

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 85

December 1986

In this Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Harvey and Evelyn Linggood
Page 2 Sacrifice – A Malodorous Muddle	Brother Ernest Brady
Page 6 Books	Brother H. Linggood
Page 7 Article of Faith – Fences - from a	B.B.C. Program
Page 8 Debt, Payment and Substitution	Brother Phil Parry
Page 20 The Fool Hath said - There is no God	Brother H. Linggood
Page 21 John's Baptism in Relation to Christ.	Sister E. Linggood

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters in Christ Jesus & Reader Friends, Warm Greetings.

We thank all those who have corresponded with us over the past month.

We are sorry to hear that our Bro. David Phillips is still in hospital having treatment for his eyes. Bro. & Sis. Phil & Rene Parry have "been to see him, he is sorry he cannot read or answer letters, we are sure we all wish him a full recovery. I was able to visit our Sister May Lockett on November 17th. and found her in good Spirits although frail, she is in her 98th year. She sends her love to the brethren and sisters.

In this issue we have "Sacrifice" by the late Bro. E.Brady, and a reply by P. Parry of the Nazarene Fellowship to the late H.H.James a Christadelphian to No. 5 of the "Simple truth Series", entitled "Debt Payment & Substitution." We pray for the welfare of you all and send our Sincere Love in the Masters Service.

Harvey & Evelyn Linggood

Someday a bright new wave will break upon the shore,
And there will be no wickedness, no more crying, no more war,
The saints will be immortal, none will suffer any more,
And there'll be a bright new morning over there,
There'll be a bright new world for them to share.

Someday there'll be an end to unkind words, and cruel,
The man who said "There is no God" will know he was a fool;
And peace will be a way of life when Christ on earth shall rule,
And there'll be a bright new morning over there,
There'll be a bright new world for some to share.

Someday, we know not when, when toiling days are done,
And saints of all ages shall be gathered in as one,
And there'll be a bright new morning over there -
Shall we be there that bright new world to share?.

Sacrifice - A Malodorous Muddle

Among apologists for Christadelphian teaching in regard to the sacrifice of Christ is A.D.Norris in an article in "The Christadelphian", June 1955, pp. 171-4. There he assembles a batch of five passages from which he sets out to prove that Jesus "died on the cross with the express purpose of displaying the deserts of 'sin exceeding sinful,'" but not even the peculiar inverted style which he evidently thinks rather effective, and of which the sentence quoted is a typical example, can conceal its demoniac features.

He informs us (p, 172); "Jesus humbled his nature beneath the hand of God, to be rewarded with God's good pleasure in his resurrection." Now we have indeed read that Jesus humbled Himself, but never that He humbled His nature. We can understand that if He was to serve us by suffering death for us He had to humble Himself to take the form of a servant, as He illustrated when He washed the disciples feet, but what possible warrant has anyone for bringing His nature into the question? Never in Scripture is there the faintest suggestion that Jesus was ever other than pleasing to God. He was declared at His baptism " My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Where and when did he forfeit that description so that he had to "humble His nature" before He could experience God's good pleasure? Also it comes oddly from one who professes to believe that Jesus came forth from the tomb with the same nature as He went into it, to say He was rewarded in His resurrection. What about all this Anastasis process of ascending to the Divine nature? What about the so-called mortal emergence? It is high time some of these latter day "educated" Christadelphians set about an analysis of their first principles.

Next A. D. Norris refers to the parallel drawn by Jesus between Himself upon the cross and the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and he affirms that the parallel is between the serpent itself and Jesus. This is not what Jesus says of course, but like W.F.Barling it suits him to draw the inference that it implies that Jesus' flesh was evil and the cause of sin and death and therefore a destroyer like the fiery serpents.

I remember being once criticised by a Christadelphian for inferring from the fact of Adam and Eve being clothed with skins, that animals were slain; it was objected that the animals might have been skinned alive - or the skins produced miraculously; one has to admit such possibilities; all the same it seems and still seems, a reasonable inference. But behold what a long bow a Christadelphian can draw if it happens to suit his fancy. We can get by skilful jumps, from the parallel of lifting up, to the brazen serpent, from the brazen serpent to the real serpent, from the real serpent to serpent-nature, from serpent-nature to Jesus nature, from Jesus nature to destruction on the Cross. This strikes us as a pretty tidy journey on such a slender broom-stick.

It seems likely that our author was not entirely unconscious of the chasm he has crossed so airily, for he says, rather revealingly: "Reverent minds might well recoil from the suggestion; for it implies that Jesus was sin."

There we have the Christadelphian teaching in all its unwashed nakedness, frankly, from the pen of one who seemeth to be somebody.

In very truth, reverent minds might well indeed recoil from such a suggestion - read it again. And if reverent minds had a grain of sense they would reconsider the sophistries which led them into so infamous a conclusion. Have they never read that no man speaking by the Spirit calleth Jesus accursed? Have they never read that He was separate from sinners? That in Him was no sin? But not friend Norris. Besotted by his conviction that physical flesh is full of sin, he dares affirm that Jesus Himself was sin.

As if anticipating the storm of protest which would overwhelm him if his readers were not as blindly intoxicated with the Papal poison as himself, he rushes on: "We are constrained to insist that this is what the parallel means," and he adds: "In any case the Scriptures leave us no alternative than to admit this comparison. God 'made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin' shows that in the death of Jesus it is possible to associate sin with the body of one who did no wrong."

It is not Scripture which constrains him, leaves him no alternative, nor even we suggest, his own reason; it is the Statement of Faith and the necessity to uphold bad Christadelphian doctrine. If he would but ask himself how under the Law of Moses sin was associated with the lamb offered in sacrifice, he would find it was by the laying of the sinner's hand upon its head, the confession of his guilt over its innocence, followed by the infliction of the penalty due to the sinner upon the spotless offering. A truly reverent and balanced mind would apply the same principle to the great antitypical sacrifice, accepting with gratitude the declaration that Christ our Passover is slain for us; rather than do violence to every principle of the Mosaic ordinance in order to place Jesus in the position demanded by a disordered imagination, where His death could serve no possible purpose.

Perhaps then A.D.Norris might bring himself to accept the guidance of eminent linguists and consider the use of the term "*Hamartia*," translated "Sin," Dr. A. Clark says he has noticed more than hundred places in the Scriptures where the word stands for "Sin-offering," and he says that this is its meaning in II Corinthians 5:21. In conformity with this view is the statement by Dr. Thomas (Christadelphian. 1880, p.7): "In saying that Christ was made sin for us, Paul did not mean that He was an actual sinner, but that He was made a sin-offering for us. Our iniquities were laid on Him." Again we must ask the reader to compare the assertion of a Christadelphian with what Dr. Thomas said and ask himself if such a direct and complete contradiction is not proof of apostasy, Norris says this Scripture leaves us no alternative to the conclusion that Jesus was sin; Dr. Thomas says it means He was a sin-offering.

We are well aware that Dr. Thomas was often self-contradictory, but his exposition here is in harmony with scriptural facts and is endorsed by scholars, so that perhaps we may venture to propose to friend Norris that there are reasonable alternatives to his "Suggestion from which reverent minds might well recoil." If he would consider them he would find that they provide no support for his silly statement that "our natural man is fleshly, and so dying, and is displeasing in God's sight." One question is sufficient to expose his foolishness. Was Adam a natural fleshly man before he sinned? How it was then that God could look upon everything which He had made and see that it was very good?

Years ago John Carter warned his followers against using the words "Sin in the flesh" as if they were hyphenated phrase describing a literal property of the flesh. We were pleased to see this slight evidence of progress in the right direction, but remarkably enough, in this very article, for all his cunningly planned argument, A.D.Norris falls into it head first and does exactly what John Carter deprecates. Quoting Romans 8:3, he tells us: "Jesus is associated with sin because of Sinful flesh' or 'Sins flesh', which he bore; and the death of Jesus did in reality what the erection of the brass serpent did in symbol and condemned sin - in the flesh, in Jesus' flesh." He makes do with one hyphen certainly, but if this is not the literal hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh John Carter refers to, what is it doing in Jesus' flesh? A counsel less preoccupied with his brief would have observed that the Apostle does not say that God sent His Son in sin's flesh but in the likeness of sin's flesh. Those words: "in the likeness of" are important; they indicate a difference, not of nature or quality of the flesh but of origin.

If Paul had meant that Jesus' flesh was sin's flesh it would have been easier to say just that than to say "in the likeness of sin's flesh." The point is this; that "sin's flesh" means, not flesh of a certain quality (i.e. sinful) but flesh of a certain ownership (i.e. sin's), all flesh originating in Adam belongs to sin. This is a scriptural conception and if the reader will refer again to the extract quoted from Eureka (in our Circular Letter No. 85 page 5 near the bottom of the page) you will find it confirmed by Dr. Thomas. Jesus' flesh was exactly the same in kind and quality, truly the likeness of ours, but His flesh - that is to say He Himself, belonged to God, because His life came direct from God, and not from Adam.

Were it not that the words are before us in black and white we should find it beyond belief that a man with even the vaguest sense of scriptural congruity could have concocted a picture of the Lamb of God, taking away the sin of the world in the following words: "Men in all ages who look upon the Cross are thus taught to see there... the exceeding sinfulness of sin, whose flesh must be thus ignominiously shamed." (He quotes): "There was no beauty in Him that we should desire Him," sets out the essential

ugliness of the spectacle, in which flesh was displayed... to show its nature and its true destruction.” (Christadelphian. June 1955. p. 174).

Would to God we had words and power to deal adequately with such sanctimonious abomination.

These filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities; we say “The Lord rebuke thee.”

Consider the perversity of the mind which will take from a glorious prophetic version (Isaiah 55) a phrase foretelling the reaction to Jesus of His fellow men who, expecting a Messiah, saw only a man of sorrows, His visage marred with grief, and apply it as if it represented God’s own attitude towards His Son.

Notice the context of the passage: “There was no beauty in Him,” which Norris slips into his picture as if it lent colour to his argument that Jesus had to “consign his flesh to the indignity and final humbling of the Cross.” The prophecy says: “He was despised and rejected of men. We hid as it were our faces from Him; he was despised and we esteemed Him not.” Was Jesus ever despised and rejected of God? Was He ever other than “My beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased.” Did He not say “I have kept my Father’s commandment and abide in His love”?

It is true that in His last hour He was forsaken by God; but not for any defect in Jesus Himself, either physical or moral, but in order that He might bear to the last extreme the suffering and loss of communion justly due to sinners. To suggest that the anguish of that awful hour was because God could see no beauty in Him and required Him to be “ignominiously shamed” is a travesty of all truth.

“Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect in whom my soul delighteth.” Is this the one in whom we are supposed to see “essential ugliness and its due destruction”? Away with such blasphemous balderdash.

If instead of tearing from its context and misapplying a fragment of Isaiah’s prophecy to shore up his tottering ruin, A.D.Norris had the grace and humility to accept its message he would cease to write such silly things and in such a silly way as this, “it became Jesus to die because He had a nature like our own.” Does he mean it was right for Jesus to die? If so he puts himself alongside those of whom Peter said: “Ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain,” Or does he mean His life was required of Him? If so then he is denying the Master Himself, who said: “I lay it down of myself.” Whichever or what ever it is supposed to mean, if Jesus had to die because His nature was what it was, then His death could not have been a sacrifice and the foundation of the Christian faith is gone.

As A.D.Norris has used - rather misused - a text from Isaiah 53 in his malodorous muddle

Brother Ernest Brady.

to be continued’

BOOKS.

Abba Eban the historian from Modem Israel, in a series on T.V. said: - “In the land of Israel the Jewish people.....gave to the world the - **ETERNAL BOOK of BOOKS.**”

Most Christian homes in this country have a copy of this book, The Bible or The Scriptures, in these homes its usage or non-usage varies. Sad to say in many cases it just collects dust and is only seen when mother does her annual spring clean and includes the book case. In others among which all our readers I hope are, its constant use is great, resulting in its page edges get frayed, marked, and pages become loose, making it necessary to replace (but not discarded) with a copy of this same book. Due to

different paper and binding although the contents are the same it may take us some time to get what we term the feel of the replacement before we are able to use it after the manner we did the old copy.

However the Bible or Scriptures is not just a book. It is The Word OF God (II Peter 1:21) and able to make us wise unto salvation (II Tim. 3:15). It is a book of action, seen in both the Old and New Testament. By God, His Son Jesus Christ and Godly men and women. In our English King James Version and other more recent ones there are two words which keep cropping up. 'Forthwith' and 'Immediately.' Each of these words portray the result of a thought, a word, or deed, without any apparent delay, in the O.T. the words *Mahar* and *Maher* occur 70 times and in our version is given the word Quick: Haste: Swift: Suddenly: Speedily: Now. In the N.T. the word *Eutheos* occurs 80 times and in our version is given the word Straightway: Forthwith: Immediately: Quickly: Now.

From Genesis to Revelation the Scriptures abound with action. At random let us look at a few instances. Genesis 1:5 "And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." No waiting or delay. Genesis 12:1 and 4 "...the Lord had said unto Abram, get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred... unto a land that I will shew thee." "So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him..." No hesitation or waiting period, action following upon God's word. Exodus 11:1 "And the Lord said unto Moses, yet will I bring one plague more upon Pharaoh... afterwards he will let you go, he shall surely thrust you out hence..." and Exodus 12:29-33 "and he called for Moses and Aaron... rise up and get you gone... and the Egyptians were urgent upon the people that they might send them out of the land in haste..." Action is seen throughout the prophets and all portions of the Old Testament.

Now let us turn to the New Testament which also abounds with ACTION. As in the O.T. we start at the beginning of events. The promise and birth of John the Baptist, according to the record from Luke's Gospel chapter 1, we again see action "...thou shall be dumb... until the day these things shall be performed... His name is John..." immediately his speech returned, "...and he spake and praised God." John baptised in the "Jordan, the participants confessing their sins. But Jesus had no sins to confess, no wonder John appeared surprised as recorded in Matthew 5:15-17. Having "baptised Jesus, God's approval was shown as soon as He came out of the water. "Lo a voice from heaven, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The healing works of Jesus had an immediate result. No where do we have recorded of any case taking time to be effective. Mark 2 records the healing of the man with palsy. Jesus said "Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house. And immediately he arose, took up the bed, and went forth before them all." Another example of speedy action is seen in the case of the Fig Tree which Jesus cursed as recorded in Matthew 21. His disciples remarked, "...How soon is the fig tree withered away!" Many examples of action are to be seen recorded in the Acts of the Apostles as when Peter and John went into the temple, a lame man asked an alms of them" Look on us... and he gave heed unto them... in Jesus name rise up and walk... immediately his feet and ankle bones received strength." Next we think of Philip and the eunuch as detailed in Acts chapter 8. With a little thought many more examples come to our minds which bring before us ACTION. As the woman with an issue of blood, she thought and then acted. Zacchaeus wanted to see Jesus, being of little stature he climbed into a tree, he acted. Finally to ourselves let us take the words of James in his 2nd chapter. Faith without works (action) is dead. Verses 14 - 17.

H. Linggood

ARTICLES OF FAITH.

B.B.C. I 16-11-86

Subject - FENCES.

The speaker stated in the main fences or creeds cause separation not unity. We know that a fence has a twofold purpose. To keep something in or to keep something out. Ask yourself what am I doing with a fence? Then we were asked what is the basic structural material of your fence? Is it the Scriptures; Creeds; or Traditions. In so many cases religious fences are made of materials passed on from one generation to another and to hold families together are accepted without investigation as to the

truth or otherwise of what one is told. But think of the Bereans of Old who searched the Scriptures to see if things were true. A fence has two sides: Let us call one side truth and the other false. On which side are you? If yours is truth defend it with all your might. If not then you must climb over the fence, it may even mean you have to leave your family. Remember Matthew 10:57. One thing you must not do or attempt to do is destroy the fence itself, for it may be rooted in Scripture. Revelation chapter 22 verses 18 and 19.

John ch. 8 v 52.

John ch.18 v 58.

**A Reply By P. Parry Of The Nazarene Fellowship
To The Late H.H.James - A Christadelphian
On No. 25 Of The Simple Truth Series Entitled –
“Debt Payment And Substitution”**

Far from being a Simple Truth series; if this is supposed to be a sample, then it goes beyond even “the confusion worse confounded” that writers of our Fellowship have already answered and proved false, namely in the many and varied contradictions expressed in the views of Christadelphian pioneers and subsequent writers of that sect of which H.H.James was a member. The word “Substitution” in respect to its application to the sacrifice of Christ has always been to Christadelphians a “Bogeyman” because of their false conception and perverted use of its scriptural meaning on account of believing the almost general and mistaken view that natural death experienced by all corruptible creatures is the penalty Adam incurred upon himself by sin. That after disobedience Adam’s nature was changed from being like the animals “Very Good” as the scriptures affirm, to what they described as a dying nature.

Yet in 1869 R. Roberts writing in the “Ambassador” opposed such a belief as lacking in scriptural evidence, Dr. Thomas also supporting him, but later in “Visible Hand of God” R.Roberts stated in regard to Adam’s disobedience and his mistaken theory of the meaning of “Surely Die,” “It required what men call a miracle to depress to the level of the beasts that perish the noble creature made in the image of the Elohim”. Where does it say in Genesis that the physical nature of Adam was superior to that of the beasts? Does it not include all God’s creation of the dust of the earth in whose nostrils was the breath of life as “living souls” and “very good? And was it not in that corruptible but nevertheless “very good” nature that Adam sinned? And could the guilt of sin make his physical nature any worse? Certainly his conscience, character and relationship to God would be affected by sin but not his physical nature of dust energised by life in the blood. This is but one of the samples from R.Roberts of his indiscriminate reading and deceitful mishandling of the scriptures and what the reader should have expected from the pen of the late H.H.James who followed his example but also went further by lending support to the theory of evolution on page 11 when he speaks of the “Law of Sin” in our members coming from another source other than the Creator, “it originated,” he says, “in the suggestions of the serpent, came to us by inheritance, a congenital-law, and is the internal tempter, the cause of transgression when temptation is yielded to.” Here is H.H.James telling us in plain language that the “Law of Sin” was in Adam when he was created. That Adam’s option of free-will was “the law of Sin” or the cause of his transgression. Surely having free will propensities to do right or wrong are not wrong in themselves. Obedience “by free-will was equally as possible as disobedience by free-will, - this option was fairly presented to Adam - he could choose life or death by his own intellectual reasoning from Divine teaching and is not an hereditary congenital law either in Adam or his posterity. In this H.H.James charges God as creating Adam with a bias towards sin or alternatively that the serpent in collaboration with Adam and Eve induced them by some suggestive and hypnotic power to produce this “law of sin” through a change in their reproductive organs. God is not the author of sin neither is He the author of such absurd nonsense. As we proceed you will see what little confidence can be placed in the words of H.H.James when his only motive is to try to destroy the pillar and ground of the Truth. “Debt Payment By the Substitutionary

Death of Jesus”, and replace it with a rotten prop - the B.A.S.F or worse. On page 1 H.H.James says, “Four questions may be asked.”

Question 1. Is it stated anywhere in scripture Adam incurred a debt by transgression?

Question 2. Did the commandment (Gen. 2: vs 16 and 17) provide for a violent death?

I answer. “The Divine injunction did not give Adam any reason to think his life would be spared by the slaying of a substitute. Why should it? Nevertheless the love of God and His foreknowledge was instrumental in making this provision through the sacrifice of His begotten Son of Mary many years later, and typified in the slain lamb whereby the coats of skins were obtained for a covering.

Question 3 is irrelevant to us who do not believe the unscriptural doctrine of immortal-soulism, but I believe it is made to appear so unacceptable and ridiculous by H.H.James, as to incline his readers to the view that what Christendom believes to be the meaning of the Substitutionary death of Christ is the same view held by the Nazarene Fellowship. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I have shown in a previous article that in “Visible Hand of God”, R. Roberts taught scriptural substitution because he could find no other way out of his dilemma.

Question 4. H.H.James, “Did Jesus die as a substitute, bearing the wages of sin” in the stead of anyone? Then follows criticism of those who reach a belief of certain things by “a process of deductive reasoning”, and that there is something wrong with a belief that cannot express itself in Scripture terms, or show that it is the expression of a Scriptural idea, for the plain fact is that Adam never incurred a debt; and it is nowhere stated in scripture that he did. It follows then that his descendants never inherited a debt from him.” This criticism is unfair and he is incorrect when he states re. Adam, “The law he was given to keep did not make any provision for debt payment, nor for the infliction of a violent death, should he transgress the commandment”. In fact the violent death (or life forfeited to the Law by transgression), was the actual death owed by Adam. The debt was to the Law not to God, that justice might be upheld. Are we to believe logical deduction and reasoning was not expected from those to whom Jesus spoke in parables, or that the Truth of the Gospel including the Atonement is all to be gained by superficial reading of the Bible? If so, why are we at variance, is it not because Truth is a hidden treasure for which we have to search if we desire it in sincerity, and for our eternal salvation? And did not Jesus thank His father that He had hidden these things from the wise and prudent of this world and revealed it to babes? It is certainly wrong to be wise beyond what is written in the scriptures and H.H.James shows himself to be very much so. This will show itself as we proceed. He says on page 3 “Adam’s living depended on obedience.” To this we agree. Therefore when Adam disobeyed, living should have ceased and this is the meaning of “Surely Die,” in the day or moment of disobedience, yet Adam lived 930 years so if, in H.H.James’s words, living depended on obedience, something occurred whereby his living was allowed to continue and we have already stated this was the providing of a “substitute” typified in the lamb slain, otherwise he and Eve would have died an inflicted or judicial death within the day of 24 hours in which they were actual sinners. Let us demonstrate from the plain truth of scripture that it is H.H.James who entertains the belief that cannot express itself in scripture terms, not us. A reading of Genesis chapter 20 verses 5 and 7 which was translated from the language used by Moses in that book, into English, will show that the words of verse 7 to Abimelech are the identical words used by the Lord God to Adam to the effect, “If thou disobey my word thou shall Surely Die.” To Abimelech this would have been an inflicted death through his own disobedience as he already knew he was subject to natural decay and death like all animals from creation in whose nostrils was the breath of life. Again we have a similar example in Genesis 26:11. Also I Kings ch. 2 vs.57-46 where not only were used the words “Surely Die” but show how this sentence was carried into effect as proof of what is meant in the sentence. Again under the Law of Moses a presumptuous sinner was to be put to death. It is failure to accept the logical statements of scripture that the term “very good” applied to Adam as a living soul of flesh and blood and also to all God’s creation in general, and that sin by Adam could not alter this fact. Therefore in his “very good” but nevertheless corruptible nature, Adam had a choice as did those under Moses, a choice of continuance of life; or death = “Surely die” by a taking away of that life; Deuteronomy ch. 30 vs. 19 and 20. There is much contradiction “by H.H.James in consideration of Adam’s lifetime of 930 years. He states that in “contrast with the animals who lived and

died without any relation to law, because no commandment was ever given them in which living depended on obedience as was the case with Adam, his conduct decided his future.” To this we are in full agreement. But does it not follow that if Adam had not been given a law, he like the animals, would have lived and died without any relation to law? And is not this exactly the teaching of Dr. Thomas in Elpis Israel, the pioneer and originator of the name Christadelphian? I will quote the statement of Dr. Thomas in one of the last things he wrote: “Death and corruption, then, with reproduction, is the fundamental law of the physical system of the six days. 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 the change was moral, not physical.” These words of Dr. Thomas were in co-agreement with Robert Roberts in the Ambassador for March 1869 page 85 where he stated in reference to the same correspondent quoted: “Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no evidence of this whatever... there was a change in Adam’s relation to his Maker, but not in the nature of his organisation.” Robert Roberts is emphatic on this point, therefore H.H.James’s theory is not based on scripture but pure imagination. Yet this imagination believed in by H.H.James is also contained in Clause 5 of the B.A.S.F. and is a part of the basis for fellowship enjoined upon Christadelphians - it is the Papal doctrine of original-sin and the late H.H.James has shown himself and Christadelphians to be its greatest supporters while protesting their opposition; what cosmetic hypocrisy! These are the identical sophistries with which apostate Christianity has deluded itself for eighteen centuries. These are the lies with which Popes and Priests have executed their sophistries and adulteries and every kind of bloody and unspeakable crime against God and His people. With these imaginary doctrines of sinful-inclination implanted in the flesh in some miraculous way (certainly not by expression of a scriptural idea, to quote H.H.James) why make a pretence of following the Nazarene? The nearest Confessional box is the place for such - not the table of remembrance.

On page 4; under the heading “The Penalty Considered,” H.H.James makes a great play on the “Law-maker and the Law-breaker.” He says, “A law-maker can only sentence a law-breaker within the terms of the penalty.” We have proved in scripture language that the terms of the penalty for a “law breaker” were spelled out to Adam, “In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,” do we read anywhere in the Genesis recording of these terms that the day referred to was of a thousand years duration and not rather a day as understood by Adam as the evening and the morning? Do you have to twist the scriptures to your way of thinking and “because of your mistaken notion that God cannot change His mind and show mercy and love for the man and woman He created? Did He not say to Moses, who rather than see God’s destruction of rebellious Israel, was willing to be blotted out of God’s book of Life, “I have pardoned, but as truly as I live all the earth shall be filled with my glory”? But H.H.James does not agree that the terms of the penalty was an inflicted death in the 24 hr. day of transgression. We submit therefore that if the terms of the penalty for a “law-breaker” consisted of a period of a day of 1000 years in God’s sight, this should have been made known to Adam and in justice to him he should have been allowed to eat of the forbidden tree for 930 years, the period he took to die according to H.H.James, so perhaps we had better read his re-translation of Genesis 5 v. 5, “And all the days that Adam died were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died”. In accepting the scriptural statements of Paul in I Cor. ch. 15 and those quoted by Dr. Thomas and R. Roberts affirming Adam was corruptible at creation, we are forced to conclude that H.H.James’s theory makes it “a life sentence” not a “death sentence” and, (before the removal of capital punishment’) would put it on a par with the British Law which contained the death sentence by hanging for any guilty person, that person already being capable of dying by reason of a physical law of creation, and not because of Adam’s sin. Thus H.H.James and all who agree with him are refuting the Spirit’s teaching in Paul and their own pioneers, and also deny the “federal” principle taught by Paul in Romans ch. 5 which absolutely discounts a physical law of sin in our members and is an impossibility because “Sin is transgression” of law and applies to conduct under law by which character is developed whether sinful or righteous. Therefore a man cannot be judged by the quality of his flesh but by his character. It is also nonsense to believe that eating of the fruit of the forbidden tree acted as a poison in the system of Adam’s nature causing defilement, corruption and death. The unlawful eating imparted a knowledge of good and evil and a stricken conscience of sin committed and laid bare; they knew they were naked, in a figurative sense as well as a physical. Why then make such dishonest and deceitful use of the mistranslated and misconstrued statements of Paul in the Authorised Version of Romans 8:5 “by transferring it to Genesis

where it is not recorded, simply to lend aid to the hypnotic power of the serpent to induce Adam and Eve to produce this “law of sin” through a change in their reproductive organs, and to justify a claim to scripture authenticity which is not there? Can anyone find in Genesis confirmation of Clause 5 of the B.A.S.F.? Certainly not. It is a jumble of illogical and unscriptural theories arrived at by superficial reading and indiscriminate use of Paul’s definition in Romans ch. 5 of the two federal heads Adam and Jesus, where neither sin as a physical element, neither death by physical inheritance, is even a part of his teaching, Paul is concerned with the “death by sin” hanging as a sentence over those enlightened to it, and from which the enlightened person could be made free by symbolic association through Baptism into the substitutionary death of Christ who suffered it “The just for the unjust to bring us to God.” Now we ask, “Was Adam ever brought to God after being alienated by his sin? Our answer is Yes on the principle of faith in a typical and substitutionary covering, but being typical he could not be restored to the Paradise of God in Eden, the true antitype or substance had not been produced so he and his posterity even if related to God in the typical sense and remissional blood-shedding, must remain outside until its restoration under the New Man Christ Jesus.

Those who accept the view of the late H.H.James must accept that there is no hope for Adam and Eve - that when they died (after 930 yrs. in Adam’s case) the death sentence was in operation for that period and was never revoked, neither by any stretch of the imagination could a resurrection alter this fact. In the words of the late H. Fry, “Can God be said to forgive sin and yet exact the full penalty? Mr. Fry a Christadelphian was too old and frail to endure or contend for this just principle which condemned Clause 6 of the B.A.S.F. the law of sin and death stated in this clause, being the sentence of decay and death contended for by H.H.James wherein it is stated a plan was inaugurated by which the race was rescued from destruction without setting aside God’s just and necessary law of sin and Death. A just law of sin and death is a judicial one inflicted by blood-shedding but we cannot be rescued from either kind of death unless we are freed from it, and as I have said resurrection is after death and cannot be a prevention of natural death nor a rescue from it, seeing that in death there is no consciousness or desire to be rescued. Certainly the sentence of inflicted death by blood-shedding was set aside for Adam by the provision of a substitute and when we become related to the law of sin and death by enlightenment and not by inheritance or personal disobedience, we also can associate ourselves with that provision by dying in symbol by baptism into the inflicted and sacrificial death of Jesus. Thus by this means we are made free from the law of sin and death, by the law of the spirit of life in Christ, our physical nature of corruptibility being unchanged, the only thing changed is our “master” as Paul declares in Rom. ch.6 verses 3-11 in respect of those in Christ who accepted his teaching of the federal principle as opposed to the present doctrine of original sin in the apostate churches and taught in H.H.James’s booklet for which the Christadelphians must be held responsible now he is dead. They must now answer the difficulties he has presented. I therefore ask them to consider Paul’s words in I Cor. ch. 15 vs 44-50 and then the following quote from “Dr. Thomas’ book Elpis Israel “The animal nature will sooner or later dissolve. It was not constituted so as to continue in life for ever independent of any further modification, we may admit therefore, the corruptibility and consequent mortality of their nature without saying they were mortal.” Elpis Israel page 72, This confirms Dr. Thomas’ statement I have already quoted in connection with the physical system of the six days, which included the whole animal kingdom man and beast. Therefore it is here proved that H.H.James’s statement, “Dying could not begin before sentence, - because it was part of a penalty which could not be imposed whilst Adam was a law-keeper,” is nothing but dogmatic assumption and that dying had already been a possibility from creation without law, therefore at creation Adam can be compared with the beasts physically, but not intellectually of course. “Why confuse the issue under discussion. Death by natural causes as a result of being like the animals corruptible, and Death by Sin which is inflicted upon a sinner through breach of law”? Paul is quite clear on this issue in his epistle to the Romans in chapter 5. When the many were made or “constituted sinners” and the many were made or “constituted righteous”, in the former by one man’s disobedience, and in the latter by one man’s obedience, it follows on H.H.Jame’s reasoning that the word “many” has no significance, but that all descendants of Adam had a law of sin, decay and death implanted in them physically, it therefore follows that as soon as the obedience of Christ was complete, all Adam’s descendants were the subjects of change of nature to Adam’s original nature under law but not having sinned. That the serpents’ power in their reproductive organs was removed by some miracle thus bringing to an end the ‘law of sin’ in their members. That this is not the case is proved in what Paul was actually teaching in respect of corruptible human beings related by enlightenment to Divine Law and

H.H.James shows his discredit and misrepresentation of Paul's teaching by using it where he can accept federal terms as applicable to the present relationship but not to the removal of death itself by baptism, because in his mind natural death is the sentence or penalty and the candidate is still a dying creature after immersion and rising from the water. Those who support H.H.James must explain the difference between Adam's nature and that of the beasts at creation, and why the "beasts die at all if they, and rightly so, are not related to sin, seeing that he insists Adam could only die through law "breaking, this death being as he insists a gradual process of decay ending in return to dust. The animals had only a physical law by which they could reproduce a likeness of their own species. The same was the case with Adam and Eve, they could not by their own volition produce a man of sinful character and a man of righteous character, take the case for example with Cain and Abel, their characters were developed by whatever teaching they received and upon which they acted. If there was a "law-of-sin", making them prone to do evil why blame Cain? And how did Abel manage to be righteous? The scriptures are full of similar examples which have all been demonstrated by the dedicated service to God of members of the Nazarene Fellowship in various literature but which has been so misrepresented and in many cases withheld from members of the Christadelphian community that they cannot be true unbiased judges of what we believe. Edward Turney did not preach or launch the doctrine of "Clean Flesh", he taught that the flesh was as God made it and as Paul affirms: - "He hath made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the earth". Robert Roberts refuted this without shame in order to gain support for his defeat by Edward Turney in the latter's lecture on the "Sacrifice of Christ", which pamphlet is available. Now H.H.James in his booklet No, 25 is teaching that the condemnation is of flesh and not of sin and that when Adam was first created he had "clean-flesh" but when he disobeyed his flesh was altered to "unclean" and classified in the term "Condemned Nature" a term which is nowhere to be found in the scriptures, because "clean" and "un-clean" are terms which have to do with Legal not the physical. This chopping and changing is a well-known theme among Christadelphian writers and they have become in the words of one of our late and well-loved brethren, "Mallet Cases," and you know what a mallet is used for I hope. It is knocking away something that will eventually leave something that makes for an accurate and sensible description and a person has to be very patient in doing this. My patience is almost exhausted when I read a statement by H.H.James that the penalty for disobedience was the same penalty as for obedience in the case of Jesus.

This is where another Christadelphian conjuring trick has to be brought into play, the separation of flesh from character - a Dual Christ. And also the paradoxical teaching of Clause 8 of the B.A.S.F, "That these promises had reference to Jesus Christ, who was to be raised up in the condemned line of Abraham and David, and who, though wearing their condemned nature was to obtain a title to resurrection by perfect obedience, and, by dying, abrogate the law of condemnation for himself and all who should believe and obey him." How in the name of sanity and scriptural logic can a person who is under a law of condemnation repeal or cancel it in the suffering of its penalty? And what difference does it make "by dying if a title to resurrection of eternal life by Jesus had already been obtained by his perfect obedience? What of H.H.James "Lawmaker" and "Lawbreaker" example if the condemned is able to cancel or repeal the power of the Lawmaker? Yet in clause 8 this is what he is paid to do, but H.H.James adds a little more by saying of course that the suffering of the penalty for being a human being, or identical nature with Adam, was part of his obedience. In effect Jesus was under compulsion from his Father to die an inflicted death as part of his obedience, and failure to do so would be twofold condemnation for a birth in which he had no choice, unless Clause 8 expects its readers to believe that he pre-existed as a person or hybrid-being, and took on him the seed of Abraham by wearing Abraham's condemned nature.

There is little room for the meaning of "Sacrifice" in Christadelphian teaching founded on the B.A.S.F. It was much consideration and discriminate reading of the epistle to the Hebrews which led me as a Christadelphian to question their teaching of Christ as a fit sacrifice, if He Himself was unclean or "condemned-flesh" and had to die to cleanse Himself, after all, what was left of Him but a corpse or lifeless-body? This was not what the Law demanded. It demanded a living being, a body of life, and it was a body of life which God offered in the form of a Ransom or Redemptive Price after Jesus being willing firstly to offer Himself to God for this purpose in order to redeem Adam and all in him on the Federal Principle. This is demonstrated in no uncertain manner in Hebrews. In pursuing this matter I was accused of putting Christ on a pedestal but I regarded the accusation as more of a compliment and was not afraid to say so. Like Paul, I was determined to know nothing, (as far as my accuser was

concerned) but Jesus Christ and Him crucified as a free will offering and sacrifice. It amazes me why a community which profess to believe the Bible will leave no stone unturned to find some way of wresting the scriptures in order to refute the true meaning of “Substitution” in regard to the sacrifice of Christ, they insist his life was under condemnation - that He had to die for Himself in order to cleanse Himself as per the High Priest, who offered two sacrifices one for himself and then one for the people. Hebrews 7 Jesus was not acting in the capacity of High Priest while on earth - He was the offering itself, who offered Himself without Spot to God, and God spared not His own son but gave Him up freely for us all, to the rulers of the darkness of this world personified as Sin as a Master or the “Devil” him that had the power of death, that he might deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. The Apostle stated, “If he were on earth he could not be a Priest for certain reasons. Hebrews chapter 8. Are we to accept the Christadelphian view that God’s offering of His Own Son was a polluted offering - inferior to the type under the Law of Moses? That this Son of God or God’s own Son unrelated to ‘Sin,’ was indeed ‘Sin’s Flesh’ or under Sin’s Ownership’, and by this means God purchased or ransomed us with the Devil’s own coinage? Could Jesus be free to offer His ‘life’ in the blood as the ransom price if it was already Sin’s property? Any who accept such blasphemous and unscriptural doctrine, reject the very words of Jesus in Matthew ch. 20, v 28, they also reject the prophetic words of Caiaphas through the spirit of God, supporting in no uncertain terms the ‘Substitutionary death’ of Christ. The words of Caiaphas therefore are addressed to Christadelphians, “Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.” John confirms that Caiaphas was speaking of Jesus who would die for that Jewish Nation and not for that nation only but for other sheep not of that fold. In other words, if Christ had not died there would be no Jewish Nation and no Gentiles to become one with them; see Eph. ch. 2 which commences with the words, “And you hath he quickened”, implying life from death without any change of physical nature, and goes on to speak of how both Jew and Gentile were made ‘One’ through the sacrifice of Christ. Christ’s death was for the transgressions that were under the first covenant and He is now the Mediator of the new covenant that they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance which is impossible if a person has not passed from death to life. Jesus put away sin or bore it away when it was laid upon him. Isaiah chapter 53. He was once offered to bear upon Himself (not in Himself at birth) to the cross of Calvary the ‘Sin of the World’ and the sins of many; and unto them only who believe this and who are looking for His return from the Most Holy Place, Heaven itself, He will appear for the second time on earth without those sins upon Him, having carried them away and left them in a land of forgetfulness; see Hebrews ch.8 vs 12 and 15, and ch. 10 vs 16 – 27.

A life equivalent to Adam’s before his disobedience forfeited it to Sin, was paid to Sin as the Ransom or Redemptive price, and all God asks of us is recognition of this fact through the obedience of faith; the debt to the Bondmaster Sin was paid and if we refuse to accept this, then we remain the servants of Sin and can only expect the wages due for that service which is death. This is all that “Bondmaster Sin can offer, but God’s offer of eternal life is a gift through Jesus Christ our Lord. In conclusion I will quote the words expressed by our late beloved brother asleep in Christ, from his booklet entitled, “What God Hath Cleansed”; page 25 and 26 “Thus, when Paul says “By man came death”, he is speaking in what may “be called a doctrinal sense, of the death which really matters; that sentence which ‘passes upon’ all men when they become responsible sinners, and which will “be executed upon such as remain under condemnation, when the secrets of all hearts shall “be revealed, in the second death. That this is the correct view is proved by the fact that the condemnation can be individually remitted by faith and obedience, Jesus says, “He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life”. Paul likewise, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus”. If the condemnation resulting from sin were natural death, then those in Christ are still under condemnation, for they are still corruptible, and both Paul and Jesus are contradicted. If death in Scripture is always death, no more, no less, then Christ’s words are falsified, because he says a believer has already actually passed from death into life. This is not ‘prolepsis’ - speaking of what is future as though it were present; He is speaking of a death-state and a life-state which exist independently of our physical life or death. Paul says: “Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” His use of the words ‘passed upon’ implies that he is dealing with something in the nature of a law or sentence. Natural death is not a sentence; it is not passed upon us we are corruptible and therefore dying because we were created so as Dr. Thomas has said.

Page 27. It is utterly wrong to look upon natural death as in any sense the penalty of sin. When it cuts short a life, severs friendships or leaves a loved one desolate, it brings grief and unhappiness, but in the case of the saints or saved ones, their death is a blessed sleep from which they will awake in Immortal Glory. We conclude that the truth is not stated in the Statement of Faith, that the sentence on Adam was his return to the ground. This evil spirit of doctrine should be cast out and replaced by the true one; the sentence was not carried out except in symbol; if it had been the human race would never have existed at all. Unless this is understood and accepted it is impossible to go on to the mighty truths that the mercy of God is from everlasting unto everlasting and that Jesus is the Saviour of all men - especially of them that believe." The above quoted author who some years ago was a member of the M.I.S. and a former president of the Union, was invited by a Yorkshire Society to speak at their Interim Conference. The then president, A.E.Owler, vetoed their invitation and said that Ernest Brady must not be allowed to be heard, having expressed doubt of the correctness of some aspects of Christadelphian teaching. The present writer also having in 1952 expressed similar doubts though unaware of the existence of Ernest Brady at that time, was also unjustly accused and misrepresented by a Christadelphian. It mattered not to him what I believed if I was opposing the B.A.S.F., - this was their Bible. And so when I read of the experiences of Peter and John who were commanded by the rulers not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus, I can only feel sorry for those people who have been denied the opportunity of reading literature by Nazarene writers through the dictatorial arrogance of Popish leaders of their community. It has never been done in order to criticize sincere members of that community but to enlighten them to the fact that physical condemnation in the flesh makes their baptism invalid for salvation, having arisen from the water with that same physical condemnation. Refusal to read or to listen to reason has left the Christadelphian Community "Spiritually Bankrupt." The late H.H.James' work will only serve to keep it that way, especially when his statements are presumptuous and beyond what is written; for example Gen. ch. 5 where after disobedience three completely differing statements were made to the three offenders which had nothing to do with the penalty, "Surely Die" in the day of sin. These Divine statements had relation to the results of being expelled from the garden of Eden. The serpent was firstly addressed whereby he was cursed and became a figure of speech where prophetically his seed would be recognised in that generation of vipers who would be instrumental in the crucifixion of the woman's seed Jesus Christ. The second statement was to the woman who incidentally, with Adam at their creation, had been told to be fruitful and multiply and replenish, the earth. Because she was first in the transgression, the penalty of "Surely Die" was upon her at the instant she sinned, so that the statement which followed was separate from this, and again was a result and consequence of being expelled from the most desirable and enjoyable conditions in the garden. Her sorrow may have been multiplied in bringing forth children in the absence of such conditions in the garden, yet the actual conception of children has always been regarded as a blessing in the Jewish nation, but the point to be noted is that Eve was not sentenced to return to the ground, and therefore we should accept that this is not the meaning of "Surely Die," Eve being already subject to a decaying nature, but by creation, not by sin. The statement to Adam was also prophetic and consequential, as a result of his expulsion from the garden, the statement confirming that he was corruptible, and this would take its course until he died a natural or common death. Whatever may have been said to Adam and his wife afterwards, we can only surmise that it may have moved him to call his wife's name Eve, which means, "The mother of all living," "not of all dying" as H.H.James has said. through the result of a miraculous change from some fictitious nature neither corruptible or incorruptible styled 'very good.'

To all Christadelphians my message is, "It is high time you put on a new record." Or should I have said, "Tape Recording"?

P. Parry (November 1986)

“The Fool Hath Said... There Is No God.”

Psalm 14 v 1

These are a few words spoken to the unbeliever by Bro. Hayden Price. “So you do not believe in God. But we are told in the beginning God created, brought this world into existence. Science can only look at what is already here but reveals nothing new, Eccl. 1 vs 9 and 10 Matt. 6:28 and 29, Luke 12:27. We are asked to consider the flowers of the field; how they grow, (not their beauty, though pleasant to the eyes) what lies behind their growth? it must be life, here then is the secret of creation. By God all things were created and are held together. Isaiah 40 v 26. Steam engines did not make themselves, nor did the stars, children’s garments do not make themselves, nor did human life. As we look at the earth we learn much; consider its graduations of climate from Artic to Tropical, Gods footmarks are everywhere. We see them in ordinary things as a Radish. It starts with a little seed which is put in the ground, later it becomes a full grown radish, the top is green, the body and root is white, around it a delicate tint or red; well, whose hand put the hues, colour and clothed it? Another seed is put into the soil, that of a Water-melon, we next need sun; shower; air and light. (Gen.8:22)

The wonders from under the ground from which our Water-melon has grown are soon revealed to us. First a little stem, later a fully grown Water-melon in its glorious clothing, a garment of green, a white rind and within a core of red and in this heart of red are thousands of seeds which can produce other Water-melons. Next we draw their attention to the apple, the pear, and the peach with its blush or to the nuts with their kernel and hard shell. Gen. 1 vs 11 and 12. The most educated men in the world cannot explain the mystery of the Radish; the Water-melon; the fruit and the nuts. Many like myself can. To the unbeliever we say. Let nature help you with your instruction that you may realize “In the beginning God created”.

The references are my addition, but remember Bro Price is talking with unbelievers, to whom scripture means little.

Harvey Linggood

John’s Baptism In relation to Christ.

The question has been asked why, if Jesus was without sin should He submit to the baptism of John which was of repentance unto remission of sins? It would seem that John too was at first puzzled by Jesus request for he said “I have need to be baptised of thee and comest thou to me”? Jesus’ reply to this was, “suffer it to be so now for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,” whereupon John complied with His request, now it is scripturally evident that Jesus had no sins to repent of so we must look for a deeper significance, we remember Our Lord on one occasion spoke of His future sufferings and death as a baptism to be baptised with and how am I ‘straightened’ (or troubled) until it be accomplished, would it not seem reasonable therefore to see in His water baptism a foreshadowing of His Sacrifice which must be accomplished before any of Adam’s seed could be saved from perishing, this last supreme sacrifice had to be made before ‘all righteousness’ could be fulfilled - He was the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth, until then Atonement could only be made through the shed blood of animals. It would seem too that in the act of submission to Johns baptism Jesus demonstrated to His Heavenly Father His willingness to play this most vital role in the plan of Redemption for it was on this occasion that God introduced Him as “ His Beloved Son in whom He was well pleased “ and invested Him with His Holy Spirit (lighting visibly upon Him in the form of a dove) as He came up out of the water - foreshadowed His Resurrection in Spirit Nature. Christian baptism too is symbolic of what Christ literally suffered on our behalf. It was a Dove which Noah sent forth from the ark (a type of Christ) and which returned with an olive leaf, the oil of the olive symbolises the Holy Spirit which Jesus shed abroad in the hearts of believers after His resurrection. It would not be out of place here to make a comment on I Cor. 15:29. which is thought by some to be one of the most difficult in the Bible, but if we can see

Baptism as an emblem of suffering and death, and believers are regarded as having 'died' with Christ (Rom. 6:6) why submit to this ordinance and suffer the persecutions and tribulations this commitment brought to believers at that time if there was no Resurrection and future life with Christ and dead saints. "They would be of all men the most miserable." I Cor. 15:19, in other words there would be no point in being baptised (an emblem of death) if they were to remain in the grave.

E. Linggood.
