

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 70

September 1985

In this Issue:

Page 1 Editorial	Harvey and Evelyn Linggood
Page 2 Man Cannot Live By Bread Alone	Poem
Page 2 A Review of Pat Brady's book "A More Perfect Way"	Brother Ernest Brady
Page 6 A Land for Which The Lord thy God Careth For	
Page 7 Jew or Gentile	Brother Harvey Linggood

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters in Christ Jesus,

Greetings and many thanks for the communications received during the past month. I had the pleasure of a visit to our Sister May Lockett on August 10th, she was in good spirits and strong in the faith and hope we share, though she suffers from the various ills that advanced age often brings, she sends her love to you all. Two newspaper cuttings have "been received from Bro. Arthur Speed. One from the Daily Express dated 14-8-81 recorded two well known scientists were researching into the origin of life, on one point they were both quite clear - that the notion of a 'creator' was inconsistent with science; but after careful consideration and exhaustive calculations that notion had to be painfully shed said one of them, "We were hoping as scientists that there would be a way round our conclusion, but there isn't. Logic is still hopelessly against that'." The other cutting was taken from the Sunday Mail of 4-8-85 and bare the Caption "The amazing story of how a computer may have proved the existence of God", a group of Jewish Rabbis are said to have come by much, as yet undiscovered information re the Torah, no doubt they are among the wise of this world, in these days when knowledge is increased, in this case via the modem computer system, but the true children of God have no need to resort to such methods, but have found the way to salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ by a study of the Scriptures, the Word of the Living God. Psalm 115 vs 1-3.

The following is from a letter from bro. W.A.Hold to our bro. Ernest Brady: "... (My cousins Ivan and Ezra Hold have given me a book, the title "A More Perfect Way" by P. Brady. The author appears to be pushing what we call the Moral View, and whilst it is a more perfect way than the Christadelphian view, it lacks the simplicity that is in Christ. If only someone could explain to him how we are of Adam and we are in his house until baptism, after which we remove from his house to God's House through the precious life of Christ, He P.Brady, does not seem to comprehend that Adam before he transgressed had a free life which was the same as Christ had. However Adam lost his by transgression and would have perished for ever had not Christ been the lamb slain from the foundation of the world. I have just arrived from Toowoomba to continue this letter and have had conversation with my cousins who had been visiting my father. They said that they had been talking to Pat Brady who told them that we (the Nazarenes) believe in inherited guilt. I endeavoured to explain to them that Adam was removed from God's House because of his sin. He was allowed to live by Gods Mercy, after an offering, and no doubt Adam and Eve realized that the blood that was shed should have been theirs. Adams children are naturally born in his house and where there is no law there is no transgression. However Jesus does say lie that believes not is condemned already. And John the Baptist says the wrath of God abides on him. Now in both these instances the people had the word preached and had refused to believe, they were no doubt Jews who should have known better. Now to me the Wrath of God etc., seems to be no more than being in Adam's house and preferring to stay there. Also of the Scribes and Pharisees, Jesus said, 'until I came they had no sin but now after refusing me their sin remains. I also used the parallel of a man

changing nationality from one country to another and becoming a citizen of that country and provided he obeys the laws of his new country he remains a citizen of that country. However I shall send you a copy of P. Brady's book knowing that you will be interested as some of your reasonings have been misrepresented and I think an answer is necessary even though a lot of his acceptable doctrine has come from your work, as he states that you have the finger on certain CDN faults. Maybe an answer in the Nazarene Circular Letter would be appreciated as my cousins now get that sent to them."

In this issue we have Bro. Brady's answer to the said book and in a future issue we hope to give further comments on the same book from our Bro. Parry, In this issue also is an article entitled "A Land which the Lord thy God careth for".

We pray for the welfare of you all, especially the sick and elderly and those who are isolated from others of like precious faith.

With our united sincere love, yours in The Masters Service.

Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

"Man Cannot Live By Bread Alone"

He lived in a palace
on a mountain of gold,
Surrounded by riches and wealth untold,
Priceless possessions
and treasures of art,
But he died alone of a "HUNGRY HEART;"
For man cannot live by bread alone,
No matter what he may have or own...
For though he reaches his earthly goal
He'll waste away
with a "starving soul";
But he who eats of HOLY BREAD
will always find his spirit fed,
And even the poorest
of men can afford
To feast at the table
Prepared by the Lord.

A Review of "A More Perfect Way"

Bro. and Sis. Hold have very kindly sent me a book, published in Australia last year (1984) by a Mr. Pat Brady of Hermitage Road, Toowoomba 4550 Queensland. Although he has a similar name I have never heard of this gentleman who is no relation, but I was most interested to read what he has written and have tried to understand his position which I think is confused and contradictory. He calls his book "A More Perfect Way," and its avowed intention is to show the falsity of the Christadelphian exposition of The Atonement. He does this well enough up to a point and to this extent his way may be a little more perfect than theirs but on some vital aspects his is a very imperfect way which falls very short of the true Gospel. He lays his position out plainly on p.2 in these words:-

“I think the major error in the Unity Basis is the concept that Adamic Condemnation is supposedly inherited by all men. This is the basis of the theory that Jesus had to die ‘for himself, to abrogate this Condemnation for himself, as well as for others.’”

The phrase ‘Unity Basis’ refers to a book published in 1958 in Australia which contained what came to be known as the Carter-Cooper Addendum which we believe was compiled for the purpose of restoring faith in the B.A.S.F. which had been considerably shaken by the literature of The Nazarene Fellowship showing that so-called Sin-in-the-flesh is a myth with no basis in reality. These two brethren (Carter is of course dead, but Cooper is still living in Watford, and still, I assume, convinced that sinful-flesh is the stuff we are made of) made an attempt to compose a doctrinal formula as an alternative to R.Roberts Statement of Faith explaining how the fall of Adam caused man to become a dying creature.

Even at the time, many people could see that this was a deception, for the Addendum said exactly the same thing in slightly different language. However it was accepted by a majority of the two main divisions, the old Temperance Hall and Suffolk St. groups, although Pat Brady affirms that ‘many who were supposed to accept it either did not read or understand it, or if they did only with reservations.’ So this re-union would be the Christadelphian Community which he joined in 1968 at the age of 20, having been born and practicing Roman Catholicism until then, and no doubt when he started to read and consider the various aspects of truth and error which would come to his notice as a thoughtful and moderately logical enquirer he would make some very painful and disturbing discoveries. He no doubt found that although they made a big profession of their Bible studies, when a problem arises they ask first what the ‘Pioneers’ believed and taught, not what does the Bible says. The result of his studies is this book, in which although he appears to consider himself still a Christadelphian he utterly rejects their teaching regarding the purpose of Christ’s death and as anyone who thinks about it knows very well, this affects practically every aspect of the purpose of God. Whether or not Christadelphians themselves regard him as one of them we have no means of knowing at present but a very few years ago any brother who questioned the correctness of what they call the first principles would have been out on his neck in short order.

Outlining his present view Pat Brady says of Christadelphian teaching “this error is the theory of a physical change, to make man more prone to Sin and physically mortal (this is a quote from Carter-Cooper - E.B.), these errors are the Spiritual offspring of the old Catholic doctrine of Original Sin.” This of course is exactly and precisely the charge we of The Nazarene Fellowship have been pressing against Christadelphians ever since Edward Turney opened the matter up in the controversy with R.Roberts in 1875, and naturally we welcome it now from a man of Catholic origin who has been and still nominally remains a Christadelphian for 17 years. It is a terrible indictment to be laid against a Community who think highly of themselves and the purity of their doctrine that they cherish “errors which are the spiritual offspring of the old Catholic doctrine.” But it is only too true. He is in a good position to know both what is Christadelphianism and what is Catholicism and he rightly rejects both. It seems clear, though he does not actually acknowledge the fact, that he has reached some at least of his conclusions from a study of the writings of members of our Fellowship, as he quotes passages from both Edward Turney and myself but he cannot accept our explanation of the Atonement as a redemptive sacrifice in which Christ gave his life voluntarily as a ransom payment to buy us back to God. The main point that he has apparently gained from us is his rejection of the belief that Christ had to be put to death to show God’s abhorrence of what they call “Sinful-flesh. Well we must be thankful for small mercies. To have convinced a Christadelphian and a former Catholic who is very far from being an ignorant fool, that the belief they hold concerning the death of Christ is an obscene blasphemy without parallel in the world of religion is no mean achievement. Pat Brady is not yet 40 years old, so he is still younger than many of us when we learned the truth, so we need not give up hope of him. When he comes to really examine what he tells us he believes about the purpose of Christ’s Sacrifice he may come to the conclusion that his fear of being mistaken for a member of the Nazarene Fellowship is capable of costing him his life! So he has renounced the Christadelphian doctrine that there was a physical change of our nature as a result of Sin or of the sentence passed upon Adam. He writes on p.5 “The really great mistake that the Unity Basis has made is its concept that Adam’s Condemnation is inherited by all men. This important doctrine is the foundation of the Concept that Jesus had to die for himself.” But more importantly this concept is

the foundation of the belief that natural death is the wages of sin and that before the transgression our first parents were not corruptible. If this doctrine is renounced there has to “be an explanation of the fact that we are dying creatures. We believe it is because we were created so that our natural span of life is a period of probation for Eternal Life, not a punishment. Pat Brady does not understand this and still clings to the view held “by nearly all Christian sects that natural death entered because of sin. But although he is very clear and definite that he does not believe there was ever a change of nature his explanation of the fact that we are a corruptible creation is very far from satisfactory to say the least. He quotes Romans 5,19 and says “This is telling us that all men were condemned because they all sinned or would have sinned” and explains (?) that with His foreknowledge God was able to typify the actions of the human race... by the acts of the first man Adam, This is his explanation of how death passed upon all men, we are mortal corruptible and dying because of sins we have personally committed or will commit. It does not seem to strike him as strange to suggest that God passed sentence and arranged for the punishment to commence before any crime had been committed. This may or may not be an improvement on Christadelphian doctrine, which declares that all are guilty and dying because of Adam’s disobedience but it still leaves him with the problem of explaining how justice is served by passing condemnation on those who might be innocent. His trouble is that he can see that the Christadelphian view that Jesus had to be under condemnation in order to explain his death IS untenable and he is to be commended for this, but he has not yet summoned up the courage to go back to the beginning and ask what really happened when Adam disobeyed. He still thinks, like any Christadelphian or Catholic that after he sinned he became mortal and commenced to die. He avoids actually saying this and talks about “the death which must follow a persistent imitation of Adam.” This is no explanation — it is simply waffle and even if it were so that by His foreknowledge God could see that all men would sin it is beyond belief that He could have condemned them to death for sins they had not committed and before they even existed. He may well ask what outrageous doctrines Christadelphians have developed, but his own is little better. If as he argues, people only die because they sin or will sin, he is under the necessity of explaining why creatures who do not sin and cannot sin, also die.

On p. 7 he has a paragraph which he appears to think answers this problem and it tells us quite a lot about the mentality of its author. It is headed “Why Babies Die” and it goes as follows:- “We may be sure that God in His loving foreknowledge, has never allowed to perish any child who would eventually have merited eternal life. Babies die condemned for what god knows they would have done, not for what Adam did.” When he wrote this sentence the very words should have screamed out from the page in protest “NO NO you cannot possibly say such a thing.” But he does say it and it is clearly his well thought out opinion and conviction. If babes die condemned, either for what Adam did or for what God knows they would do were they allowed to live, they are innocent victims of wicked injustice and to speak of God’s loving foreknowledge in such a context is worse than folly - it is blasphemy. I have never read anything to quite equal this, even in the pages of The Logos and that has some pretty terrible things. Babies are little natural creatures. They die for all sorts of reasons - starvation, neglect, accident, cot-death and it is a sad fact of this imperfect creation that such things happen but it is a very twisted mind which can attribute such misfortunes to the loving foreknowledge of God.

Pat Brady says he knows one thing for sure - I know two, neither the Christadelphian reason that babies die because they inherit the effects of Adam’s sin not Pat Brady’s reason that they die condemned for what they would have done could possibly be true of a beneficent Creator. Even as I write these words reports are coming of the trial for murder of a man of 20 in London who inflicted such injuries on his 18 month old daughter that she died in hospital. The Coroner was told that the little corpse bore 57 bitings and bruises. Let Pat Brady say how he would fit such a shocking tragedy into his scheme of what God is doing when he condemns babies to die. When Italian mothers lose their babies, their Church tells them that they have become Angioletti (little angels) and that they have gone to heaven because God loves them. This is a source of great comfort to a bereaved mother and the writer, as a former Roman Catholic will confirm what I say. It is of course a silly superstition which hardly matters for there are far worse aberrations in that Church but his own view is if possible an even sillier superstition. It would not surprise me if God, looking at these two alternatives would not prefer the pitiable ignorance of the poor peasant who thinks her cherub is in heaven to that of our friend who thinks God kills them for the sins they might commit. The Catholic view, false and foolish as it undoubtedly is, is vastly to be preferred to either orthodox Christadelphian view or that put forward by Pat Brady both of which dishonour God.

The best feature is his recognition of the fact that Jesus voluntarily suffered death and was under no obligation to submit. He says (p.5) what is undoubtedly true. "The Lord Jesus Christ had earned life for himself before he died on the Cross. Had he so desired he could have enjoyed eternal life alone." This is a mighty truth, because it truly defines the sacrificial nature of his suffering; it utterly confounds Christadelphianism and the Carter-Cooper nonsense which states that its purpose was to show by divine appointment that the flesh is rightly related to death. It would have been helpful if Pat Brady had told us how he reached this understanding and whether it came as a result of his own reasoning or from something he read. If it was the former it indicates that he has a good perceptive mind and is able to exercise pure inductive reasoning - a rare quality in the religious world. If this is the case it is puzzling to know why the same inductive process does not enable him to see that all the evidence goes to prove that natural death is the result of our corruptibility in which we were created and has nothing to do with sin. I think I am correct that I was the first writer on this controversy to clearly articulate the truth that Jesus was not obliged to give His life for us, no doubt there have been others and I should be interested to hear from anyone if they have found this fact stated elsewhere. Indeed it is possible that I owe it to someone or something I have read; who can say exactly where a thought or a conclusion comes from. With learning it is as the scriptures say for most of us "line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little." Pat Brady gives the impression that his thinking is original when he sets it out in the beginning of his book, but towards the end he quotes approvingly of what I wrote in "My life for the Sheep" as confirming the conclusion he had reached with Geo. Billiald. It is not a matter of much moment but as I wrote that in 1946, a year or so before Pat Brady was born it seems more likely that he has, perhaps unconsciously, adopted a view and made it his own. If so we are glad of it, for that is the purpose of our writing and if he is aware of it as a fact it would have been nice to have said so. The most unsatisfactory aspect of this book is its explanation of the purpose of the sacrifice of Christ. If there is one thing which is clear above almost all others in scripture it is that it accomplished something for us as sinners which no one else has done and which we could certainly not do for ourselves. In the words of the Apostles, "While we were yet sinners Christ died for the ungodly." "He gave himself for us, the just for the unjust." "He purchased us with his own blood." "He was a ransom for all." "He redeemed us to God," these and many other examples tell us that his dying had an objective purpose with us and for us before we were anything in the sight of God. Pat Brady appears not to recognise this in any way. His view is that the purpose of the suffering and death which Christ endured was required for the effect it would have on us. That is called the "Subjective" view. He writes "Without (his death) it would have been impossible for God to forgive us. I think (he says) the effect He wanted it to have upon us was to produce a sufficient depth of repentance and remorse. We can only exhibit these qualities when we experience a deep enough sense of responsibility for his death... Jesus proved by his life that perfection WAS possible, that it was possible to overcome the pitfalls of our nature and that we are capable of rising to enormous heights of self-sacrifice, love and mercy, if we follow his example." A big 'if' indeed, for the truth is that we do not follow his example. True, we know that obedience is possible because Jesus proved it, but is it not a fact that we all fail, and if it is true as he says that it would be impossible for God to forgive us unless the effect of his death upon us is so great that we rise to the same perfection there is no hope for anyone. It is not that the contemplation of Christ's sacrifice can make us perfect but our faith and belief in it can make us acceptable to God, imperfect as we are. Pat Brady's explanation of Christ's death as having primarily or solely a value for its influence upon our minds and characters is not Scripture. It has such a value of course and it affects people in varying degrees and circumstances but this is by no means what is implied when we are told that while WE WERE YET SINNERS Christ died for the ungodly. When Christ suffered it did not change us from ungodly to godly; what it did was to change our relationship from aliens without hope to heirs and children of the Kingdom. His theory overlooks completely the scripture truth that we are saved by faith and by faith alone, not by the degree to which we succeed in following the example of Christ. In Pat Brady's book the true Gospel is lost in a moral philosophy which asserts that contemplation of the awful suffering inflicted on Jesus can produce perfect characters. He says because of his sacrifice, "He expects us, if necessary, to shed our blood rather than sin." He did as an act of free choice, what we are expected to do as an obligation. He does not expect anything of us that he has not endured himself... we are only expected to endure physical suffering because he did it as a gift for us. This is not true, it is not Scriptural, it is utter delusion - it goes to the point of fanatical lunacy for we have only to examine ourselves and our motives and actions to realise how far we fall short of the example of Jesus. He does not expect us to endure the physical suffering he endured himself. He knows we are not likely to shed

our blood rather than sin. What he does expect of us is that we shall put our trust and faith in what he did for us. It is difficult to sum up this book. In so far as it reveals the fundamental error of Christadelphianism it has some sense, but it also has some non-sense. He thinks Salvation can be earned by following the example of Christ. It cannot. Salvation is the gift of God. There is a short passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians which says it all:-

“For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that NOT of yourselves it is the GIFT of GOD; NOT OF WORKS, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.”

Brother Ernest Brady

A Land Which The Lord Thy God Careth For.

Deuteronomy 11.12.

God said to Abraham, “Get thee out of thy country... unto a land that I will shew thee.” Genesis 12.1.

That land was the land of Palestine, or as we know it today ISRAEL. Recently on BBC2 has been a short series entitled TOPOL’S ISRAEL. In this present life maybe it was the closest we shall come to or see of that land. But Oh! the many references from the Scriptures which came to mind as we watched it, and later as we thought upon the contents. TOPOL is an Israeli, and how he loves the land of his birth. The children of Israel in the time of Moses during the wilderness journey were given many detailed blessings and cursings which would come about according to whether they obeyed or disobeyed God’s laws and statutes. “For the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of the valleys and hills; A land of wheat and barley and vines and fig trees and pomegranates, a land of oil olive and honey... A land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass.” Deut. ch. 8 vs 7-9. These were the promises if obedient.

But what of the other side of the coin? If they were not, just a few words from Deut. ch.28 v 25. “The earth that is under thee shall be iron”. Topol shewed us some of the hard barren land of parts of today’s Negev which were as hard as iron arid brass without roads etc., no wonder he needed a Jeep to get around. On the other hand he showed us some lush natural land and some rich highly cultivated land which earlier must have been scrub or marsh land. More Scriptures came to mind. Isaiah ch. 55 vs 1 and 2. “The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly... and the glory - of Lebanon shall be given unto it...” ch, 21 v 1. “... so it cometh from the desert, from a terrible land” ch. 51 v 5. “...he will comfort all her waste places... make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord.” As in Genesis ch. 2 v 8. We were also taken to see Jerusalem, modern Jerusalem. Here our thoughts went to Psalm 48 vs 12 and 15, which were spoken by David in days long gone by, “Walk about Zion... tell the towers thereof... mark well her bulwarks, consider her palaces ...”

Psalm 137 also often came to mind. For Topol from time to time as he surveyed the surroundings without any introduction would burst into song and with great feeling. He, however sang. of the land, in freedom, but in the Psalm it was in captivity the captors taunted the Jews to sing of the songs of Zion. Just one more lasting impression rather difficult to describe other than in Scripture which relates more fully to the age to come. Psalm 119 v 165. But even today we have a peace which the world does not understand. One of the most peaceful scenes in the programme was that of Topol in a small fishing boat on the Sea of Galilee during twilight. Mark ch. 4 v 35 came to mind. “And there arose a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the ship.”

Watching Topol in the boat made one realize the peace of calm water and the frightening rage of a storm. How we long for the storms of this age to cease, and the effect of the Son of God to say Peace be

still. Yes the land of Israel has suffered the storm of war with its aftermath, some of which Topol showed us during his journey, which was completed with a visit after travelling some hundreds of miles over rough hard ground to end at Eilat, concerning which the caption in Radio Times said, hurled us back into the 20th century with a vengeance. Surely it is "A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year." Deut. ch.11 v 12.

JEW Or GENTILE.

Romans ch. 2 v 11

Our late bro. Hembling as a local lay preacher for the Baptists had in mind to enter the ministry full time. To this end he engaged in much reading and study. I have some of his old note books in which are recorded various extracts from his studies of around the early 1900's which give food for thought today as we are nearing the end of the 1900's. His notes include an article from a Theological writer named Dale entitled "The Atonement copied from a Primer for Local Preachers," on page 142 the writer says "The Greeks worshipped the beautiful, adored the human, deified the world of nature. Their worship had no place for sin." "The Greek would not have spoken to you of sin: he would have told you of departure from a right line: want of moral harmony: discord within: he would have said that the misuse of your soul was out of tune." The Greeks knew of law and lawbreaking, but it seems they did not know of God's Law as set before us in the Scriptures, nor did they recognize the God of Israel as the creator and Sustainer of all. Their god was beauty, nature, and men, which we see portrayed in many forms in the carvings in rocks and ancient Greek buildings with their supporting columns which portrayed men and various idols in the form of statues. I John ch, 5 v 4. "whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law". Romans ch. 6 v25. "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord". II Peter ch.5 v 9. "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

The Greeks who did not know God, His law, or repentance, how were they to be taught of Him and His law, or of sin to enable them to come to repentance? In the purpose of God whatever need there may be to meet that need, a remedy was at hand. God uses man, laws, or nature as He sees fit. Nineveh was a great city whose wickedness had come up before God, Jonah was sent to them to preach repentance, the shipmen must have thought after they had thrown Jonah over board and a calm returned that's it; but Jonah had not performed his task, to this end we read "Now the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah... then Jonah prayed unto the Lord his God out of the fish's belly." Later Jonah was vomited out of the fish upon dry land. Jonah still had to fulfil his task, which he did with the result we see at the end of chapter three, "And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil, that He had said that He would do unto them; and He did it not." Another example is seen concerning Ahab that wicked king of Israel, who when he repented God looked upon him with mercy as we see in I Kings ch. 21 vs 28 and 29, where we read:-

"And the word of the Lord came to Elijah, the Tishbite, saying, seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me? Because he humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the evil in his days: but in his sons days will I bring evil upon his house."

Now let us come to the years around the time of the Few Testament and the preaching of the Gospel to all nations. Although there were many and varied nationalities who listened to the apostles as we see mentioned in Acts.- ch. 2 vs 8-11, in a more broad aspect there were only two, Jews or Gentiles. The former being under the Law of Moses and they had rejected the Lord Jesus Christ while the latter had their own ideas as to gods and whom they should worship as can be seen from Acts. ch. 14 vs 11-15. We have brought before us two classes, both in need of enlightenment. Two apostles were set apart or appointed for this work, Peter to the circumcision, Jewry: Paul to the uncircumcised Gentiles. Now let us look at the earliest sign of a work for Peter, Matthew ch. 4 vs 18-20

“And Jesus, walking by the Sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left their nets, and followed him”.

No doubt at the time Peter did not realize the full implication of the call, to be sent specially to the unbelieving Jews. It is not unreasonable to think that Peter and his fellows had heard and listened to the preaching of John the Baptist, this being so we can understand their immediate response to the call of Jesus. Peter is what we may term a stickler for the law as can be seen from his vision as recorded in Acts. ch.10 vs 9-15, wherein he was reminded that God was no respecter of persons; and in Galatians 2:11-15 Paul had to remind Peter he could not change just to suit whoever he was eating with so as not to cause offence, as we say today when in Rome doing what Rome does. Let us now look at the circumstances of Saul of Tarsus whose task was to bring “before the Greeks sin which they did not recognize, and in so doing its implication regarding repentance and life. We must also note the political times in which he lived as well as the man himself. Peter’s ministry to the Jews was more restricted than that of Paul who made long journeys during his preaching to the Gentiles. We note that we are now in the legs of iron period of Nebuchadnezzar’s image, the Grecian belly and thighs period had passed “but its influence was still with the Romans, the former shall I say was an intellectual and superstitious period while that of Rome was military, but they still hung on to much of the Grecian attributes. Good transport was essential for the Romans, and we know from our school days during history lessons the planning and construction of roads was a high priority in national planning then as now, here again we can see that good roads enabled Paul to travel far and wide without undue fear of constant highway robbers and the like, if we look at the missionary journeys of Paul as seen on the maps it was the major routes he used, thanks partly to the Romans, today our own country we see the major Fosse Ways which were planned by the Romans to enable them to go North, South, East or West quickly, much of our present road ways follow the same routes.

Returning again to Paul’s times whose travel was quite extensive, but to gain any advantage in this area we have to look at language, the Jews mainly stayed with Hebrew, while Greek and Latin was used by some, so if Paul was to bring the Gospel message to the Gentiles he would need to have a reasonable knowledge of some other language, especially Greek as this was used extensively. So where did he receive his education? The answer he gives us himself in Acts, ch. 22 v 5.

“I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day”.

So we turn to this source of Paul’s education and see what few details we can find concerning Gamaliel, from the Scriptures, Bible Dictionaries and the International Bible Students Encyclopaedia. We understand to be brought up at the feet of Gamaliel was equivalent to a high academic education at say Oxford or Cambridge university in this day or age, in Acts ch.5 v 54 we read: “...then stood there up one in the council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, had in reputation among all the people...” This Gamaliel under whom Paul sat was known under rabbinical writings as Gamaliel the Elder and to become a student it was necessary to be a son of a Pharisee. In Galatians 1:14 Paul mentions a period of advanced and specialized study of the very kind that one might expect to receive under a teacher of Gamaliel’s stature, and he does so in language strongly reminiscent of Acts ch. 22 v 5. “I was advancing in Judaism “beyond many Jews of my own age and was extremely zealous for the traditions of my fathers.” (N. I. V.). Under such a teacher Paul’s knowledge of Greek customs and their language would be of the highest, as would also the legalistic righteousness in accordance with the Judaism of his day and the traditions associated, therewith, Although the wisdom of this world is foolishness in the eyes of God, when necessary men with such learning are used by God. Paul knew when to use to advantage some of the privileges he had as a free born Roman citizen as we can see in Acts ch. 22 vs 24-50, we must also remember another advantage he had was that he could appeal to Caesar without having to obtain permission from any authority, this we see he does in Acts 20.10, We have then a very brief insight into the man whom God chose to use to bring the Gospel to Gentiles; Kings, and the Children of Israel, for that was his appointed work. Acts ch. 9 vs 8-20. In this work Paul

in his bringing the Gospel before Gentiles, spoke to the Greeks who did not recognize sin: before kings he at some time must have stood before Caesar and the children of Israel of those converted he speaks of the care of all the churches among his deep concern. No doubt the best known event concerning his preaching to the Greeks is that of his address on Mars Hill at Athens the capital of Greece. Paul made reference to the inscriptions to their various gods and their superstition, even one inscription to the unknown god for fear they would be punished for their neglect to have an image for him. It was their unknown god that Paul was about to enlighten them concerning. Paul and Silas came to Berea after their discourse at Athens, and we read in Acts ch. 17 vs 12 and 54.

“Therefore many of them believed; also of honourable women which were Greeks, and of men not a few”. “Howbeit certain men clave unto him, and believed: among which was Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them”. Other refs: “...Titus, who was with me, being a Greek...” “... but his father was a Greek...” Concerning Timothy.

We see that because of his education and upbringing Paul was able to have a useful contact with the Greeks and other Gentiles which many could not, Although so much among Gentiles and their superstition. Paul did not waver, he knew whom he had believed and nearing the end of his work for God could say “I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.” II Timothy ch, 4 v 7.

H. Linggood.