hebrews 9:27. As a Christadelphian holding the view that we are raised to judgment to ‘The Great Assize’ of popular theology it would no doubt seem to him that this verse must surely be out of place for why should the writer to the Hebrews introduce the subject of death followed by judgment into the context of the Day of Atonement? There is no doubt in my mind that John Adey, along with most Christadelphians would be at a loss to make sense of it, while C.C.Walker’s answer above gives no satisfactory explanation for he seems to assume that Jesus Christ was an High Priest at the time of the crucifixion when in fact He was the Lamb of God who had kept Himself without blemish and without spot in order to purchase us to God, thus completing His Father’s will and purpose in bringing many sons to glory. Jesus became High Priest at the right-hand of His Father for the faithful after entering heaven.

My own reply to Brother Allon: -

Dear Allon, Greetings in Jesus’ Great Name. Thank you for your letter of 30th March, regarding Hebrews 9:27. It was a most timely letter because I am at the moment writing a letter to some Christadelphians about the judgment and wondered how this verse fitted in. I haven’t any knowledge of anyone writing on this verse but your letter made me turn to Dr Eidersheim’s book “The Temple at the Time of Christ” in which he has a chapter dealing with the Day of Atonement. It was so interesting I thought I would photocopy the chapter and enclose it with this letter. It agrees with your recollection about the announcement made by the High Priest when he came out of the Holy of Holies for the last time on that day.

If one reads Hebrews chapter 9 in the ‘conventional way’ one can wonder why verse 27 should be included in this chapter dealing with the Day of Atonement. I am confident we now have the right answer and it also puts verses 26 & 27 of chapter 10 into perspective-

But I doubt if it will alter the minds of some who would rather stick with their view of a judicial judgment when Jesus comes again.

Sincerely your brother in Hope, Russell.

— — — — —

Upon a further reading of this chapter from Dr. Edesheim’s book referred to in my letter to Brother Allon Maxwell, I appear to have misread a portion of it in reference to the high priest’s announcement which I said was at the moment of coming out of the Holy of Holies for the last, or fourth, time that day. However, on coming out the third time the next duty the high priest had to perform was to send the scape-goat into the

wilderness and it was after this was done that he turned to the congregation and uttered his last words to them: “Ye shall be cleansed.”

I will here quote a short extract from the book which makes this point :-

Most solemn as the services had hitherto been, the worshippers would chiefly think with awe of the high-priest going into the immediate presence of God, coming out thence alive, and securing for them by the blood the continuance of the Old Testament privileges of sacrifices and of access unto God through them. What now took place concerned them, if possible, even more nearly. Their own personal guilt and sins were now to be removed from them, and that in a symbolic rite, at one and the same time the most mysterious and the most significant of all. All this while the ‘scape-goat,’ with the ‘scarlet-tongue,’ telling of the guilt it was to bear, had stood looking eastwards, confronting the people, and waiting for the terrible load which it was to carry away ‘unto a land not inhabited.’ Laying both hands on the head of this goat, the high-priest now confessed and pleaded: -

“Ah, JEHOVAH! they have committed iniquity; they have transgressed; they have sinned - Thy people, the house of Israel. Oh, then, JEHOVAH! cover over (atone for), I intreat Thee, upon their iniquities, their transgressions, and their sins, which they have wickedly committed, transgressed, and sinned before Thee - Thy people, the house of Israel. As it is written in the law of Moses, Thy servant, saying: ‘For on that day shall it be covered over (atoned) for you, to make you clean from all your sins before JEHOVAH ye shall be cleansed-’“

And while the prostrate multitude worshipped at the name of Jehovah, the high-priest turned his face towards them as he uttered the last words, “Ye shall be cleansed!” as if to declare to them the absolution and remission of their sins.

Upon further reflection It seems to me that the view expressed in Brother Allan’s letter by someone unknown to us, that this verse 27 of Hebrews 9 refers to the declaration made by the High Priest towards the end of his service on the Day of Atonement is the best explanation we have. If anyone can add to these thoughts we would be very grateful to hear from them, as Brother Phil Parry says, “we would welcome wholeheartedly a clearer meaning of Hebrews 9:27.”

We thank Brother Alton Maxwell for stimulating our thoughts.

Russell

Extract from a letter from Brother John Stevenson:

In my last letter I meant to tell you that I am an extreme protestant. Besides being an ordinary protestant in opposition to Roman Catholicism and the infallible authoritarian Pope, I carry Protestantism further so that I will not accept any fallible human who sets himself up as an authority on interpreting the scriptures and deciding what his followers should believe. So I oppose man-made creeds and statements of faith, and besides the Pope, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the moderator of the Presbyterian church, and all other human authorities including Robert Roberts and his followers. I believe God wants us to decide for ourselves what is truth and what is error, with the help of other people’s dissertations, but not the ones who demand authority and unquestioning obedience. We will all answer for our beliefs and actions, and saying “I follow so-and-so’s teaching” will not be acceptable. Saying “I follow the teaching of the Holy Scriptures” will be acceptable.

John Stevenson

Editor's note:

We thank Brother John Stevenson's for centring our minds on whom we serve, for it is impossible for a disciple of Jesus to be a disciple of someone else at the same time. "No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate to the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other." If we remember that being a disciple is to follow a discipline, we can see how inconsistent it is to say we follow inspired Scripture and a man-made Statement of Faith.

Russell.

Letter from Brother Phil Parry:

Dear Readers, Good news from Brother David Waye of Canada, insofar that he has the courage to face up to the present day position which for the past 130 years has grown into doubtful disputations which need not have existed as far as John Thomas was concerned - a sincere man willing to accept change of views where proved scripturally incorrect even though he was the originator for certain reasons of the name "Christadelphian," meaning "Brother of Christ." One man's obstinacy and confusion, lacking a humble and discriminate approach to the Word of God and consequently forcing his personal dogmatic views by vocal and also printed declaration to be regarded as "The Truth" to be received as the basis of fellowship with the Christadelphians who since the death of John Thomas in 1871, were left without the means of his personal advice, has been, and now is the main cause of the many divisions which exist in that community and their fear of change when faced with Truth.

It is on record that in 1873 Edward Turney, a sincere Christadelphian, had found by study certain flaws in the teaching, and wanted to correct it in a persuasive manner of co-operation with all concerned, including Robert Roberts, who was editor first of "The Ambassador" magazine, which later became "The Christadelphian." The result was direct opposition by Roberts due to his ignorance of the subject Edward Turney had brought into the limelight - the fact that Jesus, deriving His life from God, not Adam, was free to give His life as the purchasing power of redemption from under the Law of Sin and Death.

On page 34 of the lecture "The Sacrifice of Christ" Edward Turney speaks of the Gnostic theory which had been imputed to him and his friends due to the Roberts theory that when Adam sinned God changed his flesh to a defiled, condemned, sin-contaminated substance capable of decay and finally death, as the penalty. In other words, Adam's nature or flesh was considered to be by R.Roberts "unclean" or "sinful-flesh" and any who believed or taught otherwise were "Clean-flesh" heretics.

On this same page Turney says to his audience, "I had brought a long extract to read to you, showing the belief of the Gnostics, but the time is too far gone. I may say however that the Gnostics did not believe that Jesus was flesh and blood but only an apparition that looked like flesh and blood. They believed that His body was bruised; but that He did not suffer." There were others who taught other foolish things contrary to the word of God including the Papists and their theory of Mary being immaculate because the doctrine of sin-in-the-flesh would cause Jesus to be tainted with it thus making His sacrificial death for others invalid. Turney opposed and condemned the above theories and stated the following words, page 35, "Have I taught these things? I have uniformly taught that the nature of Jesus was precisely like our own, necessarily so, because it was that flesh which had impulses to sin, but which, unlike us, did not lead Him into sin."

I find that much was lacking in the views and teaching of John Thomas and Robert Roberts, especially the false doctrine of sinful-flesh and the true atoning work of Christ for others and not for Himself, was made up for in Edward Turney's Lecture in 1873 and further improved upon in his booklet "The Two Sons of God" where Turney came to the very conclusions as now taught and understood by the Nazarenes, namely that the common natural death experienced by Adam and his posterity was not, and is not the penalty for the sin which entered the world - that there is a difference between the "death by sin" and the death as a result of being created corruptible with a limitation of existence. Any person scripturally and correctly introduced into Jesus Christ by His atoning blood and the baptism of faith, can be made free from the "death by sin" passed legally upon all men and still remain physically alive at the time, but if the "death by sin" is believed to be

natural decay and ultimate death, then only a change of nature can free a person from that condition and even then impossible without redemption.

Brother David Wayne comments on the Unamended Christadelphian section and the Amended of the same name, but why should they have appeared at all on the scene of Christadelphianism? There was no documentation of this kind in the days of Dr. Thomas, binding members to certain views and doctrines to be accepted and rejected and become known as a statement of the Faith of the Christadelphians. If it was a Faith founded on the inspired Word of God and unassailable where the need for amendment?

I know not what the original statement contained but I have a grave suspicion of the reason for its introduction - this being, not to show the difference between truth and error (in this it failed) but to suppress the true teaching brought to the light by God through Edward Turney and others I can name, who taught the meaning of the atoning work of God in Christ, the resurrection of the dead in Christ (incorruptible) and the Kingdom of God all based on scriptural truth for the good of all and love of the same.

When I was immersed by a Christadelphian I knew of no Statement of Faith, only their superficial teaching of the Abrahamic promises involving Jesus as the promised Seed and baptism into Him for inheritance, no doctrinal reason or explanation of the true reason for His sacrificial death. When this became known to me and I expressed it in public I was accused of violating the B.A.S.F.; this was on the subject of sin-in-the-flesh, incorruptible resurrection as a result of present day judgment and approval through the High Priesthood of Jesus at the Right-Hand of God, but Turney and "clean flesh" was the main thing I was accused of, yet I was ignorant of Turney's existence and teaching, so where had I obtained a certain knowledge and understanding that could violate the B.A.S.F. and the subjects of doctrine it put forth as truth to be received? The answer is obvious - The inspired Word of Truth, read effectively and rightly divided.

The people known as Nazarenes and labelled, I believe, by Robert Roberts consequently to their opposition of his own erroneous views, "a sect which is everywhere spoken against" (Acts 24:5, 28:22, Luke 2:34) believe that there are grains of truth in the writings of Dr. Thomas, Robert Roberts and their successors in that field; also J.J. Andrew and Thomas Williams whom Brother Wayne mentions as the unamended pioneers who wrote a lot about "legal alienation" and "legal condemnation" and Jesus atoning for His sinful nature. I believe it was J.J. Andrew who stated that "We can be legally justified when we put on Christ at baptism but we are not morally justified until we have finished our course and kept the faith." As a Nazarene I believe this to be one of the grains of truth he taught, but his theory of believing Jesus having to atone for sinful nature is thereby cancelled as unacceptable Robert Roberts teaching lodged in his subconscious brain waiting to be cast out by the power of the Holy Spirit.

What a lot of confusion that man Robert Roberts has caused!

I commend Brother Wayne for his efforts and research into the history of what brought about this untenable position of Christadelphia. He will no doubt have to accept who was responsible for the terms "clean flesh" and "Renunciationists"; it was not the Gnostics, as Edward Turney has explained, and it was not Turney, for he neither taught "clean flesh" nor "unclean flesh" in the physical sense, and in regard to being a "Renunciationsist" said that he renounced the errors he had believed as a Christadelphian and never had renounced that Jesus came in flesh, but that He came in the very good flesh identical to that in which Adam sinned.

Dr. Thomas also stated the latter for the mission of Jesus - "Sin had to be condemned in the nature which transgressed in Eden" (very good nature). Unfortunately the Dr. misinterpreted how this was fulfilled.

Be of good courage, Brother Wayne, and may the Lord Bless your reading and understanding of the Holy Word in whatever way it is portrayed, that you may rejoice with those who have kept the Faith when our Lord will appear unto salvation to those who look for Him.

My wife Rene and myself offer our Kind Thoughts with those of Brother Gregory and Sister Helen Brady and many others, in the Name of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us,

Phil Parry.

In this Circular Letter we are reproducing two editorials by our late Brother Ernest Brady. As most of our readers will know, Ernest always wrote carefully and with purpose. It would be a shame not to use his works again. The first one below is dated June 1954.

Dear Brethren and Sisters, Loving Greetings to you all in Jesus' Name.

Here are a few selections from the articles produced by Bro. Broughton:

In one issue he deals with a question we are often asked by those who believe that Sin is a physical property of human flesh. "How did Jesus bear our sins in His own body on the tree, if it was not by bearing our sin nature?"

Bro. Broughton answers the question as follows:

Jesus bore our sins by suffering the punishment they deserved, and he quotes the following texts illustrating how in Scripture sins are thus "borne."

Leviticus 20:20 - "They shall bear their sin... they shall die childless."

Leviticus 24:15 - "Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin... he shall surely be put to death."

Numbers 30:8-15 "...the Lord shall forgive her (but her husband) shall bear her iniquity."

Ezekiel 14:10 - "They shall bear the punishment of their iniquity."

Ezekiel 18:20 - "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the fathers."

Ezekiel 23:49 - "Ye shall bear the sins of your idols."

Lamentations 5:7 - "Our fathers have sinned, and we have borne their iniquities."

This selection of passages amply illustrate that to bear sin means to suffer the punishment due to sin, either one's own or, as can be seen from one or two of the texts, the sins of others.

I remember years ago a Christadelphian advancing Ezekiel 18:20 as proof that it was impossible for Jesus to have suffered for the sins of others, but if, as Bro. Broughton shows, the idea of sin-nature or the need for atonement for sin-nature, is entirely foreign to Scripture; if Jesus did not bear the punishment of the sins of others, He died in vain.

The fact is that Ezekiel 18:20 is intended as a prohibition of the practice of punishing the innocent instead of the guilty, a thing which no just person could tolerate. To use it for the purpose of discrediting the sacrificial death of Jesus is blind perversity. Jesus was not punished instead of the guilty. He voluntarily bore the punishment due to sinners in order to set them free and show Divine Love. A person, and there are such, who claims to be unable to see the difference does not deserve to share the benefits involved.

Bro. Broughton goes on to show, by a literal example from Scripture, how Jesus bore our sin. He quotes Matthew 8:17 - "...He cast out spirits... that it might be fulfilled... himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses." He says, "Now Jesus took their infirmities by taking them from the people He cured: yet, He himself did not take the evil spirits into Himself. He bore our sicknesses like, leprosy, blindness, lameness, the palsy, not by becoming leprous, blind, lame, or palsied, but by curing those who had such diseases. In like manner Christ took upon Himself our sins when God laid upon him the iniquity of us all, by removing them from us.

But, he adds, there is a difference in the manner. A devil, i.e. a deranged mental state or a disease, could be removed as an act of mercy, pure and simple, by the exercise of Divine power; whereas sins could only be removed by transferring the penalty to Himself. And so He suffered, the Just for the unjust, on the Tree, bearing our sins, i.e. the punishment of them, and so God's mercy and forgiveness now abounds to all men.

I think that is a very reasonable answer, and taken in conjunction with the laws of sacrifice in the Old Testament, provides a complete explanation of how Jesus' death took away sins.

Recently, Bro. Pearce sent me a letter he had received from a Christadelphian who is studying our teaching concerning the Sacrifice of Christ, and he raised a question which bears on the subject and which will interest you.

He quotes Jesus' question to the scribes: "Whether is easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Arise and take up thy bed and walk." And he comments: "I have always previously thought that this passage meant that sickness and disease was the direct result of sin at the beginning. What do you think?"

I don't know what Bro. Pearce answered, but when I wrote I said I thought these words of Jesus were intended, like many others of His questions, both to reveal and conceal, to make things plain to those who were willing to see, and to make them difficult for those who were wilfully blind. The power of healing which Jesus used was not an end in itself, otherwise He would have made it His main purpose to find and heal the sick wherever they were. It was a sign, evidence of His authority and origin, and He used it for that purpose. His power to heal was proof of His authority to forgive sins. Thus, when He was faced by hostile scribes it was immaterial whether He said, "Thy sins be forgiven," or "Arise and walk." The words and the result of the one were no more difficult than of the other, but the effect of the healing was evident, whereas no one can see when a man's sins are forgiven. On another occasion they asked Jesus, "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" They also thought that sin was always the cause of disease. Jesus replied, "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him."

I think that the chapter from which this passage comes (John 9) contains some of the very few instances in Scripture where there is an element of humour, the encounter between the man whose sight had been restored and the Pharisees. They knew that Jesus had healed the man, but they dare not face the meaning of it. They tried to find a loophole by questioning his parents, but they were wary, "He is of age, ask him." Then they tried to overawe the man himself, "Give God the praise; we know that this man is a sinner." (Does this attitude of the Pharisees remind you of anyone?). But the young man had a stout heart and was not to be terrified by their pomposity, and used his common-sense. "Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not; one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see." After some further questioning and illogical reasoning, they got sick of the whole thing and concluded, "As for this fellow we know not from whence he is." But the young man had not yet finished; another dash of cold commonsense. "Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence he is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes"! Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings... With these and a few other biting cracks, which make as entertaining a bit of reading as there can be anywhere in literature, he showed that his mental eyes were as wide open as his literal eyes, and utterly exposed the foolish self-importance and arrogance of the Pharisees. Their last word put the finishing touch to their own defeat; "Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us?" And they cast him out.

Their descendants are with us today. In spite of what Jesus says they still tell us that we are altogether born in sins. And when they cannot stand up to logical reasoning and the evidence of commonsense, they follow the example of the Pharisees, and cast us out.

Here is one of the gems of that chapter which is worth recalling again; "now we know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth His will, him he heareth."

This is good enough proof for the poor blind man that Jesus was not a sinner, and I vote, Brothers and Sisters, that is good enough for us.

With sincere and affectionate Greetings,

Your Brother, Ernest Brady.

— — —

In this next editorial, dated February 1957 Brother Ernest Brady replies to a query by Brother Frank Willement:-

Frank Williment, a New Testament Jew, wrote as follows:

“With some of the Nazarene views I can agree, the Federal position of the two Adams in their respective relations to our race gives no difficulty (Romans 5:17-19; 1 Corinthians 15:22).

That Christ was in the exclusive moral position to act as a ransom sacrifice for His fellows (Matthew 20:28; Hebrews 9:26) is, if I understand you correctly, another.

We are told, however, by the Spirit in Hebrews 4:15, that Jesus was tempted in all points apart from sin, though James says the reverse, God cannot be tempted or evil.

Where, then, did Jesus obtain a nature that was capable of temptation? Was it a constituent of the life you say He received from God, or did He derive this faculty for suffering (Hebrews 2:18) from the imperfect Jewish mother?

If God cannot be tempted, and Jesus could and was, the exaltation from fleshly to spirit nature (Philippians 2:9) of the latter, provides evidence that Jesus benefited from His own death, which, I gather, is a fact you deny.

The fact that He, the only son of Adam’s race who could say “I overcame” (Revelation 3:21). indicates, I submit, in what way the ransom was provided. Jesus laid His spotless character in the scales.

Your varied images of death, too, in the Magazine puzzles me at times; death is the cessation of being (Psalm 146:4; 89:48). Does it matter as to its cause?

You say Adam’s death, 930 years after his crime, was “natural” death, the real sufferer being the animals slain to provide coverings.

Is there anything to show he was under sentence to die before his transgression?

The appalling position of the nations, Adam’s children, lusting for wholesale annihilation, makes your apologies for the ravages of sin - conceived lust (James 1.15), difficult to follow.

Perhaps at your convenience you would be kind enough to write to me.

With kind regards Frank Williment. (4th May 1957.)

To which Ernest Brady replied: -

Dear Brother Frank Williment, Thank you for your letter of May 4th and other letters you have written me; I cannot recall if I have replied to you before, but if not I would like to say that I appreciate your letters, but as you have usually been content to outline your own beliefs without much reference to the doctrines we put forward I deemed it unnecessary to open an argument with you by correspondence as our literature is familiar to you. However, you ask me to write to you and therefore I am sending you a few comments of what you say.

It is perfectly true, as you say, that there are many conflicting views expressed on various points, but I do not think we should despair of deciding where the truth lies, for is it not the purpose of God to reveal it to those who seek?

I have much sympathy with your faith which you describe as New Testament Judaism which is a true aspect of the Gospel but I gather that while you (correctly) emphasize this point, you are in other respects fairly orthodox Christadelphian in your views.

If my impression is correct you will know where and why I must disagree with you and I need not recapitulate.

At least I am pleased to learn that you understand the Federal Principle, and our relationship to the two Adams; in this you are far in front of present-day Christadelphians.

You say that if you understand us correctly we teach that Christ was in an exclusive moral position to act as a ransom for His fellows.

I should disagree with your use of the word "moral" here and substitute the word "legal."

He was in an exclusive moral position certainly, being the only one without sin, and this enabled Him to be our Saviour, but it was not His moral position which He sacrificed - it was not (as you say later) His spotless character which Jesus laid on the scales - it was His life; not the life He lived but the life which was in the blood.

He could not sacrifice His character - that was His, and neither He nor anyone else could separate Him from it. His perfect character made His life of value - or I should say, preserved the value it had when it was begotten - but it was His *psuche* that He laid down as a ransom.

No other, however good he had been, could have done so, because of his legal relationship to Adam, whereas Jesus' legal relationship was to God.

I cannot see any difficulty in your point that God cannot be tempted of evil, whereas Jesus was tempted. You ask where, then, did Jesus obtain a nature capable of temptation - was it a constituent of the life He received from God, or did He derive it from His imperfect mother? I would reply: Tell me where Adam obtained a nature capable of suffering temptation?

Adam had no imperfect Jewish mother, yet he was capable of feeling temptation. Is it not evident that a capacity for experiencing temptation is the consequence of mankind having been created with free will and reason and placed under law?

It is true that we deny that Jesus benefited from His own death, in the sense laid down by Christadelphians in their Statement of Faith, that He needed redemption in the same way as we do. If you agree that Jesus' exaltation from fleshly nature to spirit resulted from His death I could agree, but this is quite a different matter, and if, as I suspect, you are seeking to find a justification for some measure of adherence to the Christadelphian position, I hope you will be honest enough to admit that this does not provide it.

Is there any reasoning to prove that there is no way in which flesh can be transformed to spirit except by dying and being raised? Does not 1 Corinthians 15:51 prove that there is another way? And does not reason tell us that having proved Himself perfect, had He not chosen for our sakes to take the path to Calvary He could have taken the other?

I think John 12:23 proves it.

Our varied use of "death" - it is Scripture that has this varied use, not us.

We seek to apply and harmonise, and I think we have succeeded. There are 4 or 5 different usages, and while you ask; Does it matter as to its cause? surely, as a "New Testament Jew," I do not need to remind you of, for example, Hebrews 10:26-31.

There is nothing to show that Adam was under sentence to die before he transgressed, but this does not mean to say he was not corruptible - capable of dying.

I recognize fully the "appalling position of the nations," but I do not attribute this to Adam's sin but to their own greed, intolerance and foolishness.

I do not apologize for “the ravages of sin” - I just say I do not believe that anything that God has put into man or allowed to develop in him as an inheritance from his ancestors, makes him incapable of ordering his life, and his relations with his neighbour, in accordance with the commandments of Christ.

I see no reason to charge the wickedness of the world on man’s nature, on God who made it as it is, or on Adam who disobeyed a simple command and brought in the reign of sin and death: I believe that the words of the prophet are sufficient today to put the world right, if they were applied, without any change of nature:

“Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.”

“Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord.”

I am sorry you disapprove of Bro. Pearce filling up our circular letter with odd quotations from people like Fosdick; true, some of them held very erroneous views, but this should not prevent us picking out some of the wheat amongst the chaff - after all, we are not children, and can be expected to use a little discrimination.

With Very Sincere Regards and Good Wishes, in Jesus’ Name.

Ernest Brady.

Letter from Brother Phil Parry to Brother Richard Pursell, editor of “THE SHOFAR” magazine:

Brother Richard Pursell, Greetings in the Name of the Lord. Thank you for your letter received 19th April 2003 on the matters relating to Edward Turney and also on page of “The Usage and Meaning of Muth Temuth” and the reference to a footnote in “Elpis Israel,” page 69.

I would like to say at this point that in my copy of “Elpis Israel” there is no footnote on page 69 at all of what Dr. Thomas is purported to have said, and on phoning Brother Russell Gregory on the matter he informed me that his copy of “Elpis Israel” was published in 1910 by C.C.Walker, the then editor of “The Christadelphian” magazine who succeeded Robert Roberts, whereas mine is said to be ‘Reproduced from an early copy known as The Robert Roberts Edition by Photographic Process.’ I find on page 73 of my copy under the heading of THE SERPENT three quarters down the page, as follows: “The falsehood of this assertion consisted in the declaration “Ye shall not surely die,” when God had said “dying ye shall die.” Here Dr. Thomas is supporting the fact that “surely die” means death by infliction, for he knew already that Adam was capable of dying by reason of his created corruptible nature.

If as you say, to the best of your knowledge, this footnote is not the work of Dr. Thomas but rather was added by the publishers in 1924, I can quite believe you, for it is evident from page 213 of my copy of “Elpis Israel” and later editions through C.C.Walker, his work has been tampered with to suit the existing opposition to the teaching of Christ’s sacrifice being “substitutionary” this resulting from the false conception that the penalty Adam incurred was by natural decay and return to dust. I will quote what Dr. Thomas says of Jesus: “The appearing in sinful flesh was necessary for the dedication of the covenant by the death of the substitutional testator...” The words “substitutional testator” have been altered to “mediator” in the C.C.Walker edition without any permission from Dr. Thomas who died in 1871 and though the Dr. made mistakes on some subjects I am sure he did not condone dishonesty nor adding and taking away from the Holy Word of God or his own writings.

I have learned from certain sources that Edward Turney was a great admirer of Dr. Thomas while still a Christadelphian at the time of his clash with Robert Roberts in 1873, two years after the death of the Dr.

Turney was beginning to see more light as a result of a letter to Robert Roberts by David Handley, and his views were being expressed to other members of the brotherhood which resulted in his lecture on "The Sacrifice of Christ," bringing opposition from Robert Roberts and his false accusation that Turney renounced that Jesus had come in the same flesh as other men.

I will quote Turney's words from page 35 of "The Sacrifice of Christ: "I have uniformly taught that the nature of Jesus was precisely like our own, necessarily so, because it was that flesh which had impulses to sin, but which, unlike us, did not lead Him into sin." Further on Turney went on to show the falsity of sin-in-the-flesh taught by R.Roberts and which the people called Nazarenes have enlarged upon realising that Turney had not come to the conclusion until writing his book "The Two Sons of God" that natural death by process of decay was not the penalty for Adam's sin.

After Turney's death it appears that due to the lies promulgated by Roberts and his calling Turney's friends "Clean flesh heretics" and comparing them with the Gnostics mentioned in 2 John 7, this accusation of antichrist has been passed down through Christadelphia as the views of Edward Turney, that Jesus did not come in the 'unclean flesh' which Robert Roberts had taught and enjoined upon his own followers - the opposite of 'unclean flesh' being therefore 'clean flesh', with hardly any reading Turney's lecture and being able and prepared to challenge the Roberts concept, but people like N.McKain, J.Calder of Scotland, A.L.Wilson, W.Richmond, E.Parker and F.J.Pearce of S. Wales, Ernest Brady and many more who have fallen asleep but whose written works crieth from the ground as the voice of Abel's blood crieth unto God, are available in print through the labours of our Brother Russell Gregory and free of charge. I knew neither E.Turney's existence or his lecture when the Truth hit me, neither any of the above mentioned, but I have learned much from them since having to resign from Christadelphia 50 years ago; Turney's lecture having been loaned to me at the time convinced me that I was right to come out from among them and be separate and touch not the unclean thing; a separateness enjoined upon Israel when they, came out of Egypt and after they entered the promised land of inhabitants of false doctrines and idol worship.

I am not aware of the origin of the terms "Muth Temuth" but I know that it was in circulation during the lives of A.H.Broughton and our late Brethren F.J.Pearce and Ernest Brady. Be that as it may, the references shown in the booklet on this subject are convincing enough in proving "surely die" to mean the taking away of natural life by inflicted means in the case of the Genesis and other accounts such as for example Ezekiel chapters 18 and 33.

The fact that Adam continued to live after violating the Law only proves God's Love and Mercy and also the fact that Adam was capable of obedience as God demonstrated in His provision of a Son in the exact flesh and blood nature as the first man Adam.

Though Adam was not put to death for the above reason the Apostle Paul explains the legal position in which men were consequently placed; he says, Romans 5:15: "For if through the offence of one many be dead," he does not say "through the offence of one many are dying physically," but are dead - legally.

This is the whole problem with Christadelphia, but as one of them told me when opposing my views, "Salvation is an individual matter." This is the very reason I left them as a denomination of Thomasites and Robertsites, incurable en masse and when shown the light still desire to remain under the umbrella-name "Christadelphian" (confusion).

I read your comments in your recent issue, page 4, and also your Brother Paul's article on the Atonement which was very good, yet in speaking of Baptism and change of status, he failed to mention the death Jesus suffered in the place of Adam's incurred death by sin (blood shedding), the means by which baptism into the death Jesus suffered makes us the subjects of the Atonement by faith.

It is God who reveals the Truth to those only whom He calls, we sow the seed of His Word but only He gives the increase. What has been achieved by the Nazarenes (followers of Christ's teaching) is known only to God.

I hope I have been of some help to you. Yours in Hope of the Life to come, Phil Parry.