

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 93

August 1987

In this Issue : -

| | |
|---|---|
| Page 1 Editorial | Bro and Sister Harvey and Evelyn Linggood |
| Page 2 Redemption in Christ | Amended Continental Reunion Committee |
| Page 3 Comment on foregoing | Brother Phil Parry |
| Page 6 Christadelphians for Unity – our Common Redemption | |
| Page 7 Christian Service | Brother Leo Dreifuss |
| Page 9 From Eden to Gethsemane | Brother A.L.Wilson |
| Page 11 Humility – Fruit of The Spirit – Sincerity | |
| Page 12 A New Start | Poem |

Editorial

Dear Brothers and Sisters and Reader Friends, Warm, Greetings in the Saviours Name.

We are happy to report the baptism into the Saving Name of Miss Michelle Breault, (who is a granddaughter of our Sis. Stormont of Mass. U.S.A.) We extend to our new sister our good wishes and pray that in the fulness of time she will meet together with all of us in the Kingdom of God soon to be established.

We had the pleasure of a visit from Bro. Alan and Sis. Glenis Bate from Thunder Bay, Canada, last month while they were visiting relatives and friends in this country. We were much cheered by their presence and also by the correspondence and messages we have had during the past month from some of you and for which we send our thanks.

Further matter has been issued by the Christadelphians for Unity Group in North America and Bro. Phil Parry has written a short reply, also we thought it would be profitable both to us and our friends in U.S.A. to repeat in this issue the document and answer to it which appeared in a Circular Letter in 1980 as Bro. Parry has intimated so that both sides can be studied in this issue also we have a further instalment of "From Eden to Gethsemane" by the late A.L.Wilson; also an exhortation by Bro. Leo. Dreifuss entitled "Christian Service".

May a special blessing be granted to those who suffer in any way at this time and we pray for the welfare of you all.

Our Sincere Love in the Masters Service. Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

Constantine the Great was brought up steeped in Pagan worship, mythology and rites, on his so called conversion to Christianity which he established as the State Religion, resulted in the Church of Rome with its idolatrous worship. This is confirmed by a careful reading of Hislop's "TWO BABYLONS."

And from W. Durrant's Story of Civilization, we find -

“Christianity did not destroy Paganism; it adopted it. The Greek mind, dying, came to a transmigrated life in the theology and liturgy of the Church: The Greek language having reigned for centuries over philosophy became the vehicle of Christian literature and rituals; the Greek mysteries passed down into the impressive mystery of the Mass”.

Redemption In Christ

This document was prepared at the meeting of the Amended Continental Reunion Committee of North America on May 1951, as a statement of their understanding of the Atonement. The Original bears the signatures of all the Continental and Regional Delegates present. It is published here because of its value as a brief exposition of the wonderful theme of our redemption. Editor.

“The Sin of Adam brought consequences for the whole of the human race, every member of which inherited a proneness to sin and the certainty of death. Men are in no way responsible for Adam's sin nor is there any guilt attaching to them on account of the nature which they bear, even though it is unclean and tends only to sin. Man's guilt is for his own sin, actual transgression of God's law, and not for the natural state in which he finds himself. Man's plight was such that there was no remedy and no hope of life eternal except by the grace of God.

The weakness of man's flesh meant that men not only have the tendency to sin, they all become actual sinners. None can redeem himself, still less his brother. The Scriptures describe two kinds of sin in relation to man. The first is the personal sins which we have committed, the sins which can be forgiven in Christ. The second relates to the law of sin and death at work in our members which, because it is the root cause of sin, is described as sin, although it is not attributed to us as guilt before God. Redemption was wrought by the love and grace of God, and provides deliverance from both kinds of sin, the sins we have committed and the body in which they were done. The means of our redemption was by God's provision of a righteous man who fully bore our nature with its mortality and proneness to sin. The process, described in Psalm 40, was the raising of a man prepared by God who would delight to do God's will and wholly uphold his law and righteousness.”

“But the Bible makes it plain that living righteousness was not sufficient; the redeemer had to suffer death and taste it for every man. This perfection was achieved through suffering and his Sonship was crowned by complete obedience, obedience unto death. He loved the Lord his God with all his heart and soul and mind. This he achieved by overcoming completely and actually the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life which, though active in his very nature, were never allowed to conceive and bring forth sin. This sinlessness was the first and marvellous step in the redemptive process “by which we can be brought unto God. The Lord Jesus Christ did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, despite the flesh he bore in which by nature dwelt no good thing. Sin was conquered in its own stronghold and all unrighteousness was condemned in the sanctuary of his body”.

“But this was not enough. Not only was sin to be destroyed by righteousness, its very roots were to be destroyed by repudiation of the actual flesh in which it had hitherto been victorious. He whom God set forth as the mercy seat was also to be blood sprinkled to demonstrate the righteousness of God in a sinless life and to show forth openly the condemnation of sin by crucifying the flesh which gives rise to sin. Still there was more. All this was done of the Lord's free will and love. He brought himself as an offering to his Father in order to restore what Adam had stolen. No one took away the Lord's life, he laid it down of himself. As others in time past brought an animal offering for their sins, so Christ freely brought himself as an offering to God on our behalf. By Christ's carrying his flesh right up to the tree, the possibility of the victory of sin was finally defeated, since it was the last act of self-denial and self-repudiation. His life blood shed was the outpouring of himself, the accomplishment of emptying himself, that no flesh should glory in God's presence. The death of Jesus demonstrated that death is the wages of sin and God was justified in requiring that flesh be crucified. The uniqueness of the death of

the Lord Jesus Christ lay in the fact of his righteousness, and he offered himself in love to provide the means whereby God could righteously forgive our sins. In the nature which he had, the Lord bore our sins representatively and bore them away in the shedding of his blood. Our personal sins are removed by forgiveness through the grace of God when we have faith in God according to his word and make full confession of our sinfulness before him. In baptism, we identify ourselves with his death and we draw nigh to God in Christ by the new and living way, sanctified by his shed blood. Thenceforth, we are committed to putting to death the old man of the sins of the flesh and to live according to the new man in Christ. So, Christ entered into death itself in order that he might abolish it in himself. For he too needed redemption from death and was saved in that he feared God. The weakness of our flesh will be removed in the day when mortality is swallowed up of life.

The resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ to receive immortality and eternal joy was the divine evidence of his holiness and of God's righteousness; it is the key to our justification by faith when we are baptised, believing the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, and are sanctified by the blood of the everlasting covenant whereby we receive forgiveness of sins and are granted hope of the redemption of the body at Christ's return. Covered by his mighty atoning work, we long for the day when he shall fashion this body of our humiliation and make it like unto his glorious body. Meanwhile, we mortify our members upon earth and seek to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit. As the captain of our salvation was perfected by suffering unto death and has put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, so we have fled to him for refuge and have renounced the hidden works of darkness, being cleansed by faith in his blood whereby we have our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. Thus the one sacrifice will bring many sons to glory even as it has already made their captain perfect through his suffering and death".

* * * * *

Bro. Phil Parry's Comments on the foregoing.

If this continental reunion committee of North America had lived at the time of Christ, the rulers would not have needed false witnesses to testify against him; they would have shown the Jewish priests and Pontius Pilate that they were not wrong in putting Jesus to death. They would have stated 'The death of Jesus demonstrated that death is the wages of sin and God was justified in requiring that flesh be crucified. Despite what his disciples might say at a later date by the power of the Holy Spirit, it was not wrong for you to put him to death; you Jews and Romans are the instruments in the hands of God, for the doing of that which He had determined before to be done - viz, the condemnation of sin in the flesh through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all etc. Clause XII B.A.S.F.

It is difficult to remain passive when reading this blasphemous document with its unscripturally coined phrases and misunderstood passages on account of superficial reading and wrongly dividing of the word of God. It is all 'flesh' - a 'proneness to sin', the flesh is the 'vehicle of sin' - the flesh is to blame! This committee should state categorically that the Creator was wrong when he created the flesh of Adam and pronounced it very good. How could it be 'very good' if it was 'prone to sin'? There is not a whisper by them about 'Law'. Yet was it not the entrance of the Law in Eden that brought sin into the world? Adam was quite capable of keeping the law and the propensities in his makeup were for obedience or disobedience, and could never by any stretch of the imagination be termed sin, but the contrary, 'very good' as the Creator said. The Apostle Paul (whom this committee quotes but does not understand) says, 'By the law is the knowledge of sin' - 'where there is no law, there is no transgression'. "Sin is transgression of law". I would like this committee to tell me how sin exists in the flesh without mentioning Law? Or how the body of Jesus could have been the stronghold of sin when nothing resembling sin emerged from it, but only words and acts of righteousness. How can a polluted fountain send forth pure water? The fact that Jesus showed in his righteous conduct that obedience was possible in the nature in which Adam was created, is not enough for this committee in declaring the righteousness of God. It knows better than God, and declares 'But this was not enough; not only was sin to be destroyed' (the word should be condemned P.P.) by righteousness, its very roots were to be destroyed by

repudiation of the actual flesh in which it had hitherto been victorious. He whom God set forth as the mercy seat was also to be blood sprinkled to demonstrate the righteousness of God in a sinless life and to show forth openly the condemnation of sin by crucifying the flesh which gives rise to sin'. In other words (and this gives the lie to the committee), if there had been no flesh there had been no sin. But Paul declares in Rom. ch. 4 v 15 "For where no law is, there is no transgression". Adam, a natural body of life, very good in kind and condition, was alive in Eden without a law, but when God gave him a law which was possible to keep or disobey according to his propensities of freewill, he violated that law and by so doing, forfeited his right to natural life. But God did not condemn Adam's flesh; This flesh was very good and had not changed one bit in quality.

God condemned Adam's action as a man who was intelligent to know what the imposition of the law meant. In the case of Jesus, he showed and demonstrated the righteousness of God in condemning Adam's sin by exhibiting a righteous and sinless character throughout his whole life in the same nature, in the possession of which, like ourselves, he had no choice. But note the audacity of the members of this committee; in the first paragraph they state, "Men are in no way responsible for Adam's sin nor is there any guilt attaching to them on account of the nature they bear, even though it is unclean and tends only to sin. Man's guilt is for his own sin, actual transgression of God's law, and not for the natural state in which he finds himself".

Early on we read, "Man's plight was such that there was no remedy and no hope of life eternal except by the grace of God. The weakness of man's flesh meant that men not only have the tendency to sin, they all become actual sinners. None can redeem himself, still less his brother."

Their very testimony of the reason Christ had to die makes a blasphemous mockery of both these paragraphs as per Clause XII of the B.A.S.F. and paragraph 11 of this extract. Jesus could not help or prevent His birth as a man but you blame Him for having our nature and tendency to sin. None can redeem himself. You must therefore admit in accordance with your statements that Jesus did not have to die for Himself, as there is no guilt attached in possessing Adamic nature. If Jesus had the same nature as us, and we believe He did, how on the strength of such a foolish and unscriptural statement as in paragraph 2 could Jesus remain sinless and be able also to redeem Himself and His brother, for it is obvious that this paragraph must refer to Jesus as a possessor also of the weakness of man's flesh?

How on earth can these people make such absurd statements, that the "free thinking" of Adam and Eve was styled "sin" and the law of sin and death at work in their members? It is unscriptural to think or believe that "the law of sin and death" is a physical fixation in the flesh, when Paul declares that he had been freed from it through another law - "the law of the spirit of life in Christ" - and Paul could say that he was using the members of his body as instruments of righteousness and holiness, and exhorted all in Christ to do the same, that is, those who have been made free from the law of sin and death. The explanation of the Atonement by this committee remains unaltered from that which pervaded Christadelphia for years, i.e. He who knew no sin God made to be sin for us, that is (according to them), "sinful flesh" by being born of Mary, and this is how the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all, for on the cross He bore our "sinful flesh thought righteous bearer thereof."

This explanation bears no relation or comparison to the animal sacrifices under the law and prior to it, and taking into consideration the statement in Paragraph 1 that there is no guilt attaching to man on account of his inherent nature, Christ died for nothing and no one, and only put away "sin" that is "sinful flesh" by the sacrifice of Himself; He allowed therefore to be put to death on the cross, that which had no guilt or blame attached in the sight of God.

It appears to me from this document that the committee's understanding of Redemption really amounts to resurrection, judgement, and a change of nature; in other words, or rather in their words, "deliverance from death."

It appears that according to them we are not, nor can be, the subjects of redemption until Christ returns, raises the faithful and bestows on them eternal life. Their explanation of Christ's redemption as they term it, from death, is to say the least pathetic.

They say, "He entered into death itself in order that he might abolish it in himself. For he too needed redemption from death, and was saved in that he feared God." This is the most ludicrous wresting of scripture relating to our Lord's experience in the garden of Gethsemane that I have come across.

Jesus in actual fact prayed to His Father that if it were possible to let the cup of crucifixion pass from Him - it was indeed possible if the will of God had been the non-redemption of Adam and those whom Adam had sold under sin into bondage - Jesus need not have died for Himself; there was no blame or guilt attached in His birth of Mary. Like us, He had no choice in the matter. God could have, would have, spared Him the death of the cross if Jesus had prayed for legions of angels to deliver Him from the Romans, but He chose His Father's will, because our salvation, our redemption, from the bondage of 'Sin' as personified as a master, and not 'sinful flesh'.

Though Dr. Thomas is reputed to be the founder of the Christadelphian Body, the title of this document "Redemption in Christ", and the explanation under it, bears no resemblance to Dr. Thomas's exposition of it, which we regard as the true one and the scriptural one, and we therefore give him more credit than do his professed followers. Dr. Thomas wrote as follows; -

"Redemption is release for a ransom, all who are God's servants have been released from a former Lord by purchase, the purchaser is God, and the price paid, the precious blood wherein was the life of Christ as of a lamb without spot and without blemish."

Paul and Peter also made similar statements - "Ye have been bought with a price, even the precious blood of Christ, and therefore ye are not your own." "For ye have not been redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold. but with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without spot and blemish."

Purchased with an unforfeited life! This committee mentions nothing about purchase nor the lord to whom the 'life' or purchasing price was paid. It does not understand the subject and on account of a false premise as per Clause 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the B.A.S.F. has to add to the word of God, and consequently find themselves reproved liars. How could Jesus enter into death in order to abolish it in himself and obtain redemption from death? Did Jesus abolish death in himself? Was Jesus able to change his corruptible nature to incorruptible? Was he redeemed from death? The answer to these three questions is 'No'. Jesus by the grace of God, tasted death for every man willingly, and thereby He abolished 'death'; not natural death, for we still die naturally, but the death by sin which Adam merited which was judicial - inflicted death. Jesus suffered the agony of this death for us, and we only have to identify ourselves with this death in symbolic burial in water, thereby dying unto 'Sin' as a master; for he that is dead is freed from 'Sin' and by faith risen to newness of life in Christ, "who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." So my misguided friends of the committee, you must admit that your first paragraphs have destroyed all your so-called exposition of Redemption in Christ; you have forgotten that a late Editor of your magazine, John Carter, as far back as 1958, wrote to certain members of your community in that magazine, that "to talk of sin in the flesh was to talk jargon. He also said several other things which were in opposition to your basis of fellowship; (Christadelphian 1958, page 572, is one which you have used, namely, paragraph 1.) Why did you not take issue with him on this matter while he was alive?

If you had, things might have emerged which would have brought you to a closer understanding of what E. Turney contended for in regard to the Sacrifice of Christ and Dr. Thomas's definition of 'Redemption' and that of Jesus Himself recorded in John chapters 5 and 6.

The booklets 'Too True to be New' and 'Outrage on Justice' have dealt flawlessly with all this matter, and it is only their suppression, or the lack of interest in the most important event of the world's history by professing lovers of Truth that has kept that Truth from them.

The Pope of the Apostasy did his work on Pelagius and his mark has been ever since on Christendom, including Christadelphianism. We have done, and are doing our best to enlighten, but are

hated for 'his name's sake', more so by those who profess to be guardians of the Truth and respecters of the Bible than those who accept without question the paid clergy.

What a wonderful theme of Redemption to be associated with a jigsaw puzzle of the apostate 'Mystery, Babylon, the Great etc.!!' 'Wherefore should you wonder and marvel with great admiration? Consider while there is time. Revelation chapter 5 vs. 14-20

Christadelphians For Unity - Our Common Redemption.

It was 7 years ago that my comments repudiating a similar document by the North American Christadelphian Committee was printed in the Circular Letter of the Nazarene Fellowship which is sent to our own members and also to others who take a great interest in Truth qualified by Holy Writ and not that falsified interpretation arrived at by both Dr. Thomas and R. Roberts around 1875 when they became overwhelmed by the doctrine of original sin as accepted and taught by the Roman Apostate Church and which was the cause of the controversy between R. Roberts and E. Turney, the former being to blame.

It should be noted that before this took place, that around 1865 - 1869 both Dr. Thomas and R. Roberts were in harmony with the Genesis account of the nature of Adam when created, and the fact that Adam's nature was never changed from what it originally was from the beginning, i.e. capable of decay and finally death if left without a change to incorruptible nature.

Therefore it was plain then, as it is plain now, that natural death which Adam experienced with the rest of the animal creation was not the penalty for his committed sin. Neither Thomas or Roberts understood this to the full extent and light, that Paul put upon it in Romans chapter 5 and which E. Turney brought into focus in his lecture "The Sacrifice of Christ", but both Thomas and Roberts refused Baptism to a certain person on the grounds of what they regarded as a false theory he held, i.e. that Adam's nature was changed when he sinned. I will quote their words, 1 Regarding Adam's disobedience, "We believe that the change was Moral, not Physical", (Dr. Thomas, Herald of the Kingdom p. 159). "Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he transgressed. There is no evidence of this whatever, and the presumption and evidence are entirely contrary. There was a change in Adam's relation to his maker, but not in the nature of his organisation" (Ambassador, March 1869). Why do the leaders of Christadelphianism refuse to go back this far, and choose rather to accept a false theory (later adopted by Thomas and Roberts) as the basis for immersion and fellowship when there is no evidence in scripture? The answer is plain. It would expose the fallacy of the very document upon which they are still seeking unity, its contradictions and unscriptural view on the "Atonement" together with its invented terms and phrases which falsely describes human nature. All authorities on the Greek writings, agree that the term 'Sinful Flesh' is not a correct translation of Romans chapter 8 v. 3 but should read 'flesh of Sin' or in English 'flesh belonging to sin', or 'Sin's Flesh', denoting possession, or ownership.

This would destroy the B.A.S.F. and Christadelphianism in all its divisions, yet its destruction is the only means to achieve any degree towards a true knowledge and understanding of God's plan and means of salvation. The North American advocates of Unity on such a basis can only quote their pioneers where their writings agree with the B.A.S.F. Why not quote also where they contradict themselves and each other? Why resort to such twisting and distortions of the scriptures of Truth in explaining your understanding of your common Redemption in order to make it the support for such a rotten unscriptural and false system? Your Referendum will fail to Unify as it has done since Robert Roberts turned from such limited knowledge and understanding he had at one time (in 1869) to fables.

P. Parry. July 15th. 1987.

Christian Service.

Bro. G.L.Dreifuss

Suggested reading - Romans 12 and I Corinthians 12: 29 and 15

Paul and Peter are two persons outstanding among those who devoted their lives to Christian service. So we think it fitting to consider some of Paul's epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. They contain much good and practical advice. Paul tells in (Rom.12:1) "I beseech you therefore, "brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service".

This perhaps, may be regarded as the key sentence of Christian service. Our bodies are to be presented "a living sacrifice". To understand the apostolic epistles fully, we must remember the time at which they were written, the circumstances then prevailing, and the people to whom addressed. This thought of presenting our bodies 'a living sacrifice' was something quite new at the time this letter was written. The only sacrifices then known, both among Jews and Gentiles, were the ones in which an unwilling victim was killed. Among the heathen from which most of the Roman believers came, the victim could be an animal, or a human being.

In the Jewish world, the victim was always an animal, as human sacrifices were strictly forbidden under the Law of Moses. From whichever side the believer came, the only sacrifice he ever knew before he heard of Christ was one where some victim was killed for somebody else's sin. It was an unwilling victim that was killed. The only exception to this rule among the Jews were the scapegoat which on the day of Atonement was let go alive into the wilderness, and one of the birds which was to be offered when a leper was cleansed and which was to be let out after having been dipped into the blood of the slain bird. But to the Jew or Gentile who accepted Christ as his saviour, past sins were now washed away in quite a different manner. Christ died the death for their sins. And that not as an unwilling victim, but as one who fully understood God's plan of redemption, and whose whole life was dedicated to this very task of doing God's will and to die as the sacrifice for the sin of Adam which resulted in everybody being born cut off from the tree of life. He submitted to the death on the cross of His own will, although He had the chance to escape by calling for the assistance of twelve legions of angels. No animal ever had the chance of escape.

All the believer who accepts Christ has to do is to submit in symbol to the death for sin, whereas Christ submitted to this death in actual fact instead of him. This symbolic death the believer dies when he goes down fully immersed into the waters of baptism confessing his sins and his faith in Christ's redemption. Having submitted to baptism the believer is then indeed dead to sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. His life now is or should be, bent on ceasing to do his own will and to do that which is pleasing to God, looking upon Christ as his example.

His life is now dedicated to Christ. This is how he comes to be a 'living sacrifice', quite unlike the only kind of sacrifice then known, in which an unwilling victim was killed and afterwards was unable to do either good or bad. The baptised believer is not deprived of his life, and if he is genuine, he will use his life which has been spared to him because Christ died the sinner's death in his stead, henceforth for the service of Christ.

Continuing in the 12th chapter of his letter to the Romans, Paul next considers the right use of various gifts, and much of this is repeated in his letter to the Corinthians. In those days the New Testament had hardly been written. There was only the Old, and as Christ had come to fulfil the Old Testament the early believers needed some more Divine guidance. This was given by a special outpouring of the Holy Spirit, spoken of in scripture as "the Comforter". And different persons were given different abilities, such as teaching, exhorting, ministering in general, speaking or interpreting of foreign languages, etc. And it appears from Paul's letter to the Corinthians, that these differing gifts caused some friction, strife and jealousy among the believers. They did not know how to use their gifts truly for God's service for which they were intended. They abused their gifts by using them selfishly for their own ends and self-glorification. And the temptation to use our various gifts and abilities for our

own selfish ends is with us to this day. It is in the world, where many of the present day troubles are caused by selfish use of gifts, a desire to monopolise for monetary gain, instead of using one's abilities for the good of the community. The temptation to use one's abilities for the satisfaction of self is human enough. Even Christ was tempted in this respect, when he was tempted to turn stones into bread. And Christ's temptation in this, as in any other respect, was greater than any that is likely to come to us. He had fasted forty days under the scorching sun of the Middle Eastern desert. He was exhausted and hungry. If ever there was an opportunity to use His super-natural powers, here was the chance to satisfy His hunger. But His supernatural powers were not given Him for this purpose. They were given to Him to manifest to the people by signs and miracles that He was the Son of God there were two occasions afterwards when Christ did use His supernatural powers to produce food, but not to satisfy His own need, but the needs of several thousand people.

Christ overcame the temptation in the only possible way:- By the Word of God. The special powers of the Holy Spirit have been withdrawn long ago. They have been abused in many ways, beside the one we mentioned, misuse of gifts. Today we have the written word of God to guide us, the New as well as the Old Testament. And we must overcome our temptations by following the counsel given therein. This is only possible by keeping it constantly in our minds, by constantly reading from it, as was commanded to the ancient kings of Israel. If it was necessary for them, it is necessary for us. The guiding principle of Christian service is love. Pure unselfish love. Paul devotes much of Romans 12 and I Cor. 13 to it. And here again, God Himself showed in His own supreme example of it, when He gave His only begotten Son. The one who exercises this pure unselfish love delights in giving. To those of the world who follow their own inclinations, life consists mostly of getting as much pleasure as possible for nothing and of satisfying self. But God's love is giving. God gave. What a gift! If we are found worthy to attain unto the resurrection, and we meet with the saints of old, we shall meet a huge crowd of people who all have good reason to appreciate this greatest of all love. God who gave His only begotten Son. But among all these people, it is quite possible that Abraham will perhaps be the one who appreciates this aspect of God's love more than any other. You see, to use a slang expression, this type of sacrifice has 'come home to him' in a special way. God had asked him to sacrifice his only son whom he loved because he was the son of promise, and of his old age. He of all saints knows what this sort of sacrifice is like. And yet, there is still a vast difference between Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac, and Christ's sacrifice of His own, His very own life.

Abraham did not know of course that God was merely trying him. (He did not know what it was for, why God should demand this of him. He obeyed. Christ fully knew God's plan and His part in it. Isaac was spared at the last moment. Christ went through to the end, there was no escape for Him. And at the time it was not appreciated by the people. Here is another point concerning Christian service. Rendering it for the love of it, even if it is misunderstood and not appreciated. We are told (Rom. 5:8) that "God commendeth His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us". And the apostle John tells us that "the light shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehended it not", and "He came unto His own, and His own received him not". No His own people, His own brothers, did not believe in Him. Only some 70 disciples kept with Him for a while, then eventually they, except for twelve, left Him, and even one of the twelve was a traitor. Then at the hour of His greatest trial, the apostles fled from Him, only Peter followed Him, and at the decisive moment, even he denied Him. Yet Christ out of pure unselfish love of the Father, and of mankind, went through all this suffering, not appreciated even by His nearest friends, betrayed by a disciple, and mocked by the people, the very people whom He died to save.

Let us be quite honest with ourselves. Who of us would go through such suffering, render such service, not to a friend, but one whom we know does not appreciate it, or even an enemy? Yes, Christ is the supreme example of Christian service. He did not take revenge. He left it to God, while He Himself did His part to the end. Again, let us be honest with ourselves. Who of us would render such service, without some suppressed selfish thought of reward, or benefit, at the back of our minds? In the selfish world we live in such unselfish love is practically unknown. So much is done for selfish ends and made to appear to do somebody a favour, that we can hardly understand anybody doing some good for the sheer love of it, or purely for doing God's will. Yet Jesus did just that; always pleasing the Father, unselfishly, leaving the reward to God. And this is expected of the Christian service we are to render.

Giving and serving out of pure motive of love, without thought of benefit, or of praise or recognition of service, not even merely in order to gain the reward at the resurrection: God will see to that, if we render to our Master the service due to Him.

Finally, the last admonition in this 12th chapter of Romans: "Avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him, if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good".

Thus in following the Master's example, when He had gone through that terrible ordeal of crucifixion, forsaken and denied by all his friends, and mocked by the crowd, he said (Luke 15:54) "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do". He loved His enemies to the last. Let us endeavour to follow such an example, or that of Stephen in similar circumstances, and render unselfish service to God.

continued from July.

From Eden To Gethsemane.

Abel recognised this fact; but not Cain, and it is distinctly said; "But unto Cain and his offering he (God) had not respect". And we read "Cain's countenance fell, and he slew his brother". Wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous (I John 5:12). Jesus referring to this, says: "He abode not in the truth." He must have taken a Dictionary Definition of the death unto sin. Hence no recognition by faith in the spilling of life in reciprocation of gratitude to God for His Gracious ransom. Let us all avoid the way of Cain (Jude 1:11).

Before we leave the precincts of Eden we would, in the words of another, present his view of the striking scene: "When the parents of our race, recent from their fall, and conscience-smitten by the Divine rebuke, were driven from their blissful seat and filled with dismay at the threatening death, a threatening piercing through their guilty souls, but of the nature and effects of which they could form none but vaguest ideas. But when directed by stern authority to apply some instrument of death to the Lamb which, with endearing innocence, had sported around them, they heard the agonising groan; beheld the appalling sight of streaming blood; the struggling agonies, and life's last throes, they gazed upon the "breathless" body, and were told; this is death, how stricken must they have been with horror such as no description could ever paint! When further, they had to go through that other process of the Sacrifice, the putting off of their own devised covering, and the putting on of the robes of God, their hands reluctant; their hearts broken; and all their souls crushed down by the piercing consciousness that these revolting things were the fruit of their sin. We think this sublime, and ask, Had God delight in sacrifice? Nay. "To obey is better than sacrifice," and "to hearken than the fat of rams". Let us then, in guilty silence, "Behold the Lamb of God" in dark Gethsemane and Calvary, that meek and purest Lamb that was slain for us. Was His mind torn with the racking consciousness of the Editor's charge against Him, viz: "That He was as much under the curse as His brethren"? No such remorse, not the slightest tincture of it, had place in the breast of Holy Jesus. Separate was He, and undefiled. He suffered in such a manner as a being absolutely Holy could suffer. The echoes of that bitter and piercing cry: "My God, My God, Why hast Thou forsaken Me" reverberate through all the chaos and din of war, and in this far-off clime melt the adamant heart with the conviction that Jesus endured that accursed death for man! Shall we therefore, speculate about a "Dictionary Definition"; or allow any to bewitch us that we should not obey the truth before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified before us? - (Gal. iii,1).

What then is the Divine method by which the sinner can become related to that death? Every human soul must pass through that death in symbol before he can approach God. Know ye not that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ, were baptised into his death? Are we then, still under sin? God

forbid. How shall we who have died unto sin, live any longer under that dominion, knowing that our old man (previous slavedom) is crucified with him, :that the body of sin (sin's previous ownership in us) might be (katargethe) rendered powerless, that henceforth, we should not serve sin (our old master and slave-owner) (Rom. chapter 6)? This language defies man to refute the fact that the death unto sin is an accursed death which Jesus endured instead of man, just as Abraham offered the Lamb in the stead of his son (Gen. xxii. 15).

What about "Natural death", which has hitherto perplexed the minds of our friends, and forced them to the most outrageous conclusions against Jesus? If you claim the natural death of the believer to be any part of the wages of sin, you rob Christ of His redemptive work; make a mockery of God's Purchase; and at once introduce fraud into the scheme of redemption by charging twice for the same thing. God paid man's debt to sin once for all when He delivered up His Own Son (John iii. 16). There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus (Rom. viii. 1,2,5). God is not the God of the Dead." We shall not all sleep; but if the theory we are combating were true, those who are alive and remain (Thess. iv. 17) could not escape death. The purpose of Jehovah is definately stated, i.e, That He has ordained to glorify His people together (Dan. xii. 15; Mal. iii. 17; Eph. i. 10; Heb. xi. 59-40).

It is, therefore, imperative that He appoint unto men once to die (Heb. ix.27; Psalm cxvi,15; Rom. xiv.7-8). Was not Adam. a man? On the hypothesis of his obedience, therefore, who is prepared to say that God was under any obligation, there and then, to immortalise Adam, instead of laying him to rest until His Own Appointed time? Go thou thy way, till the end be, thou shall rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.

We have analysed the theory of Adam's constitution being Death-proof, and the evidence points the opposite way. Let the qualified objector examine the statement in I Cor. xv. 44-47. The believer is therefore in the same relation Legally, Morally and Physically as Adam was prior to rebellion. It is wholly a question of Law, Relation, Character, and Possession, while the physical condition in either case remains the same. Every creation of God is good (I Tim. iv. 4). Nothing unclean of itself (Rom. xiv. 14). Call no man unclean.

We would now review the Editor's second chapter. His reference to Trinitarianism, requires no comment; but why should he now occupy three pages reiterating and emphasising the fact that "Jesus was a man, real human flesh and blood"? Do his brethren for whom he writes require to be established on this fact; or does not this very eagerness to establish this truth betray hopeless confusion in the Editor's own mind regarding the faith he now labours to destroy? Do we deny these Scriptures? Are they not as precious to us as they are to the Editor for his very soul? He says: "The Scriptures lend no countenance to the idea of two kinds of human flesh. if this fact were well established in the mind, it would prevent the misapprehension into which some have fallen, that the life of Jesus differed from the life of other men. Very loose talk has been indulged in to the effect that Jesus was possessed of an unforfeited or free life, in contrast to the life of other men, which is said to be forfeited. This is language foreign to Scripture."

We are pleased the Editor has expressed himself so fully as it enables us at once to prescribe for his perplexity. Our first duty therefore, is to investigate the Genealogy of this phantom, this supposed other kind of human flesh, with which the Editor is scaring the people from the path of Life. Let us see whether is it not this confusion regarding the real human flesh which forces the very Editor to indulge in this "very loose talk", so much so that it forces him to involve Jesus "as much under the curse as his brethren".

With the editor, Free life and real human flesh are irreconcilable opposites; but he must be informed that his inability to harmonise the two by no means nullifies the fact, much less his groundless imputation of another kind of human flesh. Is the Editor's conclusion valid? Was not Adam prior to rebellion, real human flesh? Was he not therefore free? If therefore Adam was real human flesh, and free, it is a baseless libel to charge us guilty of changing the flesh of Jesus by our pointing out that He was free! Oh, but it is supposed Adam's flesh was changed after rebellion, and that his posterity, Jesus

included, partook of this changed flesh. The Editor has this assumption yet to prove, instead of making it a foregone conclusion. This is what Logicians call “Begging the question”.

First then, we assure the Editor that we fervently believe in one kind of human flesh. Paul says: “There is one kind of flesh of men”. It is therefore, our eternal conviction that Jesus appeared in this one kind. Paul also informed the Athenians that God hath made of one blood all nations. Whether, therefore they be Jews, Irish, or Laplanders, they are all one in this respect. There was however, a class who denied that Jesus was flesh, regarding whom it is not our present business; but the word of God is absolutely silent regarding this supposed other kind. We must, therefore, direct our research elsewhere. For ages it has been taught and believed that the physical condition of our first parents was somewhat between the Angelic and the human, capable in itself of living on. (Even some of our CDN friends tell us that if Adam had been pierced, he would have felt no pain. Pity the Elohim knew not this and saved them from putting him into the deep sleep to undergo his operation). But when they rebelled, it is supposed that their physical constitution was lowered from the original standard; became vile and full of sin. It was this supposed physical change which forced the Old Lady to invent “The Immaculate Conception”. Our friends acquiesce in the assumption; but part company in the Immaculate and choose the opposite extreme of cursing Jesus on account of His partaking of this supposed changed flesh, while the truth of God, like the water of life, winds its silver streak between these two Bleak Mountains of confusion till it loses itself in the Glassy Sea. We annihilate the assertion, and both the “Immaculate Conception” and the cursing of Jesus vanish in the Great Unseen. The above philosophy permeates the Christadelphian Literature. Dr. Thomas profusely taught: That Sin became a fixed principle in the flesh of man, and that the Christ-Deity veiled Himself in flesh defiled by sin”. The works of R. Roberts are saturated with it that “it ran in the blood”. The works of J.J.Andrews are brim-full, and running over. “That a change took place in Adam’s physical constitution, and that this posterity has inherited his nature after that change was effected”. The Editor follows suit, and makes that assumption his criterion, and like his teachers, declares that “Regarding physical condition Jesus was as much under the curse as His brethren. These facts disclose to the Editor what Nathan’s parable did to David: “Thou art the man”. The Editor is therefore guilty of the crime he condemns, viz: A propagator of this theory of another kind or changed human flesh. In this connection the Editor calls forth the term mortal to his aid; but as this term is not universally understood, we ask for the sake of his readers, if the term “Mortal” predicates another kind of flesh? If so, define the term “Corruptible” and explain the “physical difference”.

The leaders of the people cause them to err. Why not be candid and say there is no physical difference, but differently related to Law? Suppose the Editor commits murder, while his friend and well-wisher A.L.W. avoids this calamity, the sentence of death is just; but has this sentence produced another kind of flesh?

To be continued.

Humility - - Fruits Of The Spirit - - Sincerity

Jesus said: “Love the Lord your God with all your heart...” It is the same heart out of which proceed evil thoughts. Any evil thoughts must be suppressed and replaced with good thoughts. We read in Phil. 4:8. “Whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things”. Constant and persistent determination to do good, speak good, and to think good is one of the first necessities, We do not drift into a likeness of Christ. A casual desire to improve, if not linked with a painstaking determination will fail, no matter how optimistic we may be. In Luke chapter 15 v 24 Jesus says “Strive to enter in at the straight gate; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able”.

Each fruit of the Spirit has an ideal (the same), although all emphasise a different phase of it to varying degrees; remember an ideal is essential to the development of a genuine character. An ideal

gives direction or purpose to effort, it co-ordinates energies. One ship drives east while another drives west, in the same sea and wind.

By the self-same gale that blows,
Tis the set of the sail and not the gale,
That determines the way she goes,
Like the winds of the sea are the ways of God:
As we voyage along through life,
Tis the set of the soul that decides its goal,
And not the calm or the strife.

Our lives in Christ begin when we are baptised. We have a clean start in the sight of God, but what of all those influences which are the results of our parents training: all those habits which have been forming unavoidably? It is an inexorable law that what one sows that shall we reap. Galatians 6:7. We begin with an unfinished article which is very awkward in shape and difficult to mould. "But speaking the truth in love, may grow up in Him, in all things, which is the head, even Christ". Eph. 4:15. In the course of our progress are many and varied characteristics - the fruits of the Spirit - they are not only essential but extremely helpful. Two of these are at the head of this article. Humility and Sincerity among many others. A brief, look at these two.

Humility. The human mind is sometimes born with an ability to excel. When developed it is in the world described as having a high I.Q. from birth; in some children this is encouraged by spoiling, and in some it is repressed by unnecessary thwarting, scolding and neglect. In the one case the child grows up to be selfish and overbearing and in the other case the child is nervous; retiring and frightened.

Humility in one sense is not a virtue. Humility is the recognition of the simple fact of how far off I am from the standard set before us in Jesus Christ. Children tend while drawing to think, mine is better than yours, not how far off the copy am I. Humility should be real, not simulated. "Whosoever will be great among you let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and give his life a ransom for many". Jesus in this quotation from Matthew 20: 26-28, knew he was touching a weak spot. Nevertheless the command is plain.

Sincerity. - without wax - genuine, being what it appears to be. This does not mean be natural, if you are normally abrupt and plain speaking the result may be taken as rudeness. We must be courteous, which is Scriptural, but be sure to see your courtesy is genuine and sincere, sincerity is most needed with oneself. The human heart is deceitful above all things. It is not only others who are deceitful; it is a well-established fact that often oneself is the subject of deception.

"LORD, who shall abide in thy tabernacle"
"Who shall dwell in thy holy hill " Psalm 15: 1 and 2.

Only the humble minded man can be truly sincere in himself, for pride may stand in the way - Consider Proverbs chapter 15.

A NEW START.

I will start anew this morning with a higher, fairer creed;
I will cease to stand complaining of my ruthless neighbour's greed;
I will never sit repining while my duty's call is clear;
I will waste no moments whining, and my heart shall know no fear.
I will look of times about me for the things that merit praise;
I will search for hidden beauties that elude the grumbler's gaze;

I will try to find contentment in the paths that I must tread;
I will cease to have resentment when another moves ahead.
I will not be swayed by envy when my rival's strength is shown;
I will not deny his merit, but I'll strive to prove my own;
I will try to see the beauty spread before me, rain or shine;
I will cease to preach your duty, and be more concerned with mine.

Selected.

