

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 95

October 1987

In this Issue : -

Page 1 Editorial	Bro and Sis Harvey and Evelyn Linggood
Page 1 Poem – Be Of Good Courage	
Page 2 A Reply to The Christadelphians for Unity – North America	
Page 5 Step By Step - poem by	Brother Phil Parry
Page 6 Abide In Him	Barbara Ryberg
Page 7 From Eden to Gethsemane	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 9 Romans Chapter Seven	Brother A.L.Wilson
	Sister Evelyn Linggood

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Reader Friends. Greetings in the Name of Jesus.

We thank all those who have corresponded with us or phoned during the past month, this is always appreciated.

We have had news that our Bro. John Carter is not at all well, also our Sis. May Lockett, both well stricken in years, let us remember in our prayers likewise all who are suffering at this time.

Our Sis. Helen Brady has had a new edition of “oo True to be New” printed in memory of her father Bro. Ernest who fell asleep about a year ago. We will enclose copies to each together with a leaflet “Come let us reason together saith the Lord”. Further copies can be obtained from Sis. Helen or from us; we hope they will assist towards a right understanding regarding the nature of man and the Atonement.

In this months issue we have a reply to C.F.U. (Christadelphians for Unity) North America, by Bro. Phil Parry, an exhortation by Bro. Leo. Dreifuss “Abide in Him”, a further instalment of “From Eden to Gethsemane” by A.L.Wilson.” Also a few thoughts on Romans chapter Seven.

We pray for the welfare of you all, with Sincere Love and best wishes.
Yours in the Master’s Service. Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

Be Of Good Courage.

In silence prolonged, profound,
We wait the heavenly Sound.
The Shout, the Trump, the Voice,
When quick and dead rejoice.
For Jesus of Nazareth appears
Silencing doubts and fears.
Dismissing doubts and fears,
Perplexities and tears.
Courage - ye saints.

A Reply To C.F.U. (Christadelphians For Unity) North America. Read MICAH. ch. 6 v 8: MALACHI. ch. 5 vs 16-18.

In the locality where I live known as the Royal Forest of Dean and situated in Gloucestershire there is a religiously minded Body of people who advertise in the Personal column of two weekly papers confined to this area and drawing attention to topical subjects of varying interest in order to focus people's attention to their beliefs and teaching which is purported by them to be based wholly in the Bible.

If the printed phone number is dialled an answering machine will give a recorded message. If your interest is aroused, you give your name and address at the end of the recording and someone will either call or you will be sent literature on the particular subject. The people concerned introduce themselves by the name of their Sect and of course you would be informed of what they profess to believe and teach, and unless you had a personal visit you would have no way of challenging their teaching on a scriptural basis. I proved this by phoning on two occasions, and on the first occasion I received literature which contained errors which had been proved so for many years past, yet are still the basis upon which this particular sect struggles to hold itself together.

It seemed very strange to me that somewhere around June of this year 1987 I read in the personal column of the said newspapers the following, "Why don't the Churches Unite? Phone this number for a recorded message". The phone number was the very one used by this sect I have mentioned, which is struggling to hold itself together because it is not united on the basic teaching of Holy Scripture.

This fact is apparent in England and Australia but very much evident in North America where they have instituted a referendum to their members entitled "Christadelphians For Unity" calling on them to vote for unity and acceptance of the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith 1908 forming their basis of fellowship. I did not phone for the recorded message, the reason being apparent. Here we have the world-wide sect known as Christadelphians professing to give the reasons why the Churches of Christendom do not unite yet are so divided themselves on various issues of doctrine, that they have to resort to a Referendum for unity on the basis and acceptance of a document which has been the very cause of their disunity from 1875 to the present day. Contained in this document (B.A.S.F.) are two of the main subjects and stumbling blocks to Christadelphians - The sinful-flesh delusion and Redemption in Christ. It seems very strange, yea rather, very hypocritical that this sect which I have been forced to name, should have had an "Amended Continental Reunion Committee of North America" on May 31st. 1980 to prepare a statement of their understanding of the Atonement. I wrote a reply to this statement in August 1980, how much of it got through the obstacles of barbed-wire defence used by these people is difficult to judge but one thing is certain, seven years later they are still struggling for unity by Referendum this time, on the basis of the same old statements namely, their understanding yet it is not their understanding at all but that of the man, (one of their pioneers Robert Roberts), who was responsible in 1873 for the disunity which has existed ever since. Consequently they have remained under the constitution of his making, though they profess to accepting the doctrines and precepts of Christ, as taught in the apostolic writings, and defined positively and negatively, (they say) in the annexed Statement of Faith, and in addition they welcome to their Fellowship, all who have been immersed (by whomsoever) after their acceptance of the same doctrines and precepts. In other words they stand or fall on Robert Robert's interpretation and understanding of the doctrines and precepts of Christ despite his contradictions and adding to the Word of God together with the disharmony of his own writings with some of John Thomas the original founder of the Christadelphian sect.

My reply of August 1980 to this North American Committee's Statement on their understanding of the "Atonement" "is available but I will confine my present remarks by highlighting some of the points raised, under the heading they use ie, "Redemption in Christ". It commences as follows, "The Sin of Adam brought consequences for the whole of the human race, every member of which inherited a proneness sin and the certainty of death". This is a presumptuous and false statement. Did Abel sin? Did Seth sin? Did Enoch sin? Did Noah sin? Where is the evidence for this proneness to sin you speak of? Sin is impossible without law. Did Adam have a proneness to sin when God put him under test and

trial of faith? Was he not capable of obedience? If not, then God was unjust, and it is also presumption on your part to say that every member of the human race inherited a proneness to sin as a result of the Sin of Adam. You are refuting the fact that sin is transgression of law by saying that it is in-bred and transmitted through some miraculous change, then you make a mockery of God by stating, "Man's guilt is for his own sin, actual transgression of God's law..." In addition you say and teach that natural death is the penalty for this transgression but you ignore the fact that this natural existence decay and death was the possibility for Adam if God chose not to intervene and give him an incorruptible nature even if Adam was obedient. Adam was created capable of death if left to himself, even Dr. Thomas your pioneer wrote this in harmony with the teaching of the apostle Paul. How can you say "Men are in no way responsible for Adam's sin nor is there any guilt attaching to them on account of the nature they bear, even though it is unclean and tends only to sin", when throughout one hundred years or more of Christadelphian literature and preaching and stated in Clause VIII of the B.A.S.F., that Christ inherited condemned nature and by dying abrogated the law of condemnation for himself and all who should believe and obey him? How is it possible to abrogate a law by which you are condemned, by suffering its penalty? Add to such absurdity the fact that natural death was a possibility without a change to spirit nature, even from creation, and you have what you mistakenly believe as the penalty for sin already in operation before Adam even sinned.

These are the irresponsible false theories and statements that will explode in your faces if you really consider them. How has belief and obedience to Christ abrogated the law of condemnation in the nature of Christadelphians when they still experience what they believe is natural death as the penalty? If men are not to blame for the nature they bear why do you say Christ had to die for himself because he had the same nature? Please explain why he should not have been spared the death of the cross, if it was not for Adam and all in his loins. Please explain how the suffering of a penalty of condemnation for himself was a conditional part of Christ's obedience. How absurd! Yet this is your teaching and part of the basis on which you are seeking unity amongst your many divisions. You even misquote what the apostles say in order to bolster up your false theories: Example "So Christ entered into death itself in order that he might abolish it in himself, for he too needed redemption from death and was saved in that he feared God". This indeed is a misuse of the word redemption. Nowhere in scripture does it mean a change from corruptible nature to incorruptible, neither does it apply to Jesus whichever way it is used. How can a person who needs redemption be God's ransom-price for Adam and his posterity? Admitted Jesus did need a change of nature but this was possible for him without experiencing death, for he was a righteous man from birth and as there was no blame or guilt attached to his nature, can you explain his death by bloodshedding as anything other than a sacrifice for others? Is not this proved in Romans ch, 5 vs 10 and 11 where the apostle emphasises that reconciliation, redemption, or the Atonement, is by Jesus Christ now, and not by what you wrongly express to be redemption of the body? It has been proved that the translators in many instances used the word redemption where it should have been deliverance. One example is found in the words of Jesus to his disciples who were already the subjects of redemption in Christ, "When these things begin to come to pass then lift up your heads and rejoice for your redemption draweth nigh". Luke 21 v 28.

In whatever way this prophecy affected them the word should have been deliverance. The misquotation you use and to which I referred, is Heb. ch. 5 v 7 where Jesus is not said to be praying for resurrection out of death and the grave, as you imply, but that the cup of crucifixion should pass from him, nevertheless not my will but thine be done, the angels ministering unto him being a demonstration of the fact that through His reverence and Godly fear He had been heard far from being saved from death or abolishing it in Himself, Jesus tasted death for every man and by so doing abolished the death that came by sin (blood-shedding) and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel of which his sacrificial death was the important first principal. It does you no credit to add to the words of the Apostle in order to fit your false theories and misrepresentation, neither is it to your credit that you explain sins in relation to man in the order that the scriptures do not describe and which in any case you do not fully explain. You state, "The Scriptures describe two kinds of sin in relation to man. The first is the personal sins which we have committed, the sins which can be forgiven in Christ. The second relates to the law of sin and death at work in our members which, because it is the root cause of sin, is described as sin, although it is not attributed to us as guilt before God. Redemption was wrought by the love and grace of

God, and provides deliverance from both kinds of sin, the sins we have committed and the body in which they were done”.

The first sin the Scripture describes is the sin of Adam and not the sins which we have committed. We were never under law to God as Gentiles, only through acceptance of the Jewish faith before the advent of Christ, and only through being truly in Christ now at the present time. How was Adam capable of sin? Was the law of sin and death at work in his members the root cause? If not, why should we need to have such a root cause implanted in our members? Would we not be as capable of sin without this root cause, as you put it? Surely if you read the scriptures with less of the indoctrination Robert Roberts and co. have handed down to you it would be clear that sin is transgression of Divine Law and where no law is there is no transgression nor any law of physical sin in our members. “The law of sin and death”, to which Paul made reference was never called ‘sin’ as you say, and he declares he had been freed from it through the law of the Spirit of life in Christ and without any physical change of nature, which you insist is necessary.

The Law of Sin and death is not a physical law of our being but a law by which all men were held in bondage through Adam’s disobedience and could not be freed from its power until the correct ransom price was paid to the Bondmaster which is Sin Personified; see Romans chapter 6. This whole chapter shows the believers to have died unto the old master to whom Adam had sold the as members of his body, and through symbolic death and resurrection were in newness of life yielding their services to a new master whose members they had become verses 15-25. This is what is known as the Federal principle, Adam being the first Federal head of the human race and Jesus the second, life having been forfeited by the first and restored by the second. The Law of Sin and death was known by Adam and taught to his posterity until Moses, when it was incorporated in the Law to show that despite obedience to the Law. it could not of itself give life because the Ransom-Price or equivalent life forfeited in Eden had not yet been paid in the person of Jesus Christ the Lamb of God. Thus the sin of Eden was magnified in the Law to draw attention to this fact and for the good of all who exercised faith.

It was as Paul said, “A school-master to bring us to Christ”. You say we are delivered from sins committed and from the body in which they were done and you call this Redemption. It is nothing of the kind. How can we be delivered from sins already committed? They are committed and we can only be forgiven - the body in which they were done is not to blame - it is capable of all that God requires after we have been redeemed and reconciled to God – it is we ourselves as enlightened responsible people who are to blame, not the quality of our flesh. Is there anything that we can deem impossible in God’s requirements of His redeemed servants? The impression given in your teaching and literature is that there is, and your reason for it is. “That no flesh should glory in His Sight”. But the Scriptures teach that no one can serve God unless redeemed and reconciled to him, but you reject the fact that we are redeemed now if we are truly in Christ, this is of course by the Grace of God and not of works, but we are capable of good works in the service of our new master but they do not earn us Eternal Life, this is the Gift of God. No one agrees more than us that man is not to blame for Adam’s sin or for the nature he bears, and we quote Ezek. ch. 18 as proof of this and also I Cor. ch. 15 where Paul describes Adam as created a living soul dependent on the breath of life as we are. Who then is responsible for your false theory of Adam’s nature being changed and defiled by the implantation of a physical law of sin and death giving him and his posterity a proneness to sin after God had already pronounced His displeasure for Adam’s Sin? This is one of the unscriptural clauses of your B.A.S.F. and is derived from the Apostate Church of Rome which together with Christadelphians has misunderstood and misinterpreted Paul’s letter to the Romans chapter 5 and also other parts of his epistle. If Eve had conceived before transgression would her child have had a different nature than the nature of Cain and Abel who were born after Eve’s transgression? If you say ‘Yes’ then you must deny Clause IV of the B.A.S.F. and be forced to explain this other nature which you tell people was neither Angelic nor capable of final decay and death until God changed it. There is hardly a Clause in the B.A.S.F. that a Christadelphian can satisfactorily explain in conformity and harmony with the Scriptures, this is why the B.A.S.F. in never introduced to prospective candidates because they would not understand the unscriptural and contradictory terminology it contains. I am prepared to go through it Clause for Clause with any Christadelphian and prove the errors from the Scriptures. The example I mentioned of the birth of a child before Eve’s transgression and that of Cain after transgression shows not a change of flesh or

nature but a change of relationship to God, Adam and Eve, by transgression having alienated themselves and all other subsequent posterity from God, and God in His Love and mercy, placing them all under the same Federal Constitution of Sin so that by the righteousness of one Federal Head Jesus Christ, He might have mercy upon all on the principle of enlightenment and faith in his sacrificial death.

This inflicted death Jesus suffered was the penalty Adam incurred but had been spared - natural decay and death was already operative from creation - a change being necessary for eternal life. Around 1865 Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts believed this latter fact and wrote that there was no evidence in scripture that Adam's nature was changed only his relationship to his maker. And now this "non-evidence" is part of a condition for Christadelphian Fellowship and Unity and when challenged all one hears is, "What do the pioneers say? Not what do the Scriptures teach? Nor, "What did our pioneers first believe? We have laboured in and through our literature to enlighten members of the Christadelphian community because we regard them as sincere disillusioned people under a yoke of bondage (the B.A.S.F.) which denies them freedom of thought and expression on pain of disfellowship (or in R/Catholic terms) excommunication, not because of a denial of the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles, but of their own man-made Creed" through the interpretation and precepts of men the B.A.S.F. This document has been doomed to failure from its source and far from achieving Unity has made havoc of Christadelphianism in all its divisions and all that can be expected to see the True Light of the World is an isolated case here and there as we have experienced over the years.

Their leaders and leader writers are to blame for the suppression of Truth and we have been denied even a space in their magazines for a reply to the false accusations and misrepresentations levelled against us in these periodicals because they would contain a violation of their basis of fellowship the very document which is blinding them to the Truth. That they have no answer to what I have expressed is shown in the fact that I have been waiting for at least two years for a reply from a 'Testimony' writer who had promised it within a few weeks. I am at least grateful to God that His promises are more dependable than those of Christadelphians. Their position remains as always, not that they have the Truth, but that they are afraid of it. We have as much right to treat Christadelphians as aliens as they have in treating the rest of Christendom as aliens especially as they have much in common with the latter.

I conclude with this statement made by one of our beloved members some years ago and written at the end of a pamphlet exposing the errors of Christadelphian teaching, and it also applies now to this present article; "You can read this or burn it in ten seconds but Eternity will not efface the facts".

P. Parry 18/8/87
(Nazarene Fellowship)

STEP by STEP.

He does not lead me year by year,
or even day by day,
But step by step my path unfold,
My Lord directs my way.

Tomorrows plans I do not know
I only know this minute,
But He will say, "This is the way
By faith now walk ye in it".

And I am glad that it is so
Today's enough to bear,
And when tomorrow comes. His grace
Shall far exceed its care.

What need to worry then, or fret ?
The God who gave His Son
Holds all my moments in His hand
And gives them one by one.

Barbara C. Ryberg.

ABIDE IN HIM

We are all acquainted with the Bible account of how Rahab hid Joshua's messengers. The point I want us to notice is that when God overthrew Jericho, Rahab's relatives had to stay in her house in order to escape death. There are several instances recorded in the Bible where people had to abide within, certain place to be saved. The first case is that of Noah and his family. They had to be within the ark. Outside it there was certain death by drowning. Next we read of how when Lot was besieged by the men of Sodom and his life threatened, the angel pulled him inside, so that he and his family were safe for that night until next morning when at the Divine command they fled the city.

Then comes the Passover night when God slew all the firstborn of Egypt. The children of Israel had to stay within their houses during that night, and also put some of the blood of the Passover sacrifice on the door posts. So in all these cases people had to take cover inside some temporary abode in order to stay alive. We can say that Lot's house, the house of the children of Israel at Passover, and later that of Rahab at the destruction of Jericho, served the temporary purpose of the ark. The ark symbolised the means of being separated from the ungodly people of the world. It shows some of God's plan of how throughout the ages He took out a people for His Name; Noah, Abraham, Israel as a nation, and then those who dying to sin in the waters of baptism accepted the name of Christ, the only name by which in this age we are saved.

Note two things:-

1. There is always that distinction between those outside who are lost, and those inside who are saved.
2. To get inside we must first show faith and do something to show that faith, Noah builded an ark, the children of Israel had to sacrifice a lamb, no remission of sins without the shedding of blood, put some of the blood on the door posts and stay inside for the night. Rahab and family had to stay indoors and display the scarlet thread by which she lowered the spies at her window. Faith comes first, but by itself is not enough. We must conform to God's conditions and instructions which at this age consist of immersion into the waters of baptism. Then there is the necessity to abide within the ark, or nowadays to abide with Jesus. We all fail at times to live up to the high standard required of those who have taken the name of Christ upon themselves. And there is forgiveness if we sincerely repent. But one thing the Lord hates above all else is to deliberately turn back. This was one of the great failing of the children of Israel.

Whenever things went wrong they wanted to turn back to Egypt. We must guard against the temptation to turn back to the world. There is that solemn warning in the Epistle to the Hebrews in chapter 10 verse 38 "Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him". And then another thought. As mentioned earlier, the working of God's plan has always been that of taking out a people for His Name. The people of Israel, nationally, were such. But God never excluded strangers who were not of Israel. And Rahab serves as a good example. Not only was she admitted to the nation of Israel, but she is among the worthy ones whose name appears in the chapter on faith. Hebrews ch. 11.

Then there is the widow of Zarephath who maintained Elijah during the famine under king Ahab. Another example is that of Ruth, also an ancestress of David. Or take the Syrian leper who was cleansed during the ministry of Elijah and forsook all idol worship, henceforth to serve God only. God is truly no respecter of persons, but is willing to accept anybody who comes with the right spirit of faith and repentance. But it works the other way, too. Esau was the firstborn, but he proved unworthy and so the blessing and privileges of the firstborn passed to Jacob. The nation of Israel was a type of firstborn in that the kingdom of Israel was a forerunner to the future Kingdom of God. But nationally, except the few who proved worthy, they forsook the Divine law - the consequences we witness to this day: a scattered and persecuted people. During Christ's ministry they were so confident of being Abraham's children that they thought they needed no saviour. And this teaching prevails among the Jews to this day. I remember a teacher, a rabbi, saying to us : - "We don't need a Christ; we inherited from Abraham the absolute legal irrevocable right to the land of Israel". And we, the Israel after the spirit, had better heed Paul's warning in Romans ch. 11 vs 20 and 21: "Be not highminded, but fear: for if God spared

not the natural branches, take heed lest He also spare not thee". No there is no room for high-mindedness, we were all born outside the ark, servants to sin, and by God's mercy, and only God's mercy, were shown a better way. Let us not despise the stranger, remembering we were of them once.

But let us renew our resolution to abide in Him, and rejoice that with Noah, Abraham, Rahab and the many other worthies we are among those who will be in the Kingdom assisting Christ to put a wicked world aright,

G.L.Dreifuss

continued from September

From Eden To Gethsemane.

...e.g. James, having obtained a revolver, shot the Lion. The obtaining of the revolver precedes the shooting of the Lion. So Jesus entered the Holiest by His own blood, previously having obtained His title to Glorification, directly on account of which God anointed Him with the oil of gladness above His fellows (Hebrews i. 9).

Adam before he could live eternally, needed deliverance (not redemption) from the natural condition; but he failed to establish his title: the second, by obedience, established His title (John xii. 24: Hebrews i. 9). The latter before accepting His merited prize, in Divine Love voluntarily went through the jaws of all-devouring death for doomed man (John x. 18). Breathes not the man who will prove Jesus under the curse. We now approach Substitution, against which the Editor feels it his duty to "argue as strongly as he may". As this is our settled conviction -- yea, the anchor of our soul by day and our song in the night - we trembled in terror of Logical Martyrdom; "but instead what did we find? A theory of the Atonement which we ourselves consider the utmost possible reversal of fact. The Editor's argument is, therefore, reduced to an "Ignoratio Elenchi". If God be represented as "demanding of man the utmost satisfaction of justice, without which He is declared to be either unable or unwilling to forgive, and another pays to GOD that demand for man, we thoroughly agree with the Editor that this would reduce forgiveness to a mockery. But why did not the Editor put forth the order of redemption, even in the words of the late Dr. Thomas, which order we scrupulously endorse? Did he the Editor imagine that, by bolstering up a false theory, and then exhibiting a magnificent display in scattering to the four winds of Heaven, that, therefore, he had dispensed with substitution? Deduction from false premises may satiate the cravings of a biased mind, but is lamentably deficient to nullify eternal fact. It is imperative therefore, to re-cast the very premises and disentangle from this utter confusion the Divine order of Redemption. In doing so we deem it unnecessary to alter even one word of the late Dr. Thomas, viz. "Redemption means to buy back, hence it is release from a former lord by purchase. The purchaser is God, and the price or ransom is the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot" (I Peter i. 18-19). The poorest reasoner will now see that it is not God, but this other lord, this Sin Power, which demands the utmost farthing. What a lamentable deception it is therefore, to deny substitution by grossly inverting the Divine order, and falsely representing God as the creditor, when it is the Gracious God who condescends to pay the Bankrupt Sinner's account! O Editor! It is not until the ungrateful sinner insults this Divine Goodness that God takes action against him demanding it of him (Heb. vi. 4-8, x, 28,51). "Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men" (II Cor. v. 11).

The Editor attempts to meet this by saying: "The matter is scarcely bettered if the advocate should reply: 'Oh yes, there is forgiveness with God because He has provided the one who pays the debt'. If God has only paid Himself, and arranged for an apparent satisfaction of Divine justice". We pronounce this idea unadulterated absurdity. The Editor is truly combating a false theory, which, like a curl of mist floats betwixt his mind and his pen, and distorts the real contention to his eye, giving it an imaginary shape and colour, while he continues vigorously beating the air and deluding himself that he is doing the

work of the Lord. Do we teach that God gave Jesus to die to pay himself? What are the facts? The death that He died. He died unto sin once (Romans chapter 6). Does this accord with the Editor's gross imputation of God paying Himself? Our eternal conviction is that it is God who gave Jesus to die unto sin, and thereby rendered that Government all it could demand from man. We are therefore, as Dr. Thomas says, released from that former lord by God's purchase. To put into our mouths the idea of "God paying Himself by an apparent satisfaction of justice", is a most unscrupulous misrepresentation. Then the Editor asks: "Is the debt paid?" and adds: "If it is, it is not forgiven". No argument is more easily refuted than this. The blunder here consists in arguing on the assumption that the debt is paid to God. If this were so, the Editor's argument would be sound; but when it is proved that God is the purchaser, Who gave His only begotten Son (John iii. 16), and redeemed man from the Government of sin, then God's payment and His forgiveness gloriously harmonise in a manner hitherto undreamed of by the Editor. "Mercy and truth have met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other" (Psalm lxxxv. 10). We are bought with a price (I Cor. vi. 20). Let us therefore compare this glorious scheme of Redemption with the Editor's theory of involving Jesus "under the curse, and sin's possession? Will this accord with the rectitude of the government of God? Does God redeem man from sin by paying a Price already Sin's Possession? Here, then, is the secret of the Editor's denial of Substitution. "Why did Christ die?" This question has hitherto been answered by our friends by a wearisome disquisition on "Diabolos Flesh", which concluded that Jesus must be executed in order to be cleansed from His own physical sin, like all man made creeds which require a periodical "patch up". The reason Why God chose the death of Jesus is now considered an unfathomable mystery. The Editor says: "It appears to us that God has not formally explained His reasons for the choice of this way rather than any other". And he adds: "If this be so, the craving to fathom those reasons savours somewhat of presumption". This philosophy would at once obstruct the narrow path, and involve in intricacy the common salvation, and discourage the Holy aim of knowing amongst ourselves save "Jesus Christ, and Him crucified". Has God not "Formally declared", Jesus by the grace of God, tasted death for every man? Why? Because "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. vi. 25). Was it possible, therefore, to save the sinner from death unless Christ died on account of our sins, according to the Scriptures? (I Corinthians chapter 15). Jesus prayed: "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me". The Editor had soon dispensed with this. He says: "If God had chosen to forgive sin without a sin-offering, it would involve no reflection upon His attributes". Let us avoid this speculative presumption, this tampering with the immutability of the counsel of God, and hear the Master: "O Fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things before entering into His glory?" Does He "Formally explain" WHY? "That remission of sins should be preached in His name" (Luke xxiv. 25 and 26). Let us, therefore, "Crave to fathom those reasons". Let us with all our getting, get understanding, and so qualify ourselves "rightly to divide the word of truth". Then the Editor remarks that Crucifixion is not natural death, and admits that "Jesus was not by nature related to this". This is all we contend for; but when, with his next breath, he declares, "This was made the avenue of His own deliverance", etc., then confusion sets in. If this were the avenue of His own deliverance, then He would be irrevocably related to it. The first proposition is truth, the second is a polished form of the old delusion, "That He had to be executed to be cleansed from His own physical curse"!

If crucifixion were the avenue of His own deliverance, would sacrifice be the proper term to use? Thus the Sacrifice of Christ is robbed of all its glory. But the Editor says: "It is not affirmed anywhere that He died in our stead". The Master Himself refutes this: "The Son of Man came", etc. "and to give His life a ransom (anti) in place of many". No Greek professor will deny this. What then is the results? What the purpose? That we might Live, and not perish. Do the unredeemed perish? God says: "They shall perish for ever like their own dung" (Job xx. 7). The life of Jesus is, therefore, instead of ours, as the Master declares. The redemption of their souls is precious, and it ceaseth forever. "He poured out His soul unto death" (Isa. liii).

But the Editor says: "There could be no vindication of justice in it"; and adds: "If there could, it would only avail for one man". Jesus says: "It is a ransom for many". The righteous Government of God is that, if one involved all, the other will extricate all who accept the sin-covering name (Romans v.). But a slur is attempted if a righteous one is punished. Had Jesus been forced to against His own consent, the slur might work; but Jesus, knowing it was imperative for the Redemption of man, in Divine love voluntarily endured the chastisement of our peace. If therefore, the chastisement of our peace was

upon him, by whose stripes we are healed, does the Editor possess the logic that will refute Substitution here? Make this "The avenue of His Own deliverance from any curse", and you blot the Sacrifice of Christ. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life (for him self)? O Editor! Examine the words of Christ; "For His Friend". When Jesus disclosed this fact to His disciples, Peter, like the Editor, seeing no justice in it, rebuked the Master, who replied: "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou regardest not the things of God, but those of men" (Matthew xvi. 25). But when Peter grasped the fact that life could be purchased with neither silver nor gold; and that the blood of Bulls and Goats could not avail, he concluded that a substitute could alone be provided by God. When he realised that the Government of Sin knew no forgiveness, it was then he beheld "the Lamb of God" (I Peter i. 19). Who suffered for sin, the Just for the unjust (I Peter iii. 18).

The Editor informs us that the life is in the blood. We have never disputed that fact; but we dispute that that fact involves Jesus under the curse. Adam's life was in Mary's blood; but we deny that that was the life of Jesus. Here is the pith of the whole dispute. Adam and Jesus were the direct sons of one Father. It is therefore, gross absurdity to speak of one son being the Father of the other son. This is not a different kind of life, as the Editor grossly imputes. It is the same kind, from the same fountain; but fresh from that fountain. The Almighty put the life of Adam into his blood when He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; but he forfeited that life by sin (Matthew xvi. 26; Romans v.). If therefore, Jesus derived His life from Adam, all is a blank. Before the Editor can involve Jesus under the curse, he must first produce evidence that Joseph was the father of Jesus, or prove one instance in animated nature of the female supplying the germ of life. Jesus says; "I proceeded forth and came from God. Why do ye not understand My speech?" We say the Editor would be a wise man to give it up. Upon this Divine Germ of life was built up the Holy Child Jesus (Like i.55).

To be continued...

Roman's Chapter Seven.

This chapter is much quoted in defence of the theory that Adam's nature was changed at the fall, and unhappily this is believed by most professing Christians, but if due regard is given to the context it should be seen that from verse 5 of this chapter a digression is made by Paul from the main theme of the previous chapter -- that the believer has been made free from the law of sin and death by faith and baptism, they have in symbol been crucified with Him and raised to newness of life and been given a sure' and certain hope of Eternal life. having by faith in Christs loving sacrifice escaped sin's wages of eternal oblivion.

In the first four verses of chapter 7 Paul speaks to Jews like himself and uses the simile of their relation to the law of Moses as that of a wife to a husband, the death of whom would release the wife and give her freedom to marry another, in like manner they had become dead to the law by the death of Christ and were free to marry another even the incorruptible risen Christ. The 8th. chapter is a continuation of this theme. From verse 5 of the 7th chapter (as in parenthesis) Paul recounts his own experiences and feelings as a Jew under the law and those of like position saying "when we were in the flesh" which obviously does not mean their physical flesh but an opposite position to that which they now had "in the spirit" or "in Christ", when Saul (as he was previously) came to an understanding of the law of ordinances that it was indeed a ministration of condemnation and of death from which he sought vindication by a meticulous keeping of the 'letter', he failed to see in the endless sacrifices of animals whose blood could not take away sin a type of one who could - the promised seed of the woman who would fulfil all the types and although he realized that "the law was holy, just and good" it condemned him as a sinner to death from which there was no escape, therefore he found no real incentive to strive against sin and allowed his 'members' to perform things contrary to his better judgment thus making him 'wretched', alluding to the law of Moses (which incorporated the Edenic law of sin and death) as a "body of death" from which he now thanked God that Christ had delivered him, when in his fanatical zeal for the law he went in pursuit of Christ's followers to Damascus but was brought to a halt on the road by a vision of the Risen Christ so bright in Glory as to strike him blind for three days during which time no

doubt he was. able to fit in all the missing pieces which a true knowledge of the sacrifice of Christ supplied (for he was no doubt well versed in his understanding of the scriptures, being a Pharisee brought up at the feet of Gamaliel who was an eminent scholar but was blind as they were to the spirit of the law) so that after he was baptised he Was able to preach the Gospel to others almost at once. The 8th chapter may now be seen to be a continuation of the 6th and first four verses of the 7th. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus” etc., the 3rd verse of this chapter is supposed to teach that sin is in the flesh and because Jesus was flesh he had to die to save Himself and us as a representative man, this view is a complete violation of the truth, because properly understood and in harmony with other scripture concerning our Lord this verse is a keynote to the Atonement. Now all scripture points to Christ as a sacrifice for the sin of mankind “without blemish and without spot”, just as the typical animals offered had to be perfect to be acceptable, “For what the law could not do, in that it (the law) was weak through the flesh (being in Adamic bondage), God did by sending His own son in the likeness of Sin’s Flesh and (by an offering) for sin condemned sin (while He was) in the flesh,” “being made a little lower than the angels that He might taste death for every man”.

The ransom price of our redemption, Jesus Himself never needed redemption not being generated by any man of Adam’s stock, but by the Holy Spirit power of God, keeping in mind that the condemnation was not physical but legal it may be seen that Mary the mother of Jesus being a Godly Jewess believed in a coming Saviour, she was God’s redeemed handmaid as testified in what is now known as the ‘magnificat’, how could any doubt her faith upon reading those wonderful words. Usually there is no difficulty in seeing the federal principle re the ‘body of Christ’ (one head with many members) into which body the believer enters by an act of Faith without any change of our physical nature, why then should it be so difficult for some to see that upon enlightenment one is “in Adam” in a similar way? the believer has now “put off” the “Old man” (Adam) and ”put on” the “New man” (Christ) by baptism and are typically clothed with a garment of righteousness, not our own but that of Christ. We are now redeemed or “brought back” from the dominion of sin - the tree has been made good and God looks for its fruit to be good – to fulfil the law of loving God first and our neighbour as ourselves knowing that our High Priest is working as intercessor with the Father, this proves that believers are being judged now and if we repent of our sins we can be forgiven as we are assured in I John 1:9; we must expect chastening for our faults and as a test of faith, but if we have true faith and keep it to the end Eternal life will be ours and our standing at the judgment seat of Christ” will be for rewards of works of faith but Eternal life is a free gift obtainable by faith only, how simple then to see that the first Resurrection is for those “in Christ” who will be raised incorruptible and will not come into the judgment reserved for the unfaithful and unbelievers at the end of the Millenium (if they have died before Christ comes. Rev. 20:5 and 6), but the living unfaithful and unrepentant will be dealt with at Christ’s advent as many scriptures predict.

The nation of Israel were a miniature or type of all who have knowledge of God’s law therefore accountable or responsible, the Mosaic law was their schoolmaster designed to-bring them to a knowledge of Christ through the various types and ordinances, it was ‘Added’ to the Edenic law as a means of educating and making known again the need of redemption by making the offence (of Eden) to abound (Romans 5:20) but when (the object of) faith came in the person of Jesus Christ they were no longer under a schoolmaster and could by faith in His sacrifice be made free from the law of sin and death. It is clear that natural death the result of a corruptible body is not alluded to here, animal sacrifices were slain or put to death as Christ the antitype was and Adam should have been in the day he sinned had not love and mercy prevailed. Paul could not have been speaking of himself as a Christian in Romans 7 using such terms as “I am carnal, sold under Sin” (verse 14) for he had been bought with a price even the precious blood of Christ, it would also have been a complete negation of all that he had said in the previous chapter and elsewhere, Paul as a Christian said “I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me” also “be ye followers of me as I am of Christ”. Even Dr. John Thomas wrote that Paul in this chapter was “seeing himself as an unenlightened son of the flesh” or unredeemed.

Sister E. Linggood.

Like many other words we use to convey our thoughts, substitution is not found in the Bible, but it is impossible to take account of all the scripture on the point and prove it otherwise. It is because they are frightened of the term or what it implies, that Christadelphians prefer to ignore the subject, or if they are tackled point-blank, say “God’s ways are higher than our ways - we cannot expect to understand it,” or “Why God chose this way more than another we cannot say” and yet if they would examine their hearts honestly, they either believe Christ died in their stead - or they believe nothing at all.

Ernest Brady.

