

# The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 94

## September 1987

### In this Issue : -

Page 1 Editorial	Bro. and Sis, Harvey and Evelyn Linggood
Page 1 From Eden to Gethsemane	Brother A.L.Wilson
Page 4 Faith	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 5 Christ – The Hope of The world	Poem
Page 6 Flesh Literal and Spiritual	Brother F. L. Pearce
Page 9 Letter to a Correspondent	Sister Helen Brady
Page 11 What is Truth?	

---

## Editorial

Dear Brethren and Sisters and Reader Friends, Greetings in the Saving Name.

Once again we thank all who have corresponded with us during the past month, it is much appreciated.

The world at large looks with apprehension at the present turmoil in the Gulf states and because of the need to keep the Gulf open to shipping it looks as though other nations could become involved in the fighting, but we know that God rules in the Kingdoms of men and He will fulfil all His will.

Israel is very vulnerable with a population of about 2 million and a land mass only a little over 8000 sq. miles surrounded by 16 major enemy Arab countries having a land mass of 7½ million sq. miles with a population of 95 million: 95% of whom are Muslims of various sections.

But God said of Israel “A land which the Lord thy God careth for... from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year” (Deut. 11.12). And of the people He said “Fear thou not O Jacob my servant saith the Lord for I am with thee... I will not make a full end of thee, but correct thee in measure...” (Jeremiah 46 v. 28), we look forward to the time when Israel will dwell safely serving the Lord with all her ancients gloriously.

In this issue we have a further instalment of “From Eden to Gethsemane” by A. L. Wilson. An exhortation on “Faith” by Bro. Leo Dreifuss. An article by F.J.Pearce on “Flesh, Literal and Spiritual.” A letter to a Christadelphian from Sis. Helen Brady on receipt of a booklet entitled “Christ’s death and your Salvation”.

Our love and best wishes to all. Yours in the Master’s service. Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

---

**continued from August.**

## From Eden To Gethsemane,

Has the Editor’s flesh become in any way different from that of his friend A. L. W.? Let all avoid this delusion. A mighty change has, undoubtedly taken place; but not in the physical, it is in the Editor’s altered relation to law. Reconciliation to God consists not in the putting away of any physical defect, but in the answer of a good conscience toward God (I Peter iii. 21). We therefore challenge the Editor to point out to his readers, in unambiguous terms, where Jesus stood in a relation cursed by Law. How then

is the term “Free Life” used amongst us? In spite of the Editor’s abuse to make it another kind, he confirms us the more of his own confusion. Logicians call this blunder “The fallacy of accident”. The accidental circumstance of free or not free cannot alter the nature of a thing. Life in the abstract is all one. Not only man, but animated creation possess one ruach. Did not Adam derive his life direct from God? Was he not therefore free? But rebelled, and forfeited his life to the law. Jesus also derived His life direct from God. Did He ever rebel? Nay. In this He was rich; but for our sakes He became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich. But the Editor says, Forfeited and Free life is “Language foreign to Scripture”. We shall prove both out of the mouth of the Lord Jesus: “What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and should forfeit the life himself”? Is there a living soul who will deny this? Does the Editor’s assertion commend itself? This “Forfeiture of Life” is therefore, a phrase of the Lord Jesus. Is the Editor any more reliable in his denial of “Free”? In regard to the redemption money (Exodus xxx. 11-16; Matthew xvii. 27), Jesus, alluding to Himself, informed Peter, “Then are the sons free, exempt”. The readers duty is therefore, to choose between the words of the Lord Jesus and those of the Editor. Paul says: “The Law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free” (Romans viii. 2). If this law was in Jesus, is it not “very loose talk “to say He was, at the same time, “as much under the curse as his brethren? We would now examine the Editor’s handling of Romans viii. 3 despite his admission that it should be “sin’s flesh”, he afterwards confounds it. We have no dispute as to the term “likeness” indicating different flesh; the distinction Paul eternally settles is in the possessive case - different ownership. Now the grammar of the sentence requiring the term Likeness demands a distinction between Jesus, the Son of God, and the sons of sin, otherwise the term is superfluous. God sent His own Son, His own property, His own flesh, in the likeness of Sin’s sons. Sin’s property, Sin’s flesh. The distinction is, therefore, in the ownership, not in the physical constitution. Well then, as the Editor admits. Sin here is personified and spoken of as a ruler and possessor. It will not do, therefore, to confound the ownership, and say, as the Editor says, that Jesus was sin’s flesh, when this very Scripture opens by declaring Jesus to be God’s. But the Editor has another object to subserve, viz. to involve Jesus as much under the curse as His brethren; and he must give colour to it, even at the expense of grammar. Then he says: “We would hesitate to say that the flesh of Jesus was sinful because Jesus never sinned”. Will the Editor therefore, inform his readers on what grounds he involves Jesus “under the curse”? We would hesitate to say the flesh of Judas was sinful, because it is absurd. It is character that becomes sinful, not flesh. “Was Jesus under the Adamic Curse?” While the Editor still holds the affirmative to this question, he now objects to it in its present form. We object to the unscriptural absurdity in any form. Could anyone under the curse redeem himself, to say nothing of others left to wriggle through without payment? The Editor points to his moral relation. But by morality, or works of law, shall no flesh be justified. Why? Because there was no law given to make alive, the first requisite before anyone is in a position to observe law. Jesus must therefore, come in this alive condition. How could this be? God was His father, and His subsequent morality enabled Him to retain that condition. This scripture alone might convince the Editor that he claims for morality a power it does not possess, “I was cast upon Thee from the womb. Thou art my God from my mother’s belly “. Was Jesus capable of morality at this moment? Will the Editor say this is not an alive condition? This morality argument swamps its advocates under the Divine rebuke for ignoring the fact that this ‘alive’ condition is the free gift of God. Attainable only through Christ. Paul emphatically denounces the idea: “if righteousness came by law, then Christ died in vain”.

If therefore, language is to be relied upon, the Editor’s theory of involving Jesus under the curse is doomed. Jesus must, therefore, come in this alive condition, and His subsequent morality enabled Him to retain it. This is precisely wherein Adam failed. Well then, the Editor sees that it is too glaring to state in an honest, indicative proposition, “That Jesus was under the Adamic curse”, and he must now clothe it in modified verbose. It is interesting to observe the Editor’s skill in “touching up” this time-honoured blunder until he arrays Jesus in a garb as unbecoming as the former. He now tells us that “As regards physical condition, Jesus was as much under the curse as His brethren; but as regards His moral relation to the Father, He was under no curse whatever.” This paralyses the law of contradiction. This leap from the concrete physical condition to the abstract moral relation enables the Editor to violate the fundamental laws of thought by which the unthinking are talked over. God’s message is absolutely silent regarding an abstract Christ. Did Jesus sacrifice His moral relation for us? This had nullified His power over the grave. Well, then, if you curse His physical condition, will it improve matters? Would not a cursed sacrifice pollute the table of the Lord? (Mal. i. 12 and 15: Hebrews x. 29). Did Jesus say, “This

is My cursed body which is given for you”? O Editor, abandon that cursed calumny, and accept Jesus as the gift of God, and price of our redemption. Has it not yet dawned on you that all this “very loose talk” against the Holy One of God is the result of changing the flesh of Adam after rebellion, and introducing, contrary to God’s word, another kind of human flesh? This assumption forces the most outrageous deduction ever drawn from Holy writ. There is one kind of flesh of men (I Cor. xv. 59). Change not the flesh of Adam, therefore, and you will be rescued from this unscriptural cursing of Jesus, and saved from the sham gloss of an abstract Christ. Then there will be no double-dealing when you say: “As regards His moral relation to the Father, He was under no curse whatever. He was not in the position of guilty man, who is outside the Garden of Eden, and can approach the Father only with a petition for forgiveness.”

His relation to the Father was not that of one alienated from Him as was Adam and all his descendants. He was from the beginning Holy (Luke 1.55), “A beloved Son in whom the Father was well pleased”. When Jesus as an entire person, is taken as the nominative of each of these propositions, the truth of God shines forth in meridian splendour; but make the Editor’s abstract moral relation the only nominative, and the Sham Gloss and subtle double-dealing appears in all the unwashed nakedness of its birth.

The third chapter is also a strange mixture. Here the Editor admits that, physically and morally, Jesus was absolutely sinless, and he reproves his own school for coining and applying to Jesus such unscriptural terms as “Constitutional Sinner”, etc., and points out that “The apostles do not draw a theoretical distinction between Christ’s character and Christ’s constitution”. This is all we contend for, provided the Logical issue be not confounded. From the Editor’s own pen, therefore we ask: If Jesus was “physically and morally sinless”, was He not therefore, free from every curse? What more of Jesus is left for the Editor to curse? But as he hired himself to involve Jesus, he must brush aside these contradictions and resort to some means by which to include Jesus. Does he succeed? Please pay attention. He says: “As regards physical condition, Jesus was as much under the curse as His brethren; but as regards moral relation, He was under no curse whatever”. Here then, the very editor, before his theory of cursing Jesus will work out, is forced to draw” a theoretical distinction between Christ’s character and Christ’s constitution”, the very thing he declares “the apostles did not do”, and for which he condemns his own brethren, as he says this is the direct cause of their coining such unscriptural terms against Jesus. Is any special mental alertness necessary to detect this “very loose talk”? Paul says: “No man, speaking by the Spirit of God, calleth Jesus accursed”, The Editor says: He was as much under the curse as His brethren. Reader, think for yourself.

Next: “The will of God was not accomplished short of the Crucifixion”. Precisely so; but, we would point out, exclusively on the sinners’ account. The Editor declares that: “There was no stage, before His death, concerning which the Scripture warrants us in saying at this point He had established His title to eternal Life”. We would contrast that utterance with the words of the Lord Jesus, viz.; “The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified” (John xii 24). But the Master shows that, if this had taken place without His dying, He would have remained alone. “Verily I say unto thee, except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit”. Glorious Metaphor of Jesus! God is the farmer, Jesus is His grain of wheat which He sowed in the earth before a crop could be raised. But that other lord is still sowing tares. Let us desist, therefore, from handing HIM out the seed by declaring Jesus to be under the curse, and sin’s possession. Let us discriminate between the wheat and the tares: between the Seed of God and the Serpent’s seed. But we would point out to the Editor that Hebrews ix. 12 also declares that Jesus, prior to His death, had earned His title to immortality. The Editor shows that the Greek verb here is in the middle voice, and is equal to “having got Him” eternal deliverance. This is accurate; but it is not enough. The English grammarian also terms this “a nominative absolute”, which proves beyond dispute that Jesus, prior to His death, had earned His title. It does not say that He entered the Holiest by His own blood having obtained eternal deliverance. The tense of this nominative absolute shows that the obtaining preceded the entering.

To be continued...

All of us have at one time or another watched a circus where you see these trapeze and balancing acts. Those feats of skill where the first performer balances on a rope high above the ground, then the next person stands on top of the head of the first, then a third, and so on, forming a whole column of three or four artists. It is breath taking to watch. One naturally thinks to oneself: "I hope nobody makes a mistake which is going to end in disaster". Of course accidents do happen at times, but if they do the curtain goes up, or the T.V. screen is blacked out to avoid panic among the audience. But have you ever thought of the success of these acts depends on two things.

1. Everybody involved must know his or her part to the minutest detail, carry it out conscientiously, and know the consequences of their failure to observe their part - and very important -
2. They must have complete faith in all the other performers doing their parts.

Or take the example of all of us as road users, be it as pedestrians, or motorists. We take it for granted that the other road users do their part. Usually they do, but occasionally we all could get involved in an accident in which we are the completely innocent victims of the other fellow not observing the rules. Have you ever thought when going over a traffic-light controlled crossing with lights in our favour 'Oh I hope the one on the road crossing mine has not missed his red light', it could be a disaster, and yet it occasionally happens. And if it does happen it is not necessarily, though true in most cases, due to carelessness of the other person. It might be absent mindedness through worry. Or a much simpler cause: a strange road, lights concealed or their light obstructed by a large tree. All this goes to show how easy it is to have an accident, and how we depend on Divine protection. And this not only on the road, or at work, but in the home where, too, we can have accidents, be it through carelessness at a moment of hurry, or absent mindedness, or through circumstances beyond our control. How wise it is to pray for God's protection always, whatever we undertake, not forgetting the simple everyday tasks which have their element of danger but which we are apt to be unaware of because we are so accustomed to them that we might get overconfident and forget about dangers. Now there is another example of faith, besides that of the trapeze artist in his partners, the road user in the reliability of other road users. That is our faith in God to protect us and to care for us to the end of our probation.

But there is one difference. A circus artist can fail and let the team down. A road user can cause an accident involving an innocent person through his own negligence. But God never fails. He alone is 100% reliable, infallible, even in times when things seemingly go against us. Whatever happens during our life time, God will not fail to resurrect us if we fall asleep before the return of His Son, if we do our part and keep the faith. But like in a circus, or on the road, do our part we must. And when we fail in high our endeavour to live worthy of our calling and ask God for forgiveness in true repentance and resolve to do better next time, provided it is not a sin unto death, we can be 100% sure of God's pardon through the intervention of our High Priest.

Concerning faith there comes to mind a recent series of letters to the editor of a local newspaper. Somebody made some disparaging remarks about the Bible being a lot of fairy tales, copied by various people from other ancient sources. There were several replies including one by myself about Bible prophecy being fulfilled in our own day, and present day events being foretold by prophets living centuries apart. But one point stands out. He said that the Bible expects us to believe the impossible. Now this remark, intended to belittle the Bible, came nearer the true facts than the writer realized. Had he said "The Bible expects us to believe what seems impossible" he would have been right. God set into motion the laws of nature, the laws of Physics, Chemistry, Electricity and so on. They are designed such that normally things take their natural course. But what many non-believers forget is that God, having designed the laws of nature, can intervene. And when He does, the result is a miracle that is an event which seems impossible to us because we are so accustomed to nature following its laws. The Bible is full of such examples, to mention only Sarah giving birth to a son well beyond childbearing age, Joshua's long day, the dial of Ahaz in Hezekiah's day going ten degrees backward or when Elijah sacrificed to the Lord in the presence of Baal's prophets, the fire licked up not only the sacrifice, but all the water around it, the very opposite to the laws of Chemistry according to which the water should have extinguished the

fire. God letting nature take its every day course and only intervening if necessary is vaguely comparable to a business or works manager delegating the everyday routine to the departmental heads under him. In a well-organized business or workshop intervention by the boss is unnecessary once everybody knows his work. But intervention is still a possibility, and in an emergency can become a reality. And so it is in nature. God set its laws in motion and things look after themselves. But God has the power to intervene any time He considers it necessary. How do we stand? Do we have the same faith in God as a circus artist in his partners?

Or as Abraham that he would have a son, contrary to the course of nature? Or the faith of Rahab when she hid the spies? These are the questions we must answer for ourselves. Let us conclude with the last two verses of the famous 11<sup>th</sup> chapter on faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews. "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect".

---

## **Christ. The Hope Of The World.**

O Friend, do you stand at the crossroads of life,  
Bewildered, dismayed by the envy and strife,  
The carnage and lust, the hatred and greed  
Extant in the world? Do you faint at the need  
For someone to come and cause sinning to cease  
And out of the chaos bring order and peace?  
If so, then for is the banner unfurled  
That says Christ is coming, the Hope of the world.

The hope of the world is established in Right,  
And shall not be vested in power and might;  
Though He who delivers the world from its chains  
Shall make use of both in acquiring His gains;  
But when war and tumult are brought to an end,  
And peace and good will all our footsteps attend,  
Then mercy and love shall distinguish His reign  
Who, born to be King, governs earth's vast domain.

The world is now sick, even nigh unto death  
And no one is able to quicken its breath,  
Or fan into flame the few embers of hope;  
'No soul with earth's troubles is able to cope.  
In councils and synods they're seeking to find  
a sure panacea for ailing mankind,  
Forgetting the promise He left us to cheer,  
'Look up, your redemption is now drawing near!'

The hope of the world lies in Jesus' return,  
And for this even now our longing hearts yearn!  
For when He returns He will banish all crime  
And bring in a reign that is grand and sublime.  
So don't be alarmed - things will turn out alright;  
The dawning of Day will dispel the dark night.  
And don't be dismayed at the evil darts hurled,  
For lo: He is coming, the Hope of the world!

Contributed.

---



## Flesh - Literal And Spiritual.

When the question is asked, what is flesh? The answer is quickly supplied, viz.. It is the Body Substance of man, beast and bird. But when someone says that the word flesh does not always mean the literal flesh in the Scripture, he is at once regarded as a lunatic, a fanatic, or some such epithet. It is a true saying that the best way to understand what the other fellow means is by hearing him out. That attitude the writer recommends to be adopted, because if adopted, one cannot then be accused of condemning unheard any theory. "Doth our Law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" (John 7:51). "Ye shall not respect persons in judgment, but ye shall hear the small as well as the great, ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgment is God's, and the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it". (Deut. 1:17).

It can be indisputably proved from the Scriptures that the term flesh does not always mean the literal flesh, and must therefore always be understood by its context. The following are examples of the term flesh meaning the Literal Flesh:-

"And the life which I now live in the 'flesh' I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me" (Gal. 2:20)

"For though we walk in the flesh', we do not war after the flesh" - Paul was the same flesh after as before conversion. (II Cor. 10:5)

"That which is born of the 'flesh' is 'flesh' ". (John 5:6)

"All flesh is not the same flesh, but there is one flesh of men". ( I Cor. 15:59 )

Let us take another meaning of the term flesh:-

"For when we were in the flesh..." (Rom. 7:5).

"But ye are not in the flesh..." (Rom. 8:9).

There are more than 250 references to the word flesh, and if we accept them all as meaning the literal flesh, then Romans 7:5 and 8:9 mean that Paul and his brethren were not in the literal flesh after conversion! It needs discrimination in the application of the Word, or otherwise confusion will set in. When Paul says, "for I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18), he does not mean that his literal flesh was sinful of itself because he was "sold under sin" (Rom. 7:14), it is a matter of the person having either the mind of the 'Spirit' or 'Flesh', it is a matter of the person's status under law. Note; "For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died". Rom. 7:7-10. Gen. 2:7. Luke 9:60.

In Galatians chapter 5 verses 16-26, we have a list of the works of the Flesh, and the fruits of the Spirit. There is not one item in either that cannot be accomplished if so desired. It is obviously a matter of the Mind of the flesh lusting against the Mind of the Spirit, and the Mind of the Spirit lusting against the Mind of the flesh.

If we do the one we shall not inherit the Kingdom (v. 21) and if the other we shall reap life everlasting. (Gal 6:8). If Paul meant that there was no good thing dwelling in his literal flesh, how are we to understand the following:-

"I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me". (Philippians 4:15).

"...but I keep under my body, - bring it into subjection". ( I Corinthians 9:27).

"I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel". (Acts 20:55).

"A good man out of the Good Treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things" ( Jesus ).

What huge mountains of obstacles are created by applying the word flesh to mean that the Literal flesh is no good? Cannot one person do evil, and another person with the same flesh do good? Cain and Abel prove the point! Again, if Paul meant the literal flesh, what does he mean when he tells his

brethren “ye are not in the flesh, but in spirit”? Did he mean that they were not literal flesh and blood? Absurd! If the flesh is clean, what is wrong with being in it? Paul meant they were not in Adam. when not in the flesh, but in Christ.

Dear Reader, the blunder is obvious. The very words, “who walk... after the Spirit”, are enough to prove that Paul’s expression relate to the mental sphere of application, though both mental states are manifested in the same flesh and blood bodies - mind of the flesh and mind of the Spirit. Again if Paul meant that in the literal flesh dwelleth no good thing, how could he say: “every sin that a man doeth is without the body”? (I Cor. 6:18).

Paul referred to the time when he was an unregenerated Jew under the law (Dr. Thomas Witness), and had Paul the mind of the Spirit then, he would most certainly have refrained from persecuting the sect of the Nazarenes, thinking that he was doing God’s service. Paul’s simple teaching is that in the Mind of the flesh dwelleth no good thing, being carnal. When Paul was in the flesh he did not recognise love to be the fulfilling of the law as he did when he was in spirit, and penned the words under consideration. In His spiritual relations he was no longer in the flesh.

Let us take another quotation from Paul’s use of the term flesh. “So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God” (Rom. 8:8). If Paul meant that no natural man could possibly please God because of his literal sinful flesh, then the Scriptures are entirely misleading and contradictory. But we thank God that Paul meant no such thing, as the list of worthies in Hebrews chapter 11 testify. They were men of like passions as ourselves. Enoch had this testimony that he pleased God (v. 5). Did not Paul know that there was laid up for him a Crown of Righteousness? Did he keep the Faith? (II Tim. ch. 4 ) Again, was not the Lord Jesus Christ in the literal flesh? Did He please God? He said, “the flesh profiteth nothing”, and He knew that “all flesh is grass”. Yet He said, “I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you” (John 6:58). How are we to harmonise these passages? Simply by discriminating between things that differ. First that which is natural, and then spiritual.

There is profit in the flesh, because it is out of the literal man that the spiritual man must be manifested. Jesus told the Jews that they were Abraham’s Seed and then proceeded to show that they were not Abraham’s seed. They were Abraham’s seed by fleshly descent, but not the Spiritual seed, because they did not do the works of Abraham (John 8:57-59). The teaching of Jesus and Paul were especially directed against any fleshly descent inheriting the Kingdom - it must be by faith. Paul said, “that is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God”. (Romans 9:8). There was profit in being a Jew (Rom. 5:1). Salvation is of the Jews. They received the Oracles of God, yet they neglected the weightier matters of the law; but though they were eternal and spiritual sores from the foot even unto the head. His Hand was stretched out still, if they would “wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes (Isaiah chapter 1).

God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him” (Acts 10:54 and 55). According to some the literal flesh is so sinful and unclean that we should always put one of the words before it. This is how Scripture reads thus added to:-

“Except ye eat the sinful flesh of the Son of man, and drink His sin defiled blood, ye have no life in you” (John 6:55). What blasphemy! Jesus was the manifestation of God in flesh and blood (“But a body hast Thou prepared Me” - (Heb. 10:5). And He could say, “for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have” (Luke 24:59 ). This was after His Resurrection. This flesh was divine nature. The Natural flesh with the present life will avail nothing if that relationship to the Spirit which giveth life Eternal be absent - the one is the natural production, the other, the Spiritual arising out of the natural through Faith, without which it is impossible to please God. (Heb. 11:6).

We read of Holy flesh in Haggai 2:11. So who would say that the same Literal Flesh of one beast was Holy and the same quality of Flesh of another un-clean? It was the law that made the difference between the Clean and the Unclean. This was written for our learning, as Jesus said, “Purging all Meats” (Mark 7:19). Paul, “I know that nothing is unclean of itself” (Rom. ch. 14). Peter, “What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common” (Acts 10:15).

Here we are reminded not only of beasts but of men. "But God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean" (Acts 10:28). Therefore it is the legal and moral aspect that must govern our understanding. The flesh was nothing of itself, nor the works of offering beasts, if faith was not associated with it. "Because they sought it not by Faith" (Rom. 9:2). "Not being Mixed or united by Faith" (Heb. 4:2).

We also read of "strange flesh, and likewise of those who defile the flesh" (Jude vs. 8 and 9). But we never read of 'condemned, carnal, clean, unclean, nor sinful, in connection with the literal flesh of men. It is all a matter of law - Mental. "But to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at My word" - (Isa. 66:2). But the Jew is hidden within, even Circumcision of the heart - Spiritual, not literal; whose praise comes not from men, but from God. ( Rom. 2:29). Then we have what is known as a Synecdoche, which means, when a part of a thing is used to represent the whole, or the whole is used to represent a part. Example: -

"I will not fear what flesh can do unto me;" or "what man can do unto me", (Psalm 56: 4,11).  
 "All Flesh had corrupted his way:" and "the end of all flesh is come" (Gen. 6: 12,15).

Remember Noah, verse 9, and that "an animal man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God... But the Spiritual man examines, indeed, all things" ( I Cor. 2: 14,15. E.D.).

Dear reader, let us take the advice to "reason together" without any pre-conceived ideas which we have imbibed by parroting supposed teachers, then we shall be upon the right road toward uniting brethren who have separated because they (conscientiously) cannot accept a laid down Basis of Fellowship which is not in harmony with the just attributes of a just God. Think on these things; be open minded; don't be afraid to cast old ideas on one side when the entrance of the Word giveth Light. And always remember the words: -.For who maketh thee to differ? What hast thou that thou didst not receive? (1 Cor. ;4:7 ). "As freely as ye have received freely give". (Matt. 10:8).

---

## FLESH

Ye (Jews) Judge after the flesh.	Jesus.
For when we were in the flesh.	Rom. 7 5
Condemned sin in the Flesh.	Rom. 8 5
Ye are not in the flesh.	Rom. 8 8
They that are in the flesh.	Rom. 8 9
Gentiles in the flesh.	Eph. 2 11
Abolished in his flesh.	Eph. 2 15
Not seen any face in the flesh.	Col. 2 1
Absent in the flesh.	Col. 2 5
Both in the flesh and in the Lord.	Philemon. v 6
God was manifested in the flesh.	I Tim. 3 16
That ye should no longer live the rest of your life in the flesh.	I Peter. 4:1,2
Life which I now live in the flesh is by faith	Gal. 2:20
Though we walk in the Flesh... not war after the Flesh.	II Cor. 10:5

F.J.Pearce.



## Letter from Helen Brady, to a correspondent...

I must apologise to you for not answering your letter of April 11 and for not acknowledging the pamphlet "Christ's death and your Salvation" which you so kindly sent to me - thank you for both,

I have recently suffered a bereavement and it is an overwhelming experience that saps the mind and takes away all incentive, consequently I have not been able to attend to things as I should, I think you will understand and excuse me.

It made me very miserable indeed to read the pamphlet on Christ's death you sent me. I am deeply sorry to see that people write such things but even more sorry to think that people believe them and think the views expressed in them are Biblical truths.

I see the writer believes as Roman Catholics do in Original Sin, fallen nature or sin-in-the-flesh. Whatever it is called it means we can't help doing wrong however hard we try. This idea offends against all reason for which of the commandments is it impossible for us to obey? What about the injunction from Christ himself "Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven"?

Original Sin is a heresy; it was introduced into religion by St. Augustine to excuse his own bad behaviour. The Roman Catholics exempt Christ from this fallen state by giving Him a divine nature and calling Him God, the Christadelphians preach, according to this pamphlet, that Christ had this fallen nature and therefore died for Himself as well as us and rose above his sinful inclinations because He was the Son of God - something which we are not. So cannot do. I find it difficult to say which idea I find the most illogical.

But if Christ needed to die for Himself what are we to make of statements like "holy, harmless and undefiled and separate from sinners"?

You will perhaps agree that the entire roots of all we believe is Jewish and begins with the Old Testament. No Jew would countenance the notion of Original Sin, why should he for he waits for a Messiah who is a man.

I believe Jesus was a man like other men except that God was His Father in the same way that God was Adam's Father. All through the Old Testament we read of sacrifices without spot and without blemish being offered as a substitute for the sinner to take away his sin. The blood of animals cannot take away the sin of man, so Jesus was the final sacrifice. He too was without spot and without blemish in every respect and he died for you and for me as a substitute.

I have never come across any other sect that believes that Christ had to die for Himself, but I can quite see how you have forced yourselves into this terrible position if you insist on believing there is something intrinsically wrong with the flesh itself. It just shows what an awful result can come from a wrong premise followed through to the bitter end.

Think for a moment what an unreasonable idea sin-in-the-flesh is. Adam and Jesus were both men; the first was created very good but the second so you say inherited proneness to sin from the first. They are both put on probation - what happens? Adam, not prone to sin because he had not yet fallen, sinned. Jesus prone to sin because He inherited the fallen nature was obedient. Both cases, therefore, indicate the opposite of what your doctrine would if it were valid. Adam ought never to have sinned, because his nature was unfallen and he was not prone to sin, Jesus ought to have sinned because His nature was fallen and He was prone to sin,

Sin has nothing to do with a quality of our flesh but is transgression of law.

The writer of the pamphlet seems to have no notion of the 3 different kinds of death that are spoken of in the Bible.

1. Natural death. 2. Figurative death. 3. Death as the penalty of sin, these are different things and must be distinguished. Natural death is a circumstance of our natural corruptible condition which we share with all the animal creation. It is not a penalty, it is not an obstacle to salvation nor does it necessarily claim all men. Jesus did not die to save us from natural death that is quite obvious because most of us still die.

Figurative death is the condemned position of living men and women who are alienated from God, Adam and Eve were in this position for the few hours between the commission of the first transgression and their typical redemption. It “passes upon” people when they are enlightened by the word, which requires us to recognise that God regards us as included in Adam on the federal principle - (I was taught about the federal principal in a Christadelphian Sunday school) it can be “put off” by accepting Christ as our ransom and typically dying the death in baptism.

One whose probation ends, either by natural death or the return of Christ, leaving them in this spiritually dead or condemned position, will have earned sin’s wages. In other words death as a penalty, the execution or carrying into effect of the above in an inflicted or violent death; this is what Adam incurred and which if he had suffered it, would have ended the human race there and then. This death was suffered in Adam’s stead by Jesus and instead of us as we are included under the federal principle. Jesus died for us, a substitute for Adam and for us.

Lest you should think these are heretical mad ideas, they were in fact views espoused by two of the persons Christadelphians regard with as much reverence as they do the inspired writers of the Bible, Robert Roberts and Dr. Thomas.

In Elpis Israel the Doctor says on page 115 : -

The Apostle says, “Levi, who receiveth tithes in Abraham”. Upon the same federal principle all mankind ate of the forbidden fruit, being in the loins of Adam when he transgressed...mankind being born of the flesh, and of the will of man, are born into the world under the Constitution of Sin. That is, they are the natural born citizens of Satan’s Kingdom.... Hence by Adam’s disobedience the many were made sinners.”

Robert Roberts wrote.....

“Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no evidence of this whatever... 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 organization. The phrase sin-in-the-flesh is metonymical. It is not expressive of a literal element or principle pervading the physical organization. Literally sin is disobedience, or the act of rebellion.”

This is unquestionably the truth and if Robert Roberts had maintained this position the subsequent history of

Christadelphianism might have been quite different. You and I would have been brother and sister united in the truth. As it is Christadelphians are a part of the apostate world the only part of the true gospel they hold is the return of Christ to the earth to set up his Kingdom but many churches preach that now. But with all the other churches you teach the hopeless error of fallen nature, but you have let it take you all further than any other denomination I know in that you preach a condemned Christ. The simplest believer is way ahead of you when he honestly says and believes in his heart “Christ died for me” and he does not blasphemously add “and he died for himself as well.”

I realise this will not be a welcome letter nor will you relish the views put forward but I felt I owed you a full and proper reply.

With good wishes, Helen Brady.

**WHAT IS TRUTH?**

**Pilate asked Jesus.**

**John ch. 18 v 58**

**In the Prophets day.  
Isaiah 8. 20.**

“...if they speak not according to this word,  
it is because there is no light in them.”

**In Christ’s day,  
Matthew 15 vs 8 and 9**

“This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth and honoureth me  
with their lips... but in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrine  
the commandments of men.”

**In Paul’s day.  
Colossians 2, 8.**

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit,  
after the traditions of men... and not after Christ.”

**In our days.  
The 20<sup>th</sup> century.**

Despite the warnings many cling to the 59 Articles of the Church of  
England; or The Papal bulls and edicts for Catholics; or The B.A.S.F.  
for most Christadelphians.

