

## EXTRACTS

From the writings of Christadelphian authors since Dr. Thomas

on

THE NATURE OF MAN

and

THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST

## CONTENTS

INDEX to Quotations from Christadelphian writings

ADAM'S NATURE BEFORE THE FALL

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FALL

THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST –

(a) THE NATURE OF CHRIST

(b) CHRIST'S BENEFIT FROM HIS OWN SACRIFICE

THE LAW OF MOSES – UNABLE TO GIVE LIFE

FELLOWSHIP

APPENDICES

Copies available from GRAPHOMATIC  
PUBLICATIONS

17 Bunora Ave.  
Ferny Hills, 4055, Q.

Issued under the auspices of the Arranging Brethren of the Coopers, Redcliffe,  
and Wilston Ecclesias.



## Index

### ● ADAM'S NATURE BEFORE THE FALL

#### ADAM'S NATURE NOT RELATED TO DEATH AT CREATION

1. Dr. Thomas — Eureka Vol. 1, Pg. 248
2. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 71
3. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 73
4. Robert Roberts — Visible Hand of God, Pg. 30
5. Robert Roberts — Visible Hand of God, Pg. 31
6. Robert Roberts — Diary of a Voyage, Pg. 67
7. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian 1898, Pg. 343
8. W.F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 13
9. W.F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 15
10. John Carter — 'The Atonement', Unity Booklet, Pg. 29

#### MAN NOT SUSTAINED BY CONTINUAL EATING OF THE TREE OF LIFE

11. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pg. 63
12. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pg. 248
13. Robert Roberts — Visible Hand of God, Pgs. 36,37

#### ADAM AND EVE INCAPABLE OF TEMPTATION FROM WITHIN BEFORE THE FALL

14. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 3, Pgs. 54-55
15. Robert Roberts — Visible Hand of God, Pgs. 34,35
16. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 25
17. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 17
18. John Carter — The Unity Booklet, Pg. 74

### ● THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FALL

#### THE DIVINE SENTENCE PHYSICAL IN ITS EFFECTS UPON MAN'S BEING

19. John Carter — Christadelphian, Nov. 1943, Pg. 195
20. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 69
21. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 71
22. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 3, Pg. 705
23. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 100
24. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 126
25. Robert Roberts — On the Effects of Adam's Fall — Christadelphian, Nov. 1944 by John Carter
26. Robert Roberts — The Evil One, Pg. 9
27. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1892, Pg. 24
28. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1898, Pg. 343
29. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pgs. 12,13,14
30. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 73
31. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 74
32. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 74
33. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 75
34. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 80
35. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 81, quoting Robert Roberts 1874

#### THE IMPOSITION OF THE SENTENCE NECESSITATED A MIRACLE.

36. Robert Roberts — Visible Hand of God, Pg. 32
37. Robert Roberts — Visible Hand of God, Pg. 34

#### AN INDWELLING TRANSGRESSION-TENDENCY THE RESULT OF THE FALL

38. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 91
39. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 25
40. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 24
41. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 32

#### 'SIN IN THE FLESH' A PHYSICAL CONSEQUENCE OF THE FALL

42. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 89
43. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pgs. 126,127
44. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1898, Pg. 343
45. W. H. Boulton — Epistle to the Hebrews, Pg. 182
46. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 16
47. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 17
48. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pgs. 17,18
49. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 18
50. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 19
51. Unity Booklet — Pg. 69, Robert Roberts reply to J. J. Andrew, Question 269

#### HUMAN NATURE IS NOW UNCLEAN AND DEFILED

52. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 127
53. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 129
54. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 130
55. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pg. 142 (First Edition).
56. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 65
57. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 73

**THERE IS NOW NO GOODNESS IN THE FLESH**

- 58. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 92
- 59. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pg. 249
- 60. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pg. 247
- 61. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1874, Pg. 88

**FLESHLY LUSTS ARE ACTIVELY REBELLIOUS AGAINST DIVINE LAW**

- 62. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pg. 247
- 63. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 19



***THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST***

**THE PIONEERS ON THE EFFICACY OF BLOODSHEDDING**

- 64. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pgs. 278,279
- 65. Dr. Thomas — Patterns of things in the Heavens, Pg. 45
- 66. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pg. 84 (First Edition)
- 67. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pg. 218 (First Edition)

***THE NATURE OF CHRIST***

**CHRIST RAISED UP IN THE PHYSICALLY UNCLEAN NATURE OF MEN**

- 68. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 128
- 69. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pgs. 202,203
- 70. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pg. 108
- 71. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pg. 106
- 72. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1874, Pg. 89
- 73. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1874, Pg. 237
- 74. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1877, Pg. 370
- 75. C. C. Walker — Christadelphian, 1922, Pg. 222
- 76. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 78

**CHRIST WAS A POSSESSOR OF AN INDWELLING TRANSGRESSION-TENDENCY**

- 77. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pg. 106
- 78. Dr. Thomas — Elpis Israel, Pg. 128
- 79. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pg. 160 (First Edition)
- 80. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1873, Pg. 361
- 81. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 36
- 82. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 20

**CHRIST'S MENTAL AND MORAL ADVANTAGES FROM HIS DIVINE BEGETTAL**

- 83. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 1, Pg. 101-103
- 84. Robert Roberts — Nazareth Revisited, Pg. 428 & 430
- 85. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 36
- 85a. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pg. 228 (First Edition)

***CHRIST'S BENEFIT FROM HIS OWN SACRIFICE***

**CHRIST'S REDEMPTION FROM DEATH INVOLVED THE PURGING OF HIS NATURE**

- 86. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 3, Pg. 705
- 87. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 3, Pgs. 586-587
- 88. Dr. Thomas — Eureka, Vol. 3, Pgs. 588-589
- 89. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1869, Pg. 83
- 90. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1873, Pg. 407
- 91. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1873, Pg. 407
- 92. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pg. 246 (First Edition)

**CHRIST'S UNCLEAN NATURE PURGED BY HIS OWN BLOOD (OR OFFERING)**

- 93. Dr. Thomas — Catechesis, Pg. 12
- 94. Dr. Thomas — Catechesis, Pg. 14
- 95. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1873, Pg. 405
- 96. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1882, Pg. 29
- 97. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1895, Pg. 261
- 98. Robert Roberts — Christadelphian, 1895, Pg. 262
- 99. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pgs. 170-171 (Fourth Edition)
- 100. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pgs. 90-91, (Fourth Edition)
- 101. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pg. 167 (First Edition)
- 102. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pg. 230 (First Edition)
- 103. Robert Roberts — Law of Moses, Pg. 237 (First Edition)
- 104. C. C. Walker — Christadelphian, 1921, Pg. 313
- 105. John Carter — Christadelphian, 1943, Pg. 195
- 106. W. F. Barling — Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pgs. 22-23
- 107. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 21
- 108. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pgs. 78-79
- 109. John Carter — Unity Booklet, Pg. 81

## Index

### CHRIST'S BODILY REDEMPTION – A REPRESENTATIVE TRIUMPH WHICH WE WILL SHARE

- 110. Dr. Thomas – Eureka, Vol. 3, Pg. 705
- 111. Robert Roberts – Law of Moses, Pg. 163 (First Edition)
- 112. Robert Roberts – Law of Moses, Pg. 165 (First Edition)
- 113. C. C. Walker – Christadelphian, 1921, Pg. 313
- 114. John Carter – Unity Booklet, Pg. 21

### ● *THE LAW – UNABLE TO GIVE LIFE*

#### THE WEAKNESS OF THE LAW – JUSTIFICATION IS BY FAITH

- 115. Dr. Thomas – Elpis Israel, Pg. 248
- 116. Dr. Thomas – Elpis Israel, Pg. 248
- 117. Robert Roberts – Christadelphian, 1875, Pg. 305
- 118. F. G. Jannaway – Christ our Passover.
- 119. W. F. Barling – Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pgs. 46-47

#### PERFECT OBEDIENCE IMPOSSIBLE FOR MEN BORN OF TWO HUMAN PARENTS

- 120. Dr. Thomas – Elpis Israel, Pg. 248
- 121. W. F. Barling – Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 34
- 122. John Carter – Unity Booklet, Pg. 52

### ● *FELLOWSHIP*

#### WHY COMPROMISE ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE ATONEMENT IS OUT OF THE QUESTION

- 123. Robert Roberts – Christadelphian, 1873, Pg. 324
- 124. C. C. Walker – Christadelphian, 1921, Pg. 313
- 125. B. J. Dowling & W. Smallwood
- 126. Robert Roberts – Christadelphian, 1885, Pgs. 388-389
- 126a. John Carter – Unity Booklet, Pgs. 10-11

### ● *APPENDIX 1*

#### JOHN CARTER ON THE ATONEMENT CONTROVERSY AND FELLOWSHIP

- 127. Article by John Carter – 'Winds of Doctrine' – Christadelphian, Nov. 1943, Pg. 195
- 128. John Carter on the B.A.S.F. – Article 'A Time to Heal' – Christadelphian, 1940
- 128a. John Carter on Clause 5 of the B.A.S.F. – Article, Christadelphian, 1940

### ● *APPENDIX 2*

#### THE ESTABLISHED CHRISTADELPHIAN INTERPRETATION OF 11 COR. 5:21 – JESUS 'MADE SIN FOR US'

- 129. Robert Roberts – Christadelphian, 1869, Pg. 83
- 130. Robert Roberts – Christadelphian, 1869, Pg. 83
- 131. Robert Roberts – Christadelphian, 1873, Pg. 361
- 132. Robert Roberts – Christadelphian, 1898, Pg. 343
- 133. Robert Roberts – Christadelphian, 1898, Pg. 390
- 134. W. F. Barling – Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pg. 22
- 135. John Carter – Unity Booklet, Pg. 20

# THE ATONEMENT

The following is a brief summary of quotations from the Writings of our Pioneers and other Brethren, as well as from the Unity Book, concerning the nature of man and the sacrifice of Christ. These quotations have been selected as being relevant to the current problems on the Atonement and related matters which have kept some Australian ecclesias separated for more than a decade.

The list is not exhaustive by any means, for much has been written concerning these same problems which emerged in the brotherhood in 1873. What follows will be more than adequate for the purpose for which it has been compiled, namely, to reveal a consistent scriptural interpretation of Christadelphian beliefs by leading Christadelphian authors since Dr. Thomas.

## ADAM'S NATURE BEFORE THE FALL

### ADAM'S NATURE NOT RELATED TO DEATH AT CREATION

1. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 1., P. 248 - "...but for an animal or natural body, it was 'very good', and capable of an existence free from evil, as long as its probationary aion, or period might continue. If that period had been fixed for a thousand years, and man had continued obedient to law all that time, his flesh and blood nature would have experienced no evil; ..."
2. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 71 - "When the work of the six days was completed, the Lord God reviewed all that He had made, and pronounced it 'very good'. This quality pertained to everything terrestrial. The beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, reptiles, and man, were all 'very good'; and all made up a natural system of things, or world, as perfect as the nature of things required. Its excellence, however, had relation solely to its physical quality. Man, though 'very good', was so only as a piece of divine workmanship. He was made different from what he afterwards became."
3. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel - P. 73 - "The truth is in few words, man was created with a nature endowed with certain susceptibilities. He was capable of death; and capable of endless life; but, whether he should merge into mortality; or, by a physical change be clothed with immortality, was predicated on his choosing to do good or evil."
4. Robert Roberts - Visible Hand of God, P. 30 - "The whole incident of the entrance of death into the world by Adam's disobedience, may be considered as the next exhibition of the visible hand of God in human affairs - an exhibition reaching down to our own day in the continuance and propagation of the death constitution then miraculously established. It has become quite unfashionable to suppose that death entered into the world at that time. It is universally accepted in learned circles that death has always been in the world."
5. Robert Roberts - Visible Hand of God, P. 31 - Of the Adamic race Bro. Roberts asks - "Did it commence mortal, or was it brought down to a mortal state after it appeared?" And answers - "...However unfashionable it may have become, therefore, and however unscientific and far behind it may seem, the man stands on logically unassailable ground who holds that death did not come into the world with Adam, but by him after he came; that at the first, he was free from the action of death in his organisation; that though not absolutely immortal in the sense of being indestructible in nature, he was in that state with respect to the working and tendency of his organisation, that death did not wait him in the natural path, but had to be introduced as a law of his being before he could become mortal. His was an animal nature that would not die left to itself - a natural body free from death."
6. Robert Roberts - Diary of a Voyage - P. 67 - "That death entered the World of mankind by Adam's disobedience."  
"That death came by decree extraneously to the nature bestowed upon Adam in Eden and was not inherent in him before sentence."
7. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian 1898, p. 343 - "Adam was in the 'very good' state before he sinned. He was not in the state his descendants are in. They are heirs of death: he was not. They have the sentence of death 'in themselves' (2 Cor. 1:9); he had not. Paul had to say, 'sin dwelleth in me': 'I see a law in my members warring against the law of my mind' (Rom. 7:17, 23); Adam could not have said this."

8. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 13 - "The record informs the reader of Adam's nature - that he was formed of dust, and taken out of the ground (Gen. 2:7). But no question of his return to the earth arose until he sinned. Here again, if he was, regardless of transgression, destined to return to dust, God's pronouncement is robbed of all its point and purpose as an expression of displeasure: it becomes merely gratuitous. A respect for the structure of the chapter, however, makes it clear that God's words to Adam were intended to reveal to him the physical effect, for himself, and his posterity, of his sin."
9. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 15 - "Death was no enemy of Adam's until his sin introduced it into the world. God made him a living creature: his sin made him a dying creature."
10. John Carter - The Atonement - Unity Booklet, P. 29 - "But sufficient to notice that they experienced a sense of shame and the sentence was passed that 'dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return'. Here death came, as the Apostle says, into the world through sin. But by and by children are born. What is it that they inherit? This nature related to death, that had now become the lot of Adam and his wife."

#### MAN NOT SUSTAINED BY CONTINUAL EATING OF THE TREE OF LIFE

11. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 1, P. 63 - "... as a change must have been operated upon the first Adam in order to transform him from 'a living soul' or animal, into an incorruptible and deathless creature, or spirit. In his case, this would have resulted from eating of the Tree of the Lives in Paradise, if he had been permitted."
12. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 1., P. 248 - "... and at the end of that long day, he might have been permitted to eat of the Tree of the Lives, by which eating he would have been changed in the twinkling of an eye into a spirit-body, which is incorruptible, glorious, and powerful; and he would have been living at this day."
13. Robert Roberts - Visible Hand of God, Pp. 36-37 - "These reflections are specially cogent in their bearing upon that other tree, of which he was not permitted to eat - the tree of life - in which resided the extraordinary power that had he partaken of it even after his condemnation, he would have lived for ever (Gen. 3:22). We may dismiss the idea that some have advanced, that Adam had been in the habit of eating this tree: and that so long as he did so, he was immortal, and that all that was necessary to secure his mortality was to cut him off from the use of the daily medicament. The prompt and energetic precautions taken 'lest he should put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life', are out of keeping with this idea. It was a single eating in the case of the single tree of knowledge; and the 'also' of this verse suggests that it was a similar contingency that was in view in the case of the tree of life. The interposition of 'a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life', would have been an excess of energy if the object was merely to cut off the supply of what required to be daily taken in order to have its effect. The withering of the tree or expulsion from the garden would in that case have met all the necessities of the situation. Then it would have been strangely disproportionate with the facts to speak of Adam, 'putting forth his hand and eating and living for ever', if he had to eat for ever in order to live for ever; and a rather over-vigorous use of language to call a tree of life that which had only power to impart life during the short time the quantity taken might remain in the system. The figurative use of the tree in the New Testament to represent the life everlasting which God will give to all who receive Christ at the resurrection, is inconsistent with the notion that it had to be used constantly to be effective. The whole surroundings of the case show that Adam had not taken of it, and that if he had, he would have become immortal. The only countenance to the contrary idea is the permission to eat 'of every tree of the garden' (Gen. 3:2,3; 2:16). It is argued that this must have included the tree of life. But this does not follow. The tree of life was evidently not reckoned among 'the trees of the garden'. It seems to have stood apart by itself, having a 'way' or approach that could be guarded (Gen. 3:24)."

#### ADAM AND EVE INCAPABLE OF TEMPTATION FROM WITHIN BEFORE THE FALL

14. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. III, Pp. 54-55 - "In its original creation, this flesh, like the serpent, was 'very good' of its kind. It had its affections and desires, which, like the affections and desires of other creatures, were innocent and harmless; and the man would not have known sin in the gratification of them, except the law had said, Thou shalt not eat of the tree. There would

14. Contd.  
have been no scope for the serpent's speculation if no law had been enacted; for without the law his doctrine could have no existence. The serpent's reasoning was sin in conception. 'Sin is the transgression of law', and this transgression was originally conceived in the brain of the serpent, and by reasoning on false premises, was transferred into the woman's, where, taking occasion by the commandment ordained for life, and in itself holy, just and good, it wrought in her all manner of intense and unlawful desires."
15. Robert Roberts - Visible Hand of God, Pp. 34-35 - "Whether it were natural endowment or divine inspiration that led the creature to entice the woman to disobedience, the moral bearings of the incident are the same. The obedience of Adam and Eve was put to the proof. And this was the object intended. Left to themselves, obedience would have been a matter of course; but it is not obedience of this mild description that is commendable to God. Obedience under trial is what pleases God. To give Adam and Eve an opportunity for obedience of this sort, or to terminate and set aside the obedience they were rendering, if it should prove of the flimsy order of a mere circumstantial compliance, this creature was placed in the way. It was a divine arrangement with a divine object".
16. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 25 - "In the Genesis account we are informed of the advent of sinful lust. God endowed man with a capacity for hunger and provided for its satisfaction (Gen. 2:9,16; 3:2). Accordingly, the trees both stimulated and satisfied appetite in Adam and Eve, with one exception - the tree in the midst of the Garden (3:3). For the forbidden tree they knew no desire (and consequently experienced no lawful lust) until the external tempter 'beguiled Eve'; for, when the serpent first questioned the divine prohibition, Eve's answer was indicative of a disposition of implicit obedience - 'God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it'. Far from being 'drawn away' of her own lust (as Nazarene authors allege), Eve as yet knew no temptation. The first lie, of which the unenlightened serpent was the father (John 8:44), altered this, and it was upon belief of that lie - and not before - that Eve knew temptation. ... What Eve now experienced was not the innocent sensation of hunger which the tree had not hitherto stimulated, but an urge to indulge appetite for an ulterior purpose. This was Eve's first experience of 'lust' - which is clearly attributable to the serpent's reasoning ..."
17. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 17 - "Such a force was not part of Adam's nature, or of Eve's, when God made them: God made man upright. The significant difference between Paul's language and that of Genesis indicates that this indwelling transgression-tendency is the legacy of Adam's first transgression. For it was Sin which deceived Paul (v.11), where it was the serpent which beguiled Eve (2 Cor. 11:3). The difference is striking. In Eve's case the serpent tempted from without; in Paul's case Sin was indwelling. Eve was deceived by the enticing speech of the outward tempter who aroused in her a desire to disobey; in Paul the desire existed already, and functioned spontaneously when the commandment came, for it was his own lust which enticed him (Jas. 1:14). This can mean but one thing; after the first transgression Diabolos was inward, not external."
18. John Carter - The Unity Book, P. 74 - But let us hear Dr. Thomas. Speaking of Adam and Eve, he says: "But when they adopted the Serpent's reasonings as their own, these being at variance with the truth, caused an enmity against it in their thinkings, which is equivalent to 'enmity against God'. When their sin was perfected, the propensities, or lusts, having been inflamed, became 'a law in their members'; and because it was implanted in their flesh by transgression, it is styled 'the law of sin'; and death being the wages of sin, it is also termed, 'the law of sin and death'; but by philosophy, 'the law of nature'."

## THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FALL

### THE DIVINE SENTENCE PHYSICAL IN ITS EFFECTS UPON MAN'S BEING

19. John Carter - Christadelphian Nov. 1943, P. 195 - "Dr. Thomas' general teaching is clear, whatever ambiguity may attach to a few of his phrases. 'Man's defilement was first a matter of conscience and then corporeal'."
20. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 69 - "The sentence, then, as a whole reads thus - 'In the day of thy eating from it dying thou shalt die'. From this reading, it is evident, that Adam was to be subjected to a process, but not to an endless process; but to one which should commence with the transgression, and end with his extinction."



21. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 71 - "When the work of the six days was completed, the Lord God reviewed all that He had made, and pronounced it 'very good'. This quality pertained to everything terrestrial. The beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, reptiles, and man, were all 'very good'; and all made up a natural system of things, or world, as perfect as the nature of things required. Its excellence, however, had relation solely to its physical quality. Man, though 'very good', was so only as a piece of divine workmanship. He was made different from what he afterwards became."
22. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 3, P. 705 - "The occasion of the curse was the transgression of the divine law by the 'very good' nature formed in and of the dust of the ground. 'Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground; for out of it was thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return'. So long, then, as the sin-nature continues to inhabit the earth, there must be sorrow, toil, and death: for the sentence pronounced upon the sinning nature, declares the continuance of the curse to be in all the days of its life."
23. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 100 - "If there were no moral evil in the world, there would be no physical evils. Sin and punishment are as cause and effect in the divine economy."
24. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 126 - "Sin and evil are as cause and effect. God is the author of evil, but not of sin; for the evil is the punishment of sin. ... The evil then to which man is subjected is the Lord's doing. War, famine, pestilence, flood, earthquake, disease, and death, are the terrible evils which God inflicts upon mankind for their transgressions."
25. Robert Roberts, On the Effects of Adam's Fall - Christadelphian, Nov. 1944 - by John Carter - In the disputations on this subject there has been reference to an article by Bro. Roberts in 1869. This article contains some ambiguous expressions, and on more than one occasion "those of a contrary mind" have quoted it. In searching for something else, we have come across an explanation of his meaning in the Christadelphian, 1877, page 471. A man has a right to explain what he meant and to admit the obscurity in his terms; but if we want to quote him, we must quote what he says he meant. Here then is his explanation in 1877:  

"The article in the Christadelphian for March, 1869, continues to represent our convictions on the subject of which it treats, viz., the relation of Jesus to the condemnation which we all inherit from Adam. On some details, however, of that general subject, we should, if we were writing it again, express ourselves more explicitly, in view of the searching controversy which has arisen on the subject of sin in the flesh. We should guard ourselves against forms of expression which seem to favour the false ideas that have come to be advocated. In asserting, for instance, that there was no change in the nature of Adam in the crisis of his condemnation, we should add, that though his nature continued of the order expressed in the phrase 'living soul', a change occurred in the condition of that nature through the implantation of death, as recognised in the article in question on page 83, col. 2, line 15, in the statement that death ran in the blood of Mary. And on the subject of sin in the flesh, while retaining the declarations on page 83, as regards the operation of our moral powers, we should add that the effect of the curse was as defiling to Adam's nature as it was to the ground which thenceforth brought forth briars and thorns: and that therefore, after transgression, there was a bias in the wrong direction, which he had not to contend with before transgression. Our mind has not changed on the general subject, but some of its details have been more clearly forced on our recognition by the movements and arguments of heresy."
26. Robert Roberts - The Evil One, P. 9 - "This sentence took effect upon Adam's nature, and became a law or quality of it, which was henceforth 'corruptible' and 'mortal'. His nature became physically a dying nature, and therefore a death-nature, because of sin. Afterwards, children were born to Adam with the result of multiplying men who, having his nature, had also the 'sentence of death in themselves' (1 Cor. 1:9) which came originally by Adam's sin, and who in their moral manifestations revealed the effects of their inheritance." (Written 1881)

27. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian 1891, P. 24 - "It does not seem to us possible to be more explicit on the subject of the effect of Adam's transgression than we have aimed to be for years past. If we have failed to convey our meaning in the definitions and arguments already employed, we cannot hope to succeed by the use of any others. Those who deny that any physical change was produced in Adam's sentence of death, forget the physical power of the curse of God. Its power was seen in the effect produced on Gehazi and Elisha's simple sentence (2 Kings 5:27). It was seen in the thorn and thistle-yielding tendency of the ground after the curse pronounced (Gen. 3:17-18). It was seen in the land of Israel under the law, in blight and sterility, and pest and physical derangements of various kinds (Deut. 28:18-22). And it is seen in our corruptible and mortal state which we inherit from Adam in whom it came by sin (Rom. 5:12; 2 Cor. 1:9). Before transgression, he was 'very good' in nature, for so the record declares. After transgression he was no longer in the very good state, but in the evil state ensuing on sentence of death."
28. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian 1898, P. 343 - "Sin, as disobedience, arose in their case from a wrong opinion concerning a matter of lawful desire, and not from what Paul calls 'sin in the flesh'. It became sin in the flesh when it brought forth that sentence of death that made them mortal, and all their children with them: that is, this sentence, passed because of sin, affected their bodily state and implanted in their flesh a law of dissolution that became the law of their being. As a law of physical weakness and death, it necessarily became a source of moral weakness. That which originated in sin, became a cause of sin in their posterity, and therefore accurately described by Paul as 'sin in the flesh'."
29. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pp. 12-13 - "God then dealt with each in turn, making all three subject to new experiences.  
(a) The serpent (verses 14-15). He was sentenced to go upon his belly and dust was to be his meat. These words may be metaphorical, but they are also literal, and the sentence affected him physiologically.  
(b) Eve (verse 16). In sorrow was she to bring forth children. The joy of motherhood was to be preceded by the bodily sorrow and anguish of travail (John 16:21). She too, was affected physiologically by the sentence.  
(c) Adam (verses 17-19). The prohibition and penalty were originally communicated to him alone (Gen. 2:16-18). Thus, appropriately, it was to him that the consequences of transgression were revealed in detail. The earth was to bring forth thorns and thistles; he was to eat bread in the sweat of his face. For the first time his return to the ground was mentioned. Thus, in his case also, God's sentence was physiological in its effects.  
  
It is fundamental to the Nazarene theory to deny that Adam's transgression produced any physical effect."
30. John Carter - Unity Book, P. 73 - "In addition to this inheritance of sinfulness man also inherits a dying nature. Paul traces both the sinfulness and the mortality to the fact that 'by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned'. He proves that death is an inherited evil ..."
31. John Carter - Unity Book, P. 74 - "The phrase 'Adamic condemnation' has been used in the Truth's literature, not as expressive of any personal condemnation derived from our descent from Adam but as a useful description of the inherited mortality that came into the world by the condemnation upon Adam.  
  
It will be sufficient to cite Bro. Roberts' lecture given in reply to Edward Turney, entitled The Slain Lamb (page 9-10):  
  
'It is the person, the individual, the nature that is condemned, because it was the person, Adam, that was the sinner. Condemnation in Adam means, therefore, that we are mortal in Adam; mortal in the physical constitution - the organisation.'
32. John Carter - Unity Book - P. 74 - See 18. above.
33. John Carter - Unity Book - P. 75 - "Then in an oft-quoted passage he says: 'The word sin is used in two principal acceptations in the scriptures: It signifies in the first place 'the transgression of law'; and in the next it represents that physical principle of the animal nature, which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh 'which has the power of death'; and it is called sin because the development, or fixation, of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression.'"

34. John Carter - Unity Book, P. 80 - "It was Adam who sinned; it was Adam who was condemned; it was the dust formed organisation that was sentenced to return to the ground. It was the physical man that sustained such changes as brought shame and fear and a defiled conscience, a defilement which then became, in Dr. Thomas' word, 'corporeal'. But the opposite error is now being taught. 'Sin' used by metonymy for the fleshly impulses, is now being separated from the individual and is being made of itself a reason for alienation and estrangement."
35. John Carter - Unity Book, P. 81 - Quoting Robert Roberts 1874 - "There is a principle, element, or peculiarity in our constitution (it matters not how you word it) which leads to the decay of the strongest or the healthiest. Its implantation came by sin, for death came by sin; and the infliction of death and the implantation of this peculiarity are synonymous things."

#### THE IMPOSITION OF THE SENTENCE NECESSITATED A MIRACLE

36. Robert Roberts - Visible Hand of God, P. 32 - "But this immortality Adam did not attain. Nay, he lost the good natural state which was his by creation. He had to confess to having eaten of the tree which he was commanded not to eat; and he had to suffer the dread sentence which doomed him, after a life of toil, to return to the ground from which he had been taken. In the execution of this sentence, we have the visible hand of God. Left to himself as God had made him, he would not have returned to the ground; left to itself, too, the ground would have brought forth beneficially and plentifully. It required what men call a miracle to depress to the level of the beasts that perish, the noble creature formed in the image of the Elohim, and to cause the earth to yield spontaneously 'thorns also and thistles'. 'Cursed is the ground for thy sake' (Gen. 3:17,18). It was not cursed before. 'Thou shalt die' (Gen. 2:17); this was not the prospect apart from disobedience. How were the two results effectuated? By the interposition of the Divine will causing the one and the other. The Divine power that made man and the ground 'very good' at the beginning easily modified the constitution of things for evil. A slight alteration in the condition of the soil and in the distribution and proportional activity of vegetable germs, was sufficient to make it soon apparent that the curse of God was on the earth, while as regards Adam, the sentence judicially pronounced would write itself in his constitution after the example of Elisha's imprecation of the leprosy on Gehazi who went from the presence of the prophet's words as white as snow. Mortality has been a fundamental law of human nature from that day to this. 'We have all to acknowledge with Paul, the 'sentence of death in ourselves' (II Cor. 1:9)."
37. Robert Roberts - Visible Hand of God, P. 34 - "He will do it by the power God has given him. God has given him power over all flesh with this view (Jhn 17:2). By it, he will change the bodies of his people that they may be conformed to the likeness of his own glorious body (Phil. 3:21). The spirit of God, changing the mortal to the immortal, will thus blot out the sentence of death written in Eden. Thus one miracle will undo the effects of another."

#### AN INDWELLING TRANSGRESSION-TENDENCY THE RESULT OF THE FALL

38. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 91 - "Such is the carnal mind, or thinking of the flesh, as illustrated by the works of the flesh: a hideous deformity, whose conception is referable to the infidelity and disobedience of our first parents: by whom 'sin entered into the world, and death by sin'. It is the serpent mind; because it was through his untruthful reasonings believed, that a like mode of thinking to his was generated in the heart of Eve and her husband. The seed sown there by the serpent was corruptible seed. Hence the carnal mind, or thinking of the flesh, unenlightened by the truth, is the serpent in the flesh. It was for this reason that Jesus styled his enemies 'serpents, and a generation of vipers'."
39. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 25 - "By their voluntary belief in, and consequent obedience to, the first lie, their nature was vitiated so that they hid themselves from God (verses 7-10), and their simplicity, or innocence, was corrupted (2 Cor. 11:3). Ever since, this (moral) corruption has persisted as an evil property of human nature, part of the vanity to which God made creation subject until the day of salvation (Rom. 8:20-25)."

39. (Cont)

"... There is thus a bias to evil within man which has to be offset by an acquired tendency to do good (Col. 3:1). This bias must either have been implanted at Creation, or be the direct consequence of Adam's transgression. The first proposition is inconceivable; the second states the facts."

40. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 24 - "John explicitly declares the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life to be 'not of the Father, but of the world' (1 John 2:16). There could be no more emphatic testimony that these 'lusts' are not desires which can be attributed initially to God, but sinful propensities which only came to exist as a result of the first offence."

41. John Carter - Unity Book, P. 32 - "What is it that is within us, that the Apostle describes as sin? Clearly they are the impulses that lead to sin. There are impulses there that are the result of sin at the beginning, which we have by inheritance."

#### 'SIN IN THE FLESH' A PHYSICAL CONSEQUENCE OF THE FALL

42. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 89 - "The Carnal Mind is an expression used by Paul; or rather, it is the translation of words used by him, in his epistle to the Romans. It is not so explicit as the original. The words he wrote are the mind of the flesh, the thinking of the flesh. In this phrase, he intimates to us, that the flesh is the thinking substance, that is, the brain; which, in another place, he terms 'the fleshy tablet of the heart'. The kind of thinking, therefore, depends upon the conformation of this organ. Hence, the more elaborate and perfect its mechanism, the more precise and comprehensive the thought; and vice versa. It is upon this principle such a diversity of mental manifestation is observable among men and other animals; but after all, how diverse soever they may be, they are all referable to one and the same thing - the thinking of the flesh, whose elaborations are excited by the propensities, and the sensible phenomena of the world."

43. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, Pp. 126-127 - "The word sin is used in two principal acceptations in the scripture. It signifies in the first place, 'the transgression of the law'; and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature, which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh 'which has the power of death'; and it is called sin, because the development, or fixation, of this evil in the flesh, was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled 'sinful flesh', that is, 'flesh full of sin'; so that sin, in the sacred style, came to stand for the substance called man. ... The nature of the lower animals is as full of this physical evil principle as the nature of man; ..."

44. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1898, P. 343 - See 28. above.

45. W.H. Boulton - Epistle to the Hebrews, P. 182 - "The Apostle Paul is very precise in his references to sin as a physical principle inherent in human flesh. He speaks of 'the body of sin' (Rom. 6:6), and says in relation to it, 'Sin, finding occasion, wrought in me, through the commandment, all manner of coveting'. 'Sin revived'. 'Sin, finding occasion, through the commandment beguiled me'. 'Sin, that it might be shown to be sin, by working death in me ... that sin might become exceeding sinful'. 'So now it is no more I that do it but sin which dwelleth in me. The law of sin which is in my members' (Rom. 7). Sin as spoken of in these verses must necessarily be considered as something different from actual transgression. It is 'sin' within that leads to sin in action."

46. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 16 - "Indeed, it is fundamental to the whole argument that what hindered the personality which conversion had transformed, was the literal flesh which conversion did not and could not alter; the inward man had to contend with the body of death, or outward man. The one had been bought with a price so that thereby the other, too, became God's (1 Cor. 6:20), but the outward man was still carnal, and physically Paul remained sold under sin, since with the flesh he continued to serve the law of sin."

47. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 17 - "It is in 'the flesh' or 'members' that the law of sin resides."

48. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pp. 17-18 - "Thus Sin, in Paul's argument, is not some legal overlord, but a transgression-tendency dwelling in the literal flesh of man."

49. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 18 - "The metaphorical use of the term 'flesh' is predicated on the fact that the literal flesh is evil by nature, so that its influence has to be replaced by that of the spirit, or teaching of the Word."
50. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 19 - "That is, because a man's nature is sinful by impulse, he cannot live after the spirit through spontaneous goodness, but only 'through the spirit'."
51. Unity Book, P. 69 - Robert Roberts' Reply to J.J. Andrew, Ques. 269 - "No. 'Sin in the flesh' is physical; justification from that is by the change that is to come at another stage, viz., at the resurrection. Justification is moral first, physical afterwards."

#### HUMAN NATURE IS NOW UNCLEAN AND DEFILED

52. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 127 - "Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature. Hence, the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean."
53. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 129 - "Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; ..."
54. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 130 - "Hence, the apostle says, 'By Adam's disobedience the many were made sinners'; that is, they were endowed with a nature like his, which had become unclean, as the result of disobedience; ..."
55. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P. 142 (First Ed.) - "Man is an unclean and corruptible organization, physically considered, living or dead: and his thoughts and actions are of the same complexion. We see him in his true nature when we compare him as he is, even at his best, with what he is promised to be, - the pure, incorruptible, spiritual, everliving, and glorious nature of the Lord Jesus and the angels."
56. John Carter - Unity Book, P. 65 - "We shall be cleansed of our mortality by the transforming energy of the Spirit of God when the Lord comes."
57. John Carter - Unity Book, P. 73 - "These being the characteristics of the flesh it can be described as 'unclean'. Besides having the inherited tendencies to sin we all do one or other of the things which Jesus said 'defiles a man'."

#### THERE IS NOW NO GOODNESS IN THE FLESH

58. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 92 - "In the animal man there dwelleth no good thing."
59. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 1, P. 249 - "All this is perfectly intelligible when understood of Sin's flesh, in which dwells no good thing, and which of itself can neither do right nor think aright."
60. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 1, P. 247 - "This shows how inherently bad flesh is in its thoughts and actions, that a good thing should stir it up to wickedness. Its lusts and affections are impatient of control. Paul therefore said, 'in me, that is, in my flesh, dwells no good thing'. When this, which is utterly destitute of any good thing, is placed under a good law, scope is afforded it to display itself in all its natural deformity; and to prove that 'the law of its nature' is not the law of God, but 'the law of sin and death'."
61. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian 1874, P. 88 - " 'Sin in the flesh', which is Paul's phrase, refers to the same thing. It is what Paul also calls, 'Sin that dwelleth in me' (Rom. 7:17), adding 'I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing! Now what is this element called 'uncleanness', 'sin', 'iniquity', etc.?'"

#### FLESHLY LUSTS ARE ACTIVELY REBELLIOUS AGAINST DIVINE LAW

62. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 1, P. 247 - See 60. above.
63. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 19 - "The conclusion is obvious: human flesh and the divine spirit, or influence, are opposites. The mind dominated by the one is incompatible with the mind dominated by the other. The

63. (Cont)  
mind of the spirit has to be acquired by a man because it is not a property of his nature. Man is never spontaneously good, and from his earliest hours has to be trained and disciplined by influences from without. Nowhere in the whole of Scripture is virtue ever attributed to the flesh; 'the flesh profiteth nothing', but 'it is the spirit that quickeneth' (John 6:63). 'The things that be of God' and 'those that be of men' (Matt. 16:23) are for ever hostile, for the literal flesh lusts against the spirit. This is the consequence of Adam's transgression, "..."

## ● THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST ●

### THE PIONEERS ON THE EFFICACY OF BLOODSHEDDING

64. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 1, Pp. 278-279 - "Hence, a bloodless man could not, upon the principles of the divine law, be a covering for sin. He must have real blood in his veins containing life, as in redeeming flesh and blood nature from death, he had to give the same sort of life for the life to be redeemed."
65. Dr. Thomas - Patterns of Things in the Heavens, P. 45 - "The Altar, we are informed, was the first thing sanctified by the pouring out of the blood: that reconciliation might be made upon it. The testimonies concerning the sufferings of Christ, reveal the mystery hidden within these sacrificial services."
66. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P. 84 - (First Ed.) - "The whole congregation, as they stood there before Moses, were in the antitypically defiled state. They had not only touched death through descent from the condemned of Eden; but they were in contact with its defiling power in their own bodies. There was therefore nothing but that which was just and seemly in the shedding of blood being made accessory to the establishment of a covenant of peace between God and them."
67. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P. 218 - (First Ed.) - "That burnt-offering should be required in the absence of particular offence (Gen. 8:20; 22:2) shows that our unclean state as the death-doomed children of Adam itself unfits us for approach to the Deity apart from the recognition and acknowledgement of which the burnt-offering was the form required and supplied. It was 'because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel', as well as because of their transgressions in 'all their sins', that atonement was required for even the tabernacle of the congregation" (Lev. 16:16)

## THE NATURE OF CHRIST

### CHRIST RAISED UP IN THE PHYSICALLY UNCLEAN NATURE OF MEN

68. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 128 - "Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus, if it had not existed there. His body was as unclean as the bodies of those for whom he died; for he was born of a woman, and 'not one' can bring a clean body out of a defiled body; for 'that', says Jesus himself, 'which is born of the flesh is flesh'."
69. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. I, Pp. 202-203 - "For, if Jesus Anointed did not partake of our nature, but obtained, somehow or other, a pure physical organization, or was only 'a similitude,' such as Daniel beheld by Ulai, then Paul's testimony is untrue; for he has testified, that 'forasmuch as the children (of the Deity) are partakers of flesh and blood, Jesus also himself likewise took part of the same;' and 'in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren;' and 'God sent his own Son in likeness of Sin's flesh, and for sin condemned the sin in the flesh' - Heb. ii.14,17; Rom. viii.3; but if the principle of corruption had not pervaded the flesh of Jesus, or if he were not flesh, he could not have been tried in all points as we; nor could sin have been condemned there; nor could he have 'borne our sins in his own body on the tree.' "
70. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. I, P. 108 - "Jesus, then, like all his brethren, is to be considered in two states, each state having a nature peculiar to it. In the former state, 'he was crucified through weakness;' but in the after state wherein he now is, 'he liveth by the power of the Deity' - 2 Cor. xiii.4. In

70. (Cont)  
the former state, the flesh was 'the filthy garments' with which the Spirit-Word was clothed (Zech. iii.3); 'the iniquity of us all' that was laid upon him; 'the soul made an offering for sin' (Isa. liii.6,10); but, as He now is, the filthy garments have been taken away; 'his iniquity has passed from him,' and he is clothed with 'change of raiment.' "
71. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. I, P. 106 - "... the character of Jesus was holy, harmless, undefiled, without spot, or blemish, or any such thing; but his flesh was like our flesh, in all its points, - weak, emotional, and unclean."
72. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian 1874, P. 89 - "It is a principle of uncleanness and corruption and weakness ... Our experience answers to Paul's and leads us to sympathize exactly with his exclamation, 'Oh wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?' The body of the Lord Jesus was this same unclean nature in the hand of the Father, that deliverance might be effected by God on His own principles and to His own glory ... God accepts no compromise. He provided a prisoner furnished with the key of obedience who could open the door for all who should name themselves after him."
73. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian 1874, P. 237 - "If you admit his body (Jesus) was the same as ours, you are bound to admit the body of Jesus was dead, because ours is (Rom. 8:10); it was vile, because ours is (Phil. 3:21), it was mortal, because ours is (1 Cor. 15:53); it was unclean, because all born of women are (Job 14:4; Psalm 51:5); it had the sentence of death in itself, because Paul's had (2 Cor. 1:9), the reason of all which was, that it was produced exactly as ours, in being made and born of a sinful woman."
74. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian 1877, P. 370 - "They think with our poor Renunciationist friends, that they honour Christ in speaking of him as 'untainted with the Adamic curse' - not perceiving that thereby they unfit him for the very work he came to do in getting rid of that curse himself, and for all who should afterwards come into him and partake of his victory."
75. C.C. Walker - Christadelphian, 1922, P. 222 - "Partaking thus of the flesh, he (Christ) was 'this corruptible', though in character sinless, and so needed cleansing and redemption as much as his brethren. And as concerning the woman, we read of 'the days of her purification according to the Law of Moses' (Luke 2:22). If the flesh be 'clean' why should a woman having a man-child be 'unclean seven days'? (Lev. 12:2). And why should the child be circumcised the eighth day, and the mother then continue unclean another thirty-three days, 'until the days of her purifying be fulfilled'? What is circumcision but the drastic repudiation of this so-called 'clean flesh'?"
76. John Carter - Unity Book, P. 78 - "In the Law of Moses, Bro. Roberts quotes the following from another brother: 'We are forgiven and shall be saved for Christ's sake, he required no forgiveness ... Christ was undefiled in mind, absolutely pure, therefore he required no cleansing as pertaining to the conscience at baptism, for there never was a moment in his life when God was displeased with him; he always did and said what pleased the Father. He only required cleansing in nature which was done after resurrection'."

#### CHRIST WAS A POSSESSOR OF AN INDWELLING TRANSGRESSION-TENDENCY

77. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 1, P. 106 - "For this cause, and forasmuch also 'as the children (of the Deity) are partakers of flesh and blood, He also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the diabolos,' or elements of corruption in our nature, inciting it to transgression, and therefore called 'Sin working death in US' - Rom. vii.13; Heb. ii.9,14."
78. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P. 128 - "According to this physical law, the Seed of the woman was born into the world. The nature of Mary was as unclean as that of other women; and therefore could give birth only to 'a body' like her own, though especially 'prepared of God'. Had Mary's nature been immaculate, as her idolatrous worshippers contend, an immaculate body would have been born of her; which, therefore, would not have answered the purpose of God, which was to condemn sin in the flesh; a thing that could not have been accomplished, if

78. (Cont)  
 Sinful flesh being the hereditary nature of the Lord Jesus, he was a fit and proper sacrifice for sin; especially as he was himself 'innocent of the great transgression', having been obedient in all things. Appearing in the nature of the seed of Abraham, he was subject to all the emotions by which we are troubled; so that he was enabled to sympathize with our infirmities, being 'made in all things like unto his brethren'."
79. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P. 160 (First Ed.) - " 'Condemn sin in the flesh' (Rom. 8:3). That he [Christ] was sent 'in the likeness of sinful flesh' for the accomplishment of the work shows that it was a work to be done in him. Some try to get away from this conclusion (and this is the popular habit) by seizing on the word 'likeness' and contending that this means not the same, but only like. This contention is precluded by the use of the same term to his manhood: 'he was made in the likeness of MEN'. He was really a man in being in the likeness of men: and he was really sinful flesh in being in 'the likeness of sinful flesh'."
80. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1873, P. 361 - "Jesus by being of the seed of Abraham, became sin for us; that sin was condemned in the flesh, our sins were borne in his body on the tree; these things could not have been accomplished in a nature destitute of that physical principle, styled 'sin in the flesh'."
81. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 36 - "From his mother he inherited all the propensities of sinful human nature; from his Father he could not fail likewise to inherit divine qualities of character."
82. John Carter - Unity Book, P. 20 - "... through Adam's sin the original very good state was lost, and his posterity inherit a nature with a tendency to sin to which all have succumbed. Because this inherited tendency is so evident a characteristic of human nature, and because it is the result and the cause of sin, Paul by the use of metonymy can describe it as sin: ...Christ the sinless was made to be sin in sharing in the effect of sin in his life, and by his death providing the conditions for the forgiveness of sins and, finally, the removal of all the effects of sin."

#### CHRIST'S MENTAL AND MORAL ADVANTAGES FROM HIS DIVINE BEGETTAL

83. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 1, Pp. 101-103 - "Thus, 'the Logos became flesh, and dwelt among us,' says John, 'and we beheld his glory, glory as of an only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth;' for 'the law was given through Moses; the grace and the truth came through Jesus Anointed' - Jno. i. 14, 17. Now, 'Theos was the Logos,' says John; that is, Deity was the Word; and this Word became flesh in the manner testified. Was the product, therefore, not Deity? Did the union of spirit with flesh annihilate that spirit, and leave only flesh? Was the holy thing born a mere son of Adam? or 'the fellow' and 'equal' of the Deity? - Zech. xiii. 7; Jno. v. 18; Phil. ii. 2. The latter unquestionably.

After this manner, then, the Eternal Power, or Yahweh, became flesh; and commenced the initiation of his promise, that He would be to Israel for Elohim. The chief Eloah was now born; and, as the Star of Jacob cradled in a manger, received the homage of the wise, and the acclamation of the heavenly host. This babe was the 'body made in secret' through which 'the Eternal Spirit,' when it should attain to 'the fulness of the times,' designed to manifest himself. ...

The words, then, that came out of the mouth of Jesus, are to be received as the direct teaching of the Eternal Spirit, and to be interpreted of him. ...

In view of this moral manifestation of Deity in flesh, termed by Peter the Divine Nature, one of these Elohim, in writing to others of them, says, 'Behold what great love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of Deity.'

84. Robert Roberts - Nazareth Revisited, Pp. 428 & 430. "The divine origin of Christ, as expounded in the writings of the prophets and the apostles, supplies an explanation of every phase in which the gospel narratives exhibit the Lord Jesus Christ, and every utterance that came out of his mouth. They give the key that is beyond the reach alike of those who consider him to have been a mere man, and those whose theology compels them to describe him as eternal God. They account to us for what appear otherwise to be contradictions. They explain



84. (Cont)

to us why in a man, the deportment of God is visible; why in sinful flesh, a sinless character was evolved; why in the impotent seed of Abraham, the power of Abraham's God should be shown; why a man born as a babe in Bethlehem should speak of having come down from heaven; why a man not forty years of age should speak as if he had been contemporary with Abraham; why a man should at once be David's son and David's Lord; why a man of our own flesh and blood should assume the authority that belongs to God only, saying, 'Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well, for so I am'; why of a man it should be said that the world was made by him, that he dwelt in the bosom of the Father, and that he was the image of the invisible God, by whom and for whom all things had been created. ... They are necessary to give us a complete understanding of his character, which was perfect. He is an exact representation of the character of the Eternal Father."

85. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P. 36 - "Secondly, it is just as clearly attested, however, that Christ possessed unique powers. He was made of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord (Is. 11:1-3), so that man never spake like this man (John 7:46). He, the man of God's right hand, was made strong for God (Psa. 80:17). At the age of twelve he could confound the doctors of the law (Luke 2:46-47), and even as a babe he was aware of his mission (Psa. 22:9-10). Such declarations could never apply to any other man than Christ, and their import is clear - that Jesus was made essentially like unto his brethren does not alter the fact that he was, in important respects, different from us. ... The affinity between parent and offspring which can prove so strong in humans must, in the case of God and His beloved Son, have been transcendent. Thus Christ at birth inherited on the one hand the human urge to disobey God's Law, and on the other the power to maintain a sinlessness to which his brethren can only hope in measure to attain after repeated failure, and with God's help."

85A. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P. 228 (First Ed.) - "By this means of paternity, Christ escaped the hereditary moral and mental bias of the race, and received such a divine intellectual impress as made him strong, in spirit or mind, and of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord. He was therefore enabled to overcome all the promptings and desires of his unclean nature derived from his mother, and maintained his moral perfection without blemish and undefiled."

## CHRIST'S BENEFIT FROM HIS OWN SACRIFICE.

### CHRIST'S REDEMPTION FROM DEATH INVOLVED THE PURGING OF HIS NATURE

86. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 3, P. 705 - "So long, then, as the Sin-Nature continues to inhabit the earth there must be sorrow, toil, and death; for the sentence pronounced upon the sinning nature declares the continuance of the curse to be in all the days of its life.

To abolish the curse, then, is equivalent to the abolition of the nature cursed with sorrow, toil, disease, and death. This abolition is the consummation of all things, by which is introduced an entirely new creation; the basis of which is a nature that neither has nor can transgress - that is, the Divine Nature. All that comes out of the ground is cursed, and unclean; so that even the body of Jesus, and the bodies of the approved saints, in resurrection, require to be justified, rectified, purged, or perfected, by all-absorbing spirit: which makes every atom of their substance instinct with incorruption and life; in other words, transforms it into spirit."

87. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 3, Pp. 586-587 - In Gal. iv.4, Paul says, the Son of the Deity sent forth, 'was made of a woman, made under the law.' The body so made and born was therefore unclean materially and Mosaicallly; and could no more 'enter heaven itself to appear in the presence of Deity for us' (Heb. ix.24) in that nature, than that flesh and blood should inherit his kingdom - 1 Cor. xv.50. Would any one intelligent in the word affirm, that an unclean body, made yet more unclean by becoming a corpse, and therefore defiling to every one who touched it, becomes clean by being put into an unclean place, and lying there for three days, less or more? Would the simple fact of that corpse coming to life in a tomb which its presence had Mosaicallly defiled, and walking out of it, make it a clean body, or nature? If it be replied that it would, why then was not Lazarus, whom Jesus raised, clean of nature? If it be replied, 'he was;' then was not Jesus the 'first out of a resurrection of dead ones' - Acts xxvi.23.

87. (Cont)

But, passing through the grave cleanses no one. They who emerge thence, 'come forth' with the same nature they carried into it; and therefore their coming forth is Resurrection. If the same kind of body did not come forth that was buried, it would not be Resurrection, but only surrection, as in the case of the first man. Jesus 'rose again' (1 Cor. xv.4); his coming forth was therefore resurrection. He rose again the same Jesus that was buried, only that instead of being dead, he was alive again. He was buried under the curse of the law, which 'made him a curse for' our benefit (Gal. iii.13): he came forth while that same law was in force and operation. His coming forth upon the arena of his execution did not relieve him from the curse of that law, which sentenced him to continuous and everlasting death; so that, if they could have recaptured him, the Mosaic authorities would doubtless have returned him into death."

88. Dr. Thomas - Eureka, Vol. 3, Pp. 588-589 - "But when the body was anointed again with holy spirit and power, or 'spirit of holiness,' after it was born of the second unclean place, the tomb, it was not only endued and imbued with wisdom and power as before, but it was itself transformed into an embodiment of eternal power, in which there is no weakness, corruption, or principle of death at all. It was then 'revived,' as well as risen again. It became 'the body of his glory,' (Phil.iii.21), 'raised in glory' from the earthy body which is 'without honor,' (1 Cor. xv.43); and forty days after, 'taken up in glory' - 1 Tim. iii.16."
89. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1869, P.83 - "If Jesus came in the flesh, he was under condemnation, for the nature he inherited was a condemned one. The sentence of death ran in the blood which he inherited, from Adam through Mary. He was, therefore, 'in the days of his flesh', as much under its power as those he came to save. This conclusion follows from the testimony that he was a man; it would stand secure upon that foundation alone, but it is also expressly affirmed in divers parts of the Word. It is testified that he was 'made sin for us' (2 Cor. 5:21)."
90. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1873, P.407 - "Christ was 'the seed of Abraham', the flesh of David, the sin-nature of the condemned Adam, for the condemnation of sin in the flesh. The condemnation rested on him, which was the uncleanness, and this antitypical uncleanness of the 'one great offering' could only be cleansed after the example of the type - by death and burning: the burning being the change effected by the Spirit on the risen body of the Lord after his death for sin. The new theory contains no parallel to this uncleanness of the typical 'bodies of those beasts burnt without the camp'."
91. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1873, P.407 - "The red heifer was without spot and had never been put under yoke, pointing to the sinlessness of Christ, and of the fact that he was brought into the world for the service of God alone; but what counterpart had the uncleanness (Num. 15)? The answer is found in the fact that he was 'the seed of Abraham', the flesh of David - the sin nature of the condemned Adam, for the condemnation of sin in the flesh. The condemnation rested on him, which was the uncleanness, and this anti-typical uncleanness of the 'one great offering' could only be cleansed after the example of the type."
92. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P.246 (First Edition) - "Now these things (offerings for defilement through death) were shadows, of which we see the perfect object projecting them when we see Christ as a partaker of condemned human nature for its emancipation and purification on the principles and with the object already fully indicated. Away from this, all is confusion."

#### CHRIST'S UNCLEAN NATURE PURGED BY HIS OWN BLOOD (OR OFFERING)

93. Dr. Thomas - Catechesis, P.12 - "The flesh in or through which the Deity was manifested was, for the brief space of thirty-three years, inferior to the angelic nature, which is spirit. It had been 'purified' by the sprinkling of its own blood on the cross; it came forth from the tomb an earthy body, which, in order to become spirit, and so 'equal to the angels,' had to be 'justified,' rectified, 'made perfect,' or quickened, 'by spirit.' "
94. Dr. Thomas - Catechesis, P.14 - "Did the resurrected and quickened body enter the Divine Presence with its blood, or through its blood?"
- 'Through his own blood:' The body is nowhere said to enter heaven with its blood. Aaron entered the Holies with blood, representative of Jesus entering the true, through his own blood. In this the shadow and the substance approximate as nearly as the parable demands."

95. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1873, P.405 - "Paul's statement (Heb. 7:27) is that Jesus did once what the typical high-priest did daily. What was that? 'Offered first for his own sins, and then for the people's'. It follows that there must be a sense in which Jesus offered for himself also, a sense which is apparent when it is recognized that he was under Adamic condemnation, inherited in his flesh."
96. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1882, P.29 - "What does the Bible teach? It teaches that since Adam transgressed in the garden of Eden, a man, the seed of woman partaking man's sinful nature, if found obedient and sinless all his life, should restore and rectify the relation between God and man, and repair the breach of Eden by dying on behalf of man, not instead of man; and such a man was found in Jesus, who being a son of David, and the seed of Abraham, had to condemn sin in his own flesh on the cross, and had to redeem for himself on account of his own flesh, and afterwards to redeem his people from their sins (see Heb. 5:1,3; and Lev. 9:7)."
97. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1895, P.261 - "If we ask why it was that the Holiest of all could not be entered without a perfect sacrifice, the same answer ('God willed it', see Elpis Israel, p. 149) must be given. If we then ask whether God would have required a declaration of His righteousness if Christ had been the only one to enter life, we ask a presumptuous question. If God's purpose had been different His will might have been different. As it was He required Jesus to submit to a sacrificial death, consequently a violent death was necessary for his own redemption."
98. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1895, P.262 - "Christ required redemption from Adamic nature equally with his brethren, and the mode of redemption which God had ordained was a perfect obedience culminating in a sacrificial death."
99. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, Pp. 170-171 - "But the sacrificial blood was applied to everything as well - Aaron and his sons included (see Lev. 8:14-15, 23-24). An atonement had to be made by the shedding and the sprinkling of blood for and upon them all (Lev. 16:33). As Paul remarks, 'almost all things by the law are purged with blood' (Heb. 9:22). Now all these things were declared to be 'patterns of things in the heavens', which it is admitted on all hands converge upon and have their substance in Christ. There must, therefore, be a sense in which Christ (the antitypical Aaron, the antitypical altar, the antitypical mercy-seat, the antitypical everything), must not only have been sanctified by the action of the antitypical oil of the Holy Spirit, but purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice.
- This conclusion is supposed to be weakened by the statement of Lev. 16:16, that the atonement for the holy place, altar, etc., was to be made 'because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins'. That is, it is argued from this, that the holy things would have had no uncleanness in themselves apart from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. This must be granted, but it must also be recognised that because the children of Israel were sinful and polluted, the holy things were reckoned as having contracted defilement in having been fabricated by them and through remaining in their midst. This cannot be denied on a full survey of the testimony. They were ceremonially unclean, 'because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and had to be cleansed by the holy oil and the sacrificial blood before they were acceptable in the Mosaic service.
- Now, this is part of the Mosaic figure. There must be an antitype to it. What was it? The holy things, we know, in brief, are Christ. He must, therefore, have been the subject of a personal cleansing in the process by which he opened the way of sanctification for his people. If the typical holy things contracted defilement from connection with a sinful congregation, were not the antitypical (Christ) holy things in a similar state, through derivation on his mother's side from a sinful race? If not, how came they to need purging with his own 'better sacrifice'?"
100. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, Pp. 90-91 - "The type is before us; the antitype is in Christ. He is the altar, the book of the law, and the other things that come after. The sprinkling of the typical blood on both by Moses prefigured the operation of divine love and wisdom in Christ's own sacrifice. It was a sacrifice operative on himself first of all: for he is the beginning of the new creation, the firstfruits of the new harvest, the foundation of the

100. (Cont)

the new temple. He was the nucleus of a new and healthy life developed among men, for the healing of all who should become incorporate with it. As such, it was needful that he should himself be the subject of the process and the reaper of the results. Hence the testimony that 'the God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, the great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant' (Heb. 13:20), and that by his own blood, entering into the holy place, he obtained (middle, or self-subjective, state of the verb) eternal redemption ('for us' is interpolated) (Heb. 9:12). The Father saved him from death for his obedience unto death (Heb. 5:7-9, Phil. 2:8-9, Rom. 5:19).

The common view which disconnects Christ from the operation of his own sacrifice would have required that Moses should have left the altar and the book of the law unsprinkled. These were parts of what Paul terms 'the patterns of things in the heavens', concerning which he remarks that it was necessary they should be purified with the sacrifices ordained. The application of this to Christ as the antitype he makes instantly; 'but (it was necessary that) the heavenly things themselves (should be purified) with better sacrifices than these' (Heb. 9:23). The phrase 'the heavenly things' is an expression covering all the high, holy and exalted things of which the Mosaic pattern was but a foreshadowing. They are all comprehended in Christ, who is the nucleus from which all will be developed, the foundation on which all will be built. The statement is therefore a declaration that it was necessary that Christ should first of all be purified with better sacrifices than the Mosaic: 'Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place'; 'not into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us' (Heb. 9:12,23-24)."

101. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P.167 (First Edition) - "There is no counterpart to this (Lev. 16:33) if Christ is kept out of his own sacrifice, as some thoughts would do. He cannot so be kept out if place is given to all the testimony - an express part of which is that as the sum total of the things signified by these patterns, he was 'purified with a better sacrifice than 'bulls and goats' - viz. his own sacrifice' (Heb. 9:23,12)."
102. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P.230 (First Edition) - "The sin-offering represented and ritually prophesied that aspect of the death of Christ by which he atoned for sin. Christ himself did no wrong, and was never alienated from God, but always did that which pleased Him, both prior to and after his baptism. Thus was foreshadowed in this beautiful type, the cleansing of the human nature of Christ by his own death, and of our cleansing on account of the same, by the favour of God through faith."
103. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P.237 (First Edition) - "That the second bird (in leprosy cleansing) should be dipped in the blood of the first bird is, therefore, in harmony with what has since been revealed concerning Christ as the antitypical sacrifice. He was cleansed by his own death from the stain of death to which he was subject in common with us, as the descendant of the first sinner, and as the appointed sufferer from it that he might take it away."
104. C.C. Walker - Christadelphian, 1921, P.313 - "Christ then was 'man', and being man needed salvation from death just as other men do, though he was sinless. Hence his sacrifice, agreeably to the type of the High Priest under the Law, was first for himself, and then for the people. 'This he did once, when he offered up himself'. (Heb. 7:27). Thus he was saved from death (Heb. 5:7), and 'though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered' (Heb. 5:8). Thus God 'brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant' (Heb.13:20). Thus, 'by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption' (Heb. 9:12)."
105. John Carter - Christadelphian, 1943, P.195 - "Because Jesus partook of our nature, he shared redemption. He was 'saved out of death'; he 'obtained eternal redemption'; 'by his own blood he entered in once for all into the holy place'; he was 'brought again from the dead by the blood of the everlasting covenant.' 'By man came the resurrection from the dead'. (Heb. 5:7; 9:12; 13:20; 1 Cor. 15:21). These testimonies plainly declare that Jesus benefited by his own death. It is essential to ascertain the facts that are clearly stated in Scripture; and any theory which does not find a place for all the facts is either incomplete or wrong."

106. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pp. 22-23 - "It follows that Christ's death possessed an efficacy for himself also. This the Apostle establishes by an interpretation of the Tabernacle ritual. Atonement had to be made for the altar, 'to cleanse it and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel' (Lev. 16:18-19). Atonement had similarly to be made for the other vessels of the Tabernacle, and even for the Tabernacle itself (verse 16), because it was in the midst of uncleanness (Heb. 9:21). Thus where moral sin did not exist, uncleanness necessitated atonement still. But 'without the shedding of blood' such 'remission' or 'purging' was not possible (verse 22). The Apostle tells us what this signified. 'It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these (blood, water, hyssop, etc., verse 19); but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these' (verse 23).

Let the parallelism be noted.

- (a) The patterns of things in the heavens were purified, with animal blood.
- (b) The heavenly things themselves had likewise to be purified, but with better sacrifices.

Such purification was not in either case a purification of moral sin, but of the uncleanness resulting from contact with sin. In the case of 'heavenly things themselves' (i.e., the person of Jesus), such uncleanness was removed when he 'put away sin by the sacrifice of himself' (verse 26). 'By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place' (verse 12), that is, 'into heaven itself' (verse 24). Without such atonement, his physical entry into God's presence (thanks to which alone 'we have access unto the Father' - Eph. 2:18) would have been impossible."

107. John Carter - Unity Book, P.21 - "Another cause of difficulty arises out of the Lord's relationship to his own death. It is affirmed in Scripture that 'by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption'; and that 'God brought from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep through the blood of the everlasting covenant'; and that he was saved out of death. He needed redemption; he needed salvation from death. The confusion arises when we isolate him from his work. He was there to be our Saviour, and but for our needs we may reverently say he would not have been there."

108. John Carter - Unity Book, Pp. 78-79 - "At the same time it was rightly insisted that Jesus shared our nature with its sorrows and temptations, but always overcame every trial. As Bro. Roberts wrote (1875, page 376):

'He was a sufferer from the hereditary effects of sin; for these effects are physical effects. Death is a physical law in our members implanted there through sin ages ago, and handed down from generation to generation. Consequently, partaking our physical nature, he partook of this, and his own deliverance (as 'Christ the first fruits') was as necessary as that of his brethren. In fact, if Christ had not first been saved from death (Heb. 5:7), if he had not first obtained eternal redemption (Heb. 9:12), there would have been no hope for us, for we obtain salvation only through what he has accomplished in himself, of which we become heirs by union with him. He overcomes and we share his victory, by uniting with him, if he at the judgment seat permit.' "

109. John Carter - Unity Book, P.81 - "In 1875 (page 375) he (Robert Roberts) says concerning Jesus:

'He was a sufferer from the effects of sin in all the items of weakness, labour, pain, sorrow, death; and in this sense (as a partaker with us of the effects of sin) has been described as a constitutional sinner, or one subject to a sin-constitution of things. But as this phrase gives occasion to disingenuous cavil, it is well to discard the phrase and look at the meaning, which has been stated.

'As a sufferer from the effects of sin, he had himself to be delivered from those effects; and as the mode of deliverance was by death on the cross, that death was for himself first, not for sins of his own committing, but for deliverance from the (effect of the) sin of Adam from which he suffered in common with his brethren; and from the sins of his brethren which were laid upon him.' "

## CHRIST'S BODILY REDEMPTION - A REPRESENTATIVE TRIUMPH WHICH WE WILL SHARE

110. Dr. Thomas - Eureka Vol. 3, P.705 - See 86. above.
111. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P.163 (First Edition) - "Christ himself was included in the sacrificial work he did 'for us'. 'For himself that it might be for us', for how otherwise could we have obtained redemption if it had not first come into his possession, for us to become joint heirs of?"
112. Robert Roberts - Law of Moses, P.165 (First Edition) - "When we say, as some in their reverence for Christ prefer to say, that the death of Christ was not for himself but only for us, they destroy all these typical analogies, and in truth, if their view could prevail, they would make it impossible that it could be for us at all: for it only operates 'for us', when we unite ourselves with him in whom, as the firstborn, it had its first effects."
113. C.C. Walker - Christadelphian, 1921, P.313 - "It will be observed that the omitted words here 'for us' (in Heb. 9:12) are in italics in the A.V., the reason being that they do not appear in the original. They are omitted from the R.V. for that reason. It is perfectly true, thank God, that the eternal redemption is 'for us' contingent on its being first of all for the High Priest himself, 'Christ the first fruits'; but Paul is here dealing with Christ the 'High Priest' (Heb. 9:11), and he obtained 'eternal redemption' for himself that it might be for us. To say that it was 'for us' and 'not for himself' is to contradict the word of God, and to take a step at least towards that doctrine of the Anti-christ that denies that Christ has come in the flesh. This is a form of error that has persisted from the days of the Apostles until now."
114. John Carter - Unity Book, P.21 - "God purposed that as by man came death, by man must come resurrection. He must be one who died but whose resurrection was assured. God set him forth to declare His righteousness, that identifying ourselves with him we subscribe to the declaration of God's righteousness made by him. He did these things for himself that it might be for us. We are not entitled to say what he would have had to do had he stood alone - that is purely hypothetical, neither may we say that because God required his death in the given circumstances in becoming our Saviour, God would have required the same under different conditions. We do not know. On the one hand we must accept what is written concerning his benefit from his own work, while on the other hand we keep clearly in mind that the purpose of it all was that we might be saved through him."

*that God might  
fill the earth  
with His glory, in the resurrection of His Son.*

## THE LAW - UNABLE TO GIVE LIFE

### THE WEAKNESS OF THE LAW - JUSTIFICATION IS BY FAITH

115. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P.248 - "It (the law), was an unbearable yoke of bondage; and a law which no man borne of the will of the flesh had been able to keep without sin. If, then, a man sought to obtain a right to an everlasting possession of the land by obedience to it, he had undertaken an impossibility; for the Law, on account of human weakness could give no one a right to live for ever."
116. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P.248 - "He (Paul), says explicitly, 'By the Law shall no flesh be justified. A circumcised person is therefore bound to keep that which he cannot possibly keep; and which, if he did keep, could not benefit him, because justification to life is by faith in the promises, and not by conformity to the Mosaic Law'."
117. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1875, P.305 - "The Law of Moses was given for the restraint and regulation of the body; to stop the mouth of boasting; to cut away all chances of self-justification; and to bring in all the world guilty before God."
118. F.G. Jannaway - Christ our Passover - "Brother C.C. Walker describes the paragraph found in the old edition of Slain Lamb (P.9) as, 'a passing hypothetical speculation, uttered in the heat of a controversial lecture', which 'will not

118. (Cont)  
stand investigation for a moment'; 'It was not a feature of Brother Roberts' serious teaching' (Christadelphian, 1910, P.538). What that serious teaching was, is made abundantly clear in the foregoing pages."
119. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, Pp. 46 & 47 - "The letters to the Hebrews, the Romans and the Galatians discuss exhaustively the passing of the Law of Moses 'for the weakness thereof' (Heb. 7:18). In each epistle viewed separately, the arguments advanced to prove that the Law could not give eternal life are unanswerable: their combined testimony is therefore overwhelming, establishing beyond all doubt that 'by the works of law shall no flesh be justified' (Gal. 2:16).  
This verdict should be an end of all strife, yet one misapprehension persists in the minds of some who allege that these three epistles establish not the intrinsic inability of the Law of Moses to confer eternal life, but rather its impotence to do so because men broke it. That is, the Law is said to have in fact contained a promise of eternal life in reward for perfect obedience and to have actually conferred it on Jesus because he kept it faultlessly. Such reasoning is false. All three epistles prove it to be so. ...  
We now perceive the twofold weakness of the Law of Moses. Firstly, no one could keep it. ... Secondly, even if a man kept it, it lacked the essential power to confer life. We find this illustrated in Christ. He kept the Law perfectly, 'but that no man is justified by law' in the sight of God is evident: for, 'The just shall live by faith' (verse 11). Had it been otherwise - 'if righteousness came by law' - then Christ died needlessly (verse 21). But Christ did not die in vain, but to make good the deficiencies of the Law."

#### PERFECT OBEDIENCE IMPOSSIBLE FOR MEN BORN OF TWO HUMAN PARENTS

120. Dr. Thomas - Elpis Israel, P.248 - See 115. and 116. above.
121. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P.34 - "Yet, despite their weakness, God bids men be perfect as Himself (Matt. 5:48). This is no paradox; for, though every man is sinfully inclined by nature, and for that reason no one fails to offend, yet, when 'strengthened with might by God's spirit in the inner man' (Eph. 3:16), a person can conquer every weakness of which past failures have made him aware. But his sufficiency is of God (2 Cor. 2:14; 3:5), and achievement is for him a conquest over specific weaknesses, not a state of innocence from which he need never depart. We are thus commanded to be perfect, yet are also assured of forgiveness for imperfection. If perfection were immediately attainable by man, such provision for pardon would be the worst discouragement of effort, but since perfection is only attainable after repeated failure, the forgiveness of sins is the best inducement to renew and intensify effort."
122. John Carter - Unity Book, P.52 - "God has stretched out His arm in raising up a Son to be a Saviour, because we could not have been provided with a saviour apart from it, because no human being could have possibly lived the life of perfect obedience, that would ensure resurrection from the dead; and so provide one in whom could be vested the power to raise others also."

## FELLOWSHIP

#### WHY COMPROMISE ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE ATONEMENT IS OUT OF THE QUESTION

123. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1873, P.324 - "Those who hold Paul's doctrine ought not to worship with a body that does not. This is holding with the hare and running with the hounds - a position of extraordinary difficulty. Does not such an one love the hounds better than the hare? When the hounds come upon the hare, where will he be? No; if I agree with you in doctrine, I will forsake the assembling of myself with a body that opposes your doctrine, although it might require me to separate from the nearest and dearest. No good is effected by compromising the principles of the truth; and to deny that Jesus came in sinful flesh, is to destroy the sacrifice of Christ."

124. C.C. Walker - Christadelphian, 1921, P.313 - "These things have been faithfully upheld as principles of the Truth from the beginning, and contradictory teaching has not been tolerated, and should not be now. Yet there is such current. We noticed last month, among pamphlets received, one on Sacrifice which reproduced the errors that were introduced by Edward Turney fifty years ago, and which were met by the demonstration of the Truth in the pamphlet *The Slain Lamb*, to which attention is now again directed."

125. B.J. Dowling & W. Smallwood - "It was a principle of action with Brethren Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts 'to give the Truth the benefit of all doubts and to accept such co-operation only as uncompromising loyalty to it may allow.' Some brethren of our day appear to act on the opposite principle of giving the benefit of all doubts to the erring creature, a course which must be offensive to God, for the Bible represents Him as being jealous and very sensitive of the least encroachment upon the sacredness of His Truth, as witnessed in the case of Nadab and Abihu, Uzzah and many others. The divine order is 'first pure, then peaceable', but some Christadelphians want 'peace' without 'purity' - union regardless of unity."

126. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1885, Pp. 388-389 - "The first condition of association is the belief of the Truth, apart from the perception and reception of which, there is no basis of fellowship."

The Truth forming the basis is made up of a number of items or elements, that are each essential to its integrity as a whole.

That it is a matter of duty to require the recognition of these at the hands of those claiming association with us in the Truth.

That we are not at liberty to receive anyone who denies or refuses to believe any of them, because the receiving of such would open the way for the currency of their principles among us, with the tendency of leavening the whole community. The elements of the Truth are so mutually related that the displacement of one undermines the foundation of the whole.

A man himself believing the Truth, but willing to wink at its denial among those in fellowship in any of its essential elements, becomes by his willingness an offender against the law of God, which requires the faithful manifestation of the whole. Faithful servants of Christ cannot unite with such, on the ground that though he hold the Truth himself, such a man is responsible for the error of those whom he would admit, and therefore becomes the channel of a similar responsibility to those who may endorse him in fellowship:-

- 'He that biddeth him God-speed is partaker of his evil deeds'.

It is the duty of the friends of the Truth to uphold it as a basis of union among themselves by refusing to receive either those who deny any part of it, or those who would receive those so denying."

126a. John Carter - Unity Book, Pp. 10-11 - "But we also have a duty to protest against error. ....if an ecclesia wilfully and persistently preaches error, how can we avoid responsibility except by disclaiming association? If this principle has on occasion been pressed too far, we must not therefore fail to give it its proper place."

It is the duty of all to seek to promote unity. We must avoid the things that make for disunity, contentions and strifes of words. Unity is a unity of faith, however, and that involves agreement on essentials. ....

The citations of utterances such as that the Statement of Faith contains blasphemous assertions, by brethren in Australia who are still retained in association, create great difficulties for us. If we have a duty to avoid putting any stumbling block in your path, is not the duty reciprocal and should not you seek to remove grave hindrances to unity, either by so instructing your members that you can happily declare there is oneness of Faith, or by removing from your association, sad though it may be to have to do it, the teacher of error. 'Purge out the old leaven' is apostolic counsel."



# APPENDIX 1

## JOHN CARTER ON THE ATONEMENT CONTROVERSY AND FELLOWSHIP

127. Article by John Carter - "Winds of Doctrine" - Christadelphian, Nov 1943, P.195 -  
 "The printing press is a means of blessing or otherwise according to the use to which it is put. If it is the means of extending the knowledge of God's purpose, it is equally the means of spreading the seeds of false doctrine. In Great Britain and elsewhere zealous propagandists of ideas, either wrong in themselves or given a disproportionate and unbalanced emphasis, become pamphleteers. Errors long since exposed, and included among 'doctrines to be rejected', are revived. Occasionally a soul is disturbed, odd ones may be beguiled from truth. But persistent propagation of error calls for restatement of truth. We once again return to the subject of man's nature, sin, and sin-offering and the relationship of Jesus Christ to 'sin', in an endeavour, not to deal with the matters comprehensively - space does not permit - but to state the facts on some points controverted.

*Sentence*  
 The apostle Paul says that 'by man came death' and, 'in Adam all die' (1 Cor. 15:21,22). The same matter is stated in greater fulness in Rom. 5:12: 'By one man sin entered the world, and death by sin; and so death has passed upon all men, for that all have sinned'. If death came 'by man', and 'by sin', it was not present in the world of man before he sinned. This death was the result of the sentence 'unto dust thou shalt return'; and in the words of Bro. Roberts, 'death came by decree extraneously to the nature bestowed upon Adam in Eden, and was not inherent in him before sentence'. This expresses his views at the end of his life when he was controverting the meaning put upon some of his words written in his younger days, and which now are being reproduced. Dr. Thomas' general teaching is clear, whatever ambiguity may attach to a few of his phrases. \* 'Man's defilement was first a matter of conscience and then corporeal'. 'The great principle to be encompassed (for the taking away of sins) was the condemnation of sin in sinful flesh, innocent of actual transgression. This principle necessitated the manifestation of one ... (who) would be Son of God by origination; and Son of Man by descent, or birth of sinful flesh.' 'Sin was to be condemned in sinful flesh.' 'Sinful flesh being the hereditary nature of the Lord Jesus, he was a fit and proper sacrifice for sin; especially as he was himself innocent of the great transgression, having been obedient in all things.'

*Sin is a synonym for human nature*  
 Because the flesh is sinful it is called 'sin' by metonymy. This is denied by some in the interests of false doctrine. 'Sin', wrote Dr. Thomas, 'is a synonym for human nature. Hence the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean'. 'This view of sin in the flesh is enlightening in the things concerning Jesus. The apostle says, 'God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin'; and this he explains in another place by saying that 'He sent his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh in the offering of his body once. Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus, if it had not existed there.'

Is Dr. Thomas correct when he says that 'sin' is a synonym in the passage quoted for 'sinful flesh'? It must be clearly understood that he taught that 'sin' is used in two principal acceptations in the Scripture. It signifies in the first place 'the transgression of law'; and next it represents that physical principle of animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh 'which has the power of death'; and it is called sin, because the development, or fixation, of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression.' Can it be established that sin has this secondary meaning of sinful flesh?

It must be noticed that both the A.V. and R.V. translate 2 Cor. 5:21, that Jesus 'was made' to be sin'; but in Rom. 8:3 the A.V. 'and for sin' is changed in the R.V. to 'and as an offering for sin'. Why have the Revisers in the one place changed 'sin' into 'offering for sin' and not in the other? The answer, which is fatal to all claims that 'sin' means 'sin offering' in 2 Cor. 5:21, is that Paul did not use the same words in both cases. In 2 Cor. 5:21, he used hamartia, but in Rom. 8:3 he used peri hamartia. The two statements are therefore not 'similar'. Were then the Revisers justified in retaining 'sin' in 2 Cor. 5:21? They were justified by the established usage of words. Concerning kai peri hamartias (Rom. 8:3) it has been truly said 'Literally, and concerning sin. But the idea is defined by the constant recurrence of the phrase in the

127. (Cont)

was to hand, and he used it. But when he used hamartia without peri it was because he did not mean sin-offering. Had he meant sin-offering in 2 Cor. 5:21 he would have used the same phrase as in Rom. 8:3. The fact that he did not is incontrovertible evidence that he meant something else. That something else was not personal transgression, which is excluded by the words 'who knew no sin'. 'Sin' therefore in the phrase 'He made him to be sin', whatever other facts may be included, must, as Dr. Thomas said, mean that he was sent 'in the likeness of sinful flesh'; it cannot mean 'sin-offering'. The usage of peri hamartia in the Septuagint can be checked by anyone who has access to Hatch & Redpath's Concordance to the Septuagint. These facts were amply demonstrated in The Christadelphian 1915, pages 106 and 343 by Bro. W.J. Young. But truth needs constant re-assertion.

Because Jesus partook of our nature, he shared redemption. He was 'saved out of death'; he 'obtained eternal redemption'; 'by his own blood he entered in once for all into the holy place'; he was 'brought again from the dead by the blood of the everlasting covenant'. 'By man came the resurrection from the dead' (Heb. 5:7; 9:12; 13:20; 1 Cor. 15:21). These testimonies plainly declare that Jesus benefited by his own death. It is essential to ascertain the facts that are clearly stated in Scripture; and any theory which does not find a place for all the facts is either incomplete or wrong.

It is impossible to comment on all assertions that are made in the service of false teaching. Space alone under present conditions precludes it. If any feel the need to examine this matter further the truth on the atonement is set out in the pamphlet The Blood of Christ by Bro. Roberts; and The Atonement by Bro. C.C. Walker, the latter being particularly useful for the extensive citation and classification of Scripture references."

128. John Carter on the B.A.S.F. - Article "A Time to Heal" - Christadelphian, 1940 -  
"Some have objected to having one form of words imposed; we have heard objections to the Birmingham statement being used by other ecclesias. Wise men will not insist about the use of one particular form of words if the same thing is meant. On the other hand, when a particular form of words has come to be recognised and accepted as stating certain truths, wise men will not create doubt or risk misunderstanding by insisting on the liberty of saying the same thing in words of their own choosing, particularly when grave issues are involved.

We willingly declare again our attitude as Editor of "The Christadelphian", in the hope of helping forward the present effort for reunion. We believe the Statement of Faith to be the best compiled to set out the teaching of the Scriptures. We accept it without reservation, and believe it sets forth the minimum that should be believed as a basis of fellowship. As concerning 'The Christadelphian' and fellowship, we have declared that we do not knowingly publish intelligence from ecclesias who do not accept the teaching set out in the Statement of Faith. We believe that if a man or woman changes their belief it is the honourable course to say so, and resign from fellowship. It is not less so when ecclesias do not subscribe to the doctrines which are commonly believed among us and which are accepted as the basis upon which fellowship and co-operation can be maintained."

- 128a. John Carter on Clause 5 of the B.A.S.F. - Article, Christadelphian, 1940 - "It might be objected by some that the Statement has ambiguities, or that it might be expressed more clearly in other language. We agree that it has the limitations of human expression, but we believe it to be an honest and capable attempt to set out the essential truths of Bible teaching. The author's meaning is well known and is illustrated in many articles and in books in active circulation today. A sympathetic supporter of truth will say, 'We know what is meant and we agree with that.' As an example of such slight ambiguity, item 2 of the true teaching of the Scriptures, which is from the Statement of Faith, if rigidly construed, says 'the sentence' was transmitted to all Adam's posterity. The writer's meaning is well known to be that the defilement which followed man's sin, which came as the result of God's sentence, and which also became a physical law of man's being, was transmitted to all his posterity. Any such form of words will make some small demand on the goodwill of the reader."

## APPENDIX 2

### JESUS 'MADE SIN FOR US'

#### THE ESTABLISHED CHRISTADELPHIAN INTERPRETATION OF 11 Cor. 5:21 - 'made sin for us'

129. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1869, P.83 - "It is testified that he was 'made sin for us' (2 Cor. 5:21). As he was not of sinful character, this could only apply to his physical nature, which drawn from the veins of Mary, was 'made sin'. Again, in Rom. 8:3, we are informed that 'what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God (hath done) in sending forth His son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for (on account of) sin, condemned sin in the flesh'."
130. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1869, P.83 - "If Jesus came in the flesh, he was under condemnation, for the nature he inherited was a condemned one. The sentence of death ran in the blood which he inherited from Adam through Mary. He was, therefore, 'in the days of his flesh', as much under its power as those he came to save. This conclusion follows from the testimony that he was a man; it would stand secure upon that foundation alone, but it is also expressly affirmed in divers parts of the Word. It is testified that he was 'made sin for us' (2 Cor. 5:21)."
131. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1873, P.361 - "Jesus by being of the seed of Abraham, became sin for us; that sin was condemned in the flesh, our sins were borne in his body on the tree; these things could not have been accomplished in a nature destitute of that physical principle, styled 'sin in the flesh'."
132. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1898, P.343 - "It may shock you to think that such a condition attached to the Lord Jesus in the days of his flesh. But there is no cause where a full enlightenment prevails. He partook of our very nature that in him it might be redeemed and perfected. He did no sin, but he was physically 'made sin for us who knew no sin'. He was sent forth in the likeness of sinful flesh that sin might be condemned in him: that through death he might destroy that having the power of death. It is so testified (2 Cor. 5:21; Rom. 8:3; Heb. 2:14) and we have nothing to do but believe the testimony, even if we could not see through it."
133. Robert Roberts - Christadelphian, 1898, P.390 - "Christ was 'made sin' in being born into a sin-constitution of things - a state in which evil prevails because of sin, for the cure of that evil, and the removal of that sin in being treated as a sinner when he was not a sinner."
134. W.F. Barling - Redemption in Christ Jesus, P.22 - "As Paul expresses it, God 'made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him' (2 Cor. 5:21).  
  
The Nazarene contention that Jesus was not made 'Sin', but 'a sin-offering', destroys the antithetical balance of this verse. Men naturally know no righteousness, but are 'made righteousness' when they identify themselves with Jesus. Similarly, because of the identity existing between him and them on account of a common sinful nature, he who knew no sin was 'made Sin'. That is, God, in His mercy, accepted Christ's 'body of sin' as representative of all other human flesh, in which Sin dwells."
135. John Carter - Unity Book, P.20 - "A similar usage of metonymy is found in 2 Cor. 5:21, where Paul says that 'Him who knew no sin God made to be sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.' This statement is one of a whole series of paradoxes in 2 Cor. 5:21. Christ the sinless was made to be sin in sharing in the effect of sin in his life, and by his death providing the conditions for the forgiveness of sins and, finally, the removal of all the effects of sin."