

# The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No 142

## May/June 1993

### In this Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 2	The Holy Spirit	Brother Eric Moore
Page 5	The Genealogy of Jesus Christ Through Mary	Brother Phil Parry
Page 6	The Carnal Mind and the Spiritual Mind No.3 in a series of Bible Essays	Brother F. Lea
Page 8	“Jesus said...” No. 24.	
Page 8	Copied For The Service Of The Truth	Brother L. Wilson
Page 12	An Analysis of Islip Collyer’s “The Meaning of Sacrifice”	Brother A. L. Wilson

---

## Editorial

Dear Brethren and Sisters and Friends, Greetings in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

We are sorry to report that Brother Harvey Linggood was taken into hospital on Thursday 20th May with heart and breathing problems. We understand he is going on satisfactorily and that his condition is slowly improving. He is in the Glenfield Hospital in Leicester, Ward 1, West Wing. I am sure all the brethren and sisters will remember him in their prayers, and not only Harvey but Sister Evelyn and their family too, in their care and concern for him.

I started to write an Editorial but it turned into the “Jesus said....” article on page 10. So here I will start by thanking you all for your letters received since the last C.L. Here are a few extracts:

Sister Wendy Hancock writes, “... I’m grateful to all those brothers and sisters who contribute (to the Circular Letter). It’s wonderful to have such a store of reading and studying material, thought-provoking articles -” and exhortations... Please give my best wishes and kind thoughts to all our brethren and sisters.”

In a letter from Brother Leo we are pleased to hear that “Sister Ruth Woodhouse was not affected by those explosions at Warrington. Howbeit she lives very close to the Gas Works (where the first bomb exploded). Also one of her friends just missed the bomb explosion at the town centre a fortnight later. It just shows how we all need God’s protection and how unwise it is to make plans which are not in God’s will as we read in James 4:13-16. Ruth sends her love to all.”

Brother Phil Parry refers to the hymn compiled by Brother Caldicott and printed in the last C.L. He writes, “...even the words are not supportive of the general Christadelphian belief of the Judgment Seat of Christ before their actual acceptance by Him of their worthiness.”

And regarding the article by Brother Jeff Hadley, Brother Phil writes:

“I enjoyed reading this article but I am not sure that Luke was a Gentile though Jeff could be right, I have never thought about it. One point, however, I do disagree on is concerning Jesus being incorporated into the Priesthood even though He was God’s firstborn and considered Holy to the Lord. The writer to the Hebrews 8:4, states that while on earth Jesus should not be a Priest, and was not made one until after His resurrection, and of course, from another tribe of which Moses spake nothing concerning Priesthood. See Hebrews 7:14-25.”

I held over part of a letter from Sister Evelyn Linggood from the last C.L. regarding the order of events we might expect prior to the establishment of the Kingdom of God. She writes, “Going on information given

in Revelation 14 where the last phase of Gospel preaching appears to precede the fall of Babylon and in chapters 18 and 19 the sequence of events appears to be the fall of Babylon followed by the Marriage Supper of the Lamb and then the last great war between Christ and His enemies prior to the millennium.”

I hope we have more correspondence on this subject and to start the ball rolling I asked Brother Ray Gregory to write his views on the sequence of events. Here, then, are Ray’s notes:

“The first coming of Christ is for His Bride, which is immediately before the invasion of Israel by the Northern Confederacy and its subsequent annihilation by God. The Remnant of Israel (1/3) will take refuge at the Temple site in Jerusalem (Joel 1:14) where the Elders or priests will be met by Elijah who will take 24 of them to the Mount of Olives to meet their Messiah (Isaiah 40), after which the 24 Elders with Elijah will lead the people out, without haste (Isaiah 52:12) into the wilderness where Elijah will begin to “turn the hearts of the fathers to the children.” They remain some 3½ years in the wilderness during which time the land will be cleansed and the Everlasting Gospel will be preached by the converted Jews dispersed throughout the world.

Meanwhile the Judgments of God continue through this period for this is The Great Tribulation. Orthodox Christianity will not recognise the coming of Jesus, nor God’s intervention on behalf of the Jews and when the Jews begin their return to the Land led by Elijah they will be opposed by Anti-Christ i.e. a European confederacy backed by Orthodox Christianity, whose army will bar Israel’s way into the Land, and “then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations as when He fought in the Day of Battle.” Zechariah 14:3. “A thousand shall fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.” Psalm 91:7. All will survive. In the course of God’s judgments on this army at Armageddon the sun and moon stand still. This will be understood by those who have heard the preaching of the Everlasting Gospel as “the sign of the Son of man in heaven,” Matthew 24:30, and they will mourn for they know these judgments are of God.

Only events as dramatic as this will teach that the righteousness of God is not to be ignored and they who respond to these judgments will be the righteous who will come through The Great Tribulation and who will stand before the Throne of the Lamb (Matthew 24:21 and Revelation 7:14) when Christ is enthroned with His Bride. This is, of course, after the rebuilding of the Temple and the Marriage Supper of the Lamb.

It could take 10½ years to fulfil all these events. 3½ years for the Judgments of God in the earth - i.e. the Great Tribulation, the restoration of Israel (Elijah must first come and restore all things, Matthew 17:11), the preaching of the Everlasting Gospel, ending with the Battle of Armageddon, leaving the following 7 years for Israel to build the Temple, at the end of which time there will be only the righteous to stand before the Throne and give glory to God.” – Ray Gregory.

Please write in with your views on this subject so we can have a good exchange of ideas.

With Sincere Love to all, in the Master’s service,                      Russell Gregory,

---

## THE HOLY SPIRIT

One would believe that there could be no doubt of who or what is the Holy Spirit as those who seek to know all read from the same book. Nevertheless, we find that most believe it to be a person; i.e. the third part of the Godhead or Trinity; whilst others believe it to be the power of God, and amongst these are some who believe that this power was only manifested for a short set time.

So time is not wasted by again considering what the Scriptures reveal on this subject and in so doing we shall find a great number of positive statements placed before us. By considering such statements we shall see what the Holy Spirit is not becomes clear, and reach an understanding of what the Spirit is; because one scripture complements another - there are no contradictions.

In the Old Testament the term “Holy Spirit” is found only 3 times in the King James version:- Psalm 51:11, Isaiah 63:10 & 11. But the same subject is referred to as “Spirit of God” and “Spirit of the Lord.” The word “Spirit” in most cases being ‘*ruach*’ in the Hebrew and ‘*pneuma*’ in the Greek, and in most of its uses in Scripture it is used in two broad senses.

First and foremost it denotes a quality, attitude or disposition. The second use denotes a Spirit Being, such as God or angels. We must identify as to which group ‘Holy Spirit’ belongs. It is significant that what is said in the Scriptures of the Spirit of God, with but few exceptions, has to do with the Spirit’s effect on men. This effect is most notable in those individuals to whom God gave abilities above the natural capacity so that they could accomplish His purpose, i.e. Moses, workers on the Tabernacle, Samson, and many of the prophets. (See 2 Peter 1:21).

Our Lord was anointed with the Holy Spirit at His baptism, and many works were performed at His command. He also conferred this power of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles and on the seventy disciples. On the day of Pentecost, as Jesus had promised, the Holy Spirit was poured out again on those awaiting it. From that day and during the time of the Apostles, those who believed on Christ’s Name received various manifestations of the Holy Spirit, and bestowed with these special abilities carried forward the early ministry.

It would appear from the foregoing that the Holy Spirit is the power of God; but is this in itself an adequate description of that Spirit?

Before the flood (Genesis 6:3) God said “My Spirit shall not always strive with man,” not meaning His power was insignificant; rather that He set a time limit. (2 Peter 3:6). In this we see God’s Spirit was His influence.

Turning to one side, we find man ascribed as a spirit in Ecclesiastes 8:8; Spirit here indicates a man’s power. Genesis 41:8 also speaks of the spirit of a man - Pharaoh. What was it that was troubled with Pharaoh? Not his power; not his influence; not his life. So we find that it was his mind that was troubled. Does this fit with other scriptures? Consider Exodus 35:21. “*Ruach*” is translated “mind” in the King James version in Genesis 26:35, Proverbs 29:11, Ezekiel 11:5, 20:32, Daniel 5:20, Habakkuk 1:11 and many other instances, where it shows the spirit to do with the inward man, and the word spirit used to indicate the state or quality of mind of those described. It can also apply to a group of people as in Hosea 4:12.

We have considered man’s spirit in an effort to learn more of the Spirit of God. Paul says, 1 Corinthians 2:11 (R.S.V.) “For what person knows a man’s thoughts except the spirit of the man which is in him?” Note the spirit of man knows the things of a man; therefore man’s spirit is not only his mind but a conscious function thereof. The quote continues: “So also no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God.” Therefore the conclusion is that the Holy Spirit is a function of the mind of God.

Each of us knows why we do the things; we do and can judge ourselves by the way we have developed our minds, but in the case of another we can only detect their mind by what they do or say. On the other hand, God is able to perceive a man’s spirit before it becomes manifest in word or deed. We cannot perceive the things of God above what He has been pleased to reveal. (See 1 Corinthians 2:14) Those with whom God is pleased are privileged to see “The things of the Spirit of God.” (1 Corinthians 2:10, 12; Romans 8:14-16).

The word “Holy” is only used in Scripture when referring to God Himself, or to persons or objects associated with Him or His worship. (Worship - Hebrew, ‘*Qodesh*’; Greek, “*Hagios*”).

What then is the Holy Spirit? It can be said that it is a function or activity always identified with the mind of God; it is His power or influence, and exerts an effect on man.

Returning to the spirit of man, it is obvious that it is often opposed to God but at other times approved by Him, making that man eligible for His blessings. Isaiah 57:12-21; Numbers 14:24. Man has control over his spirit; he is not a helpless victim of it; it is in harmony with this that Malachi rebuked Israel (See Malachi

2:16) which shows that man can undergo an alteration in spirit (mind) if he so wishes. God spoke to Israel through Malachi to get them to do so.

Man's will often stands against the Holy Spirit as we read in Acts 7:15 in Stephen's witness against the Council of the Jews, "ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye." The only way man can resist God is in his mind.

A fundamental principle of God's dealings with man is that He will not override the will of man in order to make unfaithful men faithful. The choice has always belonged to man to respond to God or turn from Him.

A man's spirit will not be changed unless he is willing for that change to take place. Acts 2:38, "Repent ye, and ye shall receive the Holy Spirit." In this one sentence the vital steps toward a change of spirit are set out. First, "Repent ye" - Greek, *metanoeo* = think differently, or rethink. Repentance is proof the way to the mind is not closed. Second, "Ye shall receive the Holy Spirit," its implanting in the believer depends on his willingness to receive it.

John 1:17, "For the law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" Grace and truth introduced the higher relationship now enjoyed by the sons of God. (Hebrews 3:4-6). Many scriptures can be brought in here. However, when we learn from His Word that God has reckoned us righteous, we can understand our conscience is cleansed. Romans 8:15, "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption."

We have no longer the reason for fear knowing that if we confess our sins. He is just to forgive us, for Christ's sake. This brings the profound change in our state of mind and in our attitude towards God (Hebrews 10:22). Christ asked His Father (John 17:17), "Sanctify them in the truth. Thy word is truth". (Sanctify - *hagiazō*, Greek = to make holy). Believers are made holy by the influence of God's word, with a pure conscience directed by a mind appreciating truth; therefore God's influence dwells within.

Another factor yet remains in our spiritual change, and that is the inner commitment to be guided by the knowledge we have received. That is faith. Faith founded in truth will never fail. A clear understanding of the truths regarding sin, salvation and redemption, as they involve our heavenly Father and His dearly beloved Son, lead us to higher perceptions in fellowship with God.

The fact that miraculous abilities were given by God to believers at and following Pentecost should not distract us and lead us to believe that the Holy Spirit is not with us in this age. Those special gifts were essentially no different from those manifestations recorded in the Old Testament and had no direct effect upon the character of those through whom they functioned.

Those gifts existed for a particular purpose in the early church and when that purpose was served, they ceased. They were a means to God's end and not an end in themselves. They were given to establish the church, by proving the message was from God and to add substance to the message until the New Testament was written. When this was done there remained no need of inspired human witnesses and the miracles ceased.

It does not fit into our present phase of God's plan for us to work miracles, nor would it suit His purpose, with regard to our growth in truth, to perform miracles on us. What God desires in us is the development of the likeness of His Son. (See Romans 8:29; Galatians 4:19; 2 Corinthians 4:4). The outward likeness in our character can be produced only as our minds are formed in the image of His mind. (See Philippians 2:5; 1 Corinthians 2:16).

The Holy Spirit is then, not the 3rd part of the Trinity, or a past power, but it is a quality of the mind of God; and where it proceeds from Him for the accomplishment of His purposes, it is His power and influence. Where the Holy Spirit is in the believer - it is a renewal of the mind after the pattern of Christ, through the word of God. (Ephesians 4:17-24).

Brother Eric Moore.

# THE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST THROUGH MARY

According to Matthew's register, Joseph is the direct descendant of Solomon. We observe therefore, that the continuance of "the Royalty" in this line was, positively, contingent on faithfulness (Psalm 132:11; 1 Chronicles 27:5,9; 22:13; 1 Kings 9:1-9).

Were these conditions fulfilled? Alas! Both Solomon and his posterity proved unfaithful. What was the result? "The Lord was angry with Solomon because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, who had appeared unto him twice." Let us now consider the consequences of this unfaithfulness to the Lord, and observe where it would "land" Jesus.

Just listen; "I will surely rend the kingdom, and will give it unto thy servant" (1 Kings 11:9-12). Wherefore are they "cast out," He and his seed? "Oh earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord: write this man childless, a man who shall not prosper in his days. For no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more j-n Judah" (Jeremiah 22:26).

If therefore, Jesus be the son of Joseph, who is the direct son of Solomon, who has, with his seed been eternally debarred from occupying "the throne of the Lord," where would this land Jesus? This would force the Almighty to stultify Himself, who declared; "I will give unto him the throne of His father David."

Just one more: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper" (Jeremiah 23:5). This is a Divine metaphor. David is "**THE ROYAL TREE**"

A certain branch of that tree, with its fruit, has been eternally debarred from the royalty, and another branch Divinely chosen in its stead. Shall we make therefore Jesus a twig of that rejected branch, or one of the righteous, chosen branch? "Every tree which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."

Let us examine this other branch, this one "of low degree." Let us see what Luke's register reveals.

In this we have also a direct line to David; but through Nathan, not Solomon. This is important. Joseph is here said to be the son of Heli also, but this can only mean son-in-law, since Matthew declares that Jacob begat (*egenneese*) Joseph.

The foregoing is truly remarkable. Jesus is still "the Prince of the house of David," but in the lowly Nathan - Mary line. In spite of the fact, therefore, that the Josephites have branded the Virgin-Birth a pagan fable. The hand of God is exhibited throughout. Did the pagan, or Josephite, ever breathe who inspired Mary's song? "And Mary said. My soul doth magnify the Lord. Even my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour."

Why so Mary? "Because He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden. He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their heart. He hath put down the mighty from their thrones (*thronon*), and exalted them of low degree."

Truly Israel's sun went down, blood-red, while it was yet day, leaving nothing behind, save a mass of inky clouds, unlit by a solitary star. But He who scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock.

"In Him was life, and the life was the light of man." "As many as received Him He authorised them the sons of God to become. Even to those believing in the name of Him who was begotten, not out of blood, nor out of a will of flesh, nor out of a will of a married man (*andros*), but out of God was begotten."

Brother Phil Parry

### **No. 3 in a series of Bible Essays.**

## **THE CARNAL MIND AND THE SPIRITUAL MIND**

In this third essay we wish to consider the Bible teaching concerning the mind of the flesh, compare it with the Bible teaching concerning the mind of the spirit.

The word “carnal” means fleshly, or according to the thinking of the flesh – in other words, “the mind of the flesh.” This mind is prompted by the feelings or sensations of the flesh such as pain, hunger, anger, jealousy, love, hatred, and all the other feelings associated with our mental make-up.

The word “spiritual” describes the mind of God, who is a Spirit. This mind is revealed to us in the Bible; it is cultivated by a study of the precepts and examples of those men of God of whom we read in the Bible.

Now let us explain at the outset that not one of the various feelings or sensations of the flesh is evil of itself. Let us take the last mentioned of these - hatred. This is a quality which God Himself has implanted in the human mind. Let us also make quite clear that it is also a quality or attribute of the Divine mind, for we read that God “hates every evil way.” The same can be said of jealousy, “I the Lord your God am a jealous God.”

If, then, the feelings of the human mind have their counterpart in the Divine mind, how is it that we read of “the carnal mind” being a mind of death? It is because the mind of man left to itself seeks its own gratification without any concern for what is right in the sight of God.

The question of right and wrong depends on the acknowledgement of a standard by which to determine the appropriateness of any action. If we take a human standard we shall have the mind of the flesh gratified. Yet that standard will differ in different localities. That which is right in one country is prohibited in another.

The exercise of the emotions is quite legitimate so long as it contravenes no law. It is only when an accepted prohibition is ignored and set aside that an action is judged to be wrong. In the life of a community laws are introduced to govern the dealings of man with man. In heathen lands God is ignored. In lands professedly Christian we also find different standards of justice according to the prevailing standards of Christian teaching. The Apostle Paul, when speaking of all those not guided by Christian principles, says, “These, having not the law, are a law unto themselves... their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another” (Romans 2:14,15). He is speaking, of course, in this instance, of the Law of Moses.

Paul puts the matter very clearly when he says, in Romans 7:7, “I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.” And at verse 8, “Without the law sin was dead.” Or again in another place, “Where there is no law there is no transgression.”

In Romans chapter 7 Paul is considering himself as a natural man without law, exercising the mind of the flesh, or the carnal mind. In this state a man gives unbridled rein to his natural mind and lusts. Whilst he is without law he does not and cannot transgress. Now when law enters, a definition of right and wrong is made and established. Transgression invokes a just penalty. Human law is enforced by human measures, and punished by humanly designed penalties. Disobedience to such laws is called lawlessness.

Disobedience to, or transgression of Divine Law is called sin. For sin is the transgression of Law. Now when the Apostle Paul speaks of Law he means God’s Law, unless he specifically defines the law to which he refers as human law. The carnal mind, the Apostle tells us, is at enmity against the Law of God. Why so? Because it does not submit itself to the Law of God; it chooses its own way and pleases itself. No man can reward another with eternal life, therefore the end of the best and most law-abiding man is the grave, if his righteousness accords to human standards only.

The 8th chapter of Romans gives us the contrast between the carnal mind and the spiritual mind. And so the Apostle says, to those who have chosen to serve and obey God, “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit.”

The expression “in the flesh” in verse 9, and many of the other passages we have been considering, is used in the figurative sense; to be prompted and guided by the motives and minding of the flesh - to be carnally minded - is to be “in the flesh.” Therefore, says the Apostle, “They that are in the flesh cannot please God.” Again, “When we were in the flesh the motions of sin which were in our members did bring forth sin unto death.” The motions of sin are the impulses which (guided by the flesh) lead to sin; those same impulses spiritually directed also lead to righteousness.

The Apostle further explains that the believer in Jesus “is not (now) in the flesh.” This, as we have seen, does not mean the physical flesh. It means that they are not in that state or condition in which the natural mind is allowed uncontrolled expression.

Let it be emphasised that Paul, in Romans chapter 7 is speaking of his experiences as “Saul of Tarsus” and not of his new state as “Paul of Christ.” In the former state he was a persecutor of the followers of Jesus; in the second he could say, “Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ” - the same physical man, but in a totally different state of mind.

Let it be further clearly understood that the terms “in the flesh” and “in Adam” are the opposites of the terms “in the Spirit” and “in Christ.” The former relates to that state or condition in which a man is “without hope and without God in the world,” as the Apostle says, “as natural brute beasts.” The latter state indicates that a change of outlook and of disposition has taken place – a change of mind, and of relationship.

In the former state a man becomes condemned when the Word of God enlightens his mind to the Divine requirements; he is condemned and convicted of his sin, and is called upon to repent.

The latter state is that which a man enters when he responds to the Divine invitation, and complies with the Divine requirements, by belief and baptism, in this state there is no condemnation, nor will he come into judgment, for he has passed from death unto life. The 8th chapter of Romans describes this new state - a state in which a man begins to develop a character which will be acceptable to God; a character built upon Divine principles.

We would like to close this essay with a few words from the pen of the Apostle Paul, from his Epistle to the Colossians, where, in chapter 3 at the 1st verse he writes, “If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above... Mortify -therefore your members which are upon earth (here follows a list of some of the works of the flesh)... But now ye put off all these things... seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man... Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful.”

In these verses Paul enumerates several characteristics of the mind of the Spirit. If these characteristics of the Spirit are developed in a man who has accepted the Word of God in its purity, the result will be a spiritually minded man. Thus the Apostle exhorts us to develop the Spiritual Mind, and to reap Life and Peace, Life Eternal in the Kingdom of God, and Peace with God. The whole of this chapter is specially recommended to the reader.

Brother F. Lea.

“But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.” - Matthew 24:36.

Nevertheless, many have endeavoured to predict the day and even the hour when Jesus will come to take away His elect. Such zeal is not according to knowledge, understanding nor wisdom. However, as that great day approaches and many prophecies are being fulfilled, can we not reasonably suggest, not the hour, nor the day, but the year in which our Lord will come?

The present State of Israel came into being on the 14th May 1948 and certain Rabbis at that time declared it to be their 69th Jubilee Year. Now when Joshua crossed over the Jordan to enter the Promised Land the people were instructed to count every 7th year as a Sabbath Year and every 7th Sabbath Year as a Jubilee Year; thus every 49th year was a Jubilee Year commencing on the Day of Atonement, the 10th day of the 7th month. Now the 70th Jubilee Year would seem to be an appropriate year in which the nation of Israel should again be established in the Promised Land under God’s righteous laws, and if the reckoning of those Rabbis is correct then it will be in 1997, commencing on the Day of Atonement in the autumn of that year. This date is a little over four years away.

Seventy Jubilee years is 3430 years ( $7 \times 7 \times 70 = 3430$ ) and if we take away 1997 years then we find that according to this calculation Joshua must have entered the Promised Land in the year 1433 BC. ( $3430 - 1997 = 1433$ ). Most historians favour the date of Joshua entering the Promised Land about 1450 BC. but this discrepancy of 17 years is very little owing to the difficulty of fixing any dates before 1000 BC. In any case the Jews are likely to be more accurate than other peoples in their records because of their reckoning by seven year periods. So if 1997 is the 70th Jubilee Year and if this is to be the year of the establishment of the Kingdom Age when are the Judgments of God to commence, and when are the elect to be called away? Noah was shut up in the Ark for a week before the floods commenced and Lot was in Zoar before Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed and following this rule the elect will be taken away before the Judgments of God commence which could be very soon.

“When these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.” (Luke 21:28).

**Please note:** Sometime after writing the above article I noted that the Jubilee year came after the seven sabbath years thus making the Jubilee the fiftieth years. For this see Leviticus 25 verses 10 and 11, “And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubile unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family. A jubile shall that fiftieth year be unto you: ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it, nor gather the grapes in it of thy vine undressed.” However, I believe the above observations still hold good.

---

**The following is a collection of letters and articles written in the late 1920’s and published by the Nazarene Fellowship in 1941 in a booklet entitled:**

### **Copied For The Service Of The Truth**

I have before me your little pamphlet written in response to a request, and for the purpose of helping and explaining to others a phase of the truth regarding the nature of Christ, through which you desire to point out the meaning attached to sacrifice.

I heartily endorse your statements in the second paragraph on page one; fully appreciating and approving your motives for writing and trust you will give me credit for the same earnest intentions.



Now, in paragraph three you quote Robert Roberts, (another earnest labourer for the benefit of others, according to his own "Light" thereon) and express your own opinion and approval of this statement. Permit me, dear Friend, to call your attention more minutely to this statement, and to ask yourself, Why was repudiation of the flesh as flesh necessary, seeing that God was the Creator of that flesh? Had the flesh itself been any cause of offence or was it the person that had given offence? You proceed, and say; that human flesh was rejected as unable to effect any redemption and that this fact was shown or proved by Christ being born - not in the ordinary mode - or according to the will of the (human) flesh, but by the power of the Highest.

What kind of flesh then, do you advocate for Jesus seeing you imply that He was not human flesh, otherwise, according to your own reasoning He likewise would have been rejected? Was He Divine Flesh or what is the kind of flesh you advocate for Him, seeing we know of no other than the Divine and human, in connection with the human race and its Maker?

Wherein lies the difference between the flesh of one born of the will of the flesh and one born of the same flesh through the exercise of Divine Power? Surely there would be no difference whatsoever as regards the quality, composition or nature of that flesh?

Wherein does the difference lie, between Adam, Adam's posterity and Christ, who was born of one of Adam's descendants? Does the difference lie in the difference between the nature of their flesh or in their different relation to the Law which Adam transgressed? Wherein lies Christ's redemptive power?

Can we not arrive at a solution of this by asking, What was it Christ possessed which every other man lacked, and what was it He gave as a ransom price to redeem man? Is not the Scriptural answer to that; that He gave His life a ransom for the sheep? (Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45; John 10:11, etc). Here you may say; Well every other man did not lack life seeing there were living men descendants of Adam, all down the ages to this present time, hence life cannot be the redeeming property. But let us reflect a moment upon the statement of Christ in Matthew 8:22, "Let the dead bury their dead." Christ here refers to living men as "dead." Why so? There can be but one answer, according to Scripture, and that is that their life was lost in the first transgression in Eden in which all in Adam's loins were sold under sin. See the Greek section of the Diaglott, "having been sold under the sin." (Romans 7:14). The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin, not sins note, and consequently they were all "doctrinally" dead men (ye have no life in you) unless they become the subject of redemption.

How then did Christ escape this dead state? I answer: By being born Son of God deriving His life direct from the Fountain Head and not through transmission from the forfeited Adamic source. Jesus was born Son of God not Son of Adam His elder brother. Now no Son of God can possibly come under condemnation unless he individually sin. Therefore Jesus was free from condemnation because He did no sin and consequently was free to give His life a ransom for Adam His brother because whilst under the Law Christ earned a title to resurrection to eternal incorruptible life; hence through the providence of God both He and His brother (and those in Him who obey that form of doctrine appointed for their participation therein) could be saved to live eternally (Thank God).

"Without the shedding of blood (the giving up of the life which is in the blood) there is no remission, thus proving that remission depended upon the giving up of the life in the blood to redeem men, therefore, as it is written; "He poured out His soul (life) unto death."

May I now suggest a careful perusal of the enclosed written copy of "Jesus my Substitute" by A. L. Wilson, the which I pray the Lord will help you to digest that the light of the truth may shine forth in your heart, to the end that ye also may attain to the salvation of the Lord.

Sent in all sincerity in the Master's service for the benefit of all having ears to hear.

L. Wilson.

### **A response to the above:-**

Dear B & S, I would help you if I could but I fear it is impossible. You raise technical objections to the Scriptural doctrine of the rejection of the flesh as a basis of approach to God, and then try to set up the monstrous idea of substitution. That God regarded all lives as forfeit in Adam and then brought forth His Son with an unforfeited life to die instead of us - yet to be raised again. Nothing but the dreadful evil of fleshly controversy could produce such ideas.

The simple truth is that God determined that no flesh should glory in His presence. Christ partook of our weak and fallen nature but by the character and power that God gave to Him, He conquered it and condemned it and overcame it, by every act of His life and by His death. Thus He opened a way in which we can follow.

I cannot find time to enter into correspondence. I sometimes wish I could be quite beyond the reach of the post,

Yours in the Hope of Israel, Islip Collyer.

### **Answer to Islip Collyer:-**

Dear Friend, Many thanks for returned copy and reply to my letter. I am really rather loathe to begin this present correspondence, seeing you declare you have not the time to spare, but trust you will forgive my persistence, due alone to my love for the truth and my neighbour.

Now I must confess I cannot understand anyone objecting to the use of the term "substitution" in connection with the sacrifice for redemption purposes, seeing that such expresses what does indeed take place when anyone redeems anything in ordinary business; and seeing that such terms as redemption and bought with a price, and sold under sin are used in Scripture to express the procedure of which they record. (See copied extract from another pen at end of letter.)

Next, I fail to perceive where the credit generally accredited to Jesus, in regard to His contest between His own natural desires or will and the desires or will of His Father, if He were endowed, as you affirm, with extra power to enable Him to overcome. Surely if this were so He has no true right to pre-eminence above His brethren. We could have done every whit as well as He if God had bestowed that extra power upon us. Wherein lies the justice of God in giving to Jesus extra power to overcome His natural tendencies to indulge His own will, against the interdict of His Father? I can perceive none in that case. Moreover, could He honestly be said to have been tried in all points as we are if He were endowed with extra power to resist?

To be equivalent to ours the antagonistic force and the resistance must surely in each test have been equal in capacity, otherwise He could not truly be said to have been tempted in all points as we are. Is it not so? Surely the fact that He conquered every time whereas we sometimes fail does not necessitate His endowment with extra power to resist, but proves He exercised His natural powers to resist every time whereas we sometimes fail.

I understand the Word of God to declare, "No man is tempted above that he is able", thus proving every man has it within his own power to resist, providing he exercise that power as Jesus did - without any need for endowment with extra power to do so, hence all credit is due to Jesus in that of Him alone can it be declared, "In Him is no sin" "He did no sin."

He offered no sacrifice for His own transgressions, a fact which the Jews could not deny when He asked of them, "Which of you convinceth (convicteth) me of sin?" Not one could come forward and say, "We saw thee offering animal sacrifice," a token of transgression. He closed the mouth of every Jew, yet Christadelphians dare to preach a sin contaminated Christ and declare He inherited sin in His blood and thus they count the blood of the everlasting covenant an unholy, sin contaminated thing and thereby pollute the table of The Lord.

Come out, dear Friend, and touch not the unclean thing while there is still time. Think again re my recent correspondence and write again if need be and D.V. we will do our best to help you discover the pure truth of God which alone is able to save.

Now I should like to explain what I consider is the reason why man cannot glory in God's presence, and that is that the reason lies in man's utter helplessness and inability to work out his own salvation other than in the way appointed by God - namely through the redemption that is obtainable through the Lord Jesus. The fact that redemption is the only way out of man's difficulty very forcibly brings home to man the fact that he is captive or slave in bondage, and he must needs be bought with a price before he can be liberated and become a free citizen in the Kingdom of God (Consider here 1 Peter 3:21, "The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us," and note specially that Peter in parenthesis declares it is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh or their supposed filth of sinful flesh).

Even works of the Law cannot count until he has first been redeemed and inducted into the Household of God; hence the necessity for the Saviour, Jesus, He who shall save, being born Son of God and in a free state. Could one born in captivity honourably set his fellow captives free? Would he not require to sneak out himself first, before he could attempt to liberate his fellow prisoners? Would you suggest that God was a party to such procedure?

Next, I think that the statement you quote (1 Corinthians 1:29) has reference to the humbleness of mind that is a pre-requisite that man may humbly accept the simple written word of God instead of the wisdom of so-called wise men, who, like the Scribes and Pharisees are, by the people, supposed to have discovered the whole truth of God.

Man hath whereof he may glory or boast before men, when he, like Abraham, has stood the test and trial of his faith and obedience, but he has not thereby, whereof he may boast or glory before God because in His sight he has only done that it was his duty to do.

Now I gather you also reject the idea that all lives were forfeited in Adam as unscriptural. What then is meant by the expression "As in Adam all die"? Are not our lives but a continuation through transmission of the one life began in Adam? Did not Adam forfeit this life in Eden, and did not God slay Jesus typically when the animal was slain in Eden? Does not Revelation 13:8 distinctly declare this to have been so? Was not the animal a substitute upon which was inflicted 'the death' incurred?

I implore you to think again re these matters and then I trust the light of the truth will penetrate and show you the true appointed way to salvation.

The simple truth does not lie in the fact that God determined that no flesh should glory in His presence; but in the fact that "God so loved... that He gave His own Son" as our redemption price to redeem us from the captivity and bondage of sin into which Adam's transgression threw us all.

It is a legal transaction and carried out in a legal manner because God cannot lie nor alter the word that has gone forth from His lips. Think again, dear Friend, I am ready and willing to help. With sincere wishes for your welfare,

L. Wilson.

P.S. Can you point out to me any command in God's Book that is beyond the power of man to observe? If not, why was it necessary for Christ to be endowed with extra power to overcome? Ask yourself candidly, was there ever an act of disobedience that you, yourself could not have avoided, had you tried?

If it were beyond our power to obey, would God be justified in holding us responsible? Will you kindly oblige me by answering these questions as I am anxious to know if such could be?

Copy of a Josephite Booklet bearing upon subject of above letter:

“If Jesus was by virtue of His coming from God superior to mankind in general - a super-human being, then how could He be “like unto His brethren” and what special honour is due to Him for overcoming? If He was a “God-man” partly Divine and partly human in His nature, He ought to have overcome and what need of Him “being made perfect through suffering” for He was already Superior to Adam at the start. And furthermore, such a being would not be any kind of example for poor humanity to attempt to follow as such a being could not be “tempted in all points; as we are” for God cannot be tempted, neither can He sin. But Jesus was of such a nature like unto His brethren that He was tempted in all points as we are yet without sin.

“He overcame temptation and thus showed by His great example that it was possible for others to overcome evil and live sinless lives.”

---

## **Part Two:**

### **An Analysis of Islip Collyer’s “Meaning of Sacrifice”**

On reading through friend Islip’s pamphlet, I was disappointed at the absence of a technical definition of the term “sacrifice,” since the sacrifice of Christ is the most important event that ever transpired on earth.

We can afford to dispense with definitions, but I strongly advise the reader to refresh his mind by a scan over the “definition,” and candidly ask himself, If Christ were under sentence of death on account of His (supposed) sinful flesh or condemned nature, could that death be a sacrifice. Ask himself candidly if there was a man on earth, or an angel from heaven, who could sacrifice his own debt. Ask himself if it is possible to exhibit two more antagonistic terms? Does not the very term “debt” blaspheme the term “sacrifice”?

Understandeth thou what thou readest? There never was, under the canopy of heaven such a freak as sinful flesh, nor condemned nature, because God alone is responsible for these. The only sin recorded in God’s Book which changed the flesh is that of Lot’s wife.

This eternal confounding of flesh with character, the legal with the physical, and possession with the quality of the flesh, is that intoxicating cup of her who has charmed all nations. Sin cannot exist apart from law. Where there is no law there is no transgression, Jesus said, “If I had not done amongst them the works which no other man ever did, they had not had sin.” Islip’s assumption turns the Master out of court here.

The “sting of death” is not your supposed “condemned flesh” but positively condemned character. The sting of death is sin, not flesh. And the strength of sin is the law. The law scrutinises, not the quality of your flesh, but that of your character. Does our law hang a man for the quality of his flesh, or that of his character? Ponder this - “There is nothing unclean of itself,” and every sin man performs is outside the body.

Paul is grievously misunderstood due to this pagan “sinful flesh” assumption. Peter specially warns us against wresting Paul’s words to our own destruction. Indiscrimination of Paul’s metonymy, that abridged figure of speech, peculiar to Paul alone, when literally construed, admirably satiates the creed hunter and none more so than the “sinful flesh” glutton.

Paul, addressing the brethren, says; “Ye are not in the flesh.” Did he mean they were not flesh and blood? Even the phrase, “the body of sin” fails lamentably to prove sinful flesh. In English it means the body belonging to sin. The Greek ever uses the Genitive form of possession. So it is in Romans 8:3, the adjective “sinful” is not there. Thus friend Islip’s very criterion vanishes into oblivion.

When two nouns come together it is a case of possession, except however it be a noun in apposition as John the Baptist, meaning the same person. We, in English, do not use the Greek Genitive form of possession unless the possessor be neuter, as “the roof of the house.” We do not then say “The house’s roof.” (The following is a riddle to many - “If Moses were the son of Pharaoh’s daughter, he was then the daughter of Pharaoh’s son.”) Paul’s Greek genitive case converted me to Christ.

The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked. But don't forget that "the pure in heart alone shall see God." Whence this transformation? Would you advocate a surgical operation? Again, "Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." Here our opposing friends imagine this clinches "sinful Flesh." Permit me however, to point out that the first thing staring us in the face here is the Imperative, or Commanding Mood. Something we are divinely prohibited from doing. If our physical system be a compound of three-fourths sin and one flesh, will you please inform me how to proceed? Must I resort to anatomy?

In my Paul's inverted, elliptical figure of metonymy (*meta* = change; *nomen* = the name) he speaks of "sin that dwelleth in me." Also "the foolishness of God." If you force the literal into the former you are irrevocably bound to force the literal into the latter.

Let us hear James, "Every man..." This included Adam in Eden, who, when he saw the forbidden tree was pleasant to the eye, and to be desired. But we must not condemn Adam for these God-implemented natural desires until he tastes the forbidden fruit. Why then, condemn dear Jesus, who ever subordinated His legitimate, natural desires to the will of His Father? "Not my will but thine be done."

But let the Apostle proceed; "Every man, when he is tempted, is drawn away of his own lusts, and enticed, and when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."

I have now the utmost pleasure in transcribing Zilmer's Deductive Analysis of the Scripture, and Paul's metonymy. He says: "Lust conceived, bringeth forth sin. Although there may be a desire for some forbidden object, yet sin does not become fact until lust hath conceived. What is conception of lust? In the ordinary sense of the term conception comes from the union of two elements, the male and the female. In the case with which we are dealing there is a union between two elemental faculties; and there are two mental processes. The first of these is the judgment. Man as a rational being, ordinarily engages in actions which his judgment approves. By this we mean that he somehow justifies such acts as right. Once the judgment approves one more element is necessary to effect the conception that is the will. When the judgment approves and the will resolves to carry the desire into execution, then the union is complete; conception takes place, and sin, as an act of transgression against Divine Law is the child that is brought forth."

Was Robert Roberts anything behind the above when he declared; "The phrase sin-in-the-flesh is metonymical. It is not the expression of a literal element or principle pervading physical organisation. Literally, sin is disobedience, or an act of rebellion. The impulses which lead to this reside in the flesh, and metonymically came to be called by the name of the act to which they gave birth."

I ask, Is it possible to exhibit purer Divine harmony among any other three men on earth, the Apostle, Zilmer and Robert Roberts? But allow R. Roberts to finish; "The impulses which lead to this existed in Adam before transgression as much as they did afterwards, else disobedience would not have occurred."

I here ask. Was Adam, therefore, doomed to death on account of his being created with natural desires? Absurd! Is it not, therefore, wild deduction to condemn Jesus for possessing natural desires? But let us hear R, Roberts finish; "Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no evidence of this whatever and the presumption and evidence are entirely the contrary way. There was a change in Adam's relation to his Maker but not in the nature of his organisation."

I ask therefore how have our Christadelphian friends become "flesh changers" and ignorantly misrepresented us across the broad earth of being guilty of that "pagan delusion"?

On page 2, paragraph 3, our friend Islip says; It is as though the Prophet was anticipating this controversy when he wrote 'Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows. Yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten, and afflicted of God. But He was wounded for our transgressions....'

But, please observe, the Prophet does not say He was stricken, smitten, afflicted wounded and bruised for what friend Islip is pleased to term "His own unclean, sinful, condemned flesh nature."

Dear reader, ask yourself if that idea could honestly be read into that glorious declaration of the Prophet?

We agree with friend Islip when he says “Jesus was the Son of God, the beginning of a new creation, and that it is by His righteousness (and faith in His shed blood alone) we can be saved.” (Parenthesis mine - A.L.W.) . But when, at the top of page three he says “God made His Son strong for the work of overcoming and condemning sinful flesh” then we are forced to part company, because this idea reduces Christ to a mere machine; reduces His trial to a mere sham fight and positively robs Christ of all merit.

We verily believe that God made His beloved ‘strong for our redemption’ but we denounce the idea that His strength lay ‘in his hair’ like that of Samson. This supposed infinite strength idea is forced by the sinful flesh delusion which alone is the father of the thought. God tries no man above what he is able to bear, who, every time, makes a way of escape, that he may be able to bear it. His commandments are not grievous. His burden is light.

Jesus was truly “the beginning of a new creation” in whom alone was Life, This is wherein His strength lay. “The Prince of Life, The Way, The Truth and The Life.” Who poured out His life-blood unto death. No sham fight here. No concocted yarn of receiving infinite strength to strangle His supposed sinful flesh or condemned nature; this monster of all delusions.

Did Jesus sacrifice His own debt? Did He say; This is my sinful flesh body which must be slain for Myself? This do in remembrance of Me? Horrid idea! “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

On page 3 friend Collyer says “We recognise that it was in character and not in nature that Jesus differed from us.” This declaration we thoroughly endorse. But it evades the main point at issue and tacitly renews the false charge of our having changed nature. Is it not a deplorable fact that changed nature, with friend Islip and his adherents, is a foregone conclusion? His cherished criterion which forces him to “saddle the wrong pony,” and mutilate the Word of God.

Will friend Islip point out to us in God’s Book, where Jesus stood in a relation condemned to death on account of His sinful flesh, or condemned nature and then define sacrifice? A duty he has hitherto positively failed to do.

We do not accuse him of wilful indulgence in subtle, hidden undercurrents. It is his own sinful flesh bias which prevents him speaking plainly. He has become so much the slave of the phrase that he has lost all capacity for meaning. No amount of reasoning in a circle will, to eternity, settle this question. This supposed change in the flesh of Adam is a will-of-the-wisp against which Robert Roberts declared “there is no evidence whatsoever, and the evidence and presumption are entirely the contrary way. There was a change in Adam’s relation to his Maker but not in his physical organisation.” Why, then, change the flesh?

We patiently await friend Islip’s definition of sacrifice.

Dr Thomas held that “Christ was raised in mortal nature.” (See, “Echoes of Past Controversies” Page 80). This means raised doomed to death. Peter declares, “He was quickened in Spirit.” Paul says, “Not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.” We must not violate God’s law regarding “The Passover Lamb.” “None of it shall remain until the morning.” If God raised His own Passover Lamb in mortal nature on that glorious resurrection morn does not the assumption force God to violate His own law? We must not believe all we hear but prove all things. Because there never was a greater babble of tongues.

“When I see the blood, I will pass over.” This was the great stumbling stone laid in Zion. The great majority neglected the sprinkling of the door posts of their hearts and sought deliverance by mere works of law. Works of law could not redeem life. Hence, “By works of law shall no flesh be justified.” This demonstrates that Jesus was in a justified relation toward His Father before works of the law could count. His fidelity to the Divine Law merited His reward of immortality, by retaining His justified relation towards His own Father.

Here then, stands the Mighty to Save. Before accepting His merited reward of immortality if He will now pour out His soul (life) unto death, my salvation is eternally solved. Did the Lord do this? “Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.”

“Greater love hath no man than this.” That life blood has perished for ever. He was quickened in Spirit. His merited reward according to the oath of God, viz; “This do and thou shalt live.” This is my meaning of sacrifice.

Sinful flesh is ‘Top Dog’ throughout friend Islip’s booklet. Page 7, he says, “The racial tendencies are a part of our physical nature.” Do we deny this? Were they not in Adam also prior to transgression? Genesis 1:28. Did God hold Adam condemned for natural desires which God alone implanted? Of course not! Friend Islip continues; “For Christ to have been free from all desires of the flesh to please itself/ would have involved a miracle of Divine energy for the express purpose of making His nature different from ours.”

Here again is a subtle implication which forces changed flesh and condemned nature. If friend Islip would accept the Word of God that “there is nothing unclean of itself...” it would save him from involving God in a miracle of Divine energy to save man from what never existed.

Brother A. L. Wilson.

#### **Further notes:**

2 Peter 3:13, “Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” A new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. If righteousness consists of acts of obedience to certain laws how can it be understood to dwell in a person (O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord (earth = people) except it be by knowledge thereof, not by indulgence therein. The same with “the sin that dwelleth in me.”

1 John 3:11, “.... how dwelleth the love of God in him?”

2 John 2, “For the truth’s sake, which dwelleth in us...”

Candidly, I do not think the statement “sin that dwelleth in me” is metonymical; the indwelling of sin is due to the application of the federal principle and is doctrinal, not literal. Sin cannot literally dwell in man, neither does lust dwell in man as a constant inmate; it does not exist until something arises to call it forth. Its existence then is in the abstract realm of thought and cannot be a physical principle or property of, nor pervading the literal flesh. Lust can only be said to dwell in one when and so long as the thoughts thereon/-hence the principle upon which Paul could base his speech is the federal. In no other sense could he rightly employ or use it. Hence Robert Robert’s speech is most subtle and misleading. Isaiah 1:21 provides an example of this speech. Would they suggest righteousness was an indwelling physical principle and a lodger? What is a lodger? Answer: a person who temporarily resides in the house belonging to another person (Apply the idea of bought and sold) is this what is meant? In what form did righteousness lodge therein? Of what does righteousness consist? is it concrete or abstract? Is it acts of obedience or knowledge pertaining to acts in accordance with laws of justice?

If only they would let every word perform its own function there would not be this indiscriminate mixing of thought and matter, abstract with concrete. In what sense does righteousness lodge within a person? Is it not by knowledge thereof? Hence I concluded sin is said to dwell therein in precisely the same manner, viz., by knowledge pertaining thereto.

Hence, instead of the statement being metonymical, it is a statement of literal fact and pertains to the abstract realm of thought, not to the concrete flesh.

If the statement were metonymical where is the advantage in changing the name from lust to sin? Does this change convey a better idea of the thing said to dwell therein? What object could be served thereby? Are we intended to understand lust to be part of our physical make up by such an expression and by such use of metonymy?

It has become customary to understand that man, in connection with the Law of God, is weak on account of his sinful flesh - his sin-in-the-flesh, a fixed principle termed lust. Yet Paul says it is the law that was weak through the flesh.

Here we have something via the flesh that rendered the law weak, and I ask. Is it consistent with sound reasoning to conclude that transgression, man's mental weakness and inability to obey the law took away the law's strength?

Paul says, "The strength of sin is the law" hence the law gave strength to sin. If it could give strength to sin and yet was weak through the flesh would not such rather suggest that the impulses of the flesh towards sin were not strong enough to cause man to sin that strength might be given to the law? Surely such proves the theory of sin-in-the-flesh erroneous and should cause all to reason these things out for themselves, trusting implicitly to no man's explanation without full investigation.

How then could there be something via the literal flesh that could render such a law weak? Surely the literal flesh cannot act on its own initiative? Must we not turn to that other method in Scripture - its metonymical mode of speech, where the word flesh is employed instead of the word men or man; e.g. "The end of all flesh is before me."?

Does the passage in question include all men as in example quoted, or to one certain person? A glance at the Greek solves the problem for there we perceive the Definite Singular article denoted in English by "The" employed, and not only so but we have its grammatical meaning to assist us because the Accusative form - which indicates sin as the Object - preceded the word for sin, and the Dative form, which indicates the time and the clue or fact given for locating the person to whom it relates, precedes the word 'flesh'.

"Condemned the sin in the flesh."

What particular sin was this and what particular flesh? If sin in the shape of lust, desire or the impulse were a fixed principle, surely man could not refrain from sin. The average man does not desire to sin but desires to avoid sin because of its consequences. The average man could refrain from sin if he exercise his power to control his actions because "God tries no man above what he is able to bear..."

We do not deny there are fixed principles which govern the flesh of man, which govern (rule over) his ability mentally to experience lust or desire, which principles were fixed at his creation (as witness their conception of sin; James 1:14 and 15) but these fixed principles - governing rules, or laws - are known and exist in the mind of God alone. Man knows them not; his physical organism is controlled by them and man has no power to alter this law, though he may damage the organism and prevent their perfect operation.

Paul further says; "there is nothing unclean of itself," hence the flesh itself is not scripturally unclean, yet we read "Ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." Surely it is not the putting away of filth of the literal flesh, as Paul says, but a legal transaction; 'it' refers to the flesh and if the flesh is not unclean of itself, all this talk of inheriting sin in the flesh as a fixed principle in the flesh or as impulses which lead to sin is contradiction of these clear concise statements.

Uncleanness pertaining to the flesh is imputed per the law. To what uncleanness via the flesh does it refer if not to that under which Scripture, not man, hath shut up together all under sin? If they would refrain from repeating phrases without paying attention to the meaning thereof they might be enabled to perceive how comprehensive is the above quotation.

"What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh hath found?" (Romans 4:1). Yea, what shall we say? Shall we say he discovered it was full of a physical sin principle termed sin-in-the-flesh, or that Scripture hath legally concluded all under sin due to fleshly relationship to Adam our forefather under what is now termed the Federal Principle?

L. Wilson.