

*John Thomas & Robert Roberts*

# Their Real Teaching On Christ

A COLLECTION OF  
RECOGNISED CHRISTADELPHIAN WRITINGS  
CONCERNING THE MANIFESTATION OF  
THE INVISIBLE ETERNAL GOD  
IN HUMAN NATURE

Compiled by K.I. Jamieson

**Published by K & M Jamieson  
43 Conway Road  
Bankstown NSW 2200**

## Preface

**"Their Real Teaching On Christ"** comprises a number of citations taken without prejudice from the works of our Pioneering Brethren on the subject of **"God Manifestation."**

The idea for this collection of articles was drawn out of the Christadelphian, January 1st, 1877, where one by the name of brother Laverock collated and ordered a series of short extracts from the writings of Dr. Thomas, desiring to set forth his clear teaching in relation to the manifestation of God in Christ. To this original publication we have included further extracts of brother Thomas's writings under the same series of headings, and incorporated various articles, mainly from the works of Robert Roberts and brother Thomas's daughter, Sister Lasius, with the same intention.

It stands to reason that no subject over the last 2000 years has been the cause of so much contention, division and blood shed in the world at large as the manifestation of the eternal Father in human nature. One would only have to consult a reputable historian for evidence of this. It likewise stands to reason that no subject is more important for the world at large than the manifestation of the Eternal Father in human nature, for in the words of Jesus "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent." - (John 17:3). And the apostle Paul remarks - "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." - (2 Cor. 5:19). Unfortunately the vast majority of the World has fallen short of recognising the truth and import of these eternal principles either through disbelief or apostacy from "the truth as it is in Jesus."

However, thanks be to God for we as a body of Christadelphians are able to claim today, and rightly so, that we stand unique from any other religion, power or organisation in the world, for the principles concerning "the mystery of Godliness" have been revealed to us all. And how and why came this to be? Through the work of divine providence God raised up certain notable brethren, who were but instruments in His hand, to unearth "the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ" from the midst of the rubble of religious corruption that had dominated ecclesiastical history, that there might be a lightstand shining brightly in these latter days of darkness. We are this lightstand and our duty on the very apex of Christ's return is two fold: firstly, to maintain the purity and intensity of the light, and secondly to shed its light upon all who would believe.

The validity of our pioneer writings is seen in that they have stood the test of time. Since 1848 when *Elpis Israel* was first written the Christadelphians have successfully been able to defend the truth as brought to light by brother Thomas. It was brother Roberts' declared life time intention that "so long as God permits life and health, we shall defend the mighty results of his (brother Thomas's) labours against all ridicule and opposition for friend or foe." The truth was tried and tested through numerous attempts to demise the foundation principles of the work of God in Christ including the Josephites, the Doweites, Edward Turney and David Hanley, and one of the most capable brethren ever - J. J. Andrew. The fundamental reason why the truth has survived is because their writings are based solely upon the scriptures. Their faith and conviction was formulated from "the law and the testimony." Their directions and motivations were enlightened by "the oracles of God." The result of all this was the

generation of the Statement of Faith as we know it today, which is not merely a set of thirty principles based on the opinion of brother Roberts, but rather it is a comprehensive guide to the teachings of the Bible, and this is evident from the abundant amount of scriptural quotations used to support each proposition. The same is true for all of their writings.

Unfortunately, today, we are increasingly in danger of departing from this "treasure in earthen vessels" which we have received by a total of 70 years devotional application to the truth through the combined lives of brother Thomas and brother Roberts. Such a precarious position is by no means anything new. History reveals a continual turning away from the faith following stable periods wherein the truth prospered. There is nothing new under the sun, and the two most elementary doctrines which all error can be channelled into is firstly that of Judaism which denies the truth concerning the Sonship of Christ, and secondly the doctrine of the Nikolaitanes which denied that Jesus Christ came in the flesh. In light of this it is very interesting to realise, as any reader of the Pioneers will agree, that a considerable amount of their writings are given over to the opposition of these two false doctrines.

It is sad to hear reflections concerning the pioneers to the effect that their writings were simply the opinions of men. Whilst this in its essence is true, and they would be the last to claim infallibility, it is usually associated with the attitude of "the pioneers were not infallible, BUT I AM!" It is true that a pygmy can see further than a giant whilst standing on the giant's shoulder but what hope does the pygmy have if he leave the foundation and security provided by the giant's shoulder?

Another danger that seems to be prevalent is associated with those who quote the pioneers and embellish their works only when it is suitable with their predisposed opinions, whilst knowing full well that in other areas of doctrinal importance they are in conflict with their teachings. Either we believe the pioneers reestablished the truth or we do not - there should be no discord in our understanding of them.

And yet a third danger is evident in regard to our attitude to the pioneers. This class of thinking wipes away their respect for the pioneers by stating that "it is little use quoting the pioneers as an authority because they are contradictory and can be quoted by both sides." The viability of this dogma can only be assessed by reading the pioneer works in their totality, and upon so doing it will be found that from 1848 to 1898 they remained consistent in their fundamental teachings of the one faith. We could explain this principle no better than in the words of brother Laverock who prefixed the following to his original collation:

"An accurate writer does not contradict himself: what he affirms in one part he does not deny in another; a particular expression or statement should not be looked at by itself, but taken into consideration with the whole, and in this manner only will an accurate opinion or conclusion be formed." CHRON. 1877 P. 29.

If we sincerely desire to understand the true intent of the clauses contained in the Statement of Faith, then the most obvious and logical way to go about it is to refer back to the writings of brother Thomas and brother Roberts. Discrepancy and variance will only be read into the Statement of Faith (particularly in relation to the principles of the atonement) where one is unfamiliar with the intent and meaning that is affluently expressed in their writings. Let us get back to the way in which the pioneers expressed the truth concerning God manifest in the flesh. If we are wise we will mould our

terminology around the way they expounded scripture, for by so doing we can be sure that we are well on the right track to understanding the substance and tenor of the Statement of Faith. To this end it is hoped that this collation will provide the reader with a suitable outline of their teachings in relation to God manifestation. It is to be noted that it is by no means complete, and nor does it serve as a substitute for reading the pioneer works in their entirety, for it is doubtful that a better understanding of the Divine word could be gained otherwise.

If any desire to set forth new doctrines that are out of harmony with that which we have received from our pioneers then they are welcome to do so providing they do not call themselves Christadelphians. We as the Christadelphians stand with the pioneers because we have perceived for over 140 years in our daily readings of the Scriptures that they stood with Moses and the prophets in their wide understanding. We do not follow the men themselves, but rather the truth of the infallible scriptures which they brought to light. Hence we would encourage all not to simply just read the pioneers (as one would a novel), but to take on the notable example of the Bereans and study their works collaterally with the bible, and in the words of the apostle Paul:

*"Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions  
which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.*

*Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our  
Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting  
consolation and good hope through grace,*

*Comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good  
word and work."* (2 Thessalonians 2:15 -17)

KEITH JAMIESON, March 1990

Some of the more important terms untranslated which occur frequently in these quotations are set out below:

Ail means strength, might and power applicable to the Eternal.

Yahweh, He Who Shall Be, first in Christ personal, afterwards in Christ mystical, or the saints.

Eloah, A Mighty One.

Elohim, organisations of the eternal power, whether angels or other created powers.

Ail Shaddai, the Strength of the Mighty Ones.

Yahweh Elohim, He Who Shall be a Multitude of Mighty Ones.

Yahweh Tzidkenu, He Who Shall be our Righteousness.

# Contents

Preface .....	3-5
Contents .....	6-7

<b>PART A:</b>	<b>JOHN THOMAS ON GOD MANIFESTATION .....</b>	<b>9 - 53</b>
	The Deity Himself .....	10-11
	The Spirit .....	12
	The Term "Jesus" .....	13
	Jesus Before Anointing .....	14
	Jesus After Anointing .....	15-16
	The Term "Mere-Man" .....	17
	The Logos .....	18-22
	The Term "Christ" and Christ in the Prophets .....	23-24
	Origin of Jesus .....	25-28
	God With Us, and One of Three Things .....	29
	I Came down from Heaven &c. ....	30-31
	Before Abraham Was I Am .....	31
	The Alpha and the Omega and the Amen .....	32-34
	The Son of Man on the Cross and in Death .....	35-37
	Jesus Anointed Came in the Flesh .....	38-39
	Believing on the Christ .....	40
	The Spiritual Rock .....	41
	Jesus Overcame and Voluntary Obedience .....	42-43
	The Bible Doctrine Concerning the Tempter Considered .....	44-53

<b>PART B:</b>	<b>ROBERT ROBERTS ON GOD MANIFESTATION .....</b>	<b>55 - 113</b>
	Who Was the Father of Jesus Christ? .....	56-60
	Scriptural Knowledge Concerning Jesus Christ .....	61-62
	The Relation of Jesus to the Law of Sin and Death .....	63-67
	In What Sense Was Christ Unclean? .....	67-68
	Supposed Inconsistencies in Christadelphain Teaching Concerning Christ .....	69-74
	Is Christ and Instrument? .....	75
	The Operations of the Deity .....	76-81
	Christ - Two Natures or One? .....	82
	God Manifestation Without God .....	83
	Christ as the Son of Man .....	84-87
	Dr. Thomas and the Whole Truth .....	88-89
	Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God .....	90-91
	Mere-Manism .....	92-93
	God Manifestation Not Trinitarianism .....	93
	Renunciationism .....	94-95
	Was Jesus Born Under Condemnation? .....	95
	The Obedience of Christ in relation to the Manifestation of God in Him .....	96-97
	The Divine Impress .....	97
	God Manifestation - Real At All Stages .....	98
	The Divine Sonship Of Christ .....	99-103
	On the Nature of Christ .....	104-105
	Nazareth Revisited .....	106-107
	The Law of Moses .....	108-113

**PART C: FURTHER CHRISTADELPHIANS ON GOD MANIFESTATION \_\_\_\_\_ 115 - 129**

<b>Sis. Lasius:</b>	On the Nature of Christ .....	116-118
	The Plant of Renown and the Mystery of Godliness .....	119-121
	Deity Manifest in the Flesh .....	121-124
	God Manifest in the Flesh .....	125-126
<b>J. Carter:</b>	The Work of the Skillful Embroiderer .....	127-128
<b>H.P. Mansfield:</b>	Did Christ Inherit Divine Characteristics? .....	129

**PART D: THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST \_\_\_\_\_ 131 - 173**

<b>R. Roberts:</b>	The Condemnation of Sin in the Flesh .....	132-137
	The Sacrifice of Christ (32 Questions) .....	138-146
<b>J. Thomas:</b>	Dr. Thomas's Mind on the Subject .....	147-148
<b>R. Roberts:</b>	The Substance of the Matter .....	149
	Christ Saved From Death .....	150
	For Himself, that it might be For Us .....	151
	The Sacrifice of Christ .....	152
	The Antitypical Significance of the Consecration of Aaron and His Sons .....	153-157
	Jesus in the Psalms Confessing Sins .....	158
	The Nature of Man and the Sacrifice of Christ .....	159-161
<b>J. Carter:</b>	The Prince's Sin-Offering .....	162
	"The Christadelphian" on the Nature of Man and the Sacrifice of Christ .....	163-164
	Christ's Offering For Himself and For Us .....	165
	Christ's Fitness and High Priest .....	166
	Sin and its Condemnation .....	167-173





**PART A**

***John Thomas***  
**on**  
**God Manifestation**

## *The Deity Himself*

**John Thomas, Phanerosis, pg 55 (New Edition pg 62)**

As we have seen, Moses and the prophets teach one self-existent supreme fountain of power, *Ail*, who is spirit and self-named, *I shall be*, or *Yahweh*; that this one *Yahweh Spirit Power* is "God" in the highest sense, and constitutes the Godhead or Father in heaven; and that He is the Springhead of many streams, or rivers of Spirit which assume organic forms according to the will of the *Yahweh Spirit Power*, and that when formed after the model, archetype, or pattern, presented in His own hypostasis, or substance, they become Spirit *Elohim*, or sons of God, and are Spirit, because "born of the Spirit". Emanations of the formative Spirit being ἐξ αὐτοῦ out of Him. The spirit *Elohim* was also God, nevertheless they they are created - they are formed and made out of and by that which is uncreated - they are Spirit-forms, the substance of which (Spirit) is eternal; while the forms are from a beginning. Each one is a God in the sense of partaking of the Divine nature, and being, therefore, a son of God.

Now if we understand this, we shall be able to discern the force and beauty of the expression *Yahweh Elohim*, which occurs so frequently in the Hebrew Scriptures - *Yahweh* is the name of the uncreated power; *Elohim*, the organisations of that power after its image and likeness, whether they belong to the sun, moon and stars of the universe, or to Israel. Hence, also, the beauty and fullness of the phrase I am He the Mighty Ones, that formed the earth and made it - I *Yahweh* and none without - "ani-hu ha-elohim; ani *Yahweh*.

**John Thomas, Phanerosis, Pgs. 46, 68 (New Edition pgs 53, 75)**

The source or fountain of power in the universe is one. It is an unit. Therefore everything which exists is ἐξ αὐτοῦ, out of Him. By Godhead is meant, the source, spring or fountain of Deity - the Divine nature in its original preexistence before everything. "

**John Thomas, Phanerosis, pg. 56 (New Edition pg. 63)**

Both Paul and Moses teach that there is One who is supreme over them all. This is *AIL*, who created them, and who is alone to be an object of adoration, not with the blank amazement of superstition but of an adoration in an earnest belief of His promises, and willing and loving obedience to His commands. Of this supreme God it is that Paul and Jesus say: "There is none other God but one." He is the only Head of the universe, who will permit none to take precedence of Himself in the affection and adoration of His creatures. He does not, however, manifest Himself to all the intelligences who reside in the sun, moon, stars and earth, *through* the same medium. To us on earth, He presents Himself, not through Gabriel, but through Jesus as the medium of manifestation - incipient manifestation, for the manifestation is not yet complete - "To us there is but one God *the Father* out of whom are all things and we *for* Him; and one Lord Jesus Anointed, *on account* of whom are all things, and *wethrough* him." (1 Cor. 8:6).

**John Thomas, Eureka, vol. 1, pg. 105**

There is one Eternal Uncreated Substance, which is essentially power, incorruptibility and life, dwelling invisible in unapproachable light; and known before the days of Moses by the name of *Ail Shaddai*, the Strength of the Mighty Ones, and from his interview with the angel at the bush, by that of *Yahweh* or *Yah*, "*He who will be.*"

## The Spirit

John Thomas, Phanerosis, Pgs. 48-49 (New Edition pgs. 55-56)

That which connects the focal power of the universe with the embodied sons of power, and indeed with all created things, is also "Spirit" - styled in Scripture "free Spirit." - (Psa 51:12). It is free or uncombined in space, and fills immensity as the water fills the basin of the seas. The atoms of all material things are elemental condensations of free Spirit, connecting the orbs of heaven and all they contain with the Great Central Focal Power of the universe. It is the principle of cohesion, attraction, form - penetrating and pervading everywhere. To this universality the psalmist alludes when he inquires of *Yahweh*, "Wither shall I go from Thy Spirit? And wither from Thy face shall I flee? If I shall ascend to the heavens, Thou art there; though I shall spread down in *sheol* (the grave) behold Thee! I will take the wings of dawn; I will dwell in the utmost ends of the sea; moreover, there Thy hand (or power) shall lead me, and Thy right hand shall take hold of me .....". All this is equivalent to saying that the Father-power is omnipresent by His Spirit. Hence, He needs not to be locomotive to see what passes in the sun, moon, earth and stars. His all-prevailing Spirit places Him in contemporary juxtaposition with them all: so that at one and the same instant, He knows the fall of a sparrow on earth, and any other event small or great on the sun. In this way it is that, as Paul told the Athenian idolaters, "He is not far from every one of us." - (Acts 17:27). We are out of Him, and through Him and in Him as physical beings. This is equally true of all flesh that breathes. Hence Moses styles the Father *Ail Elohim haruchoth l'kol-bashar*, power, powers of the Spirits, for all flesh. - (Num. 16:22). Here is power as the cause of life, called *Ail*, and powers as distributed to each living thing, and therefore called *Elohim*. ..... *Ail* is life absolute; for as Paul says, "He only hath deathlessness." \* Life radiating from his hypostasis or substance is Spirit life ..... Formative of a creature and sustaining it in life, it is power of Spirit or Spirit power for that creature ..... Hence, these *Elohim* are Son-powers or emanations from *Ail*, the great paternal power. He is therefore the *Ail* of all flesh, as well as *Elohim* for all flesh ..... In this elaboration, then, we have the Father-power, Son-power, or emanation and free Spirit. Moses and the prophets teach this as we have seen. The Father-power is one, the Son-power is the one Father-power in plural manifestation; and the manifestation is developed from Free Spirit emanation from the Father-power. This is not only scriptural but reasonable; and right reason and scripture always go together.

\* 1 Tim 6:16 who only hath (immortality (1 Cor 15:54)) 110 'athanasia' from 1 as a neg. particle + 2288 'thanatos' death  
hence, DEATHLESSNESS - DEITY ONLY HATH IT.

John Thomas, Eureka, vol. 1, pg. 100

Holy Spirit is an emanation from His substance intensely radiant and all-prevailing; and that when focalised under the fiat of His will, things and persons without limit, as to number or nature, are produced.

## *The Term Jesus*

John Thomas, Eureka, vol. 1, pg. 13

Now, Jesus Anointed is power, or Spirit manifested in flesh, and justified in Spirit (1 Tim. 3:16), or made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and constituted Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, out of a resurrection of dead ones (Rom. 1:3,4), and therefore styled "the Lord the Spirit" or a "life imparting Spirit." - (1 Cor. 15:45; 2 Cor. 3:17,18). Here are Spirit and flesh. The Spirit is *Theos* or Deity; the flesh was the son of Mary, and when anointed with the Spirit again at his resurrection, became Jesus Christ, or the anointed Jesus.

John Thomas, Eureka, vol. 1, pgs. 124, 311

The Creator of the universe presents himself to the ecclesias as Deity by the Seven Spirits in Jesus the Anointed - THE DIVINE LOGOS IN FLESH. He styles himself *ο ων*, "*He who is*," which is equivalent to declaring that he is not dead, but "is risen, as he said;" also *ο ην*, "*He who was*" - He that is risen is the same as He who was before Abraham, and before the crucifixion: and *ο ερχομενος*, "*He that is coming*" in power and great glory. But that they might not separate him in their minds from the anointing, the salutation is said to come from Him, "and from the Seven Spirits *which is before the throne of him*;" and that the source of the salutation may still stand out in bolder relief, it is said to proceed "from Jesus Anointed," who is "Deity manifested in flesh;" Jesus is the flesh, and the seven spirits the Deity with which the resurrected flesh is anointed so as to be omniscient and almighty. Thus combined the salutation is from "the Lord the Spirit."

## *Jesus Before Anointing*

John Thomas, Phanerosis, pgs. 83 (New Edition pg. 90)

When we contemplate the cherub before his sealing and anointing, we see only the son of Mary - the seed of woman, in the words of Moses; and the Son of God in the same sense that Adam was. The New Testament writers give us very little information concerning Jesus during thirty years of his sojourn in the covenanted land. All we learn concerning him after his return from Egypt is that he dwelt in Nazareth and was subject to Mary and Joseph, and worked at the trade of his mother's husband. He knew his real paternity was not of Joseph; he never went to school, yet was wiser than those who assumed to be his teachers, being filled with wisdom, the grace of God being upon him; and he was beloved by all who knew him - (Matt. 1:23; Luke 2:40, 46-52; Mark 6:3; Jno. 8:15; Psa. 119:97, 104). He was clearly in an intellectual and moral condition parallel with Adam's before he transgressed<sup>1</sup>. The "grace of God" was upon Adam and imparted to him much wisdom and knowledge, but still left him free to obey the impulse of the flesh, if he preferred it rather than the Divine law. This was the case with Jesus, who in his discourses, always maintained the distinction between what he called "mine ownself" and "the Father Himself" who dwelt in him by His effluence. "The Son," said he, "can do nothing of himself," and this he repeated in the same discourse, saying, "I can of mine own self do nothing." He refers all doctrine taught and all the miracles performed to the Father whose effluence rested upon him and filled him. If this be remembered, it will make the "hard sayings" of his teaching easy to be understood.

John Thomas, Phanerosis, Pg. 48 (New Edition pg. 55)

"The flesh," says he, "profits nothing." As a son of Mary he pretended to no power, wisdom or superiority. Mary's son was "the vail of the covering" to be rent - the vail in which the Father-power was veiled, the flesh medium of power manifestation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note - intellectually and morally, not physically. Dr. Thomas's daughter express the same idea in the 1867 Ambassador. See pgs. 116-118 of this collation for confirmation of this.

## *Jesus After Anointing*

**John Thomas, Phanerosis, Pg. 43 (New Edition pg. 50)**

Now Jesus is one and the Father was another ..... it is written in the law of Moses, that the testimony of two men is credible - I am the one that bear witness of myself, and the Father who sent me (the other witness). He beareth witness of me. - (John 5:30; 7:16; 8:17-18). Here, then, are two personages. The Father Himself being *Ail* or power, but when associated with the Son of Man, who when so associated was powerful - anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power - He was *Ail Eloah*, the power mediately manifested; the power being one and the medium of manifestation being another *Eloah*.

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 2, pg. 291 (Logos Vol. 2, pg. 305)**

The Deity, says Peter, anointed Jesus of Nazareth with Holy Spirit and power (Acts 10:38), and speaking of the Son of Man, Jesus, says, "him hath the Father, the Deity, sealed." Now as sealing has to do with instruction, we find that Jesus was not only able to do works of power in "healing all that were oppressed of the devil" but he could speak words of Spirit and life which the sealed only can do. The words which I speak unto you, said he, are Spirit and life ..... Hence the discourse of Jesus must be received as the discourse of the Deity, or Spirit, in him. What he gave utterance to was the word or teaching of the Spirit - the things sealed or impressed upon his brain by the Deity ..... "I have told you the truth which I have heard of the Deity." "I speak to the world those things I have heard of Him." These things spake Jesus.

**John Thomas, Eureka, vol. 1, pgs. 105-107**

Jesus of Nazareth, in the days of his flesh, was the reflection of the moral attributes of the Deity, as likewise are all his brethren who walk in his steps. .... Jesus is the chief-begotten *Eloah of Ail*, and when sealed with Holy Spirit at his immersion in the Jordan, the Deity manifested Himself in him by the truth he spoke and the wonders he performed. .... However complete and perfect the moral manifestation of the Deity was in Jesus of Nazareth, the divine manifestation was nevertheless imperfect as concerning the substance, or body of Jesus. This is what we are familiar with as the flesh. It was not angel flesh or nature, but that common to the seed of Abraham, styled by Paul *αὐτὸ σαρκίαν*, flesh of sin, in which he says, "dwells no good thing." - (Rom. 7: 18; 8:3.) The Anointing Spirit dove, which as the Divine form descended from heaven upon Jesus at his sealing, was holy and complete in all things: the character of Jesus was holy, harmless and undefiled, without spot or blemish, or any such thing; but his flesh was like our flesh, in all its points, weak, emotional and unclean. Had his flesh been like that of Angel *Elohim*, which is cosubstantial with the Eternal Spirit, it would have been unfit for the purpose of the Deity in His manifestation. Sin, whose wages is death, had to be condemned in the nature that had transgressed, a necessity that could only be accomplished by the Word becoming Adamic flesh and not *Elohistic*. For this cause, Jesus was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death ..... that he by the grace of the Deity, might taste death for every man. 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 διαβολος, or element of corruption in our nature, inciting it to transgression, and, therefore, called sin working death in us. - (Rom. 7:13; Heb. 2:9,14.) Another reason why the Word assumed a lower nature than the *Elohistic*, was that a basis of future perfection might be laid in obedience under trial.

**John Thomas, Phanerosis, Pg. 51 (New Edition pg. 58)**

That born of Mary was *bain Eloah*, Son of Power. Besides that Power there is no saviour. Apart from the Power the Son could not save, for he as a son of Mary, testifies that "of himself he could do nothing." That the Supreme Power would save by a Servant-Power is manifest from Isaiah as well as Peter. In that prophet, the Only Potentate says to one He styles His servant: "Thou shalt be My servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the desolation of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the nations that thou may be My *Yeshua*, salvation to the end of the earth." - (Isa. 49:6). The I and the thee of this passage are but one power. Power in servant manifestation. - I the first and I the last, and independent of that I, there are no *Elohim* or powers. - (Isa. 44:6).

**John Thomas, Phanerosis, Pg. 81-82 (New Edition pgs. 88-89)**

The flesh, or Mary's son, was the earthen vessel, the cherub, hidden as a polished arrow in the quiver, or shadow of the power of the Eternal Spirit; in other words, "the Spirit of *Yahweh* rested upon him" after his anointing. He was filled with the effluence of the Eternal Substance (by effluence we mean that which flows from or out of the substance of the Eternal Father) and covered with it as with a halo of power, so that he was hidden, covered, or protected from the machinations of evil doers and from evil influences, which could not harm him until the protecting effluence was withdrawn: this resting upon, in-dwelling and covering was the sealing and anointing of the Father, foretold in Dan. 9:24: Sealing the vision and prophet and anointing the holy one of the holy ones. And John the Baptist bore record of this, saying I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode (or rested) upon him. The Spirit-dove was the seal or mark of the Father; the form or shape assumed by the divine effluence in the anointing of Jesus ..... This sealing and anointing of the Christ was the subject of the following testimonies: And the Spirit of *Yahweh* shall rest upon him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of reverence of *Yahweh*, and shall make him of quick understanding in the reverence of *Yahweh* ..... - (Isa. 11: 2-3)

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pg. 350**

Now, the Eternal Wisdom is the revealer of the Apocalypse. He gave it to Jesus, whom he anointed both Lord and Christ. Hence when the anointed Jesus speaks in the Apocalypse, it is the Eternal who speaks. Thus, we see the same rule maintained in the Apocalypse as in the testimony of John ..... the Eternal Wisdom speaking through Jesus, himself become Spirit in being begotten and born of the Spirit from among the dead.



## *The Term "Mere-Man"*

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 2, pgs. 147 -148 (Logos, Vol. 2, pg. 160)

Instead of holding fast the Spirit's name, they were developing what in history is called Αρνησιθεος αποστασια or Deity denying apostasy, which affirmed that "Christ was no more than a mere man." The Spirit's name is the Father by His Spirit manifested in sin's flesh begotten and born, not of the will of man, but by His own creative energy, as was Adam the first; but, to say that he was no more than a man, was to affirm that he was begotten of blood, or of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man, which was to lay the basis of a name which the Spirit will not only not recognise, but ~~■~~ which He hates.

John Thomas, Eureka, vol. 2, pg. 223 (Logos, Vol. 2, pg. 236)

Christ, "who was the end of the law." The Holy Spirit signified something that he regarded important in his system of wisdom, in commanding an altar to be made of unhewn stone; and in forbidding a tool to be lifted upon it. The things commanded were "a *parabola* for the time then present" - a riddle, the meaning of which would be found in the realities developed in Christ. He is declared by Paul to be the Christian altar. "We have an altar," says he, in Heb. 13:10, which, in being cleansed by the blood of Jesus is made identical with him. He was the altar of earth of of unhewn stone; and in his making ~~of~~ generation, he was begotten, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the Deity. To affirm that in his generation he was begotten of Joseph, is to "pollute him." In admitting his altarship, and at the same time affirming his paternity to be of Joseph, and not of the Deity, as related in Luke, is to make Joseph the builder of an altar of hewn stone - a polluted altar, upon which a man's nakedness had been discovered.

## *The Logos*

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 89-91

The apostle who had the honour of receiving the Apocalypse for transmission to the servants of the Deity, has called our attention to the consideration of the fountain and origin of life and power, in what is commonly called the gospel according to John. He there points us to a certain commencement and saith, "In the beginning was the λογος and the *Logos* was with the θεος and Theos was the *Logos*." In the Common Version this reads, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." We may see from this the propriety of God styling Himself "the First," "the Beginning," and He who is and who was. He was from the beginning, whether that beginning be referred to the creation narrated by Moses, or a remoter beginning before ever the earth was; and none but a fool, the Spirit saith, would affirm that God is not.

Though John introduced two words into the text, he is careful to inform us that they are not representative of two Gods contemporary with the beginning, but of one only; for he expressly says that "*Theos was the Logos*."

In this text, then, there is One Deity, and He is styled the *Logos*. This word signifies the outward form by which the inward thought is expressed and made known; also the inward thought or reason itself; so that the word comprehends both the ideas of reason and speech. Hence, by John styling him the *Logos*, it was equivalent to affirming that he was a reasoner and a revelator; or as Daniel declared to Nebuchadnezzar, that the Eloah in the heavens revealed secrets, even "the deep and secret things."

But was the deity reason and speech only? In other words, an abstraction independent of substance; or as some affirm "without body or parts?" To preserve us from such a supposition, John informs us that "the *Logos* was with the *Theos*, and *Theos* was with the *Logos*. Never was there a conceivable point of time or eternity when the one existed without the other. "Jehovah possessed me, saith the *Logos*, "in the beginning of His way ; before His works of old, I was set up from *Olahm* (the hidden period) from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth, while as yet He had not made the earth nor the open places, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When He prepared the heavens I was there ; when He set a compass on the face of the deep ; when He established the clouds above; when He strengthened the fountains of the deep; when He gave to the sea His decree that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by Him as one brought up with Him (the *Logos* was with the *Theos*), and I was duly His delight, rejoicing always before Him; rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth, and my delights with the sons of men. - (Prov. viii. 22.) No *Logos*, then there would be no *Theos*; and without *Theos*, the *Logos* could have no existence. This may be illustrated by the relations of reason, or intelligence and speech, to brain, as affirmed in the proposition: no brain, no thought, reason, nor intelligence. Call the brain *Theos*; and thought, reason and understanding, intelligently expressed, *Logos*; and the relation and dependence of *Theos* and *Logos* in John's use of the terms, may readily be conceived. Brain-flesh is substance, or the hypostasis, that underlies thought; so *Theos* is substance which constitutes the

substratum of *Logos*. There is the substance called Spirit ; as it is written, "*Theos* is Spirit," and He who uttered these words is declared to be Himself both substance and Spirit."

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pg. 93**

As we have said, the Hebrew representative of *Theos* is *Ail*. This is a primitive word, which, to the mind of the Hebrew, always presented the idea of strength and power. It is applied in the prophets to the Former of all things, when contemplating Him in His Almightyness. The meaning of the word is strength, might, power; and when used of a person, signifies a mighty one, a strong one, a hero. The first place in which it occurs is in Gen. 14:18, where Melchizedek is styled "the priest of the Most High *Ail*." This teaches, by imputation, that there are other *Ailim*, but that He whose priest Melchizedek was, was the highest of them all.

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pg. 95**

Speaking of Himself in his address to the ends of the earth, he says, "Look unto me, for I am *Ail*, and none else." - (Isa. 46:9.) And to Israel he saith, Ye are my witnesses and my servant whom I have chosen, that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I, *Yahweh*, am He; before me, *Ail* or Power has not been formed, nor after me shall be (Isa. 43:10), a testimony that identifies *Ail* with the *Logos* and the *Theos* of John, which as One Power, he saith, "made all things; and without Him was not anything made that was made." From Him came the Apocalypse as it is written, "a revelation which the *Theos* committed to Jesus Christ."

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 98-99**

In the name and memorial thus revealed at the bush, the Deity declared that He would be a person, or persons, not then manifested. He announced to Moses that he was the Mighty One who had appeared as "three men" to Abraham, and as a "host" to Jacob; but that at a future period He would manifest himself in others, even in persons of the Adamic race. Hence, in view of the new manifestation and to keep it constantly in remembrance, he imposed upon Himself the name of *Ehyeh*, "I shall be." And this name of the Deity was to retain its import in a certain time hidden in the future. The time when it shall no longer be memorial has not yet arrived. It is to continue for the *Olahm* - for that epoch when "He who is, and who was and who is coming," shall come with the clouds, and every eye shall see Him; and all the tribes of the earth shall wait before Him. (Rev. 1:7).

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 100-103

*Yahweh* or *Yah*, as a noun and signifying He who shall be, is, then, the memorial name the Deity chooses to be known by among His people. It reminds them that He will be manifested in a multitude ..... This multitudinous manifestation of the one Deity - one in many and many in one, by His Spirit - was proclaimed to the Hebrew nation in the formula of Duet. 6:4. "Hear, O Israel, *Yahweh* our *Elohim* is the One *Yahweh*," that is, He who shall be our Mighty Ones is the One who shall be, ..... Of these sons, or *Elohim*, One is "the First-born" - the child born and the son given. - (Isa. 9:6). He is *Eloah* in chief, the Head of the Body, in whom it pleased the Father that all the fulness should dwell, that among all he might have the pre-eminence.

This *Eloah* is the great theme of prophecy. His manifestation was predicted in the promise of the Woman's seed (Gen. 3:15); in Isaac (chap. 21:12); of the royal *Shiloh* from Judah (chap. 49:10); of the sceptered star out of Jacob (Num. 24:17); of the Divine son assured to David (2 Saml. 7:14), born of a virgin (Isa. 7:14), and to rule upon his throne. - (Isa. 9:6,7.) In these testimonies it was revealed that he should be both Son of Man and Son of Deity. How this could be otherwise than is related in the New Testament would be impossible to devise. Is there an *Eloah* without me? saith the Spirit; yea, there is no Rock; I know none. - (Isa. 44:8). The manifestation, therefore, must be by the Spirit of the Deity, or not at all. The time of manifestation was appointed and placed on record in Dan. 9:25; and when the fullness of the time was come, the Deity sent forth His son, made of a woman, begotten, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the Deity, by Holy Spirit coming upon her, and power of the Highest enveloping her; therefore, also, the holy thing she bore was called a son of Deity, and named Jesus. - (Luke 1:35,31.)

Thus, "the *Logos* became flesh and dwelt among us," says John, "and we beheld the 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 truth came through Jesus Anointed" - (John 1:14-17). 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. 13:7; John 5:18; Phil. 2:6.) 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 fullness of the times," designed to manifest Himself. That time had arrived when Jesus began to be about thirty years of age. He was now to be sent forth, being made under the law, that them under the law he might purchase from it, that we might obtain sonship. - (Gal. 4:5). His sending forth was subsequently to his immersion, and preceded by his anointing with Holy Spirit. Though born of "*Yahweh's* handmaid" six months after John the Immerser, John said of him "after me cometh a man who hath been preferred to me; for he was before me." Isaiah styles Him *Yahweh* and *Elohim*, in his prophecy concerning John as "The Voice" that was to herald his manifestation, saying, "Prepare ye the way of *Yahweh*, make straight in the desert a highway for our *Elohim* (chap. 40:3). The Father was an *Eloah* and Jesus was another; so that in this unity were developed two, who, in the Hebrew plural, are termed *Elohim*. Here, then, was a

practical illustration of the phrase, so often occurring in the Scriptures of the prophets, "*Yahweh Elohim*," most incorrectly rendered in the English Version "Lord God." Based upon this combination of Holy Spirit and flesh, Jesus said to Nicodemus, I say unto thee, "We speak what We do know, and testify what we have seen, and ye receive not our witness." here was plural manifestation in unity. This is abundantly evinced in all the New Testament. Hence, on another occasion, Jesus said to the Jews, "I and the Father are one" - one what? We are, in the words of Moses, "*One Yahweh*." The Jews, who "judged after the flesh," were indignant at this, and attempted to stone him, for blasphemy; saying that, because being a man, he made himself Deity. But Jesus rebuked the charge of blasphemy, with an *argumentum ad homines* which was unanswerable. "Is it not written in your law. I said ye are *Elohim* and sons of the Highest, all of you? - (Psalm 82:6). If He (the Deity) called them *Elohim* to whom the word of the Deity came (that is, to their fathers) and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am Son of the Deity? Know that the Father is in me, and I in Him; and that He who hath seen me hath seen the Father." - (John 10:30; 14:9.) They judged after the flesh (chap. 8:15), and therefore, imagined that his words were flesh; that is, the mere utterances of the thinking of the flesh. But he told them this was not so; for he said, My teaching is not mine, but His who sent me; and John also testified that "he whom the Deity hath sent spake the words of the Deity;" as Moses had predicted in Deut. 18:18, concerning the Christ saying, "I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall be, that whosoever will not hearken unto My words which he shall speak in My name, I will require it of him." And so, when the Word became flesh, the Word-Flesh recalled attention to what Moses had written and said He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words ..... the same shall judge him in the last day. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father who sent me: he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak (John 12:47), "the words of eternal life."

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

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pg. 105**

This Eternal Power is the *Logos*, or Word, which is identical with *Theos*, or Deity, glowing in light: Spirit substantial and corporeal.

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 151**

"I am the Alpha and the Omega, beginning and ending, saith the Lord, the who is, and who was and who is coming, the Omnipotent." - (Rev. 1:8.) These words announce to us that He who is coming is "the Almighty," also that this Almighty One pertains to the past, the present and the future; that He has a beginning and also an ending, as symbolised by the first letter in the Greek alphabet "α A", and by the last, or "ω Ω", "the Alpha and Omega."

But let the reader understand that this annunciation is not an announcement that the Eternal *Theos*, styled "the Father", had a beginning. If He had not always existed

without beginning, there would have been no creation. To imagine a time, or part of past eternity, when *Theos* or *Ail*, commonly styled "God," did not exist, would be to suppose an epoch when there was nothing - no existing thing; and this supposition would be to make nothing the intelligent and wise creator of something, which is palpably absurd.

No; the annunciation before us carries us back no farther than that "beginning" to which John had already introduced his readers, in the book he had already written, to convince men that Jesus is the Anointed One, the Son of the Deity; and that, believing, they might have life through his name (John 10:31), the beginning of the pre-existent Deity, by His Spirit Effluence or *Logos* becoming flesh; the beginning of the Great Mystery, Deity, manifested in the flesh. - ( 1 Tim. 3:16).

This manifestation, then as we have shown, had its beginning. It began in Jesus, Son of David and Son of Deity.

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pg. 166

Here the clouds of heaven constitute the Son of Man, who is brought before the Ancient of Days, when "they" who compose Him, themselves come into His Presence. The Ancient of Days is "the Lord the Spirit," the "Quickening Spirit," the *Logos* in David's flesh, who is the Head of this Son of Man.

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pg. 312

Under this first head I remark that Jesus Anointed was the glory of *Yahweh*. This is proved by John's testimony, that "the *Logos* became flesh and dwelt among us (Israelites), and we beheld his glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace; for the Law was given through Moses, the grace and the truth (represented by that law) came through Jesus Anointed." This glory of the Father was seen by "Judah and his companions" in the evening of the Mosaic *Aion*; and he was seen in the wilderness, as Isaiah had predicted, saying, "The voice of him that proclaimeth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of *Yahweh*, make straight in the desert a highway for our *Elohim* .....; and the glory of *Yahweh* shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together." - (chap. 40:3,5). This was partially fulfilled in the evening of the Mosaic *Aion*, as related in regard to John the Baptist. He was that voice; the Spirit descending in the form of a dove was *Yahweh* or the *Logos*; and Jesus, the *Eloah*, who, when anointed, became as the voice of John proclaimed, "our *Elohim*;" or the *Logos*, the *Eloah* from heaven, became flesh in Jesus, the other *Eloah* of the house of David. These two *Elohim* dwelt among the Son of Power and Son of Man, who hath declared the invisible Deity to men.

## *The Term "Christ" and Christ in the Prophets*

John Thomas, Phanerosis, pgs. 90 (New Edition pg. 97)

THE ETERNAL Spirit (Heb. 9:14) as Creator, is necessarily before all things, and is, therefore, the θεός "*Theos* " and the λόγος "*Logos* " of John 1:3, where it is testified that "all things were made on account of Him, and without him was made not one thing that exists." This same Eternal Spirit was effluently in Noah, in Moses, in Daniel, and in all the prophets, in Jesus and the Apostles. One Spirit in these many persons. In the Mosaic system, the effluence of the Eternal power was represented by "an oil of holy ointment," or "a holy anointing oil" - an unction that was not to be commonly used upon pain of death. - (Exod. 30:25; 1 John 2:20,27.) It was compounded of myrrh, sweet calamus, cassia and olive oil, after the art of the perfumer. The tabernacle with all it contained, with the altar of burnt offering and all its vessels, the laver and its foot, were all anointed with it, and thereby became most holy, so that whatsoever touched them became holy. Aaron and his sons were also consecrated with it when "the diadem of the anointing of the oil of his *Elohim*" was said to be "upon him"- (Lev. 21:12). The holy anointing oil was not to be used apart from these, for "upon man's flesh," saith the law, "it shall not be poured."

The cherubim were anointed with the most holy unction, by which also they became most holy. It was one holy anointing for many things, which in and of themselves differed nothing from that which was common. This principle of One in Many is thus foreshadowed in the law and the prophets, One Eternal Spirit power which "shall be' in the "mighty ones of Israel" as it was and is in Jesus of Nazareth. "Thou" Eternal and Anointing Spirit art He in the Mighty Ones of Israel, the *Theos* and the *Logos*, Creator of the Heavens and the earth.

The "Holy Anointing Spirit Oil" is styled by Peter in 1 Pet. 1:11, "The Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets," because "Christ" signifies "Anointed;" and the Spirit that was poured out upon Jesus and constituted him anointed also, anointed them; hence it was said of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob "touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm" (1 Chron. 16:22). Speaking of the same Spirit, Nehemiah says, "Thou gavest Israel Thy good Spirit to instruct them; and many years did Thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them "by Thy Spirit in Thy prophets," yet would they not give ear: therefore gavest Thou them into the power of the peoples of the lands," as at this day." (Neh. 9:20, 30).

John Thomas, Phanerosis, Pgs. 68-69 (New Edition pgs. 75-76)

To have taught the doctrine of only one *Eloahh*, as well as only one named *Yahweh*, would have been to set aside the doctrine of the Messiah altogether, so that there would be neither a personal Christ, nor a multitudenous Christ, the latter being constituted of all in him, the personal. Well, then, Moses and Jesus both taught a plurality of *Eloahhs*, - Jesus said I am *Eloahh*, and my Father is *Eloahh*, and the children of God by resurrection, each one is *Eloahh*; and altogether we are thy *Elohim*, O Israel, and yet but one *Yahweh*. But the Jews repudiate such a God-name as this. It is incomprehensible to them, and, in their opinion, nothing short of blasphemy. It was so repugnant to

their notions of things, that when Jesus taught it, "they took up stones to stone him," and declared that they did so because that he, being a man, made himself *Eloahh*, in saying, I am the Son of *Ail* (John 10:33-36). Like "Dr. de Lara," they objected to the idea of *Yahweh* having a son, and of that son being a man; and that consequently *Eloahh*, or God. Hence, when Jesus asked them, "What think ye of the Christ?" Whose son is he? They did not answer "He is the son of God:" to have done so would have been to admit that he would be equal with God, which they considered blasphemy. They, therefore, adhered to the fleshly view of the matter, and replied, "He is the Son of David." This was equivalent to saying that he was equal with David only; and consequently, not equal with Deity. But this position was pregnable, and easily turned. Jesus saw their weakness, and immediately exposed it by inquiring, "How then doth David in spirit call him *Adon* (Lord superior, ruler, &c.), saying, *Yahweh* said unto my *Adon*, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David, then, called him *Adon*, how is he his son?" They could not answer this; no man, says Matthew, was able to answer him a word (Matt. 23:41).

The point in this argument is a question of equality; and therefore of Deity, or of mere humanity. If Messiah were to have been simply son of David, then he would be equal in natural descent, and inferior in rank. If equal in natural descent, he would have been no more than a son of Jesse; and if simply David's son, he would have been socially inferior, inasmuch as in society, and especially in Hebrew society, fathers take precedence of sons. This being admitted as contained in their premises, upon what known principle could David speak of such a Messiah as his *Adon* or Sovereign Lord? Here is a notably weak point in the Jewish understanding of the doctrine of the Messiah. As in the days of their fathers, so to the present time, "they judge after the flesh." They can only see in Christ a son of David, having no higher origin than blood, or the impulse of the flesh, or the will of man, they have no conception of a Christ who should be formed by the Eternal Spirit from the substance descended from David, as Adam was formed by the same spirit from the dust; and therefore generated by the will and power of *Ail*, still less did they see that such a Son of Power should become a son by a spirit generation from among the dead.



## Origin of Jesus

John Thomas, Elpis Israel, Pgs. 39-40

But, though Adam was "made in the image and after the likeness" of the "Holy Ones," the similitude has been so greatly marred, that his posterity present but a faint representation of either. The almost uncontrolled and continuous operation of "the law of sin and death" (Rom. 7:23), styled by philosophers "the law of nature", which is an indwelling and inseparable constituent of our present economy, has exceedingly deformed the image, and effaced the likeness of God, which man originally presented. It required, therefore, the appearance of a New Man, in whom the image and likeness should re-appear, as in the beginning. This was "the man Christ Jesus," whom Paul styles "the last Adam." He is "the Image of the invisible God," εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ, (Col. 1:15); "the effulgent mirror of the glory, and the exact likeness of his person," ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, (Heb. 1:3). Hence, in another place, Paul says, he was "in the form of God," ἐνμορφῇ Θεοῦ (Phil. 2:6-8), and also "made in the likeness of men, and in the form of a man". Being thus the image and likeness of the invisible God, as well as of man, who was created in the image and likeness of the Elohim, he made himself equal with God in claiming God for his Father (John 5:18), though born of "sinful flesh." Though thus highly related in paternity, image and character, he was yet "made a little lower than the angels;" for he appeared not in the higher nature of the Elohim, but in the inferior nature of the seed of Abraham (Heb. 2:16).

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pg. 88

The mystery of godliness is practically exhibited in the incarnation of the Word in the conception of Jesus and anointing of Jesus; in the perfecting of its body at its resurrection, when *Deity in Spirit* was as visible to the apostles as *Deity in the Flesh* had been to them before the crucifixion. They preached *Deity in Spirit seen of men* as a testimony to be believed: it was believed, and that extensively, producing, through the teaching predicated upon it, the most remarkable moral effects "Believed on in the World," saith Paul, "received up in glory." Deity in Spirit having sojourned on earth with the sons of men for forty days, "received up in glory," where he has been, for the past eighteen hundred years, awaiting the appointed time to reappear in the world, not as Deity in Spirit manifested in one man only, but in "*a multitude which no man can number*" - a multitude, whose symbol is exhibited in the Son of man in the midst of the Seven Lightstands, the Head of whom is Jesus. - (Rev. 1:11-18).

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 275-277

In our remarks on "Jesus," referred to above, we have spoken of the etymology of his name. We repeat, that it signifies, He shall be; and in the form *ani Yahweh* signifies, I, the Spirit, am He who shall be. The individual who was to be - he who was promised to Eve in Gen. 3:15; to Abraham in Gen. 15:4, 21:12; to Judah in Gen. 49:10; to David in 2 Sam. 7:12-14; Isa. 9:6,7, - was the personage indicated by *Yahweh*, He shall be - styled in Hebrew, the Messiah; in Greek, the Christ; and in English, the Anointed. Now, the

Spirit said by the prophets, I shall be he; and here, in the Apocalypse, we find the Spirit and Jesus speaking as one.

Now, "the Seed of Abraham," genealogically considered, must partake of Abraham's nature - must partake of flesh and blood. But how could this be? The answer to this is, that the fact depends not upon our ability to explain the mode in which spirit may be elaborated into flesh and blood. The Bible testifies that all things are out of Deity, who is Spirit. The Eternal power formed Adam out of dust. Spirit is the basis of all created things; and according to the will of the Creator, becomes rock, dust, sea, vegetable, and animal, in all their diversity of form and beauty. All the resurrected who shall be approved, will become spirit, "for that which is begotten of the spirit is spirit:" begotten subsequently to the post resurrectional appearance at Christ's tribunal. If, then, flesh and blood thus become spirit (and some flesh and blood will become spirit without tasting of death, Paul says), why may not spirit become flesh and blood? It is but a reversal of results from a change of process.

The name, then, in connection with the testimony of the prophets, indicates a conversion of spirit into flesh and blood, developed by the formative power of the Eternal, independently of and apart from the will of man. In the case of the first Adam, spirit, as it were leaven, mingled formatively with dust, and a flesh and blood man was developed, styled "Son of God;" but in the case of the second Adam, spirit acted upon the nervous system of Mary, as it had previously done upon Sarah, and Hannah, but to a further degree (for in these it had only imparted strength for conception according to nature) - in that it operated germinatively upon the contents of Mary's ovary; and caused an ovum, or "seed of the woman" to be deposited in her womb; here, as the spirit-germ of the second man, it remained the usual "set time," subject to the laws of the animal economy. At the appointed time it was born the babe of Bethlehem, and duly named Jesus, or He who should save - both "Son of God" and "Son of Man," which the first Adam was not. Adam was Son of God and Son of the Dust; Jesus was Son of God and Son of Man, being a creation of the Eternal power from the substance of David's daughter.

Such was the babe Jesus in preparation for the sacrificial man. His germination was irrespective of the lust of the flesh, - the propensity excited in the first Adam by his guilty companion, and of which Cain was the fruit. In this particular, the generation of Jesus was different from that of all other men. If Joseph had been his father, he would have been born of blood, of the will of the flesh, and of man, instead of the Spirit. He would have been son of man only, and not son of God; and, consequently, would not have answered to the testimony of the name ..... To understand the *Yahweh* name, as exhibited in the writings of the prophets, is to "know the joyful sound," to believe the "gospel of the Deity which he had promised before by the prophets in the Holy Scriptures," concerning His Son, the Christ, made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and constituted son of Deity in power according to the Spirit of holiness (Rom. 1:1-4); and to understand the same name historically and doctrinally expounded, as it is in the New Testament, is to understand "the things concerning the Kingdom of the Deity, and the name of Jesus Anointed" of the Spirit - (Acts 8:12). In the teaching of Jesus, "the name," "the gospel," and the kingdom of the Deity are interchangeably used.

J. Thomas, *The Christadelphian*, 1866, Pgs. 191-193

The Deity did not die for sin; Why should the deity for the transgression of His own law, by the creature formed from the dust by His own hand? Did,

God, the mighty Maker, die,  
For man the creature's sin?

Superstition and ignorance, parent and child of the flesh, say, He did; but the word of Reconciliation affirms no such absurdity. This word saith "Deity condemned sin in *the flesh*," when that flesh died on the cross.

Jesus, or *Yahweh Tzidkenu* (He who shall be our righteousness) was Son of the Deity by creation, and the son of man by the flesh developed from Mary, the descendant of David's substance, without human intervention. Hence, his flesh was the same flesh as First Adam, with which ours is identical.

A man's descent is traced from his father. Jesus, Yah or "Jehovah," was, therefore, *the power* of the Deity his Father, "born of a woman, and made under the law." He was, therefore, a DIVINE SON; and in that sense, "*Deity manifested in the flesh*," as a father is *manifested* in a son. Where a son dies or is murdered, his father is not put to death; the *manifestation* only of the father through the dead son is interrupted, or, if not raised to life, destroyed.

Yah - Jesus - claimed equality with Deity in claiming to be the "Incorruptible Deity's" Son. He was therefore a Divine Man, in the original scripture styled *Eloah*, and in the common version, "God." This was the God that died, not the Almighty Maker of the universe.

The *power* which constituted this Second Adam, *Eloah*, or man of Divine Power, made all things for His power *manifested and embodied* in this *Eloah*. His *maternal* flesh was *anointed*; it did not anoint itself, because weakness cannot "anoint" itself "with power;" and "healing." "*The flesh profits nothing*." Hence, in his case it was destroyed, and exists no more. Sin was condemned in it; and on his *ascending to the Father*, (not his assumption, or "taking up into heaven,") his flesh restored to life became spirit (was raised to equality with angel-nature, which is the Father's, for "the Deity is the spirit,") or *power almighty embodied*, "the *Eloah* of the heavens;" "He who was, and is, and shall be" manifested at "the manifestation of the Sons of the Deity." He is now to be honored as the Father, Jno. 5:23; because the Father has so ordained.

In relation to the Father's Will, Testament, or Covenant, the Son is the Father's mediator and substitute, on the principle that "where there is a testament there must also of *necessity* be the death of the Testator." The testament, or "will" is the Father's; but he ordained, or ordered it at "the hands of a Mediator,"; therefore, in view of the necessity of the death of the Testator, the necessity claimed the death of the Mediator, *not the death of the Father*. Had the will not been ordained in the hand of the mediator, the necessity would have demanded the death of the Father; but there is no death in His nature, so that He could not die; and of consequence, *the will could never have come into force*. But the "Mediator is not of one" only; "but the Deity is one," - a Mediator is of two, "of God and men;" so that he can die testatorily and substitutionally; not, however, as a substitute for men, but as a Testator-Substitute for the Father Deity.

The begetting of Yehoshua, or Jesus (He who shall save) by Holy Spirit, or *power*, and of the will of the Deity, made him "more Deity than any other man," but not less sin's flesh" than we. "I said ye are Elohim; and all of you sons of the Most High. Surely as a man ye shall die, and as one of the princes ye shall fall." This was said to them whom the word of the deity came (Jno. 10:33,36), to Israel. Thus a special class of men, though mortal, are styled *Elohim*, or Gods, in the sense of being the Sons of Deity. I suppose you use the phrase "*any other man*," as indicative and comprehensive of all the men and women of our common race. Of these, then, the scripture plainly teaches, that there is no more Deity in them than in "the beasts that perish" for "they are beasts" and "have no pre-eminence above a beast" - Eccles. 3:18,19; Psa. 49:12,20. "Any other man," than Jesus and obedient believers under the several dispensations of the past and present, are Devils, or sinners under condemnation. Their relations to the Deity are all antagonistic, inimical and diabolical. Jesus was "more deity" than his brethren in that he was generated independently of the will of the flesh, but not less flesh than they. Truly, as Paul says concerning this subject, "great is the mystery of godliness, Deity manifested in the flesh, &c.

---

#### CONCERNING BRO. THOMAS'S CHART ON GOD MANIFESTATION

..... A short time ago, we had a visit from brother Harper, and since then, from brother Donaldson, who explained his [Bro. Thomas's] new chart on God-manifestation. A progressive knowledge of this grand subject is not more essential than any other divine subjects, but it is *equally so*, and in the present instance it perhaps needs more attention than others. In the Dr.'s words, the "A.B.C." of the subject is scarcely understood. I think the trouble is caused by making flesh the basis of reasoning. Jesus was flesh, but not merely so, because he developed Deity-attributes at an early age. Was the flesh the basis of those Jehovah-attributes? Here is the trouble. Only that which is divine can develop divine attributes. Jesus was flesh and blood by his mother, but did that flesh and blood inherit nothing from his Father? Whence the wisdom with which he was filled as a child? - (Luke 2:40). The child born in Bethlehem had two sides, and by one of these - the Spirit which begat him - he was the Equal of the Father, regardless of anyone's ability to explain it.

The spirit which came from above was virtue and wisdom, &c, and it was personally manifested in Jesus. He could therefore say "I came down from heaven." He was the only one that could say this. He that ascended was *same also that in the first instance descended*. Enoch and Elijah ascended, but they could not say they had descended first as Jesus could. The "He" that came down from heaven and was manifest in Jesus, was the He that preached through Noah to the spirit of men in the antediluvian times. - (1 Pet. 3:19). It was the same "He" that became mortal man and afterwards ascended to where he came from, which can be said of no other member of the Adamic race. A great mystery it may be (this "God manifest in the flesh," Tim 3:10), but none the less the teaching of the word. If this truth is not accepted, we must either make Jesus a mere man or consent to Trinitarianism, both of which are equally absurd and impossible. We prefer taking the divine testimony; and we know that Dr. Thomas fully acquiesced in this view, when he said to the effect that "Spirit was not annihilated in the process by which the Word became flesh." [Samuel W. Coffman, The Christadelphian, Volume 9, 1872, pgs. 210 - 212]

---

## God With Us, and One of Three Things

John Thomas, Phanerosis, Pgs. 63-64 (New Edition, pgs. 70-71)

The literal translation, then, is "Hear, O Israel! I will be our Mighties, is One I will be!" This is the proclamation in plain English. There is no word in it which is not perfectly intelligible. It announces a person who shall be; and if you ask Moses who that person is, he tells you in Exod. 3:14-16 and 6:3, that the person who shall be is that same One who, four hundred and thirty years before was known to Abraham as the strength of the Mighty Ones, who visited him from time to time, and whose messenger appeared to himself in the flesh. This answer is equivalent to saying that the subject of the proclamation to ~~Israhel~~ <sup>Israhel</sup> is, "One who is and who was, and who is to come the ~~παντοκράτωρ~~ <sup>παντοκράτωρ</sup>, or strength of All." He is, while Moses makes the proclamation; He was, in Abraham's time, and from an antecedent eternity; he shall be, when He comes as the prophet like unto Moses. Nothing short of this can be ~~deduced~~ <sup>deduced</sup> from the words of Moses. Had we lived in the days of Moses, speaking the Hebrew as our mother tongue, his proclamation would have created in us an expectation that, at some future time, He, the possessor of the Heavens and the Earth, the Most High, who admitted Abraham to His friendship, would appear in the midst of Israel; and that then, consequently, whatever His name might be called, he would be Immanuel, - God with us.

Now for this result to be manifested, one of three things was necessary; either that Ail, the Eternal Spirit Himself, should descend from unapproachable light, and plant Himself in the midst of the Hebrew nation unveiled, or, that a portion of free spirit, emanating from His substance, should be embodied, constituting Holy Spirit Nature, or God veiled; or that the Eternal Spirit should create a body from the material race of Adam, and fill it with His own power and wisdom without measure. In either of these events, it would have been God with Israel, dwelling in the midst of them. But the first alternative was impossible, for God unveiled in any nation would be its destruction; for Moses testified that *Yahweh* declared to him, "there shall no man see me and live;" and Paul, who taught the same doctrine as Moses, says "No man hath seen, or can see Him;" and Jesus also bears the same witness, that "No one hath seen the Father, except he who is from *Theos* (Divine Power); the same hath seen the Father."

\* 2 cor 6:18  
 REV. 1:8, 4:8; 11:17  
 15:3  
 16:7  
 16:14  
 19:15  
 21:22.

## *I Came Down From Heaven, &c.*

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 310-311

This question has been answered by Jesus in John 6. The Jews had said, "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert;" as it is written, "He gave them bread out of the heaven to eat." But in reply to this, Jesus said, "Moses gave you not the bread out of heaven; but my Father giveth to you the true bread out of the heaven. For the bread of the Deity is *He*, who, descending out of the heaven, giveth life to the *kosmos*." This was as much as to say, that the manna was representative of a life imparting agent from heaven; even the *Logos* speaking by Jesus. "In him," the *Logos*, "was life," says John; "and the life was the light of men. The *Logos*, or Spirit of Deity, was the manna or the true bread. It was this *Logos* who said, "I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Resurrection and the Life;" "I am the Bread of Life," or the Manna; "I came down from heaven;" "this is the bread which descended from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die..... If any man eat of this bread, he shall live in the *Aion*; and the bread that I, the *Logos*, will give for the life of the *kosmos*."

Thus spake the *Logos*, who was in the beginning the Deity. He promised to give *His* flesh for the sustenance of the *kosmos*. This flesh was the son of Mary and David, named Jesus.

John Thomas, Phanerosis, pgs. 83-85 (New Edition, pgs. 90-92)

These sayings caused the Jews who heard them, to enquire, "How can this man have come down from heaven whose father and mother we know? and how can he give us his flesh to eat?" These enquiries were prompted by their rule of interpretation, which has been the rule of their posterity through all the ages to this day. They interpreted the discourses of Jesus by the principles of the flesh. "Ye cannot tell whence I come," said Jesus, "and whither I go; ye judge after the flesh." They only conceived of the flesh born of Mary coming down from Heaven, and of their eating that flesh as they would eat meat. They did not recognise the voice of the Father in the words that came from the mouth of Jesus. If they had, they would have understood that it was the Spirit that had come down, and was to "ascend where he was before;" that the Spirit claimed the cherub born of Mary as "His flesh," because it was prepared for Him (Psa. 40:6; Heb 10:5), and that he gave this flesh, which he calls "my flesh," for the life of world; which flesh, Paul says, "through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without fault to God." Judging according to the principles of flesh thinking, they did not understand that it was an intellectual eating and drinking of the Spirit-and-life words, or teaching, that came down from Heaven, concerning the Christ and him crucified. "Thy words were found, and I did eat them," says Jeremiah; but the contemporaries of Jesus had almost little taste for such eating as ours. When a man marks, reads, and inwardly digests the subject matter of the Fathers's doctrine, he eats and drinks it, and is "taught of God." ..... They who understand the doctrine of the Father, and believe it unto obedience, eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man; for, saith he, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him." This indwelling is by faith of the words which are spirit and life, as appears to Paul's exhortation to us, saying, "Let Christ dwell in your hearts by faith." ..... "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profits nothing; the words that I speak unto you are spirit and life" (John 6:63); therefore, if these words dwell in us, "Spirit and life" dwell in us; otherwise not .....

It is evident that the son of Mary, the body laid in the sepulchre, was never in heaven till his ascent thither after his resurrection; how then, says the man who thinks only after the flesh, can the Son of man ascend where he was before ? This is as incomprehensible to him as the eating of the flesh and the drinking of the blood of a slain man imparting life to the eater; and he exclaims with Nicodemus, "How can these things be ?"

**John Thomas, Eureka, vol. 3, Pgs. 686, 687 (Logos, Vol. 5, pg. 343)**

That burning and shining light, John the Immerser testified, that the Bridegroom, his friend, who is superior to all, "cometh from above," from heaven (John 6:33); and, again, "No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of the heaven, the Son of Man, who is in heaven" - (John 3:13).

Now, upon the same principle that it could be said that one "born of a woman and made under the law," who, during his life, never went further from Palestine than Egypt, died on the cross, was buried, and came forth thence on the third day - came down out of heaven, and was "the Lord from heaven;" upon this identical principle, it can truly be affirmed that "a multitude which no man can number," thousands of men and women coming forth from the earth, and who had never visited any other planet of the universe, were seen, as the Bride, the Lamb's wife, the New, the Holy Jerusalem, the Great City, "descending from the Deity out of the heaven."

## *Before Abraham was I Am*

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 2, pgs. 303-304 (Logos, Vol. 2, pgs. 317-319)**

Jacob was the wall of Israel, and his sons the twelve gates, in the beginning of things. Jesus and the apostles emerged from Jacob through these gates, being descended from Jacob in their line. But, said the Spirit in Jesus, "before Abraham was I am." He was "the Root" of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David; and when he came to be manifested in Jesus, in this combination of flesh and Spirit, he was the offspring of these patriarchs. While, therefore, Jacob was a wall, enclosing the whole future nation in his loins, "the Root and offspring of David, and, therefore, of Jacob (Rev. 5:5; 22:16), is the jasper wall, great and high, "in whom" is contained all "the Israel of the Deity."

## *The Alpha and the Omega and the Amen*

John Thomas, *Phanerosis*, pg. 124 (New Edition, pg. 131)

The Son of Man, then, whom John of Patmos beheld in vision, was the Michael of Dan. 12:1, the Alpha (or Eternal Spirit) and the Omega (Jesus and the saints), the beginning and the ending, the one *Yahweh*, who is and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty.

John Thomas, *Eureka*, Vol. 1, pgs. 87-88

I am the first and the last and the living one; and I was dead, and, behold, I am living for the aions of the aions. Amen.

The Apocalypse being a revelation of the mystery hidden in the prophetic writings, it is to be presumed that it would certainly not omit to exhibit that cardinal element thereof, styled by Paul "the mystery of Godliness," which he says is "great." We find it, therefore, introduced to the attention of the reader in such terms and phrases as "God," "Jesus Christ," "the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the ending, the Lord who is and who was, and who is coming, the Almighty," "I am the first and the last and the living one, and was dead, and behold I am living for the aions of the aions."

These are very remarkable, and apart from revelation, very mysterious and impenetrable sayings. There is One who speaks of Himself in them as "I," and he saith of this "I" that he was the "First," "the Alpha," "the Beginning," "the Lord the Almighty." This is intelligible enough, and we readily comprehend that the Deity, the self-existing and first cause of all things, is meant. We also recognise in the terms the epithets bestowed by the Deity upon Himself in the prophets, and with a claim to them as His exclusively. But when we come to read the Apocalypse, we find the same terms applied to one who saith, "I am the First who was dead." This would very naturally suggest the inquiries - "Did the Deity, who is the creator and upholder of the Universe ever die? And while He was dead, how was that universe sustained? And, seeing that death is and utter destitution of all power, how was life restored to the dead Creator of all things? These are questions which intrude themselves upon the thoughtful, in view of the Apocalyptic sayings.

Apart from revelation they are unanswerable, for "the world by wisdom know not the Deity."..... There is, then, a mystery in the premises, which, as the apostle saith, "without controversy is great." By "mystery" is meant a secret - a secret which the Deity only could reveal. He has made it known, yet the revealed secret continues to be styled a mystery, in reference to what it was originally. Paul terms it the "mystery of Godliness." In particularising it, he shows that by "godliness" he means a visible manifestation of Deity, testified and believed by men. In specifying it, he saith of the mystery that it consisted, when revealed, of "Deity manifested in flesh, perfected in Spirit, seen of messengers, preached unto the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory." (1 Tim. 3:16).

Here is Deity set forth by the implication in two states - Deity before manifestation and Deity in manifestation. Does the fact of manifestation transform Deity into that which is not Deity? Certainly not. Or, is not Deity in manifestation as much Deity as before



he made Himself visible ? Certainly He is. The nature of the medium through which the manifestation is made does not change the nature of that which is manifested. Deity is Deity, though He manifest His wisdom and power through mortal flesh. The mortality of the flesh does not necessitate nor imply the mortality of the Deity; nevertheless, Deity becoming flesh and constituting a manifested individual, if that individual die and be raised again to life, and Deity again enter into combination with the resurrected body, so as to transform it into substance like the Divine essence; in other words, to make that Spirit which was before flesh, and exalt it to the Father, Deity may say, with the strictest propriety, "I am the first who was dead," and yet, abstractly from the medium of manifestation did never die."

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pg. 221**

These things (that followed) saith the First and the Last, who was dead and lived: Jesus when anointed with Holy Spirit and with power, after resurrection is styled by Paul "the Lord the Spirit," "and the last Adam was made into a life imparting Spirit:" for, as Jesus said, when in the flesh, "that which has been begotten out of the Spirit is Spirit." (2 Cor. 3:18; 1 Cor 15:45; John 3:6). Upon this principle the Spirit says "I was dead:" that element of the Spirit speaker, who had become Spirit, died; therefore, the become Spirit could say, "I was dead." Thus "the First" was dead, and lived by resurrection; and when all the saints shall have been begotten out of the same Spirit, and so also have become Spirit, the Spirit Speaker will have a still larger element of the once dead and lived, constituting him who spake to John in Patmos "the Last," or "last ones," according to Isaiah.

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 187-188**

"I was dead and behold I am living for the aions of the aions, Amen." This is from the Hebrew *ahmain*, "faithfulness." Eternal Spirit, both absolute and incarnate, is the "Amen." In the letter to Laodicea, the Spirit speaks, and, in speaking, says, "These things saith The Amen," and in the first chapter the Amen says, "I was dead." But the Spirit never died, therefore, here it must be understood of the *Logos*, speaking from a body personal and *ex parte*, with whom he has united in a resurrection thereof from the dead. All the elements of this body are faithful and true witnesses, and believers of the promises of the Deity, which, in Christ, are yea and within, Amen, unto the glory of the Deity by us (2 Cor. 1:20), the Son of Man being constituted of firm believers of the promises, is styled ο Αμην the faithful One; hence all his constituents are *Eloah Amen*, "Mighty Ones of Faithfulness," being all of that principle, faith, without which "it is impossible to please the Deity."

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 152-153

As the brain in the head has property in the body and calls it his, so the *Logos* in Jesus has property in him and his brethren, and styles them members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones, so that they all become one flesh; which is a great mystery, says Paul, - "but I speak concerning the Anointed One and the ecclesia." - (Eph. 5:22,23).

When this great mystery shall be consummated in the resurrection and the subsequent anointing of the One Body, "the Omega," the "Ending," and "the who is coming" will be manifested, - the whole multitude will be "Deity manifested in Flesh," - glorified flesh, which is Holy Spirit, or πνευμα αγιωσυνησ, the divine nature, at present common to Jesus, and the angels, and then participated in by the saints; all of which is the development of the principle affirmed by him to Nicodemus, that that which has been born of Spirit is Spirit. Here, then, is "a multitude which no man can number," every individual of which is Holy Spirit flesh, glorified substance, "equal to the Angels;" the One *Yahweh* and the One Name. When they all attain to this Omega state, there will be nothing lacking; the ending will be manifest.

## *The Son of Man on the Cross and in Death*

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 2, pgs. 223-223 (Logos, Vol. 2, pgs. 236-237)

Now, all this was significant of the substance, Christ, who was "the end of the law." The Holy Spirit signified something that he regarded important in his system of wisdom, in commanding an altar to be made of earth, or of unhewn stone; and in forbidding a tool to be lifted upon it. The things commanded were "*a parabola* for the time then present" - a riddle, the meaning of which would be found in the realities developed in the Christ. he is declared by Paul to be the christian altar. "We have an altar," says he in Heb. 13:10, which in being cleansed by the blood of Jesus is made identical with him. He was the altar of earth, or of unhewn stone; and in his making, or generation, he was begotten, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the Deity." To affirm, that in his generation he was begotten of Joseph, is to "pollute him." In admitting his altarship, and at the same time affirming his paternity to be of Joseph, and not of the Deity, as related in Luke, is to make Joseph the builder of an altar of hewn stone - a polluted altar, upon which man's nakedness had been discovered.

Jesus being sent forth by the Deity a propitiatory for the remission of sins that are passed through faith in his blood, (Rom. 3:25) exhibits him in relation to the believer of the truth as an Altar - the real *Ail-elohai* - *Yisraail* (the Strength of the Mighty Ones of Power's Prince - Gen. 33:18-20) and *Yahweh-nissi* (He shall be my banner - Ex. 17:15). The Word made Flesh was at once the victim, the altar, and the priest. The Eternal Spirit-Word was the High Priestly Offerer of His own Flesh, whose *character* was without spot - "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" "who knew no sin;" yet whose *nature* was in all points like ours - "sin's flesh," in which dwells no good thing - Heb. 9:14; 7:26; 2 Cor. 5:21; Rom. 8:3; 7:18; Heb. 2:14-17. The Flesh made by the Spirit out of Mary's substance, and rightly claimed therefore in Ps. 16:8; Acts 2:31, as His flesh, is the Spirit's Anointed Altar, cleansed by the blood of that flesh when poured out unto death "on the tree." This flesh was the victim offered - the sacrifice. Suspended on the tree by the voluntary offering of the Spirit-Word (Jno. 10:18), "sin was condemned in the flesh," when the soul-blood thereof was poured out unto death. The Spirit-Word made his soul thus an offering for sin (Isa. 53:10); and by it sanctified the Altar-Body on the tree. It was now a *thusiasterion* - an Altar Most Holy; and all that touch it are holy; and without touching it none are holy.

John Thomas, Phanerosis, pg. 86 (New Edition, pg. 93)

Between the two living manifestations was interposed the death state. In this state the Cherubic Flesh was deserted by the effluence of the Eternal Substance. The effluent spirit forsook Jesus when he exclaimed upon the cross "My Ail, my Ail, why hast thou forsaken me?" The effluent power by which he had taught and worked was withdrawn from him for some time before he died. The spirit no longer rested upon the cherub, yet that cherub continued to live as other men. In process of time he expired. He was, like the cherubic veil of the temple, rent in twain. It was no longer affirmable that "I and the Father are one," but that "I and the Father are twain," for the Father was no longer in him, nor he in the Father. In the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, the body was in the condition predicted in Psalm 38 - "*Yahweh's* arrows stuck fast in it, and His hand pressed it sore. There was no soundness in the flesh, its wounds stank, and its loins

were filled with a loathsome disease: feeble and sore-broken his lovers and friends stood aloof from His stroke, which had consumed him and laid him low in a horrible pit." This was the death state of the cherub. Will anyone affirm that the body was the Father ? That it had lived in the world before the World was ? That it was the Creator of all things ? Nay, it was the flesh only in which sin was condemned, and had it been left there, it would have crumbled into unprofitable dust. (Psalm 30:9).

But, in the wisdom of the Eternal substance, this could not be permitted. This flesh must be born again, and its ears opened - (Psa. 40:6; Heb. 10:5). The Eternal sent forth His spirit, and "healed his soul" or that "evil disease" which is enemies said, "cleaved fast unto him, that lying down he should rise up no more." - (Psa. 41:48). But the eternal power defeated their machinations, and proved them to be liars, for He turned the body into spirit and made it One in Nature with Himself - the Spirit Son of Eternal Spirit, equal in power and glory - GOD.

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 13-14**

"Messiah, the Prince," or High Priest, was "cut off" or covenanted, as the spirit had revealed to Daniel. But before he died, he cried with a loud voice in the words of Psalm 22:1 saying "Aili, Aili, my strength, why has Thou forsaken me ?" Before he had uttered this exclamation, the Holy Spirit, which had descended upon him for the Habitation of Light and Power, in the form of a dove, and rested upon him, from the time of his immersion in the Jordan, had been withdrawn. The Father Spirit had evacuated the son of David's daughter, who is styled in the Songs of Zion, "the handmaid of Jehovah - (Psal. 116:16). The Son was, therefore, left without strength or power and consequently without God. Still he was suspended to the tree a living man, a man crucified through weakness - (2 Cor. 13:4) - and dying of his own volition in obedience to God. .... But things were only to remain thus for a short space. The man Jesus, who had left behind him a character which the Father Spirit acknowledged as His own, had been too excellent and admirable a person to be left to the power of the enemy. The corpse rested, waiting to become the basis, or υποστασις, hypostasis, of a new revelation - a new or further revelation of Spirit. The Father Spirit had been manifesting himself for three years and a half, terminating at the crucifixion, in word and deed; teaching great truths, and working mighty wonders and signs, which Omnipotence alone could operate. This was Spirit-revelation through Mary's Son - "power manifested in flesh".

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 3, pgs. 587-589 (Logos, Vol. 5, pgs. 237-238)**

He "rose and revived" on the third day. - (Rom. 14:9). He not only rose on the third day, but he revived on the same day. Rising is one thing, reviving is another, and two different words are used by the Apostle to express different ideas. The Father, who is Spirit, had "forsaken" Jesus upon the cross and had left him to die there. Having become a corpse and laid in a tomb, that corpse was like all other corpses, utterly without intelligence and power; for "the dead know not anything" (Ecc. 9:5,10), and the Lord (Yahweh) is not the Deity (Ail or power) of dead, but of living ones, for they all live by Him. - (Luke 20:38).

When this corpse, named Jesus, opened its eyes, stood upon its feet, and came forth from the tomb, it "rose." At this point of time it was neither Lord nor Christ. The

Father, who had forsaken him and left him to die, had not yet returned to him; for if he had returned to the corpse while in the tomb in causing it to stand and walk, that risen body, after coming forth, would not have said "I have not yet ascended to my Father." This was equivalent to saying, I am an earthy or natural body just come forth from the unclean place, and have not yet been "made perfect," "justified by the spirit," or "made a quickening spirit." The Father hath not yet clothed me with my house which is from heaven; so that that which constitutes me earthy and mortal is not yet "swallowed up of life;" therefore "touch me not" until I had been "constituted Son of Deity in power, through Spirit of holiness, out of a resurrection of dead ones." - (Rom. 1:4). I am now simply Jesus born of the tomb, "of the earth, earthy," but when my earthiness of body is instantaneously "swallowed up of life," I shall be spirit. I shall be of equal and identical substance with the Father, and by this anointing I shall become Christ, or the Anointed One, and "the Lord from Heaven." - (1 Cor 15:47.)

This anointing with spirit and power was the revival in a greater degree of the former relation subsisting between the father and the Son. He had been "anointed with holy spirit and power," after he had been born of water. This did not change his body into spirit; it only invested the body born of unclean flesh, or "made of a women," with the wisdom and power of the Father in heaven, who discoursed and worked through it. - (John 5:19,30; 6:38, 63; 8:42,58; 10:30; 14:10,28.)

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 not weakness, corruption, or principle of death at all. It was the revived, ἀνεζήσε, as well as the risen again, ἀνεστή. It became "the body of his glory," το σωμα της δοξης αυτου - (Phil. 3:21) - "raised in glory" from the earthy body which is without honour, εν ατιμια (1 Cor. 15:43) and forty days after, taken up in glory. - (1 Tim 3:16.)

Such was the model, or "Heavenly Man," whose image, intellectual, moral, and material, all must bear who may become the future constituents of the Perfect Man, who comes upon the world as a thief.

**John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 2, pg. 146 (Logos, Vol. 2, pgs. 158-159)**

Paul styles Jesus "made Lord and Christ," "the last Adam," and says, that as the saints have born the image of the first Adam, so also shall they bear the image of the last - (1 Cor. 15:45,49). They shall be in nature like what he is now; but, in a moral sense they are required to be now like to what he was while on earth, "learning obedience by the things which he suffered." This tuition developed the moral image of Deity, as the creative energy of the Spirit did the material image, after his resurrection. It is divinely predestined, therefore, (and the predestination is a necessity that cannot be dispensed with) that all who shall inherit salvation in the kingdom of the Deity shall be conformed to the image of His son, that he might be the First-born (or chief) among many brethren.

## *Jesus Anointed Came In The Flesh*

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 2, pgs. 76-77 (Logos, Vol. 2, pg. 91)

In John's day there existed "many antichrists," who denied that Jesus Anointed came in "the flesh." They affirmed that he came in another sort of flesh than that which is common to all men, in a holier nature, that was immaculate, or pure and undefiled. This dogma, of course, rendered null and void the teaching of the word which declares the condemnation of sin in the flesh, in his bearing in his own body the sins of believers to the tree, when nailed thereon by the predestination of Deity. This, says John, was that spirit of Antichrist that should come. It was a dogma that had many advocates so early as Apostolic times. Its teachers repudiated the fellowship of the Apostles, and "went out from them because they were not of them." In denying the true nature of Jesus, they preached "another Jesus," and in so doing, denied that the Jesus whom Paul preached was the Christ; and, in denying this, denied that the Father was manifested in common human flesh; and, therefore, denied the Father and the Son; "for whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." "He is the Antichrist." "He that abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God;" of the true teachings of God manifestation he is wholly and necessarily ignorant.

John Thomas, *The Ambassador of the Coming Age*, Volume 6, 1869, pgs. 215-217.

...The objection to Proposition XX. [of the *Declaration*] turns upon the phrase "Jesus Christ," and the notion that "Christ," whose spirit was in the prophets, "had no existence before the birth of Jesus, except as a purpose, &c." This confounds all distinction between Deity and flesh. Deity is "very God." *Christ*, the Word, who "in the beginning laid the foundations of the earth," therefore pre-existed before the birth of "the body prepared" of the substance of Mary, and which lay dead in the tomb. That body named Jesus, had no existence until developed by the Christ-Power. *Federally*, indeed, it pre-existed in the loins of Abraham and in Adam, as Levi was in Abraham, and we in Adam, before birth; but not otherwise. The pre-existent Christ, or Deity, was not the less Deity because he veiled himself in the flesh, in our "sinful flesh," or "sin's flesh," and styled himself JESUS, or *he who shall be our Saviour*. The cause of all current confusion of ideas upon this "great mystery," is men working out their conclusions as the Jews did of old: their sole rule of interpretation is *the flesh*. - "Ye judge after the flesh," which the Christ-Spirit saith "profits nothing." They see nothing but *the flesh* in Jesus Christ, on the one hand; and nothing but an immaculate or spotless flesh, on the other. Both these belligerent parties are wrong. They are contending knights viewing opposite sides of the shield. If one side of the shield be black, and the other side white, what is the colour of the shield? Jesus Christ in the day of his weakness, had two sides - the one, DEITY; the other, MAN - *the eternal Christ-Power veiled in, and manifested through the flesh created from the ground; which flesh had wantonly transgressed the Divine Law, the penalty of which sent it back into the dust from whence it came*. This is Jesus Christ the true Deity<sup>1</sup>, whom to know is life eternal. This flesh which inhabited Paradise, like all the beasts "very good" of its sort, is styled "sin" and "sin's flesh," because it sinned or transgressed the Eden Law. Our flesh is the same as Adam's before he sinned, only *the worse for wear*: for Paul says that we sinned in him, and he was sinless before he sinned; and we were as much in his loins when he was sinless, as in the act of sinning. His flesh undefiled by sin is

---

<sup>1</sup> Brother Roberts gives a detailed explanation of this phrase on pgs. 69-74 of this collation.

constitutionally the same as the flesh of his posterity defiled legally thereby. The Christ-Deity veiled himself in the Adamic nature defiled by sin, in order that he might condemn sin to death in the nature which, though created "very good," had legally defiled itself by transgression of Eden law. This purpose would have been defeated if he had veiled himself in a clean nature. To say that the Man, Jesus, was *corporeally* clean, or pure, holy, spotless, and undefiled, is in effect to say that he was not "made of a woman;" for Scripture teaches, that nothing born of woman can possibly be clean: but it is credibly testified that he was "born of a woman;" he must therefore necessarily have been born *corporeally unclean*. Hence, it is written of him in Psalm 51:5, "I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." He therefore prays, "Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." This prayer has been answered, and he has been "Washed thoroughly from his (corporeal) iniquity, and cleansed from his sin;" so that *now* he has a *clean nature*, which is spirit and divine - "the Lord the Spirit" - once dead as to flesh, but now alive as Spirit for evermore. - (Rev. 1:18). "This is," as Paul saith, "a great mystery," which those who are wise and prudent" as opposed to "babes and sucklings," out of whose mouth the Deity has ordained and perfected praise, are not able to understand. ....

## *Believing On The Christ*

John Thomas, Phanerosis, pg. 78-79 (New Edition, pgs. 85-86)

That justification unto life and glory in the kingdom of God, is predicted upon three things:-

- 1) Upon believing the testimony concerning Jesus Christ;
- 2) Upon receiving the doctrine of the Eternal Spirit he delivered to the world; and
- 3) Upon one so believing, yielding an assured and affectionate obedience to the precepts he enjoins.

"Thou has," said Peter to him, "the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." - (John 6:6,8). In this, Peter connects the words and the personality of Jesus as the subject matter of faith. This is to "believe on Jesus" - to accept him according to his claims, and to receive his word as reported by those whom he commissioned to preach them. And this is the work ordained of God, that ye believe into him whom εἶς οὗς He hath apostolised, or sent forth. "As my Father hath taught me," continues Jesus, "I speak these things, and if ye continue in My word ye are my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth which I have heard of God, and the truth shall make you free." - (John 8:28, 31, 32, 40.) Hear all what he said on another occasion in regard to this matter. "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me," which is equivalent to saying that he believes the doctrine I am sent to teach - doctrine which originates, not from me as son of Mary, but from the Eternal Spirit who sent me and who through His effluence, dwells in me, speaking through me and working by me. Therefore, he said, "If any man hear my words and believe not (those words) I (the son of Mary) judge him not." Who shall judge him, then? God, certainly; and because God's doctrine is not believed; for, says Jesus, "He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words hath that which judgeth him; the word which I speak, that shall raise him in the last day. For I have not spoken of myself but the Father who sent me. He gave me a commandment what I should make known and what I should treat of." Nothing can be plainer, more intelligible, or emphatic than this; we may confess that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. .... We must not only believe this, but we must also intelligently believe the doctrine which that Son was sent to teach the Jews.



## *The Spiritual Rock*

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 2, pgs. 314-315 (Logos, Vol. 2, pgs. 328-329)

In Exodus 17 the particulars of this strife are recorded. The question in debate was: "Is Yahweh among us or not?" This was affirmatively proved by he saying to Moses: "I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb, and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink," and by his doing what he said. Now, in all this there was a mystery hidden, which they did not see into, nor Moses, not the Elohim themselves, but which we may discern, for in the revelation of the mystery taught by Paul, referring to this strife in 1 Cor. 10:4 he says: "they did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." - The holy man *ish khasid*, with whom they strove, stood upon the rock, and thus, in a figure, made the rock a part of himself, and representative of something afterwards to be smitten by certain, who, like Moses, should speak unadvisedly with their lips. In this way, it became a "spiritual rock." - Paul says "the rock was Christ," that is, it was representative of him. The holy man upon the rock was the elohistic representative of the Deity dwelling in light whom no man hath, or can see. (1 Tim. 6:16). - He spoke the words of the Invisible One by whose power placed at his disposal, water was made to flow. Hence, eternal and Almighty power pervaded the rock in Horeb, so long as the water gushed forth and followed them in their wanderings. The Holy Man himself was an embodiment of this power, and as the same power was afterwards to be manifested in the nature of Abraham and thus become his seed, the rock became highly typical of Christ. Hence, the power of which the holy man or the rock was an expression, was Yahweh, or "he who shall be," first in Christ personal, or Jesus, and afterwards in Christ mystical, or the square of twelve.

## *Jesus Overcame, and Voluntary Obedience.*

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 12, 13

Thus, "Jesus of Nazareth," the king of the Jews, is brought before the reader as the only personage from among the dead, or among the living, who could open the words and unseal the mystery of God, as he hath declared the glad tidings to his servants the prophets ..... Had the second Adam failed to establish his worthiness, like the first, John's weeping would never have been assuaged. But Jesus did "prevail" for, though in all points tempted as we are, according to the likeness of his nature to ours, yet he did not sin. Though a Son, he learned obedience by the things which he suffered. He was made perfect through sufferings, having been obedient unto death. He kept his body under, triumphing over its lusts; and, though sorely tried, he yielded not, but evolved a character that was holy, harmless, and undefiled and separate from sinners. - (Heb. 2:10, 14, 16; 4:15; 5:2, 7-9; 7:26.) When he died, he was delivered from death and now lives for evermore. For he had power to lay down his life, and to take it up again; a commandment which he had received of the Father. This he did, and in so doing, abolished the power of death, having led captivity captive, and brought to light the life and incorruptibility of the gospel of the kingdom. - (Psa. 68:18; Eph. 4:8; 2 Tim. 1:10.) Having established his worthiness in the moral conflict with the world and the flesh, God accepted him as the most excellent of the intelligencies of His universe; and in consequence gave to him what no one else possessed, namely, power to unroll the scroll and loose its seals. .... The Eternal Spirit then imparted to Jesus, after his glorification, the times and seasons, and mode and circumstances of his reappearance on earth; all of which constituted a revelation such as he had not yet been the subject of. It is a revelation of Jesus Christ very unlike the revelation of the Man of Sorrows, acquainted with grief. This was a revelation of the Son promised to Israel and David's house, as a helpless babe, born in a stable and cradled in a manger; as a fugitive in the earth, escaping from the sword of power; as a mechanic, labouring at the bench for his daily bread; as a preacher of righteousness, denouncing the hypocrisy and blasphemy of the clergy; and calling upon the people to renounce the traditions of their blind guides; and to become enlightened in the wisdom from above; as a man persecuted for righteousness sake by the pious and the powerful of the Church and State; as a man accused of blasphemy, sorcery and perversion of the people; as an alleged enemy to God, and a traitor to kings reigning by his grace, as a man in fine, adjudged "guilty of death," and worthy only of "numbered with transgressors" and ignominiously executed with thieves.

John Thomas, Eureka, Vol. 1, pgs. 107, 108

Another reason why the Word assumed a lower nature than the Elohist was, that a basis of future perfection might be laid in obedience under trial. Jesus has been appointed Captain of our Salvation in the bringing of many sons to glory. Now, these sons in the accident of birth are all "subject to vanity," with inveterate propensities and relative enticements, inciting and tempting them to sin. A captain, therefore, whose nature was primarily consubstantial with the Deity, could not be touched with the feeling of their infirmities. He would be essentially holy and impeccable, and, holiness and perfection are not the basis of exaltation to the glories of the Apocalypse. These are to be attained only by conquest of self under trial from without, by which "they come out of great tribulation." - (Rev. 7:14). Its promises are to those who overcome as their

Captain has overcome, when it can be said his victory is "apocalyptically complete." - (Rev. 3:21; 11:15). Hence, then, it became the Deity to make the Captain of His many sons perfect through sufferings; and to effect this, he must be of their primary nature, that when the Great Captain and his associates shall rejoice together in the consubstantiality of the Deity, they may all have attained to it upon the principle of voluntary obedience, motivated by faith, and maintained in opposition to incitements within, and enticements and pressure from without. The flesh is, therefore, a necessary basis for this; and, making it possible for him to be tempted in all points according to the flesh-likeness, without sin. Hence, though Son of the Deity, and heir of all things, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and, being made perfect, he became the author of Aion salvation unto all them that obey him. - (Heb. 4:15; 5:8).

Perfection of character and substance then, is the consummation predetermined by the Deity in his manifestation by Spirit in Jesus and his brethren. In his wisdom, which is "first pure," he requires perfection of character first, and as a recompense for this, he confers perfection of substance, or consubstantiality with himself - this was the order of the divine manifestation in the son of Davids daughter; who is the great model after which the One Yahweh Elohist development is to be apocalysed. Perfection of character was first manifested in Jesus, who was faultless before the Deity. The character of Jesus was the character of the Deity - a mirror in which was reflected the moral attributes peculiar to him, the Word, before manifestation in flesh. Nevertheless, though Jesus could truly say, I always do those things which please the Father, yet he said, "there is none good but the Deity," nor am I yet perfect. He testified his own imperfection in declaring that he could of his own self do nothing; that he must die; and that he would be perfected in the third day of his mission. ....

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. 13:4). In the former state, the flesh was "the filthy garments" with which the Spirit Word was clothed (Zech. 3:3), "the iniquity of us all that was laid upon him," "the soul made an offering for sin." - (Isaiah 53:6,10). But, as he now is, the filth garments have been taken away, "his iniquity has passed from him," and he is clothed with "change of raiment." His flesh thus designated has been subjected to the transforming energy of the radiant power of the Eternal Spirit. By this energy, his flesh has been transformed into Spirit, styled by Paul, πνευμα αγιωσυνης, Spirit of Holiness. That is, a nature in which there is no filthiness of flesh or spirit. It is, therefore, Holy Spirit nature, a nature generated out of the Free Spirit radiant from the Eternal Substance.

# The Bible Doctrine Concerning The Tempter Considered

(A Reply to Questions from Mr. Cook regarding Matters Raised in Elpis Israel)

By JOHN THOMAS, M.D.

(Excerpts from the "Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come," 1852)

---

That *diabolos*, rendered *devil* in the Common Version, is SIN, appears from the expressions of Paul in various parts of his writings. He says "that having the power of death is *diabolos*." The power of death is that which causes death. In a venomous serpent the *to kratos*, or power of death, is its fang or sting. Remove this, and the most deadly reptile is perfectly innocuous. It has lost its power, not of locomotion, but of inflicting death. So if the power that makes death work strongly within us could be removed, we should never die. It is that *power* that Paul styles *diabolos*. It is not death; but the death-producing power, which is in every man, young and old, saint and sinner; therefore *diabolos* is in every human being. ....

"*Sin in the flesh*," then, and the *Spirit of God*, are the two antagonistic principles to which human nature is amenable in the present and future states. The former hath the power of death, and is termed *diabolos* ; the latter hath the power of life and is styled "*the Lord the Spirit* " (2 Cor. 3:18; 1 Cor. 15:45).

Human nature is styled "*sinful flesh*" (Rom. 8:3), that is flesh full of sin; and Paul speaking of himself as sharing therein, says, "In me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18). Sin in the flesh, then, is a very evil thing. It is that principle which works within us what is not good in thought and feeling; and these workings, the apostle styles "the motions of sins" - *ta patheemeta toon hamartioon* - the physical and mental emotions which when yielded to work transgression of the law of God. So that when a man is tempted, he is not tempted of God, nor of such a monster as the gentile Devil; but as the apostle says, "Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it will bring forth sin: and sin, when it is perfected, bringeth forth death" (Jas. 1:14,15). This is the philosophy of temptation, so to speak. Man is made up of certain desires. He desires what he sees, hears, feels, tastes and smells; in other words, he desires the gratification of his senses. There is nothing *essentially* evil in this. The evil lies in their *inordinate* gratification. Now, between the ordinate or regular, and inordinate or excessive, God has placed his law. He has said, you may desire, but you may not inordinately desire; or if you do, you may not gratify that desire contrary to my law, under penalty of death. Abstractly, there was no harm in picking up sticks on Saturday; but when God said, "thou shalt do no manner of work on the seventh day," this absolute harmless thing, became a high crime against heaven; and brought forth death to him who perfected the desire to gather on that day. Thus the divine law defines what is irregular, and therefore not to be done by those who could enjoy the favour of God.

Now, if God had given no law to his people (and he has given law to none else) they would not have known what he deemed regular and what excessive, what right or what wrong. In truth, there would have been no such distinction. There would have been neither virtue nor vice; and the only course would have been for man to follow his instincts. In this there would have been no sin; because sin is "transgression of the law," and where there is no law there can be no transgression. Had the Lord God not forbidden to eat, there would have been no sin in Adam's eating of the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of good and evil. The pleasantness of the fruit in Eve's sight, the appreciation of its goodness for food, and a desire to be as wise as the gods or Elohim, were things in harmony with the nature God had given them and which he had pronounced "very good:" but when he said, "Ye shall not touch the tree under penalty of death," there was a law given that made the gratification of that sin. Hence, it was as true of them as of the apostle, who says, "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I have not known lust (inordinate desire) except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." They coveted, being enticed by their own lust, which drew them away from the Eden-Law. The desire to eat was conceived within them, *by the suggestion from without setting the flesh to think and reason without subjection to the given law.* The thinking and reasoning in harmony with their nature alone, was sophistry; and led them to conclusions in direct opposition to the divine law: had they allowed the commandment to guide their reasoning, they would have reasoned logically; and God's thought and ways would have been approved, and cheerfully acquiesced in. But the reverse of this was the fact; and sophistry led them in the way of death as it has all their posterity since.

"By the law is the knowledge of sin;" therefore those who are ignorant of the law, do not know when they sin. This is the case of those "without the law;" who are consequently under "times of ignorance." Nevertheless, they sin, though they know it not; and sin and ignorance work death, and "alienation from God's life" (Eph. 4:18); for "the wages of sin is death," and renewal unto life is by knowledge (Col. 3:10). Thus, sin had the power of death in Adam's case, and in that of all his descendants. There was no sin in the terrestrial system till he eat. The serpent could not sin, because no law was given to it; and where there is no law there is no sin, and can be none. Sin entered the world *not by the Serpent*, but by Adam; as it is written, "Sin entered into the world *by one man*, and death by sin; and so death penetrated into all men, because in him all sinned." - (Rom. 5:12).

Adam's nature was animal. Very good of its kind, as was the nature of all the other creatures. These did not sin, yet they returned to dust whence they came. So probably would Adam, if he had been left to the ordinary course of things as they were. But he would not have returned to the dust if he had continued obedient. He would doubtless have been "changed in the twinkling of an eye" on eating of the Tree of Life. But, being disobedient, his sin determined his fate, and that of the creatures. It doomed them all to death according to the law, and "nature" unchanged was permitted to take its course. This sin became the death-power; for had there been no sin there would have been no death. Though death *could* have ensued without sin, it would *not have been permitted* to do so; but desire being conceived for an unlawful object, this unlawful desire enticed to a forbidden action; the enticement was yielded to, and shame and fear, the evidences of guilt, resulted. Thus a new mode of thought, the sophistry of sin, took possession of human nature, and *caused it to fall*. Sin reigned, and Adam obeyed it in the lusts of his body, yielding his members instruments of unrighteousness to sin. The sophistical thinking of the flesh gained strength, and became in him and his posterity the rule or law of their nature. This is termed in scripture "*the law of sin*," the

presence of which within him, every man may know by the passions, or "motions of sins," at work there to bring forth fruit unto death. Because of this, it is also styled "*the law of sin and death*," to which the flesh or humanity is subject. Cain was conceived under the activity of this law of nature; hence he is said to have been *ek kou poneerou*, from the evil, that is, from sin. This was his origin. Had he been begotten before that tempest arose in his parent's nature which caused them to fall, he would not have been a murderer. But like produces like, and sin in activity produces preeminent sinners. The storm of passion had subsided, and a repentant mind had been established, ere Abel was conceived. When he was born, he was welcomed as "from the Lord" and though born of sinful flesh, he did not desire his origin under the impulses of transgression, but in parental reconciliation to the divine law. Thus, these two sons were the one from the evil, the other from the good; that is, of the devil, and of the Lord.

The word *sin* is used in two senses; first, to represent that combination of principles within us which in excitation is manifested in passion, evil affections of the mind, diseases, death and corruption. They are called sin, because their manifestation was permitted as the consequence of transgression. And this is the second sense of the word; as it is written, "*sin is the transgression of law*." Transgression was the effect of *the unbridled inworking of humanity*; and when the transgression was complete, or "finished," that inworking and its result were both styled *sin*.

This unbridled inworking yielded to is licentiousness, and is excessively deteriorating to flesh and blood. It degenerates the human organisation, and produces what is observed in the barbarous, and savage races of mankind. Man left to himself can never improve; but must always get worse and worse, because his nature is subject to "*the law of sin and death*," which is degenerating in its operation. The only real antagonist to this law is *divine truth* - "*the word of the truth of the gospel of the kingdom*." If this can be made to take root in a man's heart, it becomes there a rule of thought and action, incessantly antagonising "*the law of sin*." This rule is termed "*the law of the Spirit of life*." Between these two laws there is a deadly enmity; for "*the law of the Spirit of life*" is "*the law of God*;" and the other law, the law of sin, is rebellion against it. God's law is from without; sin's law is born in us. The law of God is implanted by *reasoning the mind into conviction of his testimony alleged*. It is the gospel transferred from the prophets and apostles to the believer's heart; and is contrary in every particular to "*the thinking of the flesh*," which is sin thinking within us. Now men the least fleshly can understand these things best. Hence Paul was well skilled in the matter. "I find", says he, "a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God according to the inward man" - the "*new creature*" formed within him by God's knowledge: "but I see another law in my members" - the law of sin "warring against the law of my mind" - the law of the Spirit - "and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." A man in whom the truth has no place can not understand this; because he is subject to only one of these laws, namely, the law of sin and death. His experience, and that of the apostle does not agree. It is only the true believer who can sympathise with the apostle - he in whom the truth is most active; he can discern the evil of his nature most acutely. It is such a man can exclaim with Paul, "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death" - from this law of sin and death to which my body is subject? There is but one that can deliver, even Jesus Christ the Lord, who partook of flesh and blood that through death he might destroy this law of sin and death from the body, that is, *diabolos*. Paul fully aware of this, therefore, thanks God in prospect of it. And there he leaves it in the patience of hope, continuing "*for his mind*" (the mode of thinking

erected within him by the truth as opposed to the unenlightened thinking of the flesh) subject to the law of God; but for the flesh to "the law of sin." This is the wretchedness of our case, that, however approved of God for character, our flesh, because still subject to "the law of sin," or "law of nature," in the language of "philosophy," is still burdened by that innate power, or *diabolos*, which reduces us to death, corruption, and dust. ....

We see from these hints that *diabolos*, or "that having the power of death," appears in divers parts of scripture in a sort of personal manifestation. The personality, however, is not that of a single individual; but the *personification of a power* in man, and in society antagonist to God and his people. Treating of sin in the flesh, the apostle speaks of it reigning, deceiving, and slaying its victims. While sin has the power of death, he says the strength of that power is the holy, just, and good law and commandment of God. That is, sin would have had no power to work death in a man for coveting, if the law had not said "Thou shalt not covet." It is manifestly good not to covet anything that is your neighbour's; therefore the law that forbids it is a good law. But if there has been no such law given, to be covetous would not be punishable with death and exclusion from the Kingdom. Hence the apostle says, "the good law was not made death unto me; but it made sin appear sin *working death in me*; that Sin through the commandment might become preeminently A SINNER." In the common version *kath' hyperboleen hamartoolos* is rendered "exceeding sinful." This is a version, but not a translation of the words. *Hamartoolos* is "one who deviates from the path of virtue, a vicious person, a sinner;" consequently "depraved, sinful, detestable." It is a substantive; not an adjective, as rendered in the English version; and therefore ought to be translated as above.

Now, this exceedingly great sinner, Sin, working death in a man, the scripture styles *diabolos*: and it may be pertinently asked, *Why is it so called?* The following I conceive to be the reason. The attribute most characteristic of Sin's character is *deceitfulness*; as it is written, "Exhort one another daily lest any of you be hardened through the *deceitfulness* of sin;" "Sin taking occasion through the commandment *deceived me*;" "Eve being *deceived* was in transgression;" and "the Serpent beguiled her through his shrewdness." Eve being deceived, the Serpent's part in the transaction was finished. He held no conference with Adam, who, the apostle says, "was not deceived." Sin, the Seducer, approached him through Eve, whose eyes were open to evil. Sin incarnate in Eve was Adam's tempter. "With her much fair speech she caused him to yield, with the flattering of her lips she forced him." She gave him of the tree, and he did eat; and eating, fell. Thus *Sin caused him to fall in casting him across the law-line*; and therefore it is called *diabolos*. For *diabolos* is a noun derived from the verb *diabollo*, which is equivalent to the Latin *trajicio*, to throw or cast over, or across. *Diabollo* is from *dia* and *ballo*, to throw, cast; and in the perfect passive, to be thrown, or cast down. *Diabolos* is one who casts over the line; in a scriptural sense, by misrepresentation and subtilty, which is lying. Hence, *diabolos* stands for "slanderer, accuser, and whatever else may be affirmed of sin. This is the proper signification of the word and intelligible to every one; its improper meaning is *devil*, and understood by none. *Sin is the Devil of our planet*; which few believe, being so much in love with it, and delighting in its pleasures wherever they can be found. Gentile superstition is terribly afraid of its Devil; but it loves Sin dearly, and serves it in all its ungodly lusts. The scripture saith, however, "*he that committeth sin is of the devil*" - he is a child of sin; "for the devil sinneth from the beginning" - sin transgresseth ever. This is the unhappy lot of all the world, composed almost exclusively of the children of sin. Therefore, the apostle saith, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world the love of the father is not in him."

We have ascertained satisfactorily, because scripturally, as it appears to me, that the thing, styled in the Greek New Testament "diabolos," and rendered "devil" in the English version, is SIN IN THE FLESH - he that "walks according to the flesh" "serves sin," diabolos or the devil. The Mortal body is "the body of sin" or Sin Incarnate, which with its affections, lusts, and transgressions, is styled "the Old Man," than whom no imaginary devil can be more wicked, and defiant of God and His Law. The Old Man in his individual, social, and political manifestations is the diabolos, or devil, or the New Testament mystery (1 Tim. 3:16), and treated of accordingly. Destroy the ascendancy of the sin-principle of the flesh over the thoughts and actions, and you have a moral development of the New Man, and then eradicate it from the flesh by the Spirit in a resurrection or transformation to eternal life, and you have the New Man in combined moral and physical manifestation, "isangelos" - "equal to an angel" (Luke 20:36). There is no sin in the flesh of the angelic nature; therefore it cannot die. No element of it has "the power of death"; so that diabolos exists not in angelic society. The devil has no place there. Being nothing in their nature causing them to transgress, or cross the line of the Divine will, there are no "ta erga diabolon," works of sin, among them. But all is just as God would have it; and it would be so here but for the disturbing principle called Sin. Eradicate this, and "the will of the Father will be done on earth as it is in heaven," that is, in angelic society.

From what I have set forth on this subject, our worthy friend will see that I do not speak in "Elpis Israel" of the agency in the original temptation as only animal. If there had been nothing in the constitution of the original nature of man impressible by the suggestions of the Serpent, there could have been no transgression. Had Eve's nature been "insangelic" instead of animal, there would have been no internal response to the external enticement. That internal something was not essentially evil; because, though possessing it, Adam and Eve were pronounced "very good." It is not evil to admire the beautiful, and to wish to possess it; to desire to gratify the taste, and to aspire to the wisdom of "the gods," or Elohim; but all this becomes evil when its attainment is sought by crossing the limit forbidden of God. The seeking to attain by crossing the line, Paul teaches was the result, not of innate wickedness, but of deception. The Serpent beguiled Eve. Had she been certain of the consequences she would not have transgressed. She had no experience of evil. It might be a very agreeable thing for any thing she knew, and highly promotive of happiness. God had warned her of danger in the pursuit of knowledge through disobedience; but then, if they were to go back to the dust, that is, to die, what was the meaning of that Tree of Lives? Did God mean something else? If they crossed the line in relation to the Tree of Knowledge, could they not eat also of that other tree, and live forever? There seemed to her mind to be an uncertainty about returning to the dust, when she lost sight of the law. This was "the weakness of the flesh." There was no uncertainty of consequences so long as she thought God meant what He said; but being deceived on this point, and so made doubtful of it, she ventured to experiment. But, however doubtful of what might be, if she had adhered strictly to what God had said, she would still have continued "very good." "Weakness," mental and physical, is an original element of animal nature; as "power" is of the angelic. Adam's nature was "very good" as an animal nature; but still weak, and therefore, deceivable and terminable. This weakness is founded in the unfitness of air, electricity, blood, and food, to maintain organised dust, or flesh, in life and power forever. The life-principles being weak, the flesh is weak in all its operations, mental and physical. The life of the angelic nature, or spiritual body, is not manifested on animal principles, but by the direct action of God's Spirit on dust so organised as to be adapted to its operations. It is therefore



strong. When Adam's weak nature began to think and act, independently of the divine law, its weakness, before an undefiled weakness, became evil in its workings, and deteriorating in its effects, and acquired the name of Sin from its having brought forth sin, or TRANSGRESSION of the Law.

The undefiled weakness of the flesh, enticed and deceived by sophistry from without, is, in a few words, the definition of the original temptation. The law of God was weak through the flesh (Rom. 8:3), not through the strength of the Serpent. Had the flesh been strong, the Serpent would have been powerless with all his sagacity. But the weakness thrown into ferment by serpent-subtilty became beguiling, and the beguiling subtilty, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived them, and by it slew them (Rom. 7:11). What I have said about the Serpent in "Elpis Israel" stands as it was. I have affirmed neither more nor less than what Moses and the apostles say. "It was more subtle," or acute, "than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." It is generally supposed that the Serpent was employed by the Devil to beguile the woman. "It cannot be doubted," says Camlet, "but that by the Serpent, we are to understand the Devil, who merely employed the Devil as a vehicle to seduce the first woman." This teaches the existence of an invisible Devil before the Serpent. The Bible, however, does not teach this. "Diabolos" had no existence before the formation of man, but the Serpent had. Moses gives not the slightest hint of the existence of a Devil before the creations of the sixth day. The Serpent first, then man; afterwards, woman; and lastly, "diabolos," or Devil. This is the scriptural order of their manifestation, the revelation in the flesh of the incitant to transgression, or "diabolos," being coeval with the Fall. Man existed before the Devil, and will flourish in eternal glory after his destruction, when Sin and all its works are eradicated from the earth.

"The beginnings" of Gen. 1:1, Matt. 19:8, John 1:1 and John 8:44 are manifestly not all the same. The "beginnings" of Genesis, Matthew and John 1:1 have relation to the creation week, but that of John 8:44 to the conversation of the Serpent with Eve, and the murder of Abel. The fall was probably several years after the creation week, and Abel's murder certainly many. Father "diabolos" was not a murderer before he brought forth our first parents under sentence of death. It was then he slew them by the commandment. The beginning referred to in this text is the "apo kataboles kosmou," or formation of the world, laid in its sin-constitution (Gen. 3:14-21). Jesus is there talking to the Jews of THEIR father, SIN, whose servants they were. They regarded themselves as the freeborn descendants of Abraham, but he told them they were bondmen to their father, Sin. "Whosoever committeth sin is Sin's doulos, or bondservant." He offered to make them free of this yoke by the truth. "I know," says he, "that ye are Abraham's seed, but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you." This murderous disposition constituted them the seed of a living father, as well as of the dead Abraham, for Jesus says, "I speak what I have seen with my Father, and ye do what ye have seen - with your father." Here was a question between them of fatherhood. Jesus claimed to be seed of Abraham and God, while he charged them with being seed of Abraham and Sin - THEY were, in other words, begotten of sinful flesh, while he was begotten of God, sinful flesh being the matrice of both parties. They said, "Abraham is our father," or begetter; but Jesus objected to this because they did not do the WORKS of Abraham; showing that he was speaking not of lineage, but of sonship based upon disposition and character. They contended for purity of lineage - that their fatherhood was not of Gentile idolaters, but Jewish believers in God, which constituted them children of God. Jesus charged them with doing the deeds of their father, which they understood to mean, of their Gentile paternity, for they said, "We be not born of fornication: we have one Father, even God." They considered that purity of descent

from Abraham constituted them children of God, without regard to character, but Jesus taught them that "THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING." If man would be "the children of God, being the children of the resurrection," it was by being like Abraham in faith and obedience, which "they" were not; but being Sin's bondmen, he said to them in the words of the 44th verse, substituting Paul's definition of "diabolos" for "devil," "ye are of your father, SIN, and the lusts of your father (the LUSTS OF SINFUL FLESH) ye will do. Sin was a murderer from the beginning (or from the Fall) and caused not to stand (Gr., *hesteken*) in the truth (or law) because truth is not in it. When Sin uttereth a lie, it speaks of its own things, for it is a liar, and the father of it." This is perfectly intelligible. All men are Sin's children who are born of blood, of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man; and they continue such until they "become sons of God" by becoming Abraham's seed through Jesus as the Christ (John 1:12,13; Gal. 3:26-29).

From what I have said under this head, our good friend will perceive that I teach that the Devil or "diabolos" had a place in the beginning, as really as the Serpent, and that place was IN THE FLESH, while the Serpent was somewhere not far off from the woman and the tree.

I now come to Mr. Cook's (the friend mentioned) third inquiry, "Does not the New Testament teach there is a Tempter, as really as a Christ - the tempted?" In reply to this, I remark, that in the case of Jesus, "diabolos" and "satan" were both concerned. When he was filled with the Holy Spirit he was led, Mark says "driven", by the Spirit into the Wilderness to be tempted, or properly, to be put to the proof under Sin - "hypo tou diabolou." Their nature was his nature, for "the children of God being partakers of flesh and blood, HE ALSO himself likewise took part of the same" (Heb. 2:14). Hence, he was sent forth "in a form of Sin's flesh" - Gr. *en homoiomati sarkos hamartias* (Rom. 8:3); and thus God made him sin (that is flesh and blood) for us (2 Cor. 5:21), and on account of sin, gave JUDGMENT AGAINST SIN in the flesh of Jesus.

The testimonies show that Jesus was "under sin" as a man under burden. He groaned under it in painful travail. While among the wild beasts of the wilderness (a similar situation to the first Adam's) he felt the danger, and desolation of his situation, and the cravings of a long and protracted fast. He ate nothing all this time, his life being sustained by the Spirit, and at the end became very hungry. Luke terms this "being forty days put to the proof under "diabolos", or sin; that is, in his case, under the perturbation of weakened flesh and blood. This was before the adversary came to him. His nature was severely tried during this period, and it remained to be seen whether his flesh thus weakened would stand in the truth, or like Adam's, seek present gratification by transgressing the Divine law. The end of the forty days appears to have been the prepared crises of the trial. At this junction, one came to TO TEST HIM. Jesus styles him, as he termed Peter, "Satan," that is, adversary. This individual, probably, was an angel, for angels were concerned in the matter, as appears from the testimony; and Paul says, "the very adversary (Satan) transforms himself into an angel of light," or knowledge (2 Cor. 11:14). Christ's visitor was evidently a person of scriptural information, and as he appeared as a tester at a time especially prepared for the trial, I have no doubt that he was sent by the same Spirit that led Jesus into the wilderness there to be PUT TO THE PROOF. I conclude, then, that he was "an angel of light," not shining with brightness, but as a friendly man, well instructed in the Word. Now Luke attributes what this concealed adversary suggested to diabolos, or one causing to transgress, but in this case without success, for they were suggestions to Jesus under the workings of SIN'S flesh, seeing that "he was put to the proof according to the likeness

WITHOUT OFFENCE." The visitor, though styled "Devil", WAS NOT "DIABOLOS" WITHIN, as in our case, but an excitant thereof - in "the likeness," or SIN'S flesh; therefore, his sayings are recorded as those of "diabolos." Jesus being begotten of God, as was Adam the first likewise, and not of the will of SIN's flesh, the promptings to transgression DID NOT PROCEED FROM WITHIN. In this the FORM of SIN'S flesh he assumed differed from the form we possess. The promptings IN OUR CASE do often proceed FROM WITHIN. In the two Adams they came from without - from the Serpent in the one, and from the angel of light in the other. These occupied for the time the position of the then as yet unbegotten "diabolos" relatively to their flesh, till the lust they might excite should by the strength thereof bring forth sin, when their personal missions would be terminated and sin enthroned as the conceived "diabolos" of the form, or likeness, of SIN'S flesh.

In the second Adam's case the testing adversary failed to move him from the stand he had taken of absolute obedience to the will of God, whatever might ensue. He appealed to the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, but all without effect. The law of the spirit of life within him was too strong for these appeals. He extinguished their effect by the word of faith, which was his shield, and emerged from the trial UNDEFILED. The tester of his allegiance then left him; and whatever perturbation may have been excited, it subsided into the peacefulness of a conscience VOID OF OFFENCE TOWARDS GOD.

In studying Christ's trial it is important not to forget what I have intimated above about his nature; because it was THE POINT OF DIFFERENCE in the nature of the two Adams from ours that caused the ordeals they were subjected to, to assume the forms narrated. No one has ever been put to the proof through a speaking reptile since Adam's fall; nor has any one been tried by an angel of light since Jesus successfully resisted his suggestions.

Paul's phrase, "in the LIKENESS of sinful flesh" (Gr., *en homoiomati sarkos hamartias*) I have rendered more literally "in a FORM of SIN'S flesh." "Sinful" is an adjective expressive of the quality of the "flesh," and signifies FLESH FULL OF SIN. This is a form of flesh common to all mankind, and indicated by Paul in the words, "in me, that is, in MY flesh, dwelleth no good thing." But ADAMS FLESH "before" his fall, and the Christ's flesh, were FORMS OF FLESH and blood to which the English word "sinful" is INAPPLICABLE<sup>1</sup>. THEY WERE NOT FULL OF SIN. The first Adam's was a form in which there was NO SIN AT ALL, but only a physical weakness inseparable from flesh and blood. Luke styles him "Son of God," because he was begotten by His Spirit from mother earth. Having TRANSGRESSED, his weakness was defiled, and became sin, and his flesh "SIN'S" flesh (Gr., *sarx hamartias*), a form afterwards inherited by Abraham in common with all mankind. But CHRIST'S FLESH was still another form of SIN'S flesh than either Abraham's or Adam's before his fall. The "homoiomal" difference of his flesh from Adam's consisted in its maternity. Adam's flesh came directly from the dust of the ground, Christ's from that "form" of SIN'S flesh styled "the seed of Abraham" (Heb. 2:16). It differed from this, however, in its paternity. Abraham's daughter, Mary, was "begotten of blood, of the will of the flesh, or of man"; but her son, Jesus, of the will of God by His creative power, which constituted him a peculiar from of SIN'S flesh; and hence the propriety of my more literal

<sup>1</sup> It is advisable that the reader consult brother Roberts explanation of this and the following paragraphs on pgs. 88-89 of this collation. Note that brother Thomas is expressing a difference as to paternity (in regard to Christ's mental quality) "which did not destroy the physical likeness of his flesh to Abraham's seed." The statement, when understood in its proper context, and not isolated, is correct.

rendering of "en homoiomati sarkos hamartias" - a FORM of SIN'S flesh - even the THIRD from under which flesh and blood has been manifested since the creation week.

In Heb. 4:15, the phrase "form of SIN's flesh" is expressed by the single word "homoiotes," "likeness, resemblance or similitude"; as "*kata panta kath, homoioteta*," "in all things according to the likeness." One thing may resemble another WITHOUT BEING IDENTICAL in every particular. This was the case with Christ's flesh. It was SIN'S flesh so far as its maternity was concerned, but not as to its Fatherhood. In this he differed from the Jews, who had SIN'S flesh for their parentage on both sides, which they illustrated in their persecution of their maternal brother, who was "born after the Spirit," thereby proving that they were the children and slaves of father, Sin, or "diabolos." Still, Christ's paternity did not destroy the physical likeness of his flesh to Abraham's seed; it only removed from it the reigning principle hereditarily transmitted by the will of man, called "diabolos," or "Devil." His flesh, however, was still reduced in strength below that of Adam's original nature, because of its MATERNAL defilement. Hence to place it on par with the first Adam's that there might be equality of strength, Jesus was "anointed" or "Christened," by which he became "full of the Holy Spirit." This filling did not destroy the "homoiotes" or likeness to SIN's flesh. It was still possible for Christ to feel the force and influence of sophistical appeals to the lusts of SIN'S flesh with which he was burdened as with "a loathsome disease" (Psa. 38:6,7). Hence, says the apostle, "he was put to the proof in all things or according to the likeness," or resemblance, of his flesh to his brethren's in its susceptibilities, "WITHOUT OFFENCE."

There being no *reigning diabolos*, "devil," or Sin, transmitted by the will of man in Adam or Christ, as in the flesh of all mankind, that causing not to stand in the truth, or *diabolos*, is in their cases, and in their's alone, to be referred to the Serpent and the Angel of light. But this does not constitute them what the Gentiles call "the Devil," or "His Satanic Majesty." The Serpent, because of his agency in the affair, became the Bible symbol representative of the evil he had done in the unconsciously immoral use he had made of what he knew by observation, and was able to express in speech. - It would be very injudicious to rush to the conclusion that, because the Serpent and the Angel of Light stood related to the two Adams as the *diabolos*, or that causing to err, therefore, whenever the word *diabolos* occurs, it means the serpent or angel of light. If it did, it by no means follows that it would signify the Devil of gentile "organised theology," which is as dissimilar from them as they are from each other. Christ was not put to the proof by a serpent, not by the serpent; nor was Adam by an angel of knowledge, nor by the angel of light, who offered his suggestions to Jesus. They were both probed to the quick; but by *provers* suitable to the times, place, and circumstances around them. ....

From the premises now before us the *inquiries concerning the tempter* on page 154 [of the 1852 Herald], may be analytically, numerically, and concisely answered as follows:

1. When is "the beginning?"

Ans. It covers a space of several years, and includes the Creation-week; the probation before the fall, *perhaps* forty years, after the analogy of the forty days of Christ's probation in the wilderness; Israel forty years under Moses; Judah's forty years to the destruction of the temple; and the future forty years probation for the ten tribes under Elijah: it includes also, the Fall; and the subsequent murder of Abel, when he had attained to manhood before the birth of Seth, Adam being then 130 yrs old.

**2. Has not the "Devil" a place "in the beginning" as really as "the Serpent?"**

*Ans.* If by the "Devil" is meant the devil of the Bible, and by "the Serpent" the reptile of which Moses writes, I answer Yes: but, if by these terms is meant the gentile "Devil" operating in and through a serpent, I answer that such a Devil-possessed Serpent has no place at all in the alpha or omega of our world.

**3. Was there not a tempter in Christ's case personally distinct from Jesus?**

*Ans.* Yes. But that tempter was not a Serpent, nor "the Serpent;" but one sustaining the character of a personal adversary to him.

**4. If the tempter be distinct from Christ, the tempted, can we be safe, or justified from departing from that idea?**

*Ans.* We are not justified in so doing; therefore I have been careful to abide by what is written without regard to the glosses of "theology," and the *petito principii* of "divines." .....



**PART B**

***Robert Roberts***  
**on**  
**God Manifestation**

R. Roberts - The Ambassador of the Coming Age, Volume 5, 1868, pgs. 81-85.

## WHO WAS THE FATHER OF JESUS CHRIST?

Mr. Dealtry asks if we are prepared to give an absolute contradiction to Phillip's assertion that "Jesus of Nazareth" was "the son of Joseph"? It is needless to say that no contradiction is needed. Jesus was the son of Joseph by Mary, just as he was the son of David by Mary. The truth requires no softening down of the phrases which affirm his relation to one or the other. There is a place for them both in the truth of the matter. They are not displaced by the fact that he was the son of God. They stand along with the fact that he was the son of God. They stand along with that fact: all points of truth co-exist. There is no incompatibility between them. Many things appear to be in contradiction till their relation is perceived. Mr. Dealtry only recognises one fact of the case, viz., that Jesus was the son of Joseph. He leaves no room for the other, and much more important fact, that he was the son of God. He excludes this, and extinguishes the "things concerning the name of Jesus Christ." This is the fearful result of his error.

He makes use of Daniel's prophecy of the 70 weeks, to countenance his idea of Christ's divine sonship dating from his immersion, and not from his birth. His reliance is upon the words "From the going forth of the commandment, &c., unto Messiah the Prince shall be" 69 weeks, or 483 years. This period expired toward the manhood of Jesus, and Mr. Dealtry argues that this fact establishes the conclusion that Jesus was not the son of God till then. He fails to perceive that the expiry of the 69 weeks has relation to the period of his anointing, and not to his sonship. Jesus was not anointed with the Holy Spirit till the expiry of the period indicated in Daniel. He was not manifested or fully constituted "Messiah the Prince," till then; but had there been no work of preparation leading up to this event? Mr. Dealtry himself has shown there was. He recognises the birth of Jesus 30 years before, in the line of David - his registration according to proper legal forms, and his training in righteousness as a qualification for the position to be afterwards occupied. Now if Daniel's prophecy admits of this amount and kind of preparation before "the fulness of time", it admits of the other preparation, in which Mr. Dealtry refuses to believe. If it admits of his being born son of Joseph 30 years before his anointing, it admits of his being born son of God 30 years before his anointing. The contention is not as to his anointing, but as to his sonship. Mr. Dealtry confuses these points a little, and obtains an occasional apparent advantage that does not belong to his argument. Daniel's prophecy proves what can never be in dispute, that the Christship (or Messiahship,) of Jesus is to be reckoned from his anointing (christing) with Holy Spirit at his baptism; but on the question of when he became the son of God, it throws no light. It avails Mr. Dealtry nothing for this. It throws him back, for a settlement of the question, upon those larger considerations, and more specific evidences which we have already seen to be so fatal to his theory. It leaves him at liberty (and would to God he would avail himself of it), to recognise that wonderful interposition of divine power and love which prepared a man from the substance of our fallen race, by whom, in subsequent operations, he opened the gates of death without the compromise or infringement of one of the unalterable ways of his wisdom.

Mr. Dealtry makes manifest the utter hollowness and impotence of his theory and the spiritual perniciousness of it, in his attempts to define the means of justification. He says "If I am asked 'How then can man be justified with God, and how can he be clean that is born of a woman?' I answer by *doing what God has commanded to be done to that end.*" By this answer, he destroys the mission of Christ in its very inception, and



subverts the whole course of apostolic teaching, for if his answer be true, there was no necessity for Christ's manifestation in the flesh at all, and no truth in the testimony that it is HE who is our righteousness and salvation, having been "delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." If a simple compliance with commandment were all that was necessary to justify men, Christ's first advent was merely an incident, and not a necessity, or a vital means of salvation, then by Mr. Dealtry's principle, we could have been saved without it; because, if Christ, a mere man, could do the things commanded, any of us mere men could do the same. The virtue would be in the commandment, and not in anything Christ had done. By "doing what God had commanded to be done to that end," we could have been justified without his death and resurrection. But this principle is a great fallacy. It was demolished 1800 years ago by Paul, who spent a great part of his life in exalting the proposition that "if righteousness come by the law, then is Christ DEAD IN VAIN" (Gal. 2:21).

As applied to perishing men at the present stage of divine operations, Mr. Dealtry's principle is true, viz., that we become justified "by doing what God has commanded to be done to that end," that is, by believing the gospel and being baptised; but the present matter in dispute has relation to the *state of things existing before this stage was reached*. The principle is true only after and in consequence of what Christ has done. Applied as Mr. Dealtry applies it, it is false. Taking our stand with Christ, in the days of his flesh, as it were, it ceases to be true. There was no way of salvation then extant, except in the faith that had always pointed forward to him, and which was only prospectively valid, depending for its efficaciousness on what he was to accomplish. He *had to die, and to rise again*. God could command nothing that would impart justification unto life apart from this, because the law of sin and death barred the way. This had to be surmounted without violation or compromise, and it was done by a sinless man, standing in our nature, as our representative to suffer the death that had constitutionally passed upon all men, and to secure life unending by a resurrection.

Mr. Dealtry points to John's baptism as a means devised for the remission of sins, and as this is an answer to the question, how can man be justified with God, if Jesus was a mere man, it is evident he ignores the character and accomplishments of Jesus, as the means of our justification, and puts forward a mere compliance with an arbitrary command instead. He is thus at war with the truth in its most vital point, and in collision with the great bulk of the apostolic testimony, which is emphatically a testimony concerning the cross, as a symbol of our justification through Christ's personal accomplishments. On such promises the first advent of Christ was a superfluity; there was no necessity for his sojourn in the flesh, and his submission to death. His appearance on the scene might have been reserved for the moment when he could enter into his glory without challenge. Why did he come 1800 years ago? The scriptural answer is "to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The very first character in which he was introduced to Israel by John, has reference to this purpose: (John 1:29). The very first explanation of his name is concerned with same truth. "His name shall be called Jesus, for *he shall save the people from their sins*." The revelation of his approach in the seventy week period has to do with the same great lesson. "*To finish transgressions, and to make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness* ..... Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself." (Dan. 9:24-26). Isaiah's delineation of his first appearing is heavily burdened with the same fact. "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed," and finally the triumphant song of the redeemed multitude, lays hold

even in the hour of consummated glory, of the great work of Christ in the flesh: "Worthy is the LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN ..... thou wast slain, *and hast redeemed us to God* BY THY BLOOD, out of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation." (Rev. 5:12,9). They are only in harmony with the incessant unvarying testimony of the apostles, of which we might quote endless examples.

Now if Christ was a mere man, how could he take away the sin of the world? Mr. Dealtry may say "by obedience." The answer is a true one, but for the present purpose it is not sufficiently explicit. It comprehends but does not define the truth in the details now in question. Two points are involved in it which must be clearly and separately seen. First, his obedience involved death, for "he was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." (Philip. 2:8). Now if he had been a mere man, his death would not have been as final to him as to any unjustified son of Adam; for as a mere man, he would have been a transgressor, at some stage of life at least, and a single transgression would have brought him within the clutch of death, in which the transgression that made him captive would have held him captive. But (and this introduces the second point), he was obedient in all things, and from the first, which, as a mere man, he could not have been, all experience being the proof, supported by the testimony of the scriptures, that all have gone astray - that there is none that doeth good, no not one - that there liveth not a man that sinneth not. He was perfectly subject to the divine will, which as a mere flesh born, he could not have been, for it is one of the characteristics of the merely natural mind - the mind formed as the result of impressions on brain flesh in the slow course of experience - that it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. (Rom. 8:7). It is wilful and foolish, from the sheer force of its own nature. This is absolutely true of every human being in the first stage of existence. "Folly is bound up in the heart of a child." (Prov. 22:15) But Jesus was an exception. Of him, the spirit in David speaks thus: "Thou art he that took me out of the womb; thou didst make me to hope when I was upon my mother's breasts. I was cast upon thee from the womb; thou art my God from my mother's belly." (Ps. 22:9,10). The meaning of it is practically illustrated in Christ's converse with the doctors while only twelve years of age. His inception by divine energy gave an affinity for divine things which is lacking in us, poor sons of the earth. To speak phrenologically, the spirit enstamped the perfect image of the elohim on the product of Mary's womb, and gave to the powers of his mind that perfect balance, which sin disturbed in the first Adam. Thus there would exist in him that soil for the quick germination of divine relation which was impossible with us; - impossible with Adam, because the weight of painful ancestral experience did not exist to incline the balance on the right side; and impossible with us because we inherit a nature hopelessly out of balance - the instincts and propensities far exceeding in development those higher faculties that distinguish us from the brutes. Thus constituted, he was capable of developing a spotless character, and having our condemned nature upon him, he could stand in our stead. He died for us. He rose again. He was without sin. Death had no claim on him as an individual. "God raised him up, having loosed the pains of death, BECAUSE IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE THAT HE SHOULD BE HOLDEN OF IT." (Acts 2:24). Having risen, he is immortal. "Christ being raised from the dead DIETH NO MORE: *death hath no more dominion over him.*" (Rom. 6:9). "He raised him up from the dead, *now no more to see corruption*" (Acts 13:34). As Jesus says of himself, "I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold I AM ALIVE FOR EVER MORE." (Rev. 1:18). It is his exaltation to this position that is our salvation. He is now an immortal representative of the human race, and having in himself for us, fully met the law which requires our death, he is permitted, nay, appointed, of God, to offer us a redemption from sin and death, on condition of faith and obedience. It is to him we have to look. He is the appointed life-

giver and judge; God will entertain no human approach unless it comes through Christ. He is the only channel of prayer, the only source of hope. "There is none other name given among men whereby they may be saved." (Acts 4:12). There is not the smallest chance of salvation for any human being apart from him. IN HIM is deposited the life offered: "he that hath not the son of God hath not life." (1 John 5:11,12).

When men and women believe the gospel, and are baptised, their sins are remitted on account of the connection which is then and thereby established between them and Christ; because as their representative, he had taken away sin, and brought life and immortality to light. By the assumption of his name, and the full surrender of the heart and mind to his authority, they are privileged to become heirs of the life and kingdom which are his. He becomes to them "wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." (1 Cor. 1:30). Belief of the gospel and baptism do this for them, *on account of what Christ has accomplished in himself*, and not that God has appointed those as the means in themselves of securing remission of sins and the inheritance of life in the kingdom of God.

Mr. Dealtry gives a very defective definition of the matter when he says that "men are justified by doing what God has commanded to be done to that end." This statement is true so far as it goes, but that does not touch the root of the matter. There is a reason in everything God commands. He does nothing arbitrarily. There is a reason why the gospel and baptism are the things "commanded to be done" as the means of justification; *they give relation to a real means of justification*. They introduce to him who was "delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification," (Rom. 4:25). Had there been no resurrection of Christ, even though a death of Christ, there could have been no salvation. "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." (1 Cor. 15:17).

Mr. Dealtry's theory would make John's baptism the means of salvation *without reference to that which made it so*. The same principle applied to the law of Moses would make it a law of life. The law was a thing God "commanded to be done;" true, not as a means of justification unto life; but why? Because it was impossible. The law was weak through the flesh. (Rom. 8:3). The flesh was under condemnation, and could not, on account of its weakness, develop a righteousness that would give a title to resurrection. Paul says "If there had been a law which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." But it was impossible that a justifying righteousness could come by any law, or any commandment, except through the provision of a man who would be capable of keeping it, who should die for the sins of those who were weak, and be able by reason of his holiness to rise from the dead. This arrangement was a stumbling block to the Jews, who "going about to establish their own righteousness, had not submitted to the righteousness of God." (Rom. 10:3). Some of the Jewish brethren had still, through the power of early association, a hankering after the law as a means of justifying righteousness. To them he says "*a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ. .... If righteousness came by the law, THEN CHRIST IS DEAD IN VAIN.*" (Gal. 2:21). Paul here unmistakably connects the death of Christ with the development of a justifying righteousness; but by Mr Dealtry's theory all this is excluded, for in Christ, he gives us a mere man, born after the flesh, simply and purely to be a King; and for righteousness, he throws us back upon our puny death-stricken selves in the performance of something God has arbitrarily and without any meaning, "appointed to be done to that end."

We shall at once anticipate two objections Mr. Dealtry might urge. He might say was not Abraham justified, and all the prophets, long before the death of Christ? Truly so, but only by prospect. Their justification, so to speak, was dated forward. As a matter of divine recognition, it was a fact existent in their lives, but as a thing to have actual effect in their deliverance from death, it could not become operative till Christ opened the way. He "confirmed the promises made unto the fathers." (Rom. 15:8). Without his death and resurrection, those promises must have remained a nullity, and the justification of the ancients would have been a myth. His death has as much to do with the remission of the sins of those who died before him as with the remission of our sins who live so long after him. This is evident from the following: "For this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that *by the means of death* FOR THE REDEMPTION OF THE TRANSGRESSIONS THAT WERE UNDER THE FIRST TESTAMENT, they which are called (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all the faithful of other times,) might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." (Heb. 9:15). The next objection Mr. Dealtry might urge would be that on the principle laid down, belief of the gospel and baptism, ought to ensure salvation, as a matter of certainty. He might argue that all such testimonies as "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God," and "except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise inherit the kingdom of heaven," are meaningless, if Christ becomes to those connected with him, a justifying righteousness. The answer is that there are two stages in this question which must be kept carefully distinct: viz., before and after baptism. Before baptism, a man can do nothing to save himself; all his righteousness is as filthy rags. After baptism, he is in a position to "work out his own salvation;" because his connection with Christ gives him a position in which *his salvation is possible*. This arrangement in Christ is all of pure favour; our destiny after introduction to this arrangement is all a question of works. Baptism confers a title, but subsequent probation determines whether that title shall be taken away, or ratified at the judgment.

We withhold, for the present, Mr. Dealtry's argument on the genuineness of the disputed chapters in Matthew and Luke. We will content ourselves with an emphatic denial of his remark that "the argument turns upon the genuineness of these chapters." The question, as we have seen, stands upon much broader ground than he assigns to it. The argument interweaves itself with every utterance of apostolic teaching, and the evidence presses itself upon us at every stage of divine revelation. The history of Christ's life, and the doctrinal application of his achievements by his apostles, involve and necessitate the fact narrated circumstantially in the disputed chapters of Matthew and Luke. These chapters, it is true, contain precise information which is not elsewhere to be found: but that the miraculous conception rests upon them is totally at variance with the fact. They clearly fill in what would be an enormous and painful blank in their absence. They allay the perplexity and the cavilling that would arise in the presence of such a life and such a character as Christ's, were we without the information that he was the son of God, by a direct divine procreation: but that they originate, or singly uphold the great doctrine is utterly untrue. It rests upon the broad basis of all the promises of God; it is upheld by almost every stroke of the apostolic pen; it is inwrought with the very substance and essence of the scheme of salvation. The subterfuge which Mr. Dealtry is practising upon himself rests upon the shifting sands of speculative criticism, the worthlessness of which we may seek on a future occasion to demonstrate, in review of the reasons he adduces from the internal construction of the disputed chapters, in proof of their alleged spuriousness.

R. Roberts - The Ambassador of the Coming Age, Volume 6, 1869, pgs. 20-21.

## SCRIPTURAL KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING JESUS CHIRST

When the words "sin" and "death" are Scripturally apprehended, the work which the Father gave to Jesus to do is seen to require him to be of the same formation as those in whose behalf he came. "He that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified are all of one (nature); for this cause he is not shamed to call them brethren" - (Heb. 2:11). As the children are, so is the parent. "Forasmuch then as children are partakers of flesh and blood, *he himself likewise took part of the same.*" Lest there should be any misunderstanding about this, the apostle adds, "he took not on him *the nature of Angels*, but he took on him *the seed of Abraham.*" It is manifest, then, that the bodily nature of Jesus was clothed with weakness. Of himself, he could do nothing. Where then lay the strength to unlock the gates of the grave? Where was concealed the power on earth to forgive sins and to raise the dead? For it is this that must be known before there can be intelligent and saving faith and hope in Christ. The answer is that the power lay in the *character* which was "without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." "I do not mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me". "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless, not my will, but Thine be done." "He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." In all this, Jesus was *not* like his brethren.

"Sin is the transgression of law," and the wages of sin is death. And without a redeeming power, it is death from which there is no return. "None of the rich can by any means redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for him, that he should still live for ever, and not see corruption." (Psalm 49:7,9.) Though poorer than the birds and the foxes, the riches of Jesus far exceeded gold or rubies, or anything that could be compared thereunto. Hence, he could buy that for which the silver and the gold, and the cattle of a thousand hills would have counted no more than dross. He had a *right* to life, for he had never forfeited it by the transgression of law. "He did no sin," and hence deserved no death. He was cut off, but not for himself. "For he had nothing in him," As a matter of law and justice, therefore, he could not remain in the grave. "It was *not possible*," says Peter, "that he should be holden of it," His perfection of character is, doubtless, to be referred to the fact that God was his Father, and not man. For never, in all the untold millions of our race, has appeared such a man as he. This was abundantly confessed by foes as well as friends. "Truly", said the centurion and the Roman guard who were with him, "*this was the Son of God.*"

Now, salvation is obtained by faith and works. Not by faith only, nor by works, but by both. For faith without works is dead. It is no better than a breathless corpse. - (James 2:17, 24, 26) Faith, however, comes first; for "without faith," says Paul, "it is impossible to please God," no matter what works a man may do. And this faith is *one*. Hence, it is described as "*the faith which was once*" - for all - "*delivered to the saints.*" - (Eph. 4:5; Jude 3) "Now faith is the substance of *things hoped for*, the evidence of things not seen." - (Heb. 11:1) But seeing that faith is *one*, or that, in other words, there is but "*one faith*," it follows that a man must have a knowledge of "*the things hoped for*" before he can possibly be in the one faith. The things are of two kinds, and are designated in the New Testament THE THINGS CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF GOD, *and* THOSE THINGS *which concern the Name of Jesus Christ.*" - (Acts 19:8, 28, 31.) To know Jesus Christ, whom God has sent, clearly involves a knowledge of *the things which concern him.*" The mere verbal confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, is very far from

this. Men say they believe this and that, but on examination, it turns out that the things said to be believed are not understood. This will never do in Scriptural matters. It is required that we "*know* Jesus Christ," and nothing short of this will suffice.

R. Roberts - The Ambassador of the Coming Age, Volume 6, 1869, pgs. 83-86.

## THE RELATION OF JESUS TO THE LAW OF SIN & DEATH

No teaching of the New Testament is more unequivocal than that Jesus was a man, and the same kind of man as those whom he was manifest to redeem. He was "*found in fashion as a man.*" - (Phil. 2:8.) He was "*made in all points like unto his brethren.*" (Heb. 2:17.) He was of the seed of David *according to the flesh.* - (Acts 2:22). And he is a man, not merely in the sense of being of the same general type as ourselves, but in the sense of partaking of our identical stock and nature - "Bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh." He was not organised from the earth as Adam was: he was not produced as a new man would be produced; he was developed from a pre-existing nature with a purpose having reference to that nature which necessitated that he should be clothed in that nature as we shall see. He was born of Mary: he was elaborated from her substance as any ordinary child is from its mother's substance, for the ordinary period elapsed from conception to birth. He therefore inherited the flesh and blood of Mary. He was made of her flesh and blood. He was built up from materials supplied by her nature in the ordinary process of foetal development. He was therefore Mary's nature embodied in a son. This fact is not interfered with by the fact that conception was caused by the power of the Holy Spirit; the materials made use of by the Spirit were human flesh and blood, and the result was the production of the Son of God in the nature of the condemned man whose representative and descendent Mary was. The purpose fulfilled by the Spirit's intervention we shall presently consider. We shall find that it had to do, not with the quality of his physical nature, but with the mental quality which was the essential qualification for a successful sacrifice.

We call attention to the fact that John lays emphasis on this doctrine, that Christ had come in the flesh. He makes it a test: he says if any man confess not that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh, the same is not of God - (1 John 4:1-3), and he forbids the faithful to receive any who bring not this doctrine with them. We shall see a good reason for this stringency. We shall find the fact of Christ having come in the flesh, involves a principle that lies at the bottom of the scheme of truth, of which the manifestation of Christ is but the expression; and that to surrender it or be a party to its surrender, is to be guilty of opening a leak which tends to the admission of the polluted flood which has for centuries submerged the world in death.

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 the divers parts of the word. 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 reigns 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 (or on account) of sin, *condemned sin in the flesh*. The word "likeness," in this statement is taken hold of by some to suggest that Christ was not the real nature of Adam, but a different nature, bearing a mere resemblance to it. The answer to this is that in testimony quoted further on we are informed that it was "THE SAME," a fact

irresistibly apparent on the face of his origin; secondly, the word "likeness" will bear the sense of generic identity. - (See Gen. 5:3). Paul's statement necessitates this view in the present case, for it must be evident that sin could not be "condemned in the flesh" if the flesh under the dominion of sin was not the subject of operation. Paul further says "Both he (Jesus) that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified, are all of ONE, *for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.*" - (Heb. 2:11). That this has reference to nature is evident from the words immediately following: "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, *he himself likewise took part of THE SAME* ..... He took not on him the nature of angles, but he took on him *the seed of Abraham*. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren." - (Heb. 2:14-17).

The next thing to be considered is the principle or law necessitating the Christ should be a man, and under the curse. This principle is to be found in the fact that Jehovah is the great king, whose words stand fast and changes not. He is immutable in His plan of operation. All His ways are founded in wisdom, and they are never diverted from their course. In the development of these ways, the human race has come under the condemnation of death, and the operation of these ways would hold them in condemnation, and destroy them forever, no new circumstance intervening. Not only is the sentence of death hereditary, but every individual of the human race is a transgressor and has been from the beginning; and, therefore, the law that "the wages of sin is death" has fatal hold of every soul. From a human point of view salvation under such circumstances is an apparent impossibility. Because, if the law cannot be relaxed, and the law has its hold on us, how can we escape? The answer is to be found in the facts before us. In His kindness God intends release for the captives, but not at the expense of His law; this must have its full course. How to allow the law its full course, and yet save those under it, is the problem solved in Christ. By the Spirit, God took hold of the condemned nature in begetting for himself a son in the flesh of Mary. The son so begotten was, "in all points," like those he was manifest to save. He was of the same flesh and blood; was under the same condemnation, and exposed to the same temptations, but - thanks to be to God! - through the power derived from his high origin, he was without sin, that is, he was not a transgressor. He was obedient in all things, even unto death, and when he died the death due to our common nature, he was not given over to its perpetual dominion, but was granted a glorious liberation from its bonds, and exaltation to a position of glory beyond the angels. The supremacy of God having thus been vindicated in the condemnation of sin in its own flesh, the father transferred to the Son "power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life" to all who should make acknowledgement of their utterly lost position, by believing the truth concerning Christ, and taking his name upon them: the only means given under heaven whereby men can be saved (Acts 4:12). The result of the scheme is that no flesh can glory in the sight of God.

But take away the doctrine which John inculcated as a first principle, (that Jesus, in the days of his weakness, had come in the flesh, clothed with the condemned nature of our race), and a foundation stone is loosed; the key-note is altered; the whole system assumes a different complexion. We are landed in the doctrine of vicarious suffering - that is, one being suffering for another, which is not a fact or a possibility in the divine dealings. The blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin and the suffering of angels could not avail. Man must suffer in his own penalty, and this he did in Christ, who was a man - "made of a woman, made under the law" - (Gal. 4:4), and therefore under the curse of the law which said, "cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree." The contrary doctrine lowers the majesty of God, in representing Him in the light of a



compromiser. God will accept no recompense. "Substitution" is a myth of the apostacy. Death having passed on the race of Adam, he will not accept the death of angels or a new race in place of what he has decreed. His law must be carried out, and the salvation there is to be, is on the strict basis of compliance with the requirements his law in the first place. This has been secured by the manifestation of Christ in the flesh of sin.

The objections to these teachings of the word are not founded in true reason. They have an appearance of force which disappears on a strict analysis. The fact, for instance, that Jesus is styled the "last Adam," does not justify the conclusion that Christ was "as much a new beginning as the first Adam;" for this conclusion goes in direct opposition to the fact that Jesus was not created from the dust, but begotten of Mary. He is the last (or second) Adam in the sense of being the beginning and father of the new order of men shortly to appear on earth, and in the sense that he bears to them the same federal relation in the matter of life that the other does in death: but we must not ignore the process whereby this glorious work is brought into accomplishment.

The idea that "he was of the same nature as Adam before his fall," is equally untenable in the sense in which it is put forward. His nature was developed from Mary, and partook of the qualities of that nature. If, therefore, Christ "was the same nature as Adam before his fall," in the sense contended for by the friend whose objections have given rise to these remarks, so must Mary's have been. The Roman Catholics themselves have seen the force of this, and have propounded the doctrine of "the immaculate conception," and given us the absurd and blasphemous title "Holy Mary, mother of God!" They are logical enough, but their premises are wrong: they make Christ "immaculate," and therefore his mother; whereas the fact is that both were of the flesh of sin. The friend in question is bound to follow the Roman Catholics to the extent to which he affirms the immaculation of Christ.

But there is a misapprehension lurking under the proposition which we are combating. Our friend imagines that there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no evidence of this whatsoever, and the presumption and evidence are entirely the contrary way. There was a change in Adams relation to his maker, but not in the nature of his organisation. What are the facts? He was formed from the dust a "living soul," or *natural body*. His mental constitution gave him moral relation to God. He was given a law to observe: the law he disobeyed, and sentence was past that he (the disobedient living soul) should return to mother earth. What was the difference between his position before disobedience and his position after? Simply this; that in the one case he was a living soul or natural body in probation for immortality; and in the other, he was a living soul or natural body under sentence of death. He was a living soul or natural body in both cases. The phrase "sin in the flesh" is metonymical. It is not expressive of a literal element or principle pervading the physical organisation. Literally, sin is disobedience, or the act of rebellion. The impulses that lead to this reside in the flesh, and therefore come to be called by the name of the act to which they give birth. In determining first principles, we must be accurate in our conceptions. The impulses that lead to sin existed in Adam before disobedience, as much as they did afterwards; else disobedience would not have occurred. These impulses are in their own place legitimate enough. We can judge of this matter by experience, because the human nature under discussion is the human nature we have upon ourselves and see in operation around us. There is no such thing as essential evil or sin. Evil and sin are relative terms. There is no propensity but subserves a good purpose in its own place. Sin is forbidden use; evil, interference

21

with desired conditions as a punishment of sin, sometimes flowing out of sin itself. The difficulty is to keep the impulses in the legitimate channel. This difficulty is insuperable so far as perfect righteousness is concerned. A child comes into the world with impulses, but know knowledge or experience to guide the action of them. The result is that "folly is bound up in the heart of a child," which the judicious administration of the rod will help to take out of him - (Prov. 22:15) For the same reason, "there liveth not a man that (at some time of his life or other) sinneth not." The reason is to some extent applicable to Adam. He was in a state of innocency, or non-experience. Obedience seemed the natural thing till there was temptation. When good results were presented to the mind as the effect of disobedience, his want of experience left his mind a prey to the impulses excited by the prospect. Had he known experimentally that the path of disobedience was a path of thorns and death, he might have resisted the temptation.

When we come to the case of Jesus, we find a different state of facts, and at once perceive the part performed by the Spirit in his conception. Having God for his father, he was "holy." He is so styled by the angel Gabriel in his message to Mary: "Therefore also shall that holy thing that shall be born of thee, be called the Son of God." There are two senses in which he was so, (but neither exclude the fact, already established, that he was born a mortal descendent of Adam by Mary). He was separated, set apart from his mother's womb as an instrument of God, who, through him, was to compass the world's redemption. In this sense he was a "holy thing," but he was holy in another sense. Having God for his father, he inherited a mental type in harmony with divine things, and a vital sympathy with the divine mind. We have only to look around us to see the proof of this. Children differ greatly in their latent capacities to apprehend moral and intellectual things, and this difference is invariably the result of a difference of parentage, either as to the individual or as to the condition at the time of parentage. Take the child of an African and the child of an Englishman as tangible illustration of the first, and the child of chastity and the child of intemperance as an example of the latter. Now, Jesus was born of our species and one of our species, and subject to the laws which (in the divine arrangement) govern our species. When therefore we realise the fact that divine power, (directly wielded by the Holy Spirit) was the energy which incepted his being, we are enabled to see that the type and texture of his being, though developed from the flesh of Mary, were something far above what fall to the lot of the mere children of men; and we shall find that this is one of the secrets of his sinlessness. It was the preparation of the suitable soil for the divine ideas to be implanted, which should germinate to such glorious results for this mighty globe which we inhabit. The soil prepared, the next stage was the sowing of the seed. The child "grew in wisdom and in stature." He was in the hands of devout and God-fearing parents who walked in the ordinances of the lord blameless. By them, in addition to the daily instruction commanded by the law, he was taken every year to Jerusalem to keep the feasts, by all of which means, he would acquire a knowledge of the past dealings of God with man, from the days of Adam onward, and being of so spiritual constitution of mind, and "the grace of God being upon him" from his infancy, he would quickly apprehend the bearings of the whole matter, and become possessed, by knowledge, of that experience of the evil of sin which Adam lacked, and which, joined to his native tendency to divine things, would complete his qualification for succeeding where Adam failed. When at the age of thirty, the Holy Spirit descended upon him in bodily form, and as it were, took possession of his being, the Father dwelt in him, and his qualification was complete. Yet he was tempted, because he possessed the impulses common to our nature. He possessed, however, that counter-balancing endowment of knowledge and superior power which enabled him to do what no man ever has done, and that is to

pass through this state of existence without sin. The common run of mankind inherit natures in which - through the prevalence of ignorance and the activity of disobedience in a long line of ancestry - the propensities are all out of order to the regulating faculties; and under the special disadvantage of being brought up in a state of society where ignorance of divine things, and consequent lawlessness is the order of the day. No wonder that sin reigns, and that no man can offer to God a ransom for his brother. But thanks be to God, for the glorious provision in Christ, by which we may escape the corruption which is in the world through lust, and enter, in due season, upon life eternal. "

**R. Roberts - The Ambassador of the Coming Age, Volume 6, 1869, pgs. 241-243. (In response to questions raised concerning the article appearing on pgs. 83-86)**

## IN WHAT SENSE WAS CHRIST UNCLEAN?

... Human nature is a bundle of faculties, each of which is good and legitimate in its own place. There is nothing unclean in itself; uncleanness is a relative idea. A faculty, impulse, or propensity going beyond the bounds prescribed by law, becomes the cause of disobedience, and disobedience is sin, and sin has brought death; that is, has evoked from divine power the purpose of dissolution in relation to the nature we bear. For purposes of description, sin is the cause, but literal definition would give God as the actual cause, because God causes the results of disobedience. Disobedience is the result of over-activity of desires which, in their own place, are good. This over-activity may be the result either of want of balance in the mental organization, or want of enlightenment in a good organization. The latter was Adam's case; the latter and former combine in our case. We labour under the double disadvantage of ignorance and malformation of brain, that is, speaking generally of our inheritance by nature. Our cranial malformation is the result of the evil moral and physical conditions to which the race has been subject in a long line of sin-stricken generations. Doubtless, all the operations of our common nature have become deranged, the forces put out of balance, and the spirit or vital energy, generated by the blood, chemically vitiated. All this has resulted from Adam's disobedience, since that was the cause of the evil circumstances that have existed in the world for six thousand years. This deranged condition of nature is, in us, the cause of sin, and, therefore, metonymically, may be expressed as sin, but, literally, and in itself, it is not sin: this derangement did not exist in Christ. The intervention of divine paternity rectified the disturbed conditions, else he, like us, would have been a sinner. Just as a cultivated European brain is capable of higher development than the Hottentot, though generically identical in nature, so the brain through which divine power and wisdom were manifested among men, was made capable of higher things than "mere man," though generically the same. The "substance that came from Mary," therefore, constituted the basis of "the mind that was in Christ," holding to that mind the same relation that an undeveloped kernel does to the tree that is to result from its development. The kernel truly, requires air, sun and rain, to grow into a tree; but, nevertheless, it contains within itself the type and hidden invisible power of the tree that is to grow. So the "holy thing" born of Mary, received the parental impress of the Deity, by the Spirit, and therefore under the circumstances by which he was surrounded, he developed into a "man separate from sinners." I should therefore take exception to your proposition that nothing but uncleanness was inherent in the babe of Bethlehem. Legally, he was unclean; that is, he was under the condemnation of the law - God having laid upon him the iniquities

of us all; but in his actual nature, he was the flesh and blood of Adam, "prepared" by the Spirit for a Son-manifestation of the Eternal Father, that justification (by death and resurrection) might be developed for the sons of men. He was the condemned nature of man, in the hand of Almighty power, for the opening of the way of deliverance. That nature was historically a sinner, and under the dominion of sin, as they regarded both moral condition and everlasting destiny. Therefore, it could be said that Jesus, though without sin, was "made sin." On the other hand, because the mortal nature he bore was a nature inheriting condemnation, that condemnation could come upon him (though himself sinless), without any violation of God's methods in the case.

..... My explanation is, first, as to "ran in the blood," "made sin," &c. Adam, before transgression, though a living soul (or natural body - 1 Cor. 15:44-45), was not necessarily destined to die, as obedience would have ended in life immortal. After transgression, his relation of destiny was changed. Death (by sentence,) was constituted the inevitable upshot of his career. He was therefore, in a new condition as regarded the actual state of his nature. In actual nature, he was a corruptible groundling before sentence, and a corruptible groundling after sentence; but here was this difference: before sentence, ultimate immortality was possible; after sentence, death was a certainty. This change in the destiny lying before him, was the result of sin. That is, his disobedience evoked from God a decree of ultimate dissolution. This was the sentence of death, which, though effecting no change as regarded his constitution at the moment it was pronounced, determined a great physical fact concerning his future experience, viz., that immortality, by change to spirit nature, was impossible, and decay and decess inevitable. The sentence of death, therefore, appertained to his physical nature, and was necessarily transmitted in his blood, to every being resulting from the propagation of his own species. This explains the first class of terms which seem to you to be a physical principle. The second class of expressions are, therefore, in harmony with the ideas embodied in the first; e.g., "there was a change in Adam's relation to his maker (that is, in the purpose of God concerning the future of Adam's experience: immortality being made impossible, and death inevitable); but not in the nature of his organisation." Again, "it (sin in the flesh,) is not expressive of a literal element or principle pervading the physical organization," but of the impulses which lead to sin, and sin (in the results it evokes from the mind of God,) re-acts upon the flesh in bringing upon it a condition in which it is mortal, and physically impure.

R. Roberts - The Ambassador of the Coming Age, Volume 6, 1869, pgs. 302-307.

## SUPPOSED INCONSISTENCIES IN CHRISTADELPHIAN TEACHING CONCERNING CHRIST

"B.B." writes as follows; and as he, probably, represents a large class of readers, in his desire to have some explanation of apparent inconsistencies on the subject of the nature of Christ, we publish his communication, with an answer, in the hope, that, hereafter, it may be possible to act on Dr. Thomas's advice, and cease discussion on the subject, and rather proceed to those practical applications of the great truth which will compass the salvation of men in their present enlightenment and sanctification. He says:

"It appears to me there are *inconsistencies* between you and Dr. Thomas on the subject of the Nature of Christ. You say in your *Twelve Lectures*, pp. 131 and 132 <sup>1</sup>, that "Christ, therefore, though *now* possessed of inherent life, has *been invested with it* it is *not*, in his case, underived. It is the only great increate, the Father, that can say "I am, and there was none else before me." "Yet though Christ's *is not underived existence*, it is more directly divine than human." "He did not exist prior to his birth by Mary." Dr. Thomas says, in the *Christadelphian* (formerly *Ambassador*), for August last, page 216 <sup>2</sup>, "Jesus Christ in the day of his weakness had *two sides* - the one DEITY, the other, MAN. The *Eternal Christ-power veiled* in and manifested through the flesh, created from the ground, which flesh had wantonly transgressed the divine law, the penalty of which sent it back into the dust from whence it came. This is Jesus Christ, *the true* DEITY, whom to know is life eternal." Now I need not remind you and the readers of the *Christadelphian*, that time and talent have been spent to prove the Trinitarian dogma of orthodoxy unscriptural. It has been contended that Christ was "not very GOD, that he *did not exist* prior to his birth by Mary, but as a purpose with the DEITY - that he is *not underived*." If that be the teaching of the Bible, what can be the meaning of Dr. Thomas in styling Christ the ETERNAL FATHER-DEITY and MAN? The bible teaching concerning Christ, so far as I apprehend it, is that he was the Son of God, not *the* DEITY; that he was derived - not the eternal Father! "Thou art my Son: today have I begotten thee." "Thou art *the Christ*, the SON of the LIVING GOD." When did he become Christ? Was it at his birth, or his baptism? When did the DEITY *veil Himself in the flesh*? and was it the DEITY, or the *Spirit* of the DEITY? Nowhere in the Bible can I find that the DEITY styles himself "The Christ" (or anointed.) I understand the Bible teaching concerning God to be that He is but one God, and that He is *substance*, and therefore, material, yet spirit, and that He must occupy space, or a part of it. I shall be glad if you can harmonize these apparent inconsistencies."

Our first remark, in reply to the forgoing, is that there is no contradiction in the several views placed in juxtaposition by our correspondent. They are all of them in there place true: they are but different aspects of the same truth. They appear to be contradictory only to those who fail to take a correct view of the terms employed in the expression of them. Dr. Thomas writes technically on the subject: the other work quoted aims at literal definition. Hence the appearance of conflict, when there is actual harmony, as we shall show. Dr Thomas employs the terms of the spirit, as one having spent a life in the spirit atmosphere, and having had his whole mind moulded by the mind of the spirit. He speaks as the spirit speaks, but is not careful to define terms. This is not wonderful, after a lifetime of wearisome iteration, especially when we consider that all the while the substance of the matter has become more and more tangible to his mind, and therefore, less and less to be debated. To those apprehending the ideas represented by the terms, technical writing is the richest and most suggestive of all writing. The other style descends to the level of ignorance, and seeks to bring

<sup>1</sup> Christendom Astray pgs. 106-107 (Logos Edition, pgs. 159-160)

<sup>2</sup> See pgs. 38-39 of this collation.

down knowledge in literal and precise language. There is no discrepancy in the ideas expressed by the two styles; the difference is in the form of expressing them; yet to those superficially acquainted with the matter, or taking an imperfect view to the terms employed, there will appear to be inconsistency. There are three terms which, it is to be feared, are little comprehended by those who take part in this controversy; and the imperfect understanding of which gives rise to all the difficulty. These are "God," "Spirit," and "Anointed." We don't speak of the words, but rather of the profound ideas of which they are the verbal symbols; and our remark holds good, whether the ideas are expressed in English, Greek or Hebrew. If these are not apprehended, how can Jesus of Nazareth, who is the human focus of them, so to speak, be understood? First, take "God." Do we grasp the Deity with our understanding? The man who thinks he does is incapable of comprehending the "doctrine of Christ;" because his limitation of the being of the Deity (implies in his supposition that he has measured it), erects a barrier in the way of that comprehension. We can follow the idea of the Creator to a certain small height, and there we stop. We cannot go beyond our little atmosphere. Overwhelming immensity bewilders: eternity and the ways of infinity stagger the mental man; and he drops his flight, and returns to earth with the stunned feeling of one who has ventured to high in a balloon.

We know that the person of the Deity is "in heaven;" but this knowledge is apt to mislead us. We are not apt to think of Him as we think of ourselves, or those we know. We are apt to think of him as confined to the space His dazzling and inscrutable substance occupies. This were a great mistake; He "fills heaven and earth;" His being occupies boundless space - (Jer. 23:24; Psa. 139:7). His person "in heaven," is but the focus of His being as it were - the seat of that ineffable intelligence which guides, and is embodied in Universal Power. His illimitable being is ONE. You cannot divide anything from God, or any part of Him from Himself. He is, as it were, an Intelligence of measureless vastitude, holding in himself all that exists or can exist, occupying all space by spirit, irradiant from His person, "in heaven," which is spirit intensely.

And of the spirit, what know we? Nothing but in its effects. The gifts of the spirit are familiar only as manifestations of power. God, by the Spirit, enstamped upon the apostles and early believers, certain powers and faculties extra to those appertaining to the living soul of Edenic origin; but the essence of the spirit is as inscrutable as the Father's person. Prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; this was but the expression of ideas burningly impressed upon their minds by the omnipotent power of the Father, exerted by, or through, or in the spirit. Our familiarity with prophecy is apt to make us imagine ourselves familiar with the *modus operandi* of inspiration. The prophets were acted upon by divine impulse; but the divine impulse understand ye? Nay; we know it as a fact - that is all. The spirit, though a fact is a mystery to our understanding. We talk much of it, and may come from sheer familiarity with the word, to put it by in the mind as a thing we understand; but let it be perceived, that it is only in its manifestations or functions toward ourselves, that we apprehend it. In itself, it is incomprehensible.

If the spirit is incomprehensible, what say ye to the "anointing" with it? Do ye understand the mighty idea involved in this expression? Many talk as if it were a mere effusion of galvanism - the pouring out of something, which, when poured, was a limited quantity in the possession of him anointed. We shall find it imports a profounder thing than this - viz., the establishment of such a connection between the anointer (God) and the anointed, as that the power and the intelligence of the one streams with the anointing through the other, establishing a unity of which we have

little conception.

Whence comes the term anointed? It is borrowed from the practice under the law of pouring oil in token of appointment or consecration. Confined to this, the limited idea referred to is in its place, but it must be remembered that the anointing with oil was a mere type of the marvellous operation which was to result in Christ - the great end and substance and antitype of all the Mosaic ceremonies: - God manifest in the flesh by the spirit, constituting a Son of God. When that operation was accomplished, Jesus of Nazareth was in the bosom of the Father, "for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him." By the spirit, he was in God, and God was in him. The connection was one of power and intelligence. If the limited action of the spirit on a prophet made the prophet *en rapport* with the Deity for the time being, what was the mental condition of a man begotten of the spirit and inhabited by the spirit in measureless presence? It was a condition of unity with the great fountain head. Jesus and the Father were ONE.

When did this begin? There were stages in the development. The first was when the words of the angel to Mary were fulfilled. "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee; and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also shall that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." - (Luke 1:35). A child begotten of the Holy Spirit - that is, of God - was a very different child from one begotten of the will of the flesh. The difference was manifest in the fact that at no period did the child commit sin. An ordinary child, however well organized, would have gone astray before acquiring the experience necessary to give wisdom. The brain brings nothing into the world but impulse. There is the latent capacity for wisdom, but no wisdom until the experience of evil imparts it. But this child had wisdom from the beginning: Wisdom was its starting point. It grew in wisdom; it never sinned; at twelve it knew its Father and its mission and devoted himself to His work - a knowledge intuitively derived from the Spirit that guided him from his mother's womb; (Psa. 22:9-10; 71:6); for such a knowledge with such results at such an age would have been an impossibility with a merely human brain. At 30, the time had arrived to introduce him to Israel, and to bestow an increase of the power to which he owed his existence. Accordingly, it was revealed to John (sent to prepare the way of the Lord), that on whomsoever, among the crowds that came to his baptism, the Spirit should visibly descend that was the Christ. When Jesus came out of the water, the manifestation was given; and the Messiah (or Christ) stood revealed; "This is my beloved son in whom I AM well pleased!" He then entered upon the second stage: the manifestation of God in mortal flesh by the spirit shed without measure upon a man provided for himself by the operation of the spirit upon the "seed of David according to the flesh." For three years and half, this wonderful man - in whom God tabernacled - to whom the winds and the sea were obedient - went about doing good, speaking the words of God, and teaching as one having authority and not as the scribes. - (Matt. 7:29). At the end of that time he was crucified, and the Father left him for three days. On the third day, He returned to him, and the anointing was then consummated in the substance of the man Christ Jesus being changed to spirit, and he was "received up into glory," where "he to make intercession for those who come unto God by him."

With these facts in view, we are prepared to answer our correspondent's queries. Jesus Christ as an individual manifestation of Eternal Power, had a personality and a character as the Son of God, distinct from the Father, whose Son he was, and which, from the very nature of things, were developed subsequently to his begetting by the Holy Spirit. The former was the attribute of the body born of Mary, and afterwards crucified on Calvary, and raised from the dead, and "taken up into glory"; the latter was the

result of his probationary contact with evil during the days of his flesh. But individuality of his own existence as a man, does not exclude the fact that he was the flesh-embodiment of the Eternal Father by the spirit. "God was in Christ." (2 Cor 5:19). "The Father dwelleth in me." - (John 14:10). "A man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders, and signs which GOD did *by him*, in the midst of you." - (Acts 2:22). These are New Testament definitions on the point. It may be difficult for us, as mere flesh-borns, to realise this combination of the human and the divine in one person, but the fact of the combination is self-evident. Someone says "O, that is Trinitarianism!" Not at all; Trinitarianism teaches the incarnation of "the Son;" the truth recognises the incarnation of the Father, resulting in a Son, which is a very different thing.

Of Jesus Christ, the individualised and intelligent manifestation of the Father, then, it is true that "though now possessed of inherent life, he has been invested with it; it is not, in his case, underived" - (*Twelve Lectures*, Pg. 131,132<sup>1</sup>); and that "he did not exist prior to his birth by Mary." There is nothing inconsistent with this and the statements of Dr. Thomas: (a) "Jesus Christ, in the days of his weakness, had two sides, the one Deity and the other man." (b) "The Eternal Christ-power, veiled in and manifested through the flesh, created from the ground in Eden &c." (c) "This is Jesus Christ, the true Deity, whom to know is life eternal."

- A) Dr. Thomas does not say that the two sides of the Christ were first, the divine Son; second, man. He affirms that which the scriptures declare - that his two sides were first the Father who was manifested in him, and second the medium of manifestation - the man who was of the seed of David according to the flesh, begotten by the Spirit. This manifestation of the Divine in the human was Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ was not the human or the Divine separately, but both in combination, constituting the Son.
- B) What then, it is asked, is the meaning of "the Eternal Christ-power, veiled in and manifested through the flesh?" The meaning is evident when the language is correctly understood. The "Christ-power" has no reference to the character or individuality of Jesus Christ, our Elder Brother, who learned obedience by the things he suffered; but to the power that was before him, and of which he was the incarnation. Who is the Eternal Christ-power? Why, the Father, who is Spirit, and everywhere present. Then why obscure the subject by this mode of description? There is a reason. But first, it is no real obscuration, though the matter can be otherwise expressed. Whence sprung "Jesus Christ," understood in the most superficial way? From the Eternal Power. Would there have been such a man, but for the power of the Spirit upon Mary? No. What determined his character and gave him his Power? That which he owed his existence, which was the eternal power of the Father exerted by the Spirit. It is, therefore, no inaccuracy to term that antecedent power, the "Eternal Christ-power." There would have been no Christ but for that power. But the reason for keeping this aspect well in the foreground: well that is to be found in the tendency on the part of some - having but a superficial apprehension of the truth - to ignore the divine element in Jesus, and teach falsehood concerning him, in saying that he was a mere man, though begotten of the Spirit, having but the nature of his mother, and not of his Father, or that he was the Son of Joseph. The forms in which truth are expressed are always affected by the attitude of heresy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Christendom Astray pgs. 106-107 (Logos Edition, pgs. 159-160)



Our correspondent asks, "When did the Deity," (that is the Eternal Christ-power) "veil himself in the flesh?" The answer has virtually been given. The process was commenced with the conception of Jesus, and completed by the visible descent of the spirit at the Jordan. The then asks, "Was it the Deity or the Spirit of the Deity?" This question reveals the source of misunderstanding. To speak of the Deity apart from "the Spirit of the Deity" in such a matter as this, is a mistake. The Deity and His Spirit are *one* in the sense attempted to be defined a little way back. What one does, the other cannot be said not to do. The difference between the Father and the Spirit, is only a difference from our point of view. As bearing upon us finite mortals, there is the Spirit in which we live, move and have our being, and the Father dwelling in light that no man can approach; but when we take God's point of view, there is a great change in the situation. God is one and fills all; "He fills heaven and earth" (Jer. 23:24); "He is not far from every one of us." - (Acts 17:27). The spirit is but the infinite extension, so to speak of Himself; and when the spirit does anything, it is the Father doing it, because the spirit is not separate from the Father. Now on the question of God's manifestation in the flesh, the language is derived from God's point of view, because God is the actor. To ask, then, whether it was the Father or the spirit of the Father, that was veiled in the flesh, is to go off the track. The Father (by the Spirit) veiled himself in the flesh, and the result was Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God, and King of the Jews. If it be asked "was not the Father as much dwelling in light, in the heavens, after Jesus was born as before," the answer is, Certainly; and it was to this glorious and everlasting Father that Jesus prayed and taught his disciples to pray; but who nevertheless, dwelt in Jesus. - (Jno. 14:10). When men realise the immensity of Deity, they will better comprehend the doctrine of His manifestation in Jesus. Read the following: - "If ye had known me, ye should have also have known my Father also; and from henceforth, ye know Him and have seen Him. Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, "Have I been so long time with thee, and thou has not known me Philip?" He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me, or else believe me for the very works' sake." - (John 14:7-11).

- Q Jesus was the true God in manifestation. The angels who spoke to the fathers were so also; and hence, relatively to men, are described as God. - (Judges 2:1-3). The angel in the bush said "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." - (Ex. 3:6). When three angels presented themselves to Abraham, it is said that "Jehovah appeared" unto him. (Gen. 18:1). So with the Angel on Mount Sinai that spoke to Moses, (Acts 7:38), and many other cases. There is nothing inappropriate in this. These were the official manifestations of the Eternal Power of the Universe to the fathers. The fact that Eternal Power was the speaker is kept in the foreground, but this does not exclude the minor fact that the mediums of speech were created intelligences. So Christ being the Father veiled in our flesh is styled the Deity, but this does not exclude the fact that literally, he is but the manifestation of him, viz, the Son of God, the man Christ Jesus. The two aspects co-exist. Indeed, there is a trinity in the case, though not *the* Trinity. Jesus is "the Father, (manifested in a) Son (by the) Holy Spirit;" and in combination "these three are one." Hence, in being "baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." - (Matt. 28:19). When we are in Christ, we are "in God," (1 Thes. 1:1), because he is in the Father. "The head of every man (in Christ) is Christ, and the head of Christ is God's." - (1 Cor. 11:3). "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God." - (1 Cor. 3:23).

God is the great head, Christ is the mediator. In due time God will be all in all. "Then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him." - (1 Cor. 15:28).

"Nowhere does the Deity style himself the Christ," observes our correspondent. There are not wanting instances where the Deity's operations are described even under this name. "The Spirit of Christ" was in the prophets. - (1 Pet. 1:11-12). This is parallel with "the Spirit of God." "Let us not tempt Christ as some of them (under Moses) also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents." - (1 Cor. 10:9). "He (Christ) preached unto the spirits in prison, who were disobedient in the days of Noah." - (1 Pet. 3:19). But does not such a use of the term Christ involve confusion? Our correspondent may ask. On the surface it may appear so; but when we consider that the Christing of Jesus was the Deity dwelling in him by the spirit, it is no marvel that the same power, otherwise manifested, should be designated in the same way in the days of the apostles, when their great effort was to set forth the Lord Jesus, as the Word made flesh, in opposition to those who said "Is not this the son of Joseph? Whence hath this man this wisdom and these mighty deeds?" Realise the nature of the anointing that constituted Jesus the Christ, and there will be less difficulty in apprehending the language that speaks of Deity and Christ as the same.

We conclude with a hint that may not be amiss for those who think Dr. Thomas mistaken on this question: Do you think that the intellect that produced *Elpis Israel* and *Eureka*, applied for many years to the study of the Holy Oracles, is less likely to arrive at a correct apprehension of the matter, than your own feeble minds, but recently directed to the consideration of these profound subjects? We leave the wisdom that any man may have, to supply its own answer, and "if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant." - (1 Cor. 14:38).

---

### A MATTER OF FELLOWSHIP !

...The friends of the truth in Detroit, who are unhappily divided, apparently differ in their modes of defining the truth on one of its subtlest points, and hence disagree. We must refer them to our remarks this month under the head of "Supposed Inconsistencies in Christadelphian teaching concerning Christ," for a possible ground of agreement. So far as we can judge, there is no difference in their actual conception of Christ, unless the definition above is intended to mean that Jesus was *only* the son of man, and *not* the Son of God; that "the power of the Highest" merely "quickened the seed of the woman" without imparting of its own nature to that seed. If this is the idea with those with Mr. Paton, (that Jesus possessed only the nature of his mother), then there is substantial difference between them and those whom they have left - a difference justifying disunion. If this is not so, and those with Mr. Paton endorse the self-evident conclusion that Jesus received the basis and type and power of his nature "from above," by the Spirit (which is the Eternal Word, Discourse or Expression of the Father,) and that the man Christ Jesus was the flesh-form and individual character produced by this interposition of Eternal Power, laying hold of the condemned nature of Adam, in the line of Abraham and David - then there is no ground of disagreement, except such as may arise from different forms of speech; and this is a disagreement that ought to be put an end to as quickly as possible. [R. Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1869, pg. 318]

R.Roberts, The Christadelphian, 1872, pgs. 88-89

## IS CHRIST AN INSTRUMENT?

*"Is it scriptural to assert "that Christ is to be an instrument in the hands of God, to punish the nations," in view of the following passages: Psalm 110:1-3; Matt. 28:18; John 5:17, 18, 22." - R.H.*

ANSWER: - Strictly speaking, an instrument is the passive agent by which a thing is done by the intelligence using it. In this sense, Christ is not an instrument. He is the intelligence itself embodied. The light of the glory of God "shines in his face," to use an apostolic metaphor. - (2 Cor. 4:6). "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. It hath pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell." - (Col. 1:19). The Father dwells in him by the Spirit. "God was in Christ." He is "God manifest in the flesh." He is the individualization of the power and intelligence and wisdom which dwell in the Eternal Fountain. Therefore when he comes it will be the "appearing of our great God and Saviour." - (Titus 2:11). "Our God for whom we have waited." - (Isa. 25:9). YAHWEH who will come with fire and His chariots like a whirlwind to render His anger with fury and His rebukes with flames of fire. - (Isa. 66:15). When he punishes the nations it is Yahweh who makes desolation in the earth; who makes wars to cease, and is exalted among the heathen. - (Psa. 46:8-11). When He smites the hosts of Gog, it is at Yahweh's presence that men shake, (Ezek. 38:20); and Yahweh's hand they will see uplifted. - (Ezek. 39:21). When he reigns it will be the Lord of Hosts (Yahweh of armies) in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, before His ancients gloriously, for His very name is the Mighty God, the everlasting Father - Emmanuel - God with us - God manifested in the flesh and justified in the spirit.

Considering that he is the mystery of God-manifestation, it may be objectionable to use the phraseology referred to by our correspondent. Yet, there is the other side of the question in deference to which it is probable the phraseology is employed. That is, that the prime mover in all these proceedings is the Eternal Majesty of the Heavens, who is the head of Christ (1 Cor. 11:3), the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Eph. 1:3), to whom he belongs (1 Cor. 3:23), who is greater than he (Jno. 14:28), and from whom he has received his position, knowledge, and revelation (Phil. 2:9; Heb. 1:2; Rev. 1:1); and to whom he will be subject when all things are subdued unto him, at the end of the kingdom - (1 Cor. 15:28). In the sense of all these statements it is not incorrect to say, that "God hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world, by (as by a vital willing instrument) that man whom He hath appointed, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, that He hath raised him from the dead." It is well to avoid equivocal language in the matter; but if the truth in both aspects of the case is recognised, provided the form of words do not affirm a palpable error, the phraseology is scarcely a thing to quarrel about.

## THE OPERATIONS OF THE DEITY

..... Recognising the fact that the language which exhibits the spirit as an actor in the arena of human affairs, originates in the fact of a new volition from the Deity, directed toward our affairs, having taken place since He established the present order of things, we shall find our task greatly simplified in considering that profounder aspect of the matter, already hinted at, viz., the manifestation of God in the flesh. This introduces to notice "the man Christ Jesus," who caused no end of controversy among his contemporaries (John 7:43), and even among his own disciples, (John 6:60) and who has been the theme of much disputation ever since, even to bloodshed, in accordance with his own statement, "I came not to send peace on earth, but a sword; from henceforth, there shall be division." - (Matt. 10:34).

The secret of this discordant tendency is doubtless to be found in the inability of most men to grasp the mighty phenomenon of the Creator of all things manifesting Himself in a man, who (though inhabited by the Father through the spirit,) was yet a distinct person, sustaining the relation of Son to the Father, and having to develop character under trial, like those he was manifested to redeem. Speaking of the subject Paul says: "Great is the mystery of Godliness. God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." - (1 Tim. 3:16). Critics have endeavoured to get rid of this verse, substituting for "God" "he who," which would make the verse read "He who was manifest in the flesh." There are some grounds for this emendation; but they are not conclusive. The three most ancient Greek manuscripts extant: Vatican, Sinaitic, and the Alexandrine, all have  $\alpha\varsigma$  instead of  $\Theta\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$ : i.e., "he who" instead of "God." The suggestion is, that the introduction of  $\Theta\epsilon$  before  $\alpha\varsigma$  has been the blunder of a transcriber, or a wilful corruption of the text to support Trinitarianism. This, however, does not follow. The three MSS referred to, may themselves be but the perpetuation in the text in question, of a previous corruption, by which  $\Theta\epsilon$  was dropped. This is more the likely from the circumstances that the Latin Vulgate, on which the English version of the Scriptures is chiefly based, is a translation made from earlier MSS than the date assigned to the three MSS in question, when the translator (Jerome), had a wide range of choice, so far as what would now be very ancient copies of the New Testament are concerned; and this contains the reading given in the English version - "*Deus conspicuus factus est in carne.*" The conflict is between the three old MSS. and the version of a man who had opportunity of choosing from a multitude of manuscripts contemporary with these, and who must have had a reason for declining the "He-who" reading, which, by the way, is unsuited to the context. The correct reading is as likely to be on one side as the other. However, it does not much affect the argument on the main question, because although the words, as they stand in the common version, give a concise definition of the mystery of godliness, and a good starting point for the consideration of the subject, they are not essential for the demonstration of the subject itself, because the fact that God was manifested in Christ is testified in too many ways to leave it dependent upon a single text.

Thus John, in his first epistle, defines the matter in the following words: "That which was from the beginning which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, of the word of life, for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto your that

eternal, which was the Father, and was manifested unto us. " This is only in another form what John says in the first chapter of his gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God." *"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."* These two testimonies, of themselves, uphold the probability that Paul in 1 Timothy 3:6, wrote the verse as Jerome gives it. However, the great question is, what is it that these verses describe? They describe a phase of "the man Christ Jesus," which was not apparent to those who looked upon his exterior, or to use his own words, who "judged after the flesh." What phase was this? The history of Jesus, as recorded in the gospels, supplies the answer, and the answer begins at the beginning of history. Luke tells us that the angel Gabriel came to Mary, and said unto her: "Thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and call his name Jesus." Mary is surprised, and asks how this can be, seeing she is a virgin. The answer to this is (verse 35, chap. 1) "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore, also, that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." In this, we have a literal definition of the thing referred to in more obscure terms in the other verses I have quoted. Let us consider what it involves. The child born was the offspring of the Spirit as well as of the flesh and blood of Mary. This cannot be denied in the face of the statement of the angel, that because the Spirit - which is God - should come upon *her*, THEREFORE, the child to be born should be *Son of God*. And being the offspring of the Spirit, does it not stand to reason that though a man, he was a different "manner of man" from what we are? - the very same nature physically, because made out of the nature of Mary, and therefore, as Paul says, "He took not upon him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham - partaking of flesh and blood, for as much as the children were partakers thereof " (Heb. 2:14), "made of the seed of David according to the flesh." - (Rom. 1:2), "of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came." - (Rom. 9:5). Yet in so far as the energy, power, or spirit, underlying his flesh nature was concerned, he was higher than we. He was human nature in the hand of the God of Israel, for its condemnation, in order to salvation. He was a man, yet God manifest in the flesh by the Spirit. This is the testimony, and agrees with our conceptions of what must have been the result of such an operation as that recorded by Luke in connection with Mary. The impregnation of a human ovum by the Spirit must have resulted in a different child from that which is born of the will of the flesh.

The argument set against this by those who contend for Jesus being "a mere man," ignores an important aspect of divine operation. The argument is this: that as the Spirit has created flesh and blood - men and animals - without infusing into them a divine element, so may the Spirit have begot Jesus, without imparting anything beyond the qualities appertaining to men in general. If the Spirit were a mere mechanical agent, like the elements of chemistry, there would be force in this argument; but the Spirit is the Eternal Essence - God - the First Cause, and, consequently, the vehicle of the Eternal Wisdom and purpose. *The results of its operation are, consequently, according to the divine purpose.* BY THE SAME SPIRIT, ENDLESS DIVERSITY OF RESULT IS DEVELOPED. Thus, in the apostolic ecclesias, there were "diversities of gifts, but the same spirit." - (1 Cor. 12:4).

In creation, there is infinite variety of life and nature, but all existing in and produced by the same spirit, which determines the constitution of anything by its own will. Now, applying this principle to the matter in hand, the question is, *What was the result, divinely contemplated, in the conception of Jesus?* Was it not the bringing about of the thing imported by the name bestowed upon the child - *Emmanuel* ? (GOD WITH US) - the manifestation of God in our nature, resulting in a man, who though a man, was

"the arm of the Lord" (Isa. 53:1), stretched out in love for our salvation from death ? If this is admitted - and it cannot be otherwise - then it follows that the interposition of the Spirit, in the way announced by Gabriel, produced a higher result than when it merely operates for the creation of an animal. It introduced "the Word made flesh" the God of Israel in flesh-manifestation, through the Spirit: a man, therefore, in such sympathetic relation to Deity as to be, in his mental relations, a very different man from us, who are merely of the earth, earthy. This difference is put forward by John the Baptist, who was sent to prepare his way: "He (Jesus) must increase, but I must decrease. He that cometh from above is above all; he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from heaven is above all." - (John 3:30,31). The difference is manifest in all his history. Angels celebrated his birth on the high plains of Bethlehem; a star guided the wise men of the east to his cradle; the Spirit detained Simeon till he put his eyes upon the babe which was declared to him to be "the Lord's Christ;" at twelve, the child confounded the doctors of the law in the temple, and was even then bent upon "his Father's business." The difference becomes more and more apparent at every step. Did there ever live another man, who could say to those who knew him, "Which of you convinceth me of sin ?" - (John 8:46). People may quarrel as to what the difference consisted in; but that there was a difference cannot be denied; and if there was any difference at all, there may have been a great difference so far as the principle is concerned. This was a man who *spake as never a man spake*. Where did the difference lie ? In his parentage, for he was a child of the Spirit, on his Father's side, and of the flesh on his mother's side. See the statement of the angel to Joseph when he was about to put Mary away, being found with child: "Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: *for that which is conceived in her is OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.*" Shall it be said that he was the child of the Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Spirit was not with him in his childhood? Why even John, the forerunner of Jesus, was "*filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb.*" This is the testimony of Luke 1:13. If this was the case with John, who said he was not worthy to stoop down and loose the shoe latchet of him whose way he was sent to prepare, on what principle shall we deny it was the case with him who was the greater than John? If it is denied, the manifestation of God is denied; and there is then a want of explanation as to the sort of man Jesus grew into; for, let this fact be noticed, that the human brain, however well organised, brings no wisdom into the world. It is like a clean sheet of paper: there is nothing written upon it. Wisdom is only acquired by experience, and does not always come then. When it does come, it comes late. It is never first. As Solomon says, "Folly is bound up in the heart of a child." Many blunders pave the way to what little wisdom we may ever attain to. Now, if Jesus in his infantile stage was purely and merely human, how comes it he never fell into sin? Good organisation does not explain it, because organisation of itself is neutral; good organisation is ready to sin as bad organisation, in the absence of knowledge and experience. There is only one explanation to it, and that is also furnished by Luke (2:40), "The grace of God was upon him," which is equivalent to being filled with the Holy Spirit. Someone may say "Then there is no difference between him and John, who was also "filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb." If the begetting of Jesus is left out of account, this would follow; but with that in view, the great difference is visible: for while John was merely a natural man, acted upon from without by the Holy Spirit, Jesus was that Holy Spirit veiled in the flesh, as it were, placed among men for the accomplishment of the mighty work which his Father had given him to do.

Here someone else may say, "if that be so, how can he be to us an example?" Now, what is that question based upon ? I think we shall see it is based upon a great fallacy. To manifest the fallacy of this assumption, we have only to ask, was he - even with the

view of him taken by those who use such an argument - in all respects as weak as we? Had he not, even on their theory, a higher moral and intellectual energy? Do they not admit that in his conception of the Holy Spirit, he received a start that we never receive; and that, during his public career, in which his example alone is manifest, he had a power we never have, even the power of the Holy Spirit without measure? These things are without dispute, and, therefore, the fallacy of the objection is demonstrated. Jesus was our example, in the sense of being a character for us to copy, but for the production of such a character, the Father himself had to interfere by the Spirit. He saw there was no man: therefore, His own arm brought salvation. This is the great aspect in which Jesus is to be contemplated - the doing for us, by Almighty power, that which we could not do for ourselves, that the excellency might be of God, and not of man - that salvation might not be by works which we have done, but by the grace or favour of Eternal Wisdom, that no flesh should glory in His sight. On this principle, the man Christ Jesus is "counted worthy of more glory than Moses, *inasmuch as HE WHO HATH BUILDED THE HOUSE hath more honour than the house: for every house is builded by some man, but he that built all things is God.*" (Heb. 3:3).

The relation between the Father in heaven and the Spirit Universal is inscrutable, and, for that reason, there is in Jesus, who was inhabited by the Spirit, an element that is inscrutable. We perceive the evidence of it in the fact that those who heard him speak, strove about the meaning of what he said. He said "I came from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." It cannot be said of any of us that we came down from heaven. And because those who heard the statement were ignorant of the nature of Jesus, they did not see how it could be said of him: "He that cometh from above," "Ye are from beneath," he said at another time: "I am from above;" which is the contrast that Paul draws in saying "The first man is of the earth; earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven." Now, in what sense did Jesus come from heaven? It was not "the man Christ Jesus" who came down from heaven, for that man was born in Bethlehem. It was the power embodied in that man that came down from heaven, even the Holy Spirit, who came upon Mary according to the words of the angel, and afterwards descended upon Jesus in visible form at his baptism in the Jordan, and abode upon him. Remembering that the Holy Spirit is ONE with the Father, we can see how the birth and baptism of Jesus constituted a manifestation of the Father. The illustration of the jet of flame in relation to the light irradiated from it, will help us here. What the Father does by His Spirit, He does by himself. Thus He dwelt in Jesus, and spoke by him, and worked by him. This enables us to see how, although Jesus is the Son and a separate person, he is God. He is the arm of the Jehovah outstretched toward us in love. The Jews did not recognise this arm in Jesus. Let us be wiser than they.

There were two persons; there was the man Jesus. This is what he says: "Is it not written in your law, the testimony of *two* men is true. *I am one* that beareth witness, and the Father who sent me" is another. - (John 8:18.) "*Of mine own self, I can do nothing.*" "*The doctrine that I speak I speak not of myself.*" "*My doctrine is not mine, but HIS that sent me.*" Nevertheless, let us not exclude the other aspect, viz., that Jesus and the Father, by the Spirit, were one; that he was the mouth and arm of God in a more vital sense than the prophets. You see this when you look at the man Christ Jesus, who had only been alive about 33 years, standing over Jerusalem, and saying, "Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children, as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and ye would not." These were not the words of the man who

spoke them, who had never sought to "gather" the nation of Israel, but on the contrary had shrunk from the opportunities afforded him in that direction. (John 6:15; Luke 12:14.) They were the words of the God of Israel, who, through many messengers, over a long series of generations, had offered national consolidation and protection on condition of obedience. Yet, observe, Jesus did not preface the words, by "thus saith the Lord," because he himself was that Lord in manifestation. In this we see a difference between him and the prophets. "The Father dwelleth in me," saith Jesus. This could not the prophets say. He also said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father;" this could not the prophets say. It is never said of the prophets that they were *Immanuel*, or that they were the "word made flesh," because they were only the instrument made use of by the Spirit outside themselves, whereas Jesus was our nature taken hold of by the Spirit as it were, and used as the antitypical mercy-seat, though, as over which, the Spirit communed with men. But there did come a time, when that Spirit that had begot him, by means of which he was one with the Eternal Father, was withdrawn, and when he hung a helpless human being on the cross. This was the Son who "died for us." The Father did not die, for that is an impossibility; Christ died, and in this was the love of God manifested. (Rom. 5:8). The Son did not pre-exist from all eternity. The Father did. There is only one God, and He is the Father. Distinct from Him (though one with Him), there is the Son of God, the man Christ Jesus. He who is our High Priest, our Elder Brother, the Captain of our Salvation, had no individual pre-existence. Yet how can you separate him from the pre-existent power constituting him such - the power that produced him, the power that was in him, of which he is the expression, and of which he is the mouth-piece? He was, if you may say so, a divine phenomenon in flesh - an individual manifestation of the spirit in the flesh; and as the Spirit is one with universal power, and wisdom, having source in the Father, can you not see that there is an inscrutable connection between the man Christ Jesus and the power whose views and purposes he came to accomplish; so that when John the Baptist went out preaching, to pave the way for his introduction to Israel, he was preparing "the way of Jehovah."

When you consider that Jesus was the manifestation of Jehovah, by that Spirit which in its immensity is Jehovah, there is no difficulty; but if you exclude the Spirit, then the subject is all in mist. Somebody will say. 'Oh, the Spirit came at his baptism.' Yes; but it came before then; it came upon Mary; and it cannot be that a high cause is brought to bear to produce no result. The result was to introduce, incipiently, the manifestation styled *Emmanuel*, and this result appeared in the babe Christ. For he was proclaimed to be "the Lord's Christ" (anointed) from his mother's womb. The Angels that came to the shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem, said: "Unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, *which is Christ the Lord*." And also it is written that to Simeon, who came in when the child Jesus came to be circumcised, it had been revealed that he should not see death till he had *seen the Lords anointed*, the Christ; and when he had seen the babe, he said "Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before all people, a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." The Spirit descended upon Jesus at his baptism, *in token that he was the Christ*. This was the testimony of John: "*There standeth one among you whom ye know not. He it is who, coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoes' latchet I am not worthy to lose ..... And I knew him not, but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come, baptizing with water ..... He that sent me to baptize me with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit.*"- (John 1:26-33). The visible descent of the Spirit was then a public identification of the Messiah, as well as a bestowal of higher degree of



power than was conferred by his Spiritual origin. Let those who think that the presence of the Holy Spirit with him during the first thirty years of his life, unfitted him to be an example, consider this that the Spirit as they are obliged to admit, was with him when he was tempted in the wilderness. If then the presence of the Spirit, at that crisis, is no barrier to his being considered an example, why should it be considered so in the case of his earlier years? If it is a barrier in the one case it is a barrier in the other. If you are to say that at any stage, there was no Spirit with him, because of his being an example, you are bound to deny the presence of the Spirit at all stages: for, at all stages, he was an example. And this is indeed what some would go to the length of doing, and say that the things performed by Jesus were not performed by his individual volition, but by the Father in heaven, in answer to Christ's prayer. This is dangerous speculation, which cuts at the root of that unity by Spirit - inhabitation which Jesus affirms to subsist between himself and the Father. Jesus was "God with us." When the immensity of God is realised, there is no difficulty in understanding this, so far as it is possible to understand such a matter; but when people restrict the person and presence of God to heaven, they create a difficulty for themselves. When we realise the fact that God is an immeasurable being, filling all space by His Spirit, we can comprehend how the man Christ Jesus could be He in manifestation. This is a different idea from Trinitarianism, and presents both Father and Son in a beautiful aspect. The God of Israel manifested in our nature for our salvation, is a very different spectacle from an eternal Son incarnate to appease the wrath of the Eternal Father. This is the great ugliness of Trinitarianism, that it represents one God, more loving than another God, coming to suffer the penalty due to somebody else, in order that those under penalty may escape from the less loving God. The truth of the matter is, that the whole scheme emanates from the Father himself; that the Son did not come separately from the Father, because there was no Son exist so to come. The Son is the Father himself manifested by the Spirit; and hence it is that he is placed before us as the name of "the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit," all in one person, so that in being baptised into the Christ, we are baptised into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The three converge in Jesus of Nazareth, he being the Father, manifested by the Spirit, in the Son.

Yet, after all said and done, though we approximate thus closely to an apprehension of the matter, there is a greatness in it that compels us to take David's position, when he said, "Such Knowledge is too wonderful for me." Our understanding is very limited, and the capacity of the common run is totally unequal to the mighty thought; minds that are only accustomed to consider the relation of one piece of wood to another, or of house to land, or of even man to man - minds that deal only in the superficial relation of things - will fail to raise up to the great idea of God manifest in the flesh. Jesus says that all men do not believe; Paul said, "All men have not faith." Some men cannot receive the truth. Those who have minds capable of it, will. In the parable of the sower, the seed fell into various kinds of ground. Some had no root in themselves. Some had no understanding to comprehend the word. But those who had understanding, and bring that understanding to bear on the Scriptures, will be able to see the great glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, beginning with his conception as a babe, and ending with his being changed unto that glorious spirit-nature, of which we, having no experience, can have no idea, but of which, in the mercy of God, we hope to taste in the day of the manifestation of the Sons of God.

R.Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1872, pgs. 187-188

## CHRIST - TWO NATURES OR ONE?

My mind on the subject I express in a short paragraph among 'Answers to correspondents', in the coming (March) number of the *Christadelphian*. I accept Dr. Thomas's teaching on the subject of God manifestation, because I can see it to be the teaching of the word; but I do not understand that teaching to require me to regard the flesh and blood of Jesus as anything higher in nature than the flesh and blood of 'the children' he came to redeem. Paul says it was the same (Heb. 2:14), and I believe it. It was the first instance, drawn from the veins of Mary, during the nine months' gestatory process, in the same way as any other child; and was afterwards sustained like other men by the process of eating, except during the forty days he was in the wilderness, when like Moses for a similar period, he tasted no food, being upheld by the Spirit. But then, underlying this was the Spirit. You rightly say the Spirit has to do with all men; but there is this great difference between Jesus and ordinary men, in this matter. In the case of ordinary men they inherit a nature originally contrived by the Spirit, but not for a manifestation of the Spirit. The Spirit was the Creator, but the thing created (the living soul), partook no more of the quality, mind or tendency of the Spirit than any other animal fabrication. Adam was a man simply, purely and merely, because the Spirit designed no higher result; and his descendants have not even the advantage he had in having a nature (earthly though it be) directly from the hands of the Spirit. In the case of Jesus the Spirit designed a manifestation of itself, through the medium of the flesh. Hence the babe born of Mary was the flesh-blossom, so to speak, of spirit seed. The spirit was imparted to the human ovum, and the result was a man, who though the flesh and blood of his mother, was the manifestation in all his characteristics of the invisible power which overshadowed Mary and quickened her womb, and allied itself as it were with her substance. The man Christ Jesus was not Spirit-nature. He was the Spirit manifested in flesh-nature - the divine glory concealed by the veil of the flesh. Some call this two natures; but I think this is a wrong description of it. These abstractions, however, should not trouble us. The main thing is to believe and receive the benefit, even if we do not understand, as in the case of the sun. Hoping we may be accounted worthy to be clothed upon with the house which is from heaven.

R.Roberts, The Christadelphian, 1873, pgs. 562-563

## GOD MANIFESTATION WITHOUT GOD

Renunciationism exposes the brethren to the danger of being taken captive by a specious fallacy which separates God from Jesus; presenting to view a mere man, while professing homage to the sublime fact of God manifestation in the flesh. "We believe," say these perverse disputations, "the Scripture teaching of God manifest in the flesh; for the scheme is all of God." If a "scheme" of God is God manifest in the flesh, then the law of Moses was God manifest in the flesh, for it was a scheme of God. But there is a difference between a scheme of God and God Himself. The mystery of godliness is not the manifestation of a scheme, but the manifestation of the Schemer, for a reason that comes not within the understanding of such as speak and judge of God as if he were a man. Then it is said, "Without God, there could be no Son of God." If this makes Jesus God manifest in the flesh, then is an elephant God manifest in the flesh, for without God, there could be no elephant. "God devised the plan," is the rejoinder. The answer is, a plan is not of God. "Marvellous manifestation of God's love to death-stricken man," is the next periphrasis, by which it is attempted to make plausible God-manifestation without God. The manifestation of God's love is seen in rain on the just and unjust, but God's love is one thing; God himself another. Then it is put forward as sufficient, that the Spirit of God gave Mary power to conceive. So the Spirit of God gave Elizabeth power to conceive (Luke 1:7,13), and Sarah also (Heb. 11:11), but neither John nor Isaac was God manifest in the flesh. Then it is said, the Spirit was on Jesus; so it was on John the Baptist (Luke 1:15), but John the Baptist was not God manifest in the flesh. The manifestation of GOD in the flesh is displaced by all definitions which seek to bring Christ's case within the lot of mere men. And much as those who put forward these definitions may profess the acceptance of God manifest, they, in fact, deny the doctrine, and impose on others, if not on themselves, a deception. Jesus was Emmanuel - God with us - for the doing of what human weakness could not accomplish of itself, that the praise might be to God and not to men. By him and in him, God helped the seed of Abraham out of condemnation. Renunciationism denies God in Christ, and it denies man in Christ; for it says, he had not our mortal nature, and that he had "no power within him superior to man, enabling him to pass through this state of existence without sin." It, therefore, denies, despite its protestations to the contrary, the great doctrine that God was manifest in the flesh. It preaches a God-manifestation without God, a doctrine which will be to the certain destruction of all believers of it.

## CHRIST AS THE SON OF MAN

In *Mutual Help*, a manuscript magazine conducted by brother Paterson, of Edinburgh, there are some good remarks on the private letter of a Renunciationist to former friends. Deprived of their personal allusions, and amended accordingly, we published the following portion of them: "The central point, and that upon which all the rest is founded, is the assertion that Jesus was not a descendant of Adam. Well, what is the meaning of descendant? The first English Dictionary we take up says, 'the offspring of an ancestor.' Turning next to the Scripture, what do we find? Jesus is there called the son of man (in the New Testament more than sixty times), seed of the woman (Gen. 3:16), seed of Abraham (Heb. 2:16), seed of David (2 Tim. 2:8), the fruit of David's loins (Acts 2:30), David's seed 'who shall proceed out of thy bowels' (2 Sam. 7:12), *offspring* of David (Rev. 22:16), and so forth. It is hardly necessary to affirm that the most superficial will recognise 'descent' in a very distinct way in every one of these appellations. Indeed, in them we have an unbroken chain of descent from the cradle of the race down to the time when the angel announced to the daughter of Eve as well as of David's house (which message, by the way, she did not receive 'passively,' for she expressed her own will and readiness in the words, 'be it unto me according to thy word') - that she should bring forth a son, who should be called the son of the Highest and to whom the throne of his father (or ancestor) David would be given. - (Luke 1:32).

Now while the renunciationist admits that *we* die in virtue of our descent from Adam, he thinks that because Jesus was the son of God he could not be reckoned a descendant of Adam. For ourselves, we cannot see anything unreasonable or impossible or inharmonious in the two relationships co-existing. But it seems clear that before we talk of the reasonableness or otherwise of the thing, we must deal fairly with the many statements which say, almost as plainly as may be, that he was a descendant of Adam. The point, however, with the renunciationist is, that having no immediate human father, or, as he expressed it, 'not having a sinner for his father,' the relationship of descent was severed. Now, we desire to do this point every justice, and to weight it carefully. But allowing everything we can to it, we are confronted with this difficulty: *Jesus' mother was a sinner*. How is the fact of his relationship to her to be got rid of? For if the argument is that the being related to a sinner by descent brings death, it is evident Jesus stood in that relationship to his mother. Even if we admit, for the sake of the argument, that his birth by a special act of God's power had a purifying influence, that influence can only be partial, for side by side with it, we have the impure influence arising from the relationship to the mother. Putting the matter, then, from the Renunciationist point of view, in the most favourable light, Jesus as regards relationship was partially pure and partially impure. Suppose we illustrate the point in this way: humanity is a river which has been polluted at its source; this pollution permeates all its windings. There is a stream near at hand which is not polluted; a portion of the impure water is drawn away from the main body, and mingled with the clean stream. Is the impurity thus destroyed? By no means. The mingled pure and impure waters may be a modification of the great river's pollution; but a modified evil is an evil nevertheless. We put the matter in this fashion, not because we think it a correct way of describing the case, but for the purpose of showing that even granted what the Renunciationist wishes on this point, it does not warrant the conclusion he has come to. The only possible way to get rid of the penalty resulting from the fact that Jesus was a descendant of Adam, through his mother, is by taking up the position that

he was not the woman's offspring. This, however, cannot be done without throwing the testimony overboard.

It is very desirable that we should keep clearly in mind in what sense God was the father of Jesus because of his birth, and what effects that birth legitimately carries with it. In the first place in regard to that Spirit begetting itself, we cannot too strongly insist that there is no analogy between the case and that of an ordinary human father, because much that has been written on the subject seems to imply this. The simple unvarnished fact is that God, by His Almighty Spirit-power, caused Mary to bring forth a son out of the ordinary course. This son, because of that, was named God's son in a special sense. The letter says here: 'This divine relationship separated him from us to begin with.' We endorse this, because it agrees with the testimony. But we differ as to what the 'separation' means. Paul tells us that Jesus was 'holy, harmless, and undefiled, and separate from sinners.' This, without doubt, describes to us his spotless character. But Yahweh laid the foundation for this development by the manner in which Jesus was brought into being, and by the subsequent protecting care extended to him.

The Spirit in Isaiah and the record in Luke agree in demonstrating this. The servant in whom He would be glorified the Lord called from the womb, and made mention of his name from the bowels of his mother - a prophetic forecast of what took place when 'the power of the Highest overshadowed' Mary, and she brought forth that holy (or separated) thing who was to be the horn of salvation to the house of David. Thus, the separation had reference to a certain work to be accomplished by God through Christ. And when we remember that that work was a sovereign act of God's mercy to the race, and one in which He desired that the flesh should have no room to glory, we see at once the necessity for Jesus not being brought into existence by the will or power of man. But this does not destroy the other side of the question. When both are combined we are able to contemplate the glorious truth of God alone, in 'the great love wherewith he loves us,' redeeming death-stricken humanity through one of its members, whom He developed for the purpose by His own power and might.

'One who is condemned for a capital offence (says the letter) cannot give his life to save another who is in the same condemnation.' We do not know whether this statement is based on such parts of Scripture as the Psalm 49 and Romans 5, or whether it simply is drawn from the procedure of law in human affairs. If the latter, it is now very happy. When a criminal is condemned to death in our own country, the only way he can escape is by the law being set aside in whole or part. As to substitution, it is an unknown thing, and would not be entertained for a moment, under any civilised human code. An outraged law can never be satisfied by the punishment of an innocent one. Though ten thousand innocents might be slain, if the guilty one still lived, the law would continue to demand the life of the real transgressor, unless its administrators set it aside. Now, we say that God, who is unchangeable as well as just, could neither set aside His law nor satisfy it by inflicting its penalty where it was not justly due. Jesus being, as we have already shown, a descendant of Adam, there was no violation of the principles of justice in the penalty being visited on him, while his sinlessness afforded ground for his resurrection unto life eternal, and his being constituted a saving name, in whom we have redemption.

But the redemption which is in Christ Jesus has no counterpart in anything we know of. Where, in any case of redeeming among men, do we find the lawgiver and law administrator furnishing the redemption-price himself for the satisfaction of his own broken law? The truth is that the relationship God sustains to the creatures of His

hand can, in no respect, be compared to anything in human affairs. We are completely dependent on Him as clay in the hands of the potter. And so when the reconciliation of the world was effected, it was not like the reconciliations of men, in which there are mutual action, mutual demands, and it may be mutual concessions. We had absolutely no say in the matter. That reconciliation, which God designed Himself and carried out Himself, has placed humanity upon a legal footing towards the Almighty - in respect that they can, by giving heed to the 'word of reconciliation,' now approach Him with acceptance through the channel which He has appointed.

We do not think the Renunciationist properly describes the matter. It is not that a condemned one redeemed condemned ones, but that God first redeemed one of the condemned family, upon a certain principle, and next made the Redeemed One a means of escape for those of the others who were willing to put on his saving name; and the principle upon which God proceeded - as we have already seen - in the development of this one was that in him should be exhibited a personal holiness by which a great moral foundation would be laid, without the just demands of the broken law being ignored.

It is true that Jesus voluntarily gave his life for us. But in what sense did he give it? Clearly in obedience to his Father's commandment (John 10:18). [which required him to submit to a violent death long before the time for death had arrived in the order natural to him as the son of David. - EDITOR *Christadelphian*.] Being instructed in the Father's will, he cheerfully fell in with its requirements, although that obedience involved his own death. Thus did the Father's purpose and the Son's obedience work in beautiful harmony. If Jesus had been merely a perfect man, offering the Deity something to rescue himself or his fellows from death, then truly he would have been no Saviour, for nothing that mankind could offer or do was of any avail. But seeing that it was not man, but God, who was working in Jesus Christ "to usward," the whole complexion of the case is changed.

This brings us to Psalm 49, and Romans 5. When in these places it is said, firstly, that 'None of them can, by any means, redeem his brother,' and next, that when Christ died for us we were 'without strength,' we are asked to believe that this arose from the fact that no one had an 'unforfeited life.' But we search in vain for this notion in the Scriptures. The Psalm, indeed, is a striking confirmation of what we have been contending for. It is a simple declaration of the truth that no one could save mankind but He who had stricken them,<sup>1</sup> this being convincingly brought out in the 15th verse, which, immediately succeeding the description of man's helplessness, and finding its only true application in the case of Jesus, exclaims, 'But GOD will redeem MY soul from the power of the grave, for He shall receive me.' The testimony of the same Spirit in Paul cannot differ from this. Hence, in Rom. 5, the apostle speaks twice of the 'love of God' in connection with what has been done for him in Christ Jesus; and in verse 15 he says: 'For if, through the offence of one, many be dead, much more the GRACE (favour) OF GOD, and the gift by grace, which is BY (or through) ONE MAN, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.'

What the letter says about 'the nature' sounds strange in our ears when we remember from whom it comes. 'THE NATURE (it says) WAS NOT THE SINNER, BUT THE

---

<sup>1</sup> The context shows David's meaning to be that wealth could not redeem from death. The remark is an allusion to the ancient practice of redemption from death by heavy ransom in money payment. It has no bearing on the subject of the redemption that is in Christ. Brother Paterson's remarks are, however, excellent. - (EDITOR *Christadelphian*. - R.R.)

MAN WHO HAD POSSESSION OF THE NATURE.' *What then was the man?* Surely the new doctrine is in straits when it has to seek support from what very much resembles the principle underlying the popular dogma of the immortality of the soul. But, whatever sophistries may be uttered and believed, this we are told in the Word - and no sophistry can ever drive us from it - that the sinner was the living flesh and blood organism called man; and it was this living, organised flesh and blood, or nature, which was condemned to return to the ground from whence it came. The letter says a good deal in this direction, which need not be followed, being only a repetition of the idea contained in the sentence we have quoted, the value of which will be obvious to our readers.

At the conclusion, the letter alludes to that beautiful passage in Phil. 2, concerning Jesus humbling himself, and says that it is now seen in a way impossible before. The 'unforfeited life' idea makes Paul teach here that Jesus personally did not need to die, but laid down his life voluntarily for us, and thus, we are told, there was reality in the humiliation. The beauty of the passage, however, seems to us to lie in the other direction. The 8th verse says: '*And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.*' These words give us both cause and effect. The necessity for his death consisted in the fact that he was born in the likeness of men. When Jesus, on the one hand, contemplated himself as the manifestation of the Father, invested with His authority and power - as the Messiah, the heir of all things, so gloriously described in the prophets - the natural thought would be that death was no part of his lot. But when on the other hand, he saw himself as the Son of Man, he knew he could only reach the joy that set before him through the suffering of death; and though the cup was bitter and the shame great, he cheerfully submitted; wherefore God hath highly exalted him."

## Dr. Thomas and the Whole Truth.

F.R.S. - The lithographed letter you have had sent to you is a crafty attempt to deceive, which will not entrap the discerning. That the writer may be sincere does not alter the character of his attempt; for one who is deceived (and there were such in Paul's day as well as our own, "deceiving and being deceived") though possibly sincere, is none the less a deceiver in his efforts to bring others into a like position. We abide by our declaration of December last: that "there is but one safe position, and in that we mean, by the favour of God, to entrench ourselves, "for better or worse," viz, *the whole truth as brought to light by Dr. Thomas*. But what does that declaration mean? Does it mean the endorsement of all that Dr. Thomas at any time wrote? If so, we must become a Campbellite: for we could quote from the *Advocate* in proof of the kingdom being set up on the day of Pentecost. No, no: it means "*the whole truth as (finally) brought to light*" by him. This was a process, tarnished in its earlier stages by unavoidable contamination with prevalent error from which, in the providence of God, he slowly emancipated the truth. Your correspondent, who is so solicitous of your "unbiased judgment" against the truth is either ignorant of this, or feigns the ignorance. He quotes a remark made by Dr. Thomas in 1852 <sup>1</sup> (which, by the way, he calls "evidence wholly unanswerable." An assertion of Dr. Thomas unanswerable evidence! If in this he was sincere, he would not remain in his present position; for Dr. Thomas afterwards spoke to plainly on the subject to be misunderstood). He quotes from an article published in 1852 (and by the way, he cuts a part of this article into a number of separate bits, spread out and divided by rules, as if they were "extracts" from various parts of Dr. Thomas's writings.) He quotes from this article an assertion of the Dr. at that time, that the term "sinful" was inapplicable to the flesh of Christ, and artfully places this side by side with our reference to the truth brought to life by Dr. Thomas. Is he ignorant of the fact that after nearly twenty years further study of the Scriptures, the Dr. said, "*To deny that Jesus came in SINFUL FLESH is to destroy the sacrifice of Christ?*" (See *Christadelphian* for July, 1873, page 323 <sup>2</sup>.) On this point, the Dr.'s later expositions of the word are clear enough; and even at the time he penned the words so sweetly relished now by those who wish to go backwards, he had no idea of teaching that Christ was a substitute, exempt in his own person from the operation of the hereditary death common to us all. He held the truth distinctly on this point, but hazarded an opinion on the physical constitution of Christ, in connection with Christ's sinlessness. The opinion was an excrescence on the truth, which as the Dr.'s knowledge of the holy oracles expanded, was cutt off and thrown away without interfering with the stem of truth to which it had adhered. Nevertheless, there is a sense in which the Dr.'s words are not wide of the mark. As there is a difference between a sensualist and a philosopher, though both partaking of the common stock of humanity, so between us and the Lord Jesus (though of identical stock), there was the difference produced by the superior moulding influence of the Spirit in his conception, resulting in sinlessness morally through the counteraction set up against the native tendencies of the flesh. From nothing we have written on this subject do we depart in the least degree. "Contradiction" is only apparent to those who do not take every element into consideration. As to such as cavil at our expression about sticking to the Dr. "for better or worse," we ask them to remember the declaration with which it was associated, that our deference to him was not a slavish one, but based upon an increasing perception of

---

<sup>1</sup> See pages 51-52 of this collation.

<sup>2</sup> See pages 147-148 of this collation.



the scripturalness of the conclusions which he was instrumental in developing. No doubt, behind this, and in addition to this, there is a feeling of which we are not ashamed, that if we are in any degree to be guided by the reasonings and opinions of any (and, doubtless, all are more or less open to influence) we prefer to commit ourselves to the company of one whom few in this generation are able to appreciate in the greatness of his soul and the profundity of his reverence for the divine word in all things. We have not yet the man whose judgment we should set against his in such things. Our own judgment we have sometimes waived to find at last that he was right. The cry of being guided by no man, sound noble, but it is usually hypocritical, for it turns out to mean with most of our small friends - "no man *but myself* ; Dr. Thomas was not infallible, *but I am* ." When we are asked to choose between the Dr.'s judgment and theirs, we must be excused for choosing against them.

R. Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1874, pgs. 337-338

## Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God.

W.R. - It is not the mode but the fact of God-manifestation through Christ that is important to be recognised. If a man have faith in the fact, it matters not that he be unable to explain it. At the same time, if his recognition of the fact be linked with a theory that brings Christ to the level of a mere man, the value of his recognition is destroyed, because that recognition is then a matter of mere words and not of enlightened conviction. To say that Jesus was by divine begetting only in a higher degree what his brethren are by the enlightenment of the truth as regards the "inner man," is to deny the divine definitions of him. John declares him to have been "the word of life," which had been from the beginning with the Father, and was manifested unto them, - (1 John 1:1). In no "degree" could this apply to any of us. The "Word made flesh" is his other well known description, which it is scarcely necessary to remark is equally inapplicable to any other man or woman born. "God manifest in the flesh" is the Spirit's definition by Paul (1 Tim. 3:16), notwithstanding the attempt to substitute an early and favourite corruption which, by changing "God" into the relative pronoun "who," takes all sense out of the verse. Then the appearing of Christ in Israel, as heralded by the ministry of John the Baptist, is described as the revelation of the glory of YAHWEH (Isa. 40:5), in harmony with which, John said of himself, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, *make straight the way of THE LORD (Jehovah)*, as said the prophet Isaiah;" and of Christ, the Jehovah-manifestation, he said, "There standeth one among you ..... whose shoe latchet I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. .... He must increase, but I must decrease. *He that cometh from above* is above all; he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; *he that cometh from heaven* is above all. And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth, and no man receiveth his testimony. He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true. For he whom God sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." - (Jno. 1:26,27; 3:30-34). Need it be said that this language in no sense or degree can be applied to the brethren of Christ. He is said to be "the image of the invisible God" (Col. 1:15); the express image of His person. - (Heb. 1:3). His name Emmanuel (God-with-us) involves the doctrine taught by Paul when he said "God was in Christ reconciling the world *to Himself*, not imputing their trespasses unto them." - (2 Cor. 5:19). It points in the direction of Christ's own declaration: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father: how sayest thou then, shew us the Father." - (Jno. 14:9).

No one can acceptably approach a personage of dignity who has an inadequate apprehension of the greatness of that dignity. If this is true among men, how much more true towards God, whose greatness is unsearchable, and whose whole course towards men has been for the establishment of His name in its proper position of glory and authority among them, and, furthermore, whose penetration of our minds extends to the discernment of even unformed thoughts. - (Psa. 139:4). He knows our attitude towards Him, even if unexpressed in word or gesture. Hence, how unprepared to enter the presence of His glory in Christ are those who think of Christ as merely a glorified human being.

The object aimed at in the whole work of God in the earth is that no flesh should glory in His sight. - (1 Cor. 1:29-31; Rom. 3:19-26). This revealed principle of divine action necessitates this doctrine of God-manifestation in Christ, which is unpalatable to carnal minds; for unless God were the worker by and through and in Christ, the glory would

be to a mere man, and, therefore, to the flesh. But God has expressly excluded the flesh from all glorying in the case. God did the work Himself, and Christ was the form of it, Hence when thanks are ascribed to Christ (1 Tim. 1:12), it is thanks to God: for the Son and the Father are one, the one being the manifestation of the other. But by bringing Christ down to a level with us purely (though blessed be God, he was on a level with us by one side, as the seed of David), discord is introduced, and the divine supremacy compromised.

Don't trouble yourself with the phrases, "essential Deity," "Deity substance," or any other term by which the glorious mystery is sought to be explained. Believe in the fact without attempting metaphysical explanations, caring only to avoid those doctrines which would teach a God-manifestation without God.

---

*"Is it not more correct to say that Jesus was a manifestation of God, than it is to say that he was God manifest in the flesh?" - (H.H.)*

ANSWER - Provided they are both used to mean the same thing, it matters little which form of expression is used; but as a matter of words, the one is apostolic and the other is not. The apostolic one is the latter. Paul's words are Θεός ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, *God was manifest in the flesh*. This expression agrees with the other testimonies: "The Word (which was God) was made flesh." - (Jno. 1:14). Emmanuel - God with us; Yahoshua - Jesus - God shall save; "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person." - (Heb. 1:3). Any form of words intended to disconnect the man Christ Jesus from the Father who was in him, is not only incorrect, but dangerous. [R. Roberts, The Christadelphian, 1874, Pg. 381]

---

R. Roberts - The Christadelphian, 1874, pgs. 405-413.

## MERE-MANISM

.... Into the mere-manist defence, it is not necessary to enter particularly. The pamphlet declares that the mere-manists "believe as firmly as their accusers, that Jesus was God manifest in the flesh." If this statement were true, the persons referred to would never apply the term "mere man" to Jesus: for no mere man ever was God manifest in the flesh. That Jesus was a man is true; but his relation to the power that begat him, both in the effect resulting to himself from such a begetting, and in the connection existing between him and the Father afterwards, is such as to preclude the use of the term "mere man," which means only man. The name of this man intimates who he was - Emmanuel - God with us - a name bestowed while yet in his infancy; a name worshipped in the infantile stage by wise men from the East, signalled by a star-like token in the heavens, and celebrated by the rejoicing of the angelic host on the plains of Bethlehem: "Unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord." Simeon, to whom it had been revealed that he should not see death till he had seen the Lord's Christ, having taken up the child conceived of the Holy Spirit, said, "Now, lettest Thou thy servant depart in peace. For mine eyes have seen Thy salvation, which Thou has prepared before the face of all people!" The child grew in wisdom, and at twelve, confounded the doctors in the temple, saying afterwards to his mother "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" At thirty, he was publicly acknowledged and further qualified by the unmeasured effusion of the Spirit that begat him, and enriched him, and made him what he was. "He went forth speaking as one having authority and not as scribes."

..... So Jesus though a man, was a spirit-produced man, a spirit-moulded man, a spirit-guided man for a work and purpose of the Spirit apart from which he, the man, would have had no existence. To apply the term "mere" to such a man is a desecration of the divine work, which no reverential mind, enlightened by the truth, can bear to be guilty of, either by their own words, or by complicity with those who use them. With whatever reservation the words may be accompanied, the words themselves have a tendency in the direction of blasphemy when applied to him who was God manifest in the flesh. While the man Christ Jesus was one, and the Father another, the man Christ Jesus was himself the product of his Father's power in his conception - a power which was not exercised to produce a mere man, of which there were millions already in existence; but a man who, by reason of the power imparted to him, shewed forth from the beginning the Father's character and glory for the Father's purpose; a man who had the Father's name upon him from his babyhood, and expressive of the fact that the whole work to be done was to be the work of God, and not of mere man: a man in such intimate connection with the Creator as to be able to say, "I and my Father are one."

But this pamphlet denies that Jesus was the Word made flesh till his baptism, and asserts that he did not begin to manifest God till he was thirty years of age. It quotes the remarks of John in connection with the miracle of turning the water into wine, "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory" (John 2:11), and declares it to be a specification of the time when Jesus began to manifest God. But the words do not answer to the description by any means. A *beginning* of miracles is not a beginning of the thing the believer of the truth contends for against the mere-manist. The beginning of the exhibition of a thing is not the beginning of the thing itself. The glory of Christ, in the sense of the term as now used, existed before the manifestation of it. It began with the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit at his

conception, which gave him all the excellence he had. John was sent that he (Jesus) might be *made manifest* to Israel (John 1:31), and miracles were superadded to draw attention to Jesus as Jehovah's name bearer: not to constitute him such.

R. Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1874, Pg. 523

## God-Manifestation Not Trinitarianism

*How is the passage in Heb. 1:10-12 explained in harmony with the Christadelphian doctrine of Christ's non-existence before birth ("Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish but thou remainest, and they shall wax old as doth a garment. And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed, but thou art the same and thy years shall not fail.") - (C.D.)*

ANSWER. - "Christ's non-existence before birth" is not a form of speech that exactly defines Christadelphian doctrine. The personage Jesus was *a manifestation* by the Eternal Spirit operating formatively in his conception and energisingly at his baptism - both acts being an anointing of the Seed of David with the Spirit, and constituting the resultant man the anointed or Christ. Since the resultant man was *a manifestation* of the antecedent anointing power, apart from which he would have had no interest, value, or even existence, he cannot well be considered apart from that power. He would not have been Christ apart from it; and since that which made Christ was the power of the Eternal Father working for the manifestation of HIMSELF in the flesh of David, a true Christadelphian could not, without qualification (understood or expressed,) speak of Christ as at any time non-existent. He was the Father in manifestation by christening or anointing of the Spirit. Hence to him, as such, words are addressed that are not addressed to the angels or to any of his brethren; and these words as often as not (as in the case of those referred to) identify him with the pre-existent Father, while as yet Jesus of Nazareth was unborn. A great mystery it must ever be to those whom the Father Himself must (while in the flesh) be a mystery; but it is at least as intelligible as such a doctrine can ever be, and plainly distinguishable from Trinitarianism, as the manifestation of the Eternal Father in contrast to the manifestation of an Eternal "Son," so called.

## RENUNCIATIONISM

W.B. - The publication of C.W.'s paper is unnecessary. It could have no more "complete reply" than it has already received many times over. Suffice it for your own sake, in answer to the question, "how comes the existing variance between Christadelphian and Renunciationists," and whence the name "Renunciationists," to say that the first comes from former friends having "renounced" (their own word) a doctrine of Scripture, the discovery of which has removed one of the greatest stumbling blocks in modern times, out of the way of the reception of the gospel of Jesus crucified; and the second (the name) originates in and describes the fact of their having so done. As to the printed proposition which you forward, its unscripturalness lies in the following sentence: "That though bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, he was not a 'constitutional sinner,' or a sinner in any sense whatever; but THE SON OF GOD, not under sentence of death, or included in the judgment that came upon all men unto condemnation." - (Rom. 5.18) It is true that Jesus was, in no sense, a transgressor; in no act or sense did he disobey God; but he was hereditarily related to sin in his birth, in so far as he inherited the weak, defiled, mortal nature resulting from the introduction of sin by Adam. This was a necessity before he could take that sin away; for otherwise an angel or a beast would have sufficed. This being the sense of the phrase "*constitutional sinner*", that is, a man made subject to the consequence of sin in being born of a sin-polluted mother, it is a contradiction in terms to say that he was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, and yet not a constitutional sinner. Our being constitutional sinners is an affair of inheriting certain bone and flesh, which have come under the operations and condemnation of sin, and if Jesus had this bone and flesh, how could he be otherwise than what the printed proposition denies him to be? It would be a permissible parody of the printed words to say, "Though bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, Jesus was not a man or a member of the human race in any sense whatever."

But though constitutionally related to the consequences of sin, Jesus was no transgressor. On the contrary, he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, without sin." He was absolutely and without qualification, "separate from sinners" as regards moral characteristics. Herein - (without considering the secret cause of his sinlessness, viz., his relation to the Father whose manifestation he was) - lay the great difference between him and us. It is this difference which gives point to the repeated declaration that he "died for us". It was our "many offences" that made our case hopeless. It is the forgiveness of these for his sake that constitutes the great feature of proffered mercy. This is manifest from many scriptures that you will be able to call to mind if you are a constant reader of the Word. Now of these transgressions, iniquities, sins, Jesus had none. He was morally without spot; though physically, he was the flesh of David in all its hereditary relations. This was the great difference between him and us. The mistake of former friends lies in confounding his character with his physical nature. His character was without spot; his physical substance was the same as our own; and since the mortality we inherit from Adam resides in our physical substance, Jesus in partaking of our physical substance necessarily partook of our mortality, and was, therefore, fitted to endure in himself that condemnation of sin which the law of God required on the cross as the foundation of a return to favour on the part of all the sons of Adam who should place their faith in the offered Lamb of God. On such a sin-bearer, our actual sins could be laid in their effects without any departure from the divine modes of operation. It was not the substitutionary atonement taught by orthodox christianity which has stumbled thoughtful minds so long. Jesus does not turn away

anger or pay a debt by suffering instead of others. This substitutionary doctrine is the most hideous part of Renunciationism. It is a return to the apostacy in this particular. It is innocent and beautiful on the surface, but it mars the wisdom of God in the gospel, and insults Him in its logical results. It destroys the doctrine of forgiveness by favour. It makes Him exact a debt and then speak of having forgiven it. It obscures the fact that Christ's death is God's own gracious act by which our affections are engaged, our will constrained and our haughtiness humbled that we may receive the forgiveness offered over the body of the Slain Lamb in whom, as one of ourselves, there was endured what the Father's honour requires in His dealing with a sinful race. Rescued from death by the Father, because of his obedience, this slain lamb revived is offered to us as the dispenser of the Father's name. The teaching of the printed proposition makes Jesus a substitute instead of our elder brother, and denies he came in our flesh, which compels those subject to apostolic teaching to stand aside from all who uphold it.

R. Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1874, pg. 526 (*Christadelphian Unity in Australia, The Accepted Basis*, pg. 78)

## Was Jesus Born Under Condemnation ?

ANSWER. - In the scriptural sense of hereditary condemnation, the answer is, yes; but this requires to be fenced against the misunderstanding natural to the terms employed. Condemnation, in its individual application, implies displeasure, which cannot be affirmed of Jesus, who was the beloved of the Father. But no one is born under condemnation in its individual application. That is, no one is condemned as an individual till his actions as an individual call for it. But hereditary condemnation is not a matter of displeasure, but of misfortune. The displeasure or "wrath" arises afterwards, when the men so born, work unrighteousness. This unrighteousness they, doubtless, work by "by nature," and are, therefore, by nature, children of wrath - that is, by nature, they are such as evoke wrath by unrighteousness. It was here that Jesus differed from all men. Though born under the hereditary law of mortality, as his mission required, his relation to the Father, as the Son of God, exempted him from the uncontrolled subjection to unrighteousness.

R. Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1876, pgs. 117-125

## The Obedience of Christ in Relation to the Manifestation of God in Him

Another error is advocated among some professing the truth, and, as usual, it is the result of one part of the truth being unskillfully used to the destruction of another part. Jesus was the manifestation of the Father in human nature. Therefore, argue the new errorists, he was not the subject of probation, but simply the passive medium for the exhibition of the moral attributes of God, possessing no independent will of his own, and no power of choice between good and evil, but simply yielding to the uncontrollable impulse which used him for manifestation. The seriousness of this error lies in its practical denial of the obedience of Christ, and therefore of the glory appertaining to him as the Son, whom it is testified that he was "tempted in all points like his brethren" (Heb. 4:15), but "overcame" (Rev. 3:21), and was consequently approved of the Father (Is. 53:12; Ps. 91:14; Matt. 3:17), and rewarded by elevation to the position of universal lordship (Phil. 2:9,10). It destroys for us our great High Priest, who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

The error springs from the application of human reasoning to the testified ways of God. If, say the errorists, Jesus was God manifest in the flesh, he could not be otherwise than righteous. In a sense this is true; but it is using this truth with an unscriptural result when it is made to exclude the fact that the individual Jesus had a separate volition and character of his own, which was put to the proof under trial, and who "doing no sin," became to his brethren a captain and example, who learnt obedience by the thing that he suffered. The two facts (that Jesus was God manifest and that he learnt obedience in suffering), are consistent one with another, as is evident from the fact that they are both testified; and they are in their nature consistent. God manifestation resulted in a new person - the Son: and this Son was made "perfect through suffering." It is only a narrow and unenlightened mode of reasoning that extracts from the one truth the negation of the other.

In two senses the mistake is not a new one. It belongs, in the first place, to the entire religion of the Roman Mother. It is a peculiarity of the reasonings of the apostacy on the subject of God and His Christ, to destroy the probationary character of Christ's life in the flesh, and his relation to his brethren as the Elder Brother and firstborn in the house of God. And it is not the first time the notion has been ventilated by modern professors of the truth. Ten years ago it found advocates in America, and elicited the pamphlet by Dr. Thomas's daughter, entitled *The Origin and Nature of the Lord Jesus*, which first appeared as an article in the *Ambassador*, vol. 4, pg. 85<sup>1</sup>. This article was published with the consent and under the supervision of Dr. Thomas, and in it occur the words: "We do not say that Christ could not sin," which constitutes an express indication of the Dr.'s mind (though dead) on the subject now raised anew to the distress of some in the truth. When we are told that this idea of Christ's probation "hung as a cloud" over the Dr.'s writings on the subject, we can only wonder at the presumption which affects a superior discernment to Dr. Thomas on a subject pre-eminently requiring the power of balancing various parts of the truth; and marvel also at the facility possessed by some of blinding themselves to the explicit testimony of the Word. Scripturally enlightened minds can only dissent emphatically (if with sorrow) from those who would take from us so precious a part of the truth as Christ's

---

<sup>1</sup> See pg. 116-118 of this collation.



brotherhood to us. ....

This is the best demonstration of the fallacy that underlies your attempt to exclude the obedience of Jesus, the Son of God, through the subjection of his own will to the will of Him who sent him. What you say as to His character being a divine writing is unexceptionable, but you fail to give the wide scope to the idea. God made Jesus what he was by the Spirit in His begetting. On the seed of the woman was engraved the Father's moral likeness, but this was latent in the babe of Bethlehem, and had to be developed in the man by those circumstances of suffering and trial to which he was subjected. Hence the statement of Paul, that in bringing many sons to glory, "it became him to make the Captain of their salvation *perfect through suffering*." You say this was physical perfection. At this I am astounded. Does suffering engender physical perfection? Rather the contrary: suffering deteriorates physical nature. Adam was more perfect physically before he suffered than after. Not suffering, but the healing influence of the Spirit of God in the change to immortality makes the physical man perfect. But the moral man, the character, can only be perfected through suffering. Called upon to perform painful acts of obedience, our character of submission to God is more perfected, strengthened, settled, than it could ever be if the path of obedience was a path of pleasure. The character latent in the man Christ Jesus when a babe, and gradually ripened as he advanced in years and stature, was perfected by the sufferings he was called on to go through in the end of his career. ....

R. Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1888, Pg. 171

## THE DIVINE IMPRESS

Christ being perfect in both kind and degree, surpassed all other, both in character and in extent of his excellence; and not less so in the immeasurable fullness of the Spirit which he possessed, and the divine fatherhood to which he stood related. As fitting into these altogether unique conditions, he had a mission and a work placed in his hands, to which none other might compare; for said his forerunner, "behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world". Such an exceptional work required equally exceptional circumstances, as the channel of its accomplishment. These were all divinely created and supervised, with the most delicately adjusted bearing upon the result proposed that it is possible to conceive of. The impress of the Father's mind and image, upon the mentality of the Son of his love, laid the foundation of a child, the like of which had never yet appeared in the annals of human history, and never would again, as the sequel has shown. Nature left to itself never produces such, as the history of all nations and all ages abundantly testify.

R. Roberts, The Christadelphian, 1889, Pgs. 27-30

## GOD MANIFESTATION - REAL AT ALL STAGES

Christ was more than a man. We may overlook this in the efforts which have rid us of the false conceptions derived from "the vain traditions of our forefathers." He was a man, but a man who was the vehicle of a manifestation of God, and that God the eternal God, even the Father. The manifestation was a progressive one, but real at every stage - fainter than at the beginning than at the end, but as real at the beginning as at the end. A rose in the bud is as really a rose in nature as when it is full blown. The babe that received adorations of the wise men of the east, and whose birth was the same night angelically signalised on the plains of Bethlehem, was as really the manifestation of the Father as the glorified man who felled Saul of Tarsus to the earth with his brightness. The difference was a difference of degree. The Holy Spirit overshadowing Mary gave the impress, which laid the foundation of the manifestation of be made. But for this impress there never would have appeared in Israel such a man as Jesus of Nazareth. There would never have come the lamb of God without spot. Poor Adamic flesh, in which dwelleth no good thing, never could have yielded such such a perfect character as that of Jesus, unless the father had taken hold of it and wrought it for us into such a pattern. It is "*of God*, that he (Christ) is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."

This in no way excludes the fact that the perfect man so made for us was of the same physical nature, and put to the proof, and in all points tempted like as we are. Without temptation, the perfection of the result would not have been manifest. The best of characters, even among men, are not pronounced or seen to be the best till they have come through the fire. And it was needful for the perfection of this most glorious of the works of God upon earth, that in suffering, its excellencies should be tested and made manifest. But though put to the proof, it was in itself the excellent thing God had made it - a pattern of His own character, the exhibition of His own excellence, the interposition of His own power and kindness for the salvation of His people from their sins.....

....The divine origin of Christ 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 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.

R. Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1889, Pgs. 386-392

## The "Divine Sonship of Christ."

The Josephite theory creates a difficulty which is insurmountable. If Christ was a mere man, how is it that he was sinless? Was any other man ever known or heard of without sin? Experience says "No;" and the Bible says "There is not a man that liveth and sinneth not." "If any man say he has no sin, he is a liar, and deceiveth himself." How, then are we to explain the fact that Jesus was "holy harmless, undefiled, WITHOUT SIN?" The testimony which the Josephites would throw overboard, explains it, because it reveals the source of Christ's high capacity and impulse in a divine direction, in a divine paternity. This explains everything. The clay of fallen human nature, in the hands of the Divine Potter, was fashioned unto the likeness of the divine; that by the instrumentality thus established, a door of escape from the pit might be opened for this doomed race. Admit that Jesus was the son of Joseph, and then it is not true that "God hath concluded all under sin;" it is not true that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God;" for Jesus is an exception: he was sinless, and yet a mere man; and if Jesus was sinless any other man might have been sinless; and Christ's being the Messiah was a mere accident; every man his own Saviour, and Christ's name (JEHOVAH shall save by an Anointed) a great fallacy! This is the conclusion to which the Josephite premises lead.

The Josephite say if the apostles held the doctrine of the miraculous conception, it would have been as prominent in their teaching as in the religious writing of the present day. So it is. Nothing is more prominent in all their writings than that Jesus is the Son of God, and every time this proposition is affirmed, the miraculous conception is proclaimed; for the divine sonship of Christ is a myth without it. But the Josephites argue that because the phrase "miraculous conception," or some literal equivalent is not made use of by the Apostles, they did not believe that Jesus was the Son of God in that way. Apply this to cases of ordinary paternity, and the fallacy will be apparent. We say such a man is son to so-and-so; we do not go further. The rest is implied - maternity is understood. The means are always involved in the expressed result. It is sufficient to say that Jesus was the son of God. The iteration of this statement is virtually a repetition and prominent setting forth of the miraculous conception; for it involves it. Jesus could not be the Son of God without it. If other men who have not been miraculously conceived, are called sons of God, it is because they acquire this title from Christ, and possess "We are all the children of God *through faith in Christ Jesus* (Gal. 3:26). By union with him, they are legally covered with his name, and incorporate with his relationship. They are not adopted till the resurrection. (Rom. 8:23; Luke 20:36). They are only sons by virtue of connection with him who was primitively and *par excellence* the SON OF GOD. The relation had its origin in him, and in judging of what constituted that relationship we must not look at those who have only a borrowed title; and say that because they are mere men; therefore Jesus was.

The Josephites challenge quotation from Paul, who "declared the whole counsel of God," in proof of the miraculous conception. We possess but a fragment of the speeches to which Paul refers, when he said he had declared the whole counsel of God. What we have, however, taken in conjunction with his letters, furnish the proof desired. The very first thing recorded of him is that after his conversion "Straightway he preached Jesus in the synagogue, that HE IS THE SON OF GOD" (Acts 9:20). If it was believed at the time by any considerable section of professed disciples that Jesus was the

son of Joseph (which the Josephites contend was the case), this shews the side of the question Paul took. To say that he simply preached that Jesus was the son of Joseph, was raised from the dead, and that this is what he meant by preaching the Christ was the Son of God, is to play with words. The resurrection of a son of Joseph in one thing; the declaration that such a man is the Son of God, quite another. The propositions are not interchangeable. Christ was the Son of God before his resurrection. A crowning proof is furnished in the incident recorded in connection with the cured blind man, who was cast out of the synagogue for confessing Jesus. "Jesus heard that they had cast him out, and when he had found him, he said unto him *"Dost thou believe on the SON OF GOD?"* He answered and said, "Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him?" and Jesus said unto him, "Thou hast both seen him, and it IS HE THAT TALKETH WITH THEE" (John. 9:35-37). When Paul, therefore, straightway preached that Jesus was the Son of God, he proclaimed something that was a fact previous to Christ's resurrection. Did he simply preach that the son of Joseph, a righteous man, was filled with the Holy Spirit? The suggestion seems absurd. He brought before their notice a man whose origin was direct from God, as declared by his resurrection.

Paul's letters, more than Paul's speeches, which are scarcely preserved, furnish conclusive evidence of the miraculous conception. In Gal 4:4, he says "When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, MADE OF A WOMAN, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of the sons." The Josephites try to escape the force of this by citing the language of Job, "Man that is *born of a woman* is of a few days, and full of trouble." As a mere matter of words, there is a coincidence, but the subject and nature of the allusions are as different as possible. In Job's use of the words, one can see the poetical association of weakness of origin with ephemerality of nature; but there is no poetry in Paul's words. His is the language of fact and logic. His subject, in the scripture in question, neither suggests nor admits of Job's use of the phrase. He is stating the mode of deliverance adopted by God with reference to those who, under the law, were in hopeless condemnation. He says he sent forth HIS SON (not that he adopted a son of Joseph); and, indicating the method of the sending, he adds "*made of a woman*." This agrees with Luke, Matthew, and Isaiah, who say that for this very purpose, he begat a son of his own by a virgin of the house of David, overshadowing her with the creative power of the Holy Spirit. It is very significant that Paul should have inserted the words "made of a woman" in such a connection. They are not the only words in which Paul, in declaring the whole counsel of God, affirms the divine sonship of Jesus. He says (Rom. 8:3) "What the law could not do, in that it was weak *through the flesh*, God (hath done in) sending HIS OWN SON in the likeness of sinful flesh." Here the sonship of Christ is placed in contrast to the weakness of the flesh. The Josephite theory destroys the contrast, since it makes Jesus part and parcel of that flesh, the weakness of which, Paul says made salvation impossible. Jesus was the Son of God by constitution. How else are we to understand Paul's other words: "THOUGH HE WERE A SON, yet learned he obedience by the *things which he suffered*" (Heb. 5:8). Did he not learn obedience before he was thirty? Did the Father not pronounce himself "well-pleased" with him at that age, viz., at his baptism, which was part and parcel of his obedience? and what was the basis of this approval, publicly proclaimed, if not his obedience which he had learned? This obedience he had learned "*though he were A SON.*" Therefore he was a son in the first instance, instead of only becoming one in some recondite sense by the anointing of the spirit at his baptism. He was a son, because of his direct procreation by the Father through Mary, without human intervention. This explains Paul's other words, in which, declaring the counsel of God, he virtually affirms the miraculous conception, viz., those in which he quotes Psalms 40:6,8. "When he cometh into the world he saith

"Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but A BODY *hast thou prepared me* ..... Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." He taketh away the first that he may establish the second, by the which will, we are sanctified *by the offering of THE BODY OF JESUS CHRIST* once for all." - (Heb. 10:5-10).

All this is intelligible in view of the miraculous conception. The sacrifices under the law were incapable of taking away sin (verse 4), because the sin of a human being could never be punished in an animal. Sin requires the death of the sinner; the law admits of no substitution. It fastens on the offender and destroys him, and that which commits him to destruction holds him in destruction. The only remedy in the case was the one that has been adopted, and that was for God to manifest himself in the nature under condemnation, and meeting the full requirements of the law in death, vanquish it in a resurrection necessitated (on account of sinlessness) by its own operation. This plan was foreshadowed in the words of the Spirit through David. "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not." As an ultimate arrangement, sacrifices were worthless. They were merely part and parcel of a provisional order of things, established intermediately to teach preparatory lessons, and pointing, allegorically, to the real remedy in contemplation. As a final means (which ignorance was apt to regard them) "in them thou has no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come." The spirit was to accomplish the real work, and to enable it to do this, "a body hast thou prepared me." The body required to be *sin's flesh*, that is, the nature of Adam, which by reason of sin, was under condemnation. This was one ingredient in the preparation. "He took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham." "He was made sin." "He was sent forth in the likeness of sinful flesh." But had the body been a mere product of Adamic procreation, it would not have been servicable for the purpose. A mere human being would have been a sinner. Had Jesus been the natural son of Joseph, he would not have been the body prepared; because as the son of Joseph, he would not have been sinless, and though he might have risen again, for that which kept all the children of Adam in bondage would have held him, and the scheme of salvation would have been a failure. - It is in resurrection after suffering where success is achieved (1 Cor. 15:17). This success, as between God and man, is limited to Christ, but he is invested with power and authority, as a mediator, to operate towards all who come unto God by him, and to dispense the results of his victory to all who receive them by faith. He is their judge and life-giver - the resurrection and the life. Being begotten by the spirit, Jesus was a prepared body; for by this means he was made capable of sinlessness. He received a stamp and capacity of mind which qualified him for greater accomplishments than were possible in the polluted channel of merely Adamic generation; and was thus qualified to be the Saviour of the world.

As to the idea of miraculous conception dating back into antiquity, this is not worth much. The misapplication of truth in times of ignorance, does not destroy it. The ancients believed that the righteous became gods after death. Is it therefore untrue that it is the destiny of the righteous to become *elohim*, after the death state is at an end? The heathen fable was the truth with distortion. The Babylonians believed Nimrod to have been miraculously conceived; is it therefore untrue that the captain of salvation - the seed of *the woman* - who was promised from the earliest times, and whose tradition was misapplied to Nimrod, was "sent forth made of a woman?" There is an ingredient of truth in fables sometimes. Something is made of the circumstances that Jesus was not officially proclaimed Son of God till his immersion in Jordan. Consider the testimony of John the Baptist, who said to his disciples "After me cometh a man who is preferred before me, for he was before me, for he was before me, and I knew him not, but THAT HE SHOULD BE MADE MANIFEST to Israel, *therefore am I come*

*baptising with water* ..... He that sent me to baptise with water, the same said unto me, *upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending, and remaining on him*, the same is he that baptiseth with the Holy Spirit, and I saw and bare record, that **THIS IS THE SON OF GOD**" (John 1:30,34). The immersion of Christ was therefore merely his official introduction to Israel - *his manifestation*, not his making; the descent of the Holy Spirit at his baptism was his *identification* as the son of God - not his constitution. He was the Son of God before, having been begotten by the power of the Highest, according to the testimony of Luke.

Then it is asked "Is it not strange that there was such positive ignorance of the fact that he was the Son of God, if it was announced at his birth?" The answer is that the ignorance was not so positive as assumed. John the Baptist knew there was such a man, though he was unacquainted with him personally. He said "*there standeth one among you WHOM YE KNOW NOT* ..... whose shoe-latchet I am not worthy to unloose." If it be thought a wonder that John should not know him, being his cousin, we have only to remember that John was brought up in the desert from childhood (Luke 1:80), and probably never had the opportunity of seeing Jesus, who lived in another part of the country: As to the people not knowing him, it shows they were mistaken in supposing him to be the son of Joseph. As Jesus said to them afterwards "Ye judge after the flesh" (Jno. 8:15). "But, if it was announced at his birth, why should they be ignorant?" We must remember that the announcement was not made with the publicity which it has since attained in the wide spread diffusion of the scriptures of the New testament, nor at a time when there were the facilities for propagating news that now exist. We are apt to judge the incidents of the time with reference to modern experience in the circulation of intelligence. Thirty years has elapsed from the birth of Christ to the baptism in the Jordan. This was long enough to have effaced in great part the impression made at the time of his birth. The child Jesus grew up as an ordinary child, under the care of his parents; and presenting nothing remarkable to the notice of neighbours, the tradition of his birth, if it ever got beyond his family, would soon sink into forgetfulness. Popular interest feeds on marvel; and when marvel ceased, the attention would flag and die, and Jesus would grow up unnoticed, as the carpenter's son. It is highly improbable that his divine paternity was a matter of common report. It was precisely a matter of that description that would be kept private. "Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart." It is a question if Joseph and Mary understood the matter fully. It is testified of them in the very narrative "that Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things that were spoken of him" (Luke 2:33). The lapse of thirty years would greatly tend to involve in haze the mysterious and feebly-comprehended occurrences of his birth, and made the public manifestation of his true character by immersion, by the visible effusion of the Holy Spirit, a necessity and an appropriate introduction of him to Israel at full age. The idea that he was the son of Joseph from his birth to 30, and at that age became the Son of God by the anointing of the Spirit, is a mere theory and absurd at that. There is nothing in proof of it; while to prop it up the Josephites throws overboard the narratives of Matthew and Luke, which, if one or two scholars opine to reject, an overwhelming majority consider genuine, and which, if lacking in one or two MSS. (mutilated to suit the carnal doctrines of the Josephite school), a preponderating number possess?

The Josephites gives two reasons for Jesus being styled the Son of God. First, he says, "Son of God" was equivalent to "the Messiah." But how came this to be the case? The answer is, because the Messiah was to be a son of God. Can the Josephite theory furnish an answer? "It was so understood by the Jews," he adds, viz., that the two terms were equivalent. This does not help the matter. The reason which made them

interchangeable among the Jews, destroys the theory. Although the Jews consider Jesus to be son of Joseph, yet as to the Messiah of their own expectation, they looked for him to be "the Son of the Blessed" (Mark 14:61), and that he should "continue for ever." The "Messiah" and the "Son of God" were interchangeable, because one was to be the other. The second reason why Josephism alleges Jesus to have been styled the Son of God, is the fact that he was the first to rise from the dead immortal. This is confuted by the fact that he was called the Son of God before his resurrection, as already shown.

The Josephite cannot account for Matthew introducing Joseph as *the husband of Mary*, and not as the father of Jesus. He simply says that Matthew having done the one, it was unnecessary to do the other. This is not satisfactory. The truth admits of a complete solution. It was only by the legal union of his mother with Joseph in marriage, that Jesus could acquire the rights and titles of Joseph's first-born, and Matthew is careful to show that this was accomplished. The Josephite enquires why the miraculous conception, if a fact, was not placed above suspicion by happening before instead of after the marriage? If Christ's birth happened out of wedlock, he would not have been Joseph's son, and would therefore have lacked one of the qualifications of the Messiahship, but occurring after Mary had become "one flesh" with Joseph, he had all the advantage of a direct paternity, without the hopeless defilement that would have come with a purely Adamic descent.

The Josephite claims the application of Isaiah's prophecy - ("A virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel") - to Isaiah's own son - "Mahershalalhashbaz." His says Jesus was not called Emmanuel. If this is a good reason against Christ, it is a good reason against Mahershalalhashbaz, for *he* was not called Emmanuel. But, says he, it was applied to Mahershalalhashbaz, to "denote the presence of God in the liberation of the Jews." According to this, the name "Emmanuel" was applied on the principle of a recognised significance in the events to which the child stood related. If this is sound in the case of Mahershalalhashbaz, why is it to be refused in the case of Jesus? Oh, says the objector, he was not to be called *the meaning* of the word Immanuel, but "shall call his NAME *Immanuel*." If this is to rob Jesus of the name, does it not equally bar its applicability to the other child? But more; if this is a sound principle as applied to Immanuel, can it be unsound in reference to other names? If because Jesus was called Jesus, and not Emmanuel, we should be compelled to dismiss this passage from Isaiah from the list of Messianic predictions. The same remark applies to "THE BRANCH," "David," "Michael," and other names which only express doctrinal truth concerning Christ, but were not denominatively applied to him. "Immanuel" is as much a name of Christ as "Jesus;" for all names are his that define the truth about him. He, and he alone, is, "God with us." "The word was *made flesh* and dwelt among us" (John 1:14). "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, *God was manifest in the flesh*, justified in the spirit, seen of angels," &c. (1 Tim. 3:16).

R. Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1895, pgs. 62-64

## ON THE NATURE OF CHRIST

Both John and Paul place the nature of Christ in the position of a first principle, on which there is to be no compromise. John says that no man is to be received who denies that Jesus came *in the flesh* (1 John 4:3; 2 John 7-10); and Paul is careful to emphasize that the flesh in question was "of the seed of David" (2 Tim. 2:8; Rom. 1:3); derived from which, he necessarily partook of "the same" flesh and blood as his brethren (Heb 2: 14), and was consequently "tempted in all points like them," though without sin (Heb 4:15). There are other reasons why, in the wisdom of God, it was needful that this should be. These reasons have been amply exhibited in the past controversies that have taken place, and need not be repeated here. Our correspondent, without intending it, places himself in antagonism to the testimony in affirming that, while Jesus came in the flesh, it was not in flesh "sinful in its tendency as ours." The testimony is that he was "tempted in all points" as ourselves, which could not have been the case in the absence of the susceptibilities which our correspondent denies. The very essence of temptation is susceptibility to wrong suggestion. The victory lies in the opposing considerations brought to bear. The truth of the matter does not depend upon the word "likeness" or any other single term, but upon the combination of statements made - which are all in language plain enough to be free from obscurity. At the same time, it has to be pointed out that the word "likeness" in Greek has the force of resemblance so complete as to be sameness. This is illustrated in the statement that Jesus was made in "the likeness of men" (Phil 2:7). The extent of the likeness is defined as extending to "all points" and "all things" (Paul's words - Heb 2:17, 4:15). What can we say but that he was a man, and not the mere likeness of a man? But then, exclaims our correspondent, "Surely he was made superior to man in some respects." Unquestionably. He was not a mere man - not a mere Jew - not mere flesh. He was the flesh of Abraham in a special form. Our correspondent well says that "a mere ordinary man would have failed." True, but wherein did the extraordinariness consist? It is here where our friend gets on to the wrong line. He makes Christ of different stuff - "flesh not sinful in its tendency". He should rather realise that he was the same stuff specially organised and specially used, having the same inherent qualities tending to temptation and death; but qualified to overcome both by the superior power derived from his paternity. Much of the difficulty that some experience in the understanding of this subject arises from a wrong assumption on what we may call the natural-history side of human nature. It seems to be imagined that all human beings are necessarily on the same level of moral imbecility. This is far from the case, as we know from experience. All human beings would be equally incapable on all points if all were equally left untended from the cradle. They would all be speechless idiots without exception if suckled and cradled up by beasts, as has happened in rare instances. But the difference made by instruction and training makes all the difference in the world between two men both equally human; one shall be a stolid brute, and the other verging upon the grace and intelligence of angelhood. But this is not the only difference. Though all men are equally human on certain main points, there are fundamental differences arising from parantage. Two boys - one an Indian cross-breed, and the other a European - may be brought up in the same family, sent to the same school, and will turn out totally different men - one stupid and barren and intractable, and the other bright and fertile and docile. They are both human, but they differ radically. How fallacious it would be to reason from one to the other on the ground of both possessing a common human nature. They are both human truly, but human of



very different qualities. To say that Christ was a man partaking of our sinful nature does not mean to say that he was the same sort of man as other men. His parentage and education were both divine; and as it was said, "Never man spake like this man," so it has to be said that never man thought as this man, or loved as this man, or felt as this man. He was a special man altogether, though as to nature the same: just as a special vase, got up and gilt for a royal table, is a different article from a common mug, though made of the same china clay. ....

Divergencies on these subjects are as lamentable and bitterness-engendering as our correspondent feels them to be; but they are inevitable where men are in earnest about the supremacy of the Divine principles. It would be pleasant, and in many ways profitable, to hold them in abeyance and "agree to differ," but such a policy on the part of enlightened men is not possible without unfaithfulness. There is nothing for it but to maintain the truth in our basis of fellowship, with all the patience and urbanity we can exercise, but with all the quiet inflexibility of men who know they are dealing with a Divine trust, in which will be "a fearful thing" to be found at last unworthy stewards.

---

All passions are good when one masters them; all are bad when one is a slave to them. [The Christadelphian, 1893, pg. 255]

---

## NAZARETH REVISITED

**R. Roberts - Nazareth Revisited, pg. 7 - (Original 2 Column Edition, pgs. 4-5).**

But Christ - there is nothing in common between him and the age in which he was born, or any other age, before or since. Whether we take character, principles, aims, views, capacities, deportment, or achievements, he stands, not only at a measureless altitude above, but absolutely disconnected from the common ways and tendencies of men.

The best proof of this will be found in the history of his life as exhibited in the apostolic narratives in what are known as "the gospels" - of which this book [Nazareth Revisited] aims to be but a modernised reflection. He had nothing in common with men beyond the infirmity of a mortal nature derived through his mother, from a common stock. His tastes lay where the human mind has no affinity. His intellectual interest - his mental affection - intensely centred on God from whom man is naturally alien (Rom. 8:7). Even at twelve years of age, he showed this powerful bias which distinguished him from all men: "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business" (Luke 2:49); and "always," it is his own testimony concerning himself, "he did those things which were pleasing to the father" (John 8:29). His case, with reference to his own age, is only fitly classified in his own language: "Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world" (John 8:23).

**R. Roberts - Nazareth Revisited, pg. 90 - (Original 2 Column Edition, pg. 55).**

.... His ready responses to the tempter show that both acquaintance with the scriptures, and that memory of their practical instructions that was able to apply in the hour of need. If Jesus thus new the scriptures, it was because "his custom was" to frequent the synagogue and read the scriptures (Luke 4:16). His being God Manifest in the flesh would lead to a powerful proneness in a scriptural direction; but it did not make him independent of the testimony which the spirit in David says was his study all the day, and the understanding of which made him wiser than his teachers (Psa 119:97-104). In Christ, therefore, we have an example of that endeavour to become familiar with the scriptures in daily reading, which is the characteristic of the modern revival of the truth. We have also, in his treatment of them, a justification for regarding the scriptures as the unerring source of information in matters pertaining to God.

**R. Roberts - Nazareth Revisited, pgs. 477-488 - (Original 2 Column Edition, pg. 298).**

..... Jesus lays the emphasis of repetition on this point: "I came forth from the Father." The disciples thought this was plain speaking. So it was in a manner. Still, it was part of the parable in which he spoke. The truth expressed is literal, but requires understanding. Jesus literally came out from the Father, but not as a man comes out of wood. He was not a man before he came, but the Word or spirit-power of God, which became, became a man in the way described by the angel's words to Mary (Luke 1:35).

Those who think that Joseph was his father are bound to deny this truth, and place themselves on the awful reverse side of Christ's comforting words. How can the Father regard otherwise than with displeasure the man who denies that His Son Jesus came out from Him in any more direct sense than other men who, as Jesus said, are "from beneath" while he is "from above?"

**R. Roberts - Nazareth Revisited, pg. 481 - (Original 2 Column Edition, pg. 300).**

But this is not necessarily inconsistent with the other view to which Dr. Thomas was always inclined to accord weight and prominence, and which it is impossible to dismiss with a full regard to the grounds on which it rests. It is not necessarily an alternative view, but one that may have a place coordinately with the other: namely, that Jesus being what he was, the "Word made flesh," the manifestation of the God of David in the seed of David, and therefore David's "Lord" - it is impossible to disconnect his mentality from the eternal power in which he was rooted; and that, although as the son of David and the man Christ Jesus, his existence dates from his conception "of the Holy Spirit," the consciousness within him, whose foundation was laid by the Holy Spirit, may have reflected previous relations in a way of which pure earthborn like ourselves have no experience. The facts stated in the words "I and my Father are one," and, "The words that I speak are not mine, but the Father's who dwelleth in me," would necessarily carry such an idea, and involve a state of mind requiring expressions to describe it that could not be applicable to us.

## THE LAW OF MOSES

### R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pgs. 113-114

.... The two main facts in the type were that the manner came from heaven, and that the children of Israel were so situated that if they had not received it, they must have perished. Almost of their own force, they speak of eternal life through Christ. This meaning becomes absolutely certain in the presence of Christ's promise "to him that overcometh" of permission to "eat of the hidden manna" (Rev. 2:17), and of his declaration during a conversation on the Mosaic manna that he is the living bread that came down from heaven, whereof if a man eat, he shall not die (John 6:51). This interpretation involves the doctrine that man is mortal, and will die apart from Christ; and also the truth that Christ is not of human origin, as the Josephite school alleges, but of Divine origin by the Holy Spirit in the way narrated in Luke 1:35.

### R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pgs. 122-125

.... Why was there a veil? We see the answer when we ascertain what it represents. This we ascertain by the circumstances recorded by Matthew, that when Jesus died, "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom" (Matt. 27:51), considered in connection with the exegetical remark of Paul in Heb. 10:20, that there is "a new and living way which Jesus hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh". The veil, then, stands for the flesh of present mortal nature, as possessed by Christ in his natural days. This nature veils off or stands between us and the glorious realities signified by the golden ark-throne in the Holiest of all.

.... If Christ had not risen, his death would have been in vain, as Paul teaches (1 Cor. 15:17). A successful rending of the veil required the righteousness of a perfectly obedient man, which existed only in Christ. Therefore, the veil, while standing for the flesh-nature, stood particularly for the Christ form of that nature - through which only could the new and living way be opened.

.... The veil was a composite fabric. It was not a simple sheet of linen or of any other woven stuff: it was composed of various materials and various colours, "blue, purple, and scarlet, and fine-twined linen of cunning work" (that is, clever, complicated needlework), and it was embroidered with cherubic figures. Where are we to look for the significance of this complexity? Looking at Christ (who "opened the new and living way through the veil, that is to say, his flesh") we readily get the answer. The veil did not stand for the flesh merely, but for the form of it provided in Christ, who blended in himself all the elements foreshadowed by the different materials of the symbolic veil. If it had been a prophecy of the flesh merely, a red cloth would have sufficed. But such a prophecy and such an appointment were impossible, as we readily discern when all the truth involved is seen. "Fine-twined linen" is a speaking part of the symbolism. Linen always stands as a figure for righteousness, as illustrated in the bridal array at the marriage supper of the Lamb, which it was explained to John represented the righteousness of the saints (Rev. 19:8); and also in the wedding garment, for lack of which the speechless guest was expelled from the marriage feast (Matt. 22:11-12). Hence we easily read righteousness in the fine-twined linen of the veil;

and that a special righteousness, a perfect righteousness deftly wrought, as signified by the fineness of the twinning or working. It is the prophecy of a perfectly righteous man who should be no product of accident, but the express provision of divine workmanship, as exemplified in the begetting of Jesus by the Spirit (Matt. 1:20; Luke 1:35), giving point to the apostolic declaration that "he of (or by) God is made unto us righteousness, sanctification, wisdom and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30). Mere flesh and Adamic nature would have lacked this element of the veil. A mere son of Adam would have been fit for death, but not for raising to immortal life, because a mere son of Adam would have been, as he is everywhere, a mere sinner. It was needful that the Adamic nature should be divinely embroidered with the anti-typical "fine-twined linen", before there could be in the nature of Adam the undefiled and holy one required for taking away the sin of the world, that the way into the eternal glory might be opened through the veil. Those who allege Jesus to have been the son of Joseph come into collision with this part of the Mosaic prophecy.

But though a sinless man was needed for this work of wisdom and mercy, yet he had to be a man clothed in the very nature that is the historical sinner, and that has come under death by sin; for the very aim of the whole institution was that this nature should be redeemed in him. Hence the scarlet enters into the composition of the veil. It was not all linen. Had it been all linen, the prophetic import would have been that an angel or an immaculate man (a new man provided outside the Adamic race) would open the way into the Holiest of all by death and resurrection. But it was fine linen, blended with *scarlet*. Scarlet always stands for sin in scripture metaphor, e.g., "Though your sins be as scarlet" (Isa. 1:18); "a scarlet-coloured beast" (Rev. 17:3), etc. But the difficulty with some is how to associate such an ingredient with the sinless Son of God. There ought to be no difficulty if the whole case is kept before the mind. It is not the whole case that "he was without sin:" it is part of the case that he was "made sin for us" (2 Cor. 5:21); that he was made of a woman in the likeness of sinful flesh (Gal. 4:4; Rom. 8:3), and that by a figure God hath laid on him the iniquities of us all (Isa. 53:6), and that he bore our sins in his own body to the tree (1 Pet. 2:24). These are the testified facts; they need have no difficulty for us in the view of the historic fact that he was born of a mortal woman who was under death because of sin. As we contemplate the babe of Bethlehem, born after nine months' gestation, built out of his mother's blood, and nourished by his mother's milk, we cannot resist the conclusion forced on us by the words of Paul, that "he partook of the same flesh and blood" as those he came to redeem, and that he was made in all points like unto his brethren (Heb. 2:14-17). He was palpably and before our eyes thus made subject to the sin constitution of things that has prevailed on the earth "through one man's offence", which enables us to understand the otherwise unintelligible statement of Paul that, when he died, "he died unto sin once" (Rom. 6:10). *A sinless man made subject to the consequence of sin:* this is the combination of the fine-twined linen and the scarlet. There is no difficulty when each element in the case is allowed its place. The difficulties arise from looking too exclusively at one or two elements. Rome has created difficulty by her doctrine of immaculate conception, in which she has latterly included Mary herself. This doctrine has gone through the world by tradition, and breaks out here and there in unsuspected places. Renunciationism has troubled us with it in a special shape, and well-meaning minds perpetuate the trouble by their superficial partiality for a view that seems more honouring to Christ than the truth.

**R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pgs. 135-136**

But how is it that the same materials - which, as the veil separating the holiest, represented Christ in his mortal nature as the Lamb of God to take away the sin by the rending of the flesh-veil in himself (the passing through which should lead into the immortal state) - should now stand for the means of entrance into a state which, though holy, is still mortal and imperfect? The answer is that it is the same Christ in another relation. Though it is true that it was the personal Jesus that was represented by the veil, in opening the way into the holiest of all in the sacrifice of himself, it is no less true that it is the personal Jesus that is brought to bear on outside sinners when his achievements are offered by apostolic report to their faith as the means of their introduction to a relation of favour and hope. Therefore, materials representing him are in place, both at the door and in the veil. Christ is as much the door of entrance to the holy state as he is the opener of the way into the holiest. He is the door as well as the veil, and the doctrines symbolised by the blue and purple and fine-twined linen (considered in the last chapter) are as much in operative view at the initial stage of a sinner's justification as when he stands in the immortal throng of glorified saints at the last to ascribe salvation, and glory and honour, "to him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

**R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pgs. 154-155**

Even as early as the manifestation of Yahweh on Mount Sinai, before Moses had received directions for the construction of the tabernacle, God had forbidden the people to touch the mount on pain of death (Exod. 19:12). Their unfitness was alleged to consist in their "uncleanness" (Lev. 15:31) - a term expressive of their both physical and moral defilement - the character of the entire human race - the one growing out of the other. Man is an unclean and corruptible organisation, 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, ever-living, and glorious nature of the Lord Jesus and the angels.

.... The priesthood were to stand between God and the people ..... Its particular significance concerns Christ, who is the substance of all these preliminary shadowings (Col. 2:17). In him we see a chosen mediator (1 Tim. 2:5) - not self appointed: "No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron" (Heb. 5:4). It was God who said, "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek" (Psa 110:4). We see him offer blood - not the blood of bulls and goats, but his own blood: he alone entering into the holiest, "heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24). We see him the perfect one, without spot, without sin, without superfluity, or incongruity - and this, his character from the beginning: yet assisted by his originally blemished sons in the ultimate development of his priesthood; for his children - his seed - the forgiven saints, are to reign with him as priests as well as kings. (Heb. 2:13-14; Isa. 53:10; Rev. 5:10).

**R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pg. 168**

The washing of Aaron with water was, therefore, a prefiguration of the moral cleansing to be effected in a son of Abraham by the Spirit in preparation for the priestly office. The application of this in the antitype may be discerned in the operation of the Spirit, which, though resulting in a son of David according to the laws of maternity, produced such a Son of David as the world had never seen before, viz., a sinless man: human nature morally cleansed. "He did always those things that pleased the Father." He could ask without fear of successful answer, "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" "He did no sin." He was in this sense "without spot", which could not be affirmed of any other son of Abraham.

Some experience a difficulty here. They say that if the begetting of Jesus by the Spirit had such an effect as this, he was not of the same nature as ourselves. The simple answer may suggest itself in the question: Are there not different sorts of the same nature in everything? Contrast a crab-apple with a delicious Blenheim: a worn-out cart-horse with a high blooded charger: a mumbling savage with a British peer - different sorts, but the same nature. Jesus was a man, but not as other men in his powerful affinity for God, and his abhorrence for everything in opposition to His will. He was human nature mentally washed in this sense by the Spirit. If it were not so to what can we attribute his spotless divinity of character? It is there: was it an effect without a cause? Education cannot account for it - for other Jewish children had a good an education as he. Education had something to do with it, doubtless, but it was only as the culture of good seed in good soil. The parable of the sower touches the subject: the same seed produces different results, according to the nature of the soil. The "soil" differs in different men, and yet they are all men. Christ was a man, yet his mental soil differed from all men's. He had the impulses common to all men, but conjoined with these, a power of control possessed by no man. And this was the result of the antitypical washing to which, in him, the seed of David was subjected to in harmony with the Mosaic figure.

**R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pgs. 209-210.**

The antitype is clear as noon-day. Man had nothing to do with the preparation of the Christ-altar. Jesus was the Son of God direct (Matt. 1:20; Luke 1:35; Isa. 7:14). Had he been the son of Joseph, he must needs have been what other men are - by nature a transgressor. He could not have been what he was - the lamb without blemish and without spot (1 Pet. 1:19-20); undefiled and separate from sinners (Heb. 7:26); without sin (Heb. 4:15; 1 John 3:5). He was the earth and stone of a human nature derived from Mary, and, therefore, physically weak and mortal because of ancestral sin, as she was: but through the absence of human paternity, there was a power in this physically weak nature of Adam to overcome, which no other man possessed. It matters not whether we consider this power as the absence of the irresistible bias derivable from human procreation or the presence of "help" arising from the participation of the Holy Spirit in the inception of his being. The practical result was the same. He was not "defiled"-by human manufacture. He was, by God Himself, "made unto us righteousness," as Paul says.

**R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pgs. 223-224.**

The Lord Jesus was human nature taken hold of by the Spirit, and morally-washed both in the act of his begetting and in the moral operation in his mental development afterwards, while physically Adam's nature unchanged. Thus washed as to mind, while heir of death as to nature, he was fitted, in the arrangements of God, to perform that wonderful achievement of destroying through death, that having the power of death, and delivering them (believing in him) who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. (Heb 2:14). If men have a difficulty in understanding this, it is not a wonder, considering that it is a divine arrangement with divine aims - both of which are liable to be unintelligible to the mere mind of the flesh.

**R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pgs. 243-244**

"The antitype in Christ, "the one great offering," "who put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," is clear. Though made of like nature with ourselves, as his sacrificial mission required, though subject to death because of its entrance into the world by sin, as all men are - he was the Lord's "Holy One" - separated and dedicated from the very beginning for this very work of taking it away - without iniquity himself, as prefigured by the spotlessness of the sacrificial animals, yet bearing in himself the hereditary effects of sin, that he might remove them by death and resurrection for all who should take his name and be approved by him. Preached as the crucified and resurrected Jesus - (the Lamb of God bearing away the sin of the world) - he is the flesh of the sin offering most holy, by the eating or contact with which, in the affectionate understanding thereof, we become holy in him."

**R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pg. 248.**

"In the man-child born of a woman and circumcised on the eighth day, we have one made of our own identical nature, yet *not* born of the will of man, or of the will of the flesh in any sense, but of God, for God was the father of Christ by His Spirit operating upon his mother, who probably did not know what had occurred within her for a considerable time. 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 and word 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. Such being the case, he required no justification or cleansing pertaining to the conscience as we do: he needed only a cleansing or justification by spirit of his physical nature - sin's flesh - which he bore."

**R. Roberts - The Law of Moses, pg. 249-250.**

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, as said, after resurrection, but all others have to be cleansed both in mind and body before they can live for ever in God's presence. The mental and moral cleansing takes place at baptism, when we are baptized into the death of Christ, which took place after the thirty-third year of his life. The double number of days in the cleansing for the woman-child represents, I take it, the double cleansing process all believers must be subjects of before they can attain to eternal life, but both the moral and physical purification is in virtue of the one sacrifice.

*K. Cook*

Bro. D. Rucker

DANGER OF REMOVING OLD LANDMARKS. PROV. 22:28.

PRESENT DIFFICULTIES - NOT ABLE TO BE PROGRESS INTO.  
 Condemnation: Movement sin defiled sinful flesh reconciliation gods.

CLAUDE S. defiled obviously physical defilement.

6. 'law of sin & death'.

7

8 "condemned line" condemned nature few of condemnation  
 all hinged on offering (blood & death) physical defilement  
 2 THINGS TIE TO RES  
 BLOOD SHEDDING.

9. necessitated

INSTRUCTOR 35

54

condemnation of sin is more than  
 saying something is wrong  
 Not sinning

Needs Blood letting SAC in which SIN Destroyed

55

56. sin condemned in his crucifixion

57

took away sin by sacrifice of himself  
 See Heb 2:14.

PURGATION → CRUCIFIXION → GLORIFICATION.

IF AN IN LINE CAN ARE ONLY MONTH TRAILS. BLOOD LETTING SAC  
 CAN ONLY REFER TO OUR NATURE THEREFORE

Some Secs. 4000 in 50s 2000 in 1910.

"THE CHURCH IN AUST" MARCH 1944 NO. 27 VOL 3 No. 3.  
 AUG 12 1901. VS  
 THE SHIELD

Rom 8:3  
P. 134

## **PART C**

# ***Further Christadelphians*** **on** **God Manifestation**

## *Dr. Thomas's Daughter on the Subject*

Sis. Lasius, The Ambassador of the Coming Age, 1867 Pgs. 85-88

### ON THE NATURE OF CHRIST<sup>1</sup>

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS. - The story of your recent encounter with "Dowieism" has been read be several in this city with great interest, because of the light you have thrown upon the fortunes of the truth of God among some of its professed friends, and the fate it is likely to meet with at their hands. The truth in these latter days has, in many places, fallen in among a class of professed truth in the first centuries, like those of whom you have spoken, who seek to make a smoother path and a broader way, wherein to journey to the heavenly city, than that which is already marked out. The progress of the truth in first centuries, after the days of the Apostles, was also accompanied by a "falling away" from the purity of doctrine and practise delivered by them. It came very gradually, little by little; but when men begin to step aside from the form of sound doctrine, they will continue to wax worse and worse, until they are found identified with a state of apostacy corresponding to the Laodiceans of early time, thus putting themselves in a position to be spewed out of the Spirit's mouth at his appearing in his kingdom. In him they will not find a champion to lead them on to glory and honour, as was the case in the days of Constantine, the first so-called Christian emperor. They will have to give place to their more humble and *truth-loving* brethren.

We rejoice to know, however, that the truth in its purity is gaining ground on this, as well as the other side of the great waters.

There are, this time, some interesting points of doctrine in process of discussion among some in different places, and we do earnestly hope that all parties engaged therein will be enlightened in the end, and that no cause of strife may arise therefrom. I wish, in this letter, to mention and enlarge a little upon one of these points. It is about the nature and constitution of Jesus Christ. Some parties affirm that he did not possess the Divine nature in any respect; that he was constitutionally a sinner, like any other son of Adam; that when a child he was no more than any other child, and when arrived at years of maturity the Deity saw that his character was good and suitable for his purpose, therefore he made use of him, and filled him with the Holy Spirit at his baptism. Others affirm that he was constitutionally righteous and *incapable* of sinning, and devoid of the propensities inherit in our nature. Now, evidently the truth of the matter is not wholly on either position according to the Scriptures. That Jesus was constitutionally good and righteous there can be no doubt, but, that he was *incapable* of sinning we do not believe. If this were so, there would have been not virtue or merit in withstanding temptation; consequently, the temptation, as recorded in the New Testament, would have been a useless performance. We learn form the testimony that Jesus was created by the Father out of the substance of his mother Mary, at the time appointed by Jehovah - according as it is written - "When the fullness of time was come, he was made of a woman," and the angel Gabriel appeared unto the Virgin Mary and told her the manner of its fulfilment - that the "Holy Spirit should come upon her,

---

<sup>1</sup> Brother Roberts states - "This article was published with the consent and under the supervision of Dr. Thomas." (See pg. 96 of this collation).

and the power of the Highest should overshadow her," and, "That Holy Thing that should be born of her should be called the *Son of God*." Now we know that, as a general thing, all children partake of the nature, constitution, and character of BOTH their parents. No child is ever wholly, and entirely, and in all respects like *one parent only*, and we are not warranted in making an exception to this law in the case of the Son of God. From his mother, he derived all the faculties, propensities, and instincts which belong to the nature of the first Adam - as it is written - "He took upon himself the nature of the seed of Abraham," that sin might be condemned in the nature which had sinned: and also, that he might be able to sympathise with *our* infirmities, and to "succour those who are tempted," "forasmuch, as he also was compassed with infirmity." This was the "body prepared" for a habitation of the Spirit in all fullness - as it is written - "A body hast thou prepared for me," "Lo! I come to do thy will, O God." Now we understand what was the nature of the *medium* of manifestation, but what was that which was *manifested*? Was it merely the natural manifestation of a natural man? By no means. It is written, "He shall be called Emmanuel," that is, being interpreted, "*God with us*." This was God manifest in the flesh, for the first time. It could not be affirmed of any other man that ever existed, before or since, that he was God manifested in the flesh, although the Spirit of God has operated through other media, both in word and sign. He is called the "only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Some might ask, how was the Deity manifested? We answer, in the *character* of the son and his *mental attributes*.

The Apostle John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the word was with God, and the Word was God," and, "the *Word became flesh* and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." The *Word* of God is the wisdom of God; the thoughts or intelligence of Deity. This word of wisdom is personified in the Proverbs of Solomon, thus, - "I, Wisdom, dwell with prudence and find out knowledge of witty inventions," with many other similar passages. Jesus Christ was the wisdom of God embodied in flesh - "the express image of his person" or character, because it was ordained that in him should dwell the *fullness of the Godhead bodily*, so that it became essential that he should not only receive the Spirit, without measure, at his baptism, for the purpose of preaching the Gospel and working miracles, but that he should also have the power within himself to become *perfect in all virtue*; that he might be found without transgression and without fault from his infancy and childhood; that he might be the lamb without spot or blemish. So, from the Deity, his Father, he inherited wisdom, thought, intelligence, elevation, and purity of character. Being aware of his divine origin and mission at twelve years of age, and perhaps before, he was able to discuss matters pertaining to the law with men of years education - professed doctors of divinity. Thus we see that he displayed, even in the years of childhood, wisdom and knowledge inherited from his heavenly father. "Being the Son of God he thought it not robbery to be equal with God," as all children are, in a certain sense, equal with their parents. The *natural illustrates the spiritual*.

"In studying human character we find that the inward thoughts, judgment, or intelligence is something different and distinct from the desires, affections, and propensities; all these are right and good in the proper sphere, when directed and circumscribed within certain limits prescribed by the law of God. If the judgment is clear and well regulated and controlled by the word of God, it will entirely subjugate the desires and affections, and only allow them a certain limited scope. This, however, is a state of mind never completely attained to by us who are born after the will of the flesh by the will of man. Jesus being the word, thought or intelligence of his Father, consequently, the will of the flesh was far more subdued and he was not liable to be led

away by excited impulses and perverted desires. The desires of his nature were in a *natural state*, such as those with which the first Adam was endowed at his creation <sup>1</sup>. Some of the first Adam's descendants, however, have so nourished and cultivated those propensities (which in their simplicity are good enough), that they have become perverted and altogether *unnatural*.

"In the consideration of this or any other subject of Bible doctrine, we should seek to harmonise all the passages bearing upon any particular point; and not accept some and reject others, which (to our limited comprehension) seems to convey opposition of meaning; when in reality there is no contradiction, but a beautiful harmony when rightly put together.

---

<sup>1</sup> Intellectually and morally speaking. Brother Thomas explains this principle in Phanerosis - see pg.14.of this collation under the heading "Jesus Before Anointing."

Sis. Lasius, *The Christadelphian*, 1875, Pgs. 5-7

Referring to criticisms on the doctrine advocated by *The Christadelphian* concerning Christ, Dr. Thomas's daughter says:-

## **The Plant Of Renown And The Mystery Of Godliness**

It appears almost singular how views so different and opposite can be taken of the same author, as seen from different standpoints. We have failed to discern in your teachings concerning the nature of Christ, any of the ideas attributed to you. We have never understood you to teach that the substance of the body of Christ was a 'mixture of human and divine substance,' although you do hold that the operation of the Spirit of God, in and through the 'body prepared,' was according to the Scriptures from the beginning of its formation.

Why should this be so perplexing to many ? Why is it not as easy to comprehend 'the union of Spirit with flesh,' as to understand the union of Spirit with the manna in the wilderness? The spirit preserved the manna from decomposing, yet it was manna in substance still - suitable for food to sustain natural life.

It would scarcely become a question in our minds whether the Spirit had transformed the substance of the manna into 'semi-Spirit substance.' Why, then, should it be more difficult to realise that Spirit operation upon flesh substance should *animate* the flesh without changing the substance? The Spirit of Deity being subject to the will of Deity, would perform no more and no less than He purposed to accomplish.

The power that divided the waters of the Red Sea, and brought water out of the flinty rock, could also, under fiat of the same sovereign will, bring forth a 'Plant of Renown.' Plants grow from seeds or roots embedded in the earth. Yet, if not subject to the subtle, penetrating, vivifying influence of the sun's rays, they would never come to maturity. Naturalists know well how to estimate the electrical power and life-giving agency of the sun's rays, without which no vegetation would mature, and nature would remain shrouded in eternal winter. And still they do not contend that the plants or the seed have incorporated a particle of the substance of the sun, but simply the electrical influence of its rays.

One of your critics makes the extra-ordinary assertion that the 'seed of woman' cannot be understood to mean the seed of woman physiologically. If this were true, then of what value are the testimonies which trace the descent from Abraham and David according to the line of the flesh?

The prophet Isaiah says: 'He shall grow up before him as a tender plant, as a root out of dry ground.' With this beautiful figure, we associate the idea of parent earth and Spirit sun in combination. The plant derives nourishment from both, though of a different kind and different nature, yet the substance of the plant remains the same.

We sometimes derived much assistance in studying the figures borrowed from nature, although they may not in every particular be fitted to the heavenly subjects represented. The figures presented in the Word will, doubtless, be more appropriate than those of our own choosing. The 'Tender Plant,' to which we refer, receiving nourishment from mother earth - colour, size and mature growth from the rays of its

father sun, grew and developed to a 'Plant of Renown.' 'The child grew and waxed strong in Spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him.' Although this plant was to be laid low for a ~~long~~ time, it was not doomed to decay, because the Father's Spirit preserved it from decomposition, raised it up again, transplanted it into a heavenly atmosphere, where it fully expands into the 'Tree of Life:' retaining life, and giving life to as many as shall be engrafted upon it in the appointed way.

It is further asserted that the Word was made flesh *only* at the time of anointing with Holy Spirit and baptism. Here we are puzzled again with mathematical definiteness, without reference to the harmonious grouping of testimonies. Is it to be maintained that the wisdom or thought of Deity was not at all incorporated with the mind and thought of the Son, until the anointing? Are we not rather to believe that it was only the *fullness of measure* that was conferred at the anointing? If the latter, then we may be able to find scope for certain testimonies which otherwise might have to be excluded. 'The child grew, *waxed strong in Spirit, filled with wisdom.*' Another Scripture says, 'there is a spirit in man:' this we know is 'the spirit of the world,' which inclines the thoughts towards the things of the world. 'The Spirit which is of God' directed the thoughts and mind of Christ towards the things of God, endowed him with wisdom beyond his years, prompted attention towards the Father's business and gave him understanding concerning it which astonished all who heard him. This manifestation of Deity in him was 'mental and moral.' His mind and thoughts tended heavenward, because the 'Spirit of wisdom and understanding rested upon him.' Thus the spirit of his mind was pure and holy. Innocence characterised him, as the Lamb without blemish.

The Deity, as exhibited in the mental and moral characteristics of the Son, can be traced only in limited degree of manifestation, in the stages of youth and early manhood. We see in this the gradual unfolding of the beauties of 'the Plant;' not an instantaneous or meteorlike development.

In the revelation unto Moses of the name of Yahweh, we see how limited was the first exhibition simply, 'He who shall be.'

The second was fuller and more comprehensive, proclaiming the moral attributes of Jehovah: 'Gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth,' &c. Then there was a manifestation of the *glory*. Afterwards, the word or law went forth to the children of Israel.

The Mosaic pattern of heavenly things exhibits the order and system according to which Jehovah manifests Himself. Everything has its order and system of development. We must observe times and seasons in this manifestation of Deity.

The real name-bearer of Jehovah, in the time appointed, appeared in the person of Jesus. The manifestation of the Father in and through him was according to the Mosaic pattern: first, his name and existence; afterwards, the development of moral attributes; then the giving of the Word to Israel, with power and miracles; and finally, the manifestation of His glory to certain witnesses. These things, however, were not exhibited all of a sudden; like a shooting star, or a meteoric shower.

When our minds become deeply impressed with the grandeur of this subject, we shall cease defining it in terms of human wisdom; but grouping all the testimonies pertaining to it, combining their separate relations, and arranging them in harmonious



combination according to their proper relations and positions, we shall see the grandeur of the subject, and be content to contemplate, wonder and adore.....

Let us bear in mind the greatness of the subject before us, the manifestation of the Deity in flesh. It is the 'great mystery of godliness,' which we have the privilege of looking into. Let us, then, approach it with reverence; free from cramping imitations, and mathematical lines, which tend to confuse and perplex, instead of to enlighten and build up.

Sis. Lasius, *The Christadelphian*, 1876, Pgs. 494-498

## DEITY MANIFEST IN THE FLESH

### DR. THOMAS IN HARMONY WITH HIMSELF AND WITH THE PROPHETS AND APOSTLES

It may perhaps be considered a work of supererogation to attempt to add anything to what has been said and written in demonstration of this subject. But no subject, however clear and plain, can be damaged by an increasing amount of testimony in its favour, and it may not be altogether uncalled for when the number of those who affirm the contrary may be increasing. In reference to the subject of "Deity manifest in the flesh," the source of so much perplexity of thought, as also to all other cardinal doctrines of Scripture, we shall find the Doctor in harmony with himself and with the Word; at least in the estimation of those who have profited by the simplicity and clearness of his mode of exposition. By referring to the *Herald of the Kingdom*, vol. 5, we shall find there some thoughts from the Dr.'s pen, relative to the "pre-existence of Christ," written by him for the purpose of showing in what sense only a pre-existence could be affirmed of him, and how certain passages of the New Testament can only be understood. We shall only quote from the article to represent the idea intended to be conveyed by the writer. His first quotations are the expressions of the Spirit through Solomon, speaking in the first person as a personality:

"I, Wisdom, dwell with prudence, &c. Jehovah possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old ..... Then I was by Him as one brought up by Him; I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him.' - (Prov. 8). Here is an existence," says the Dr., "previous to the existence of the earth and all that it contains. 'By me,' says Wisdom, 'Jehovah formed the earth.' In the words of David, 'By the word of Jehovah were the heavens made, and all the host of them, by the Spirit of His mouth. For He spoke and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast.' From these premises it is evident that 'wisdom,' the 'word,' and 'the spirit,' are but different terms expressive of the same thing. The apostle John, in speaking of this saith: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made which exists. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men.' The 'word,' 'wisdom,' 'spirit,' 'God,' are all one and the same; for He being the fountain and origin, is as the emanation from Himself. Now, this spirit-word, or spirit of wisdom, Peter styles 'the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets,' or in the words of Nehemiah who saith to Jehovah concerning Israel, 'Thou gavest also Thy good Spirit to instruct them. Many years didst Thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them, by Thy prophets.' But why was the good Spirit of Jehovah in the prophets styled by Peter the Spirit of Christ? Because it was the same Spirit that dwelt in Moses and the prophets that afterwards dwelt in Jesus without measure, and so constituted him pre-eminently the Anointed One, or Christ. Now, of this anointing, it is said in the prophets concerning the man whose name is THE BRANCH - the 'Spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and of might; the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of Jehovah.' This was one spirit, not many, and styled in the New Testament 'the Eternal Spirit' through whom Jesus offered himself without fault to God.

'The Spirit of Jehovah,' says David, 'spoke by me, and His word was in my tongue.' Let us hear, then, what the

Spirit saith by David in the fortieth Psalm: 'Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire; burnt offering and sin offering Thou hast not required. Then I said Lo, I come: it is written of me in the volume of the book, Thy will, O my God, I delight to do; yea Thy law is within my heart. I have preached righteousness in the great congregation. Lo, I have not refrained my lips, O Jehovah, Thou knowest.' Thus spake the Eternal Spirit of Wisdom, who was brought forth before the earth had being, who was from the beginning by Jehovah as one brought up with him. Did not Jehovah then sustain the relation of a father to the Spirit?" - *Herald of the Kingdom*, vol. 5, page 110.

The main features of the extract just quoted will be seen to be, first identity of the *Logos*, or Spirit of Wisdom, with Deity; second, its harmonious subjection to the will of the Father, in all the works of creation and in all the divine arrangements concerning the salvation of His people; and the indwelling of the same in Jesus Anointed. This is in exact agreement with what is written on page 95 of *Eureka*, vol. 1. concerning the same point:

"Of all the *Elohim* one only is the original, independent power of the universe. Speaking of Himself, in His address to the ends of the earth, he says 'Look unto me, for I am AIL, and none Else' - (Isa. 45:22). And to Israel he saith 'Ye are my witnesses, and my servant whom I have chosen, that ye may know and believe Me, and understand that I am He; before Me AIL, or power, *has not been formed*, nor after He shall be' - (Isa. 43:10): a testimony that identifies AIL with the *Logos* and *Theos* of John, which as ONE POWER, he saith, made all things, and without Him was not anything made that was made."

Again, on page 166, the same doctrine is taught when speaking of the visions which Daniel saw concerning the Son of Man, who is brought before the Ancient of Days:

"the Ancient of Days is the Lord the Spirit, the Quickening Spirit, the *Logos* in David's flesh, who is the head of this Son of Man."

Again, vol. 1, pg. 95:

"In view of these testimonies, we can understand the Annunciation in the Apocalypse concerning Him who is coming, saying, 'I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.'"

Some who profess to believe, while agreeing with the Dr. thus far, call in question his teaching concerning the body of Christ, the nature of the flesh in which he came, or the precise time when the Spirit or *Logos* became flesh. We would remark that the Dr. who is careful to preserve distinctions between times and seasons, is also careful not to indulge in speculation, or to assume a positive position upon matters which are not the subject of revelation. Referring again to the *Herald of the Kingdom*, we read:

"The testimonies show that in a time appointed, the Eternal Spirit of Wisdom would connect itself with a body. Jehovah styles this body He promised to prepare for the Spirit of Wisdom, 'a *precious stone*,' and said, 'I WILL ENGRAVE THE ENGRAVING THEREOF.' - (Zech. 3:9). He had told Abraham and David that the body should be taken from their race and nature; but that when the days for its being fashioned should arrive, He would engrave it Himself, so that it should be to Him a Son; son of David according to its nature, son of Jehovah as having formed it by His Spirit." This is in harmony with the Scripture saying: He was 'made of a woman, made under the law.' - (Gal. 4:4)."

The Dr. further says:

"Now, if these things be duly apprehended, the prophetic testimony concerning the body to be prepared for the Spirit in the days appointed, will not be difficult of comprehension. The testimony has relation, first, to the body before its diversification in the grave; and, second, after the operation has been perfected. THESE DIVISIONS MUST NOT BE CONFOUNDED; for the things they treat of are as diverse as corruption and incorruptibility."

This is in harmony with an idea he presented in vol. 6. pg. 269, concerning these two periods or stages of development.

"Christ made sin, though sinless, is the doctrine of God. Such was Jesus in the days of his flesh; when through weakness he was crucified for sin; but now no longer weak, he lives by the power of God. In power he rose from among the dead, and ascended into glory. The revival of his body was its begettal as Jehovah's first-born from the dead. Of his resurrection it is written: 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee.' This was the second begettal by the Spirit. *At the first, he was begotten of Mary after her nature; at the second of the grave, with a nature incorruptible, glorious and powerful; a spiritual body - or life-imparting spirit.*"

These passages clearly present to us the Dr.'s idea concerning the nature of Christ, and will be found perfectly harmonious with other portions of his writings. He further says on the same page:

"As a last resort, the doctors of the apostacy fall back upon the saying of Gabriel in Luke 1:35, that the child to be born of Mary was a 'holy thing,' and consequently of an immaculate nature. But they forget that all the firstborns of Israel were 'holy things.' Jesus was Jehovah's firstborn by Mary, therefore, one of the firstborns of the nation; so that the law of the firstborn applied to him equally with the rest. Hence the holiness of Mary's babe was *not of nature*, but of constitution by the law. Gabriel declared his legitimacy in styling it a 'holy thing:' a declaration ratified by Jehovah himself before the multitude, when He acknowledged Jesus as His Son, in whom he delighted. (Matt. 3:17)."

In *Eureka*, vol. 1. page 408, the Dr. says: -

"Now, this new creation, wonderful in its development and consummation, began with the formation of a babe in the womb of the handmaid of *Yahweh*, and ends with the cessation of every curse." "When created *and anointed* this new creation was Eternal Power manifest in the flesh; and when resurrected and glorified, that flesh was transformed into spirit or Deity; a substantial corporeal entity called by Paul a 'quickening spirit,' and 'the Lord the Spirit.' And He is the head of the body, that among all he might become pre-eminent. The creation of the material world is attributed to Spirit of *Elohim*; the same spirit afterwards incarnated. Jesus, so that he, *when anointed*, was not only the created but the antecedent and creator of all things defined."

The same idea is expressed on page 312 of the same volume:

"Jesus ANOINTED was the glory of *Yahweh*. This is proved by John's testimony that the *Logos* became flesh and dwelt among us - (Israelites) - and we beheld His glory, the glory of the Father, full of grace and truth. This glory of the Father, was seen in the evening of the Mosaic aion; he was seen in the wilderness as Isaiah had predicted; saying, 'the voice of him that proclaimeth in the wilderness,' 'Prepare ye the way of *Yahweh*; make straight in the desert a highway for our *Elohim*, ..... (Isa. 40:3,5). This was only partially fulfilled in the evening of the Mosaic aion, as related in regard to John the baptizer. He was that voice; the spirit descending in the form of a dove was *Yahweh* or the *Logos*; and Jesus, the *Eloah* of Israel, who when anointed, became as the voice of John proclaimed, 'our *Elohim*.' These two *Elohim*, dwelt among the Jews as the only begotten of the Father, Son of Power and Son of Man, who hath declared the invisible Deity to men."

The Dr. has not omitted to give all due weight to those passages relating to the birth of Jesus, although he did not consider it essential to pry into such a matter any further than it was given the angel to reveal. The testimonies which satisfied the natural inquiry of the mother of Jesus, were also sufficient for his faith to rest upon. A careful perusal of his remarks on page 101, *Eureka*, vol. 1., bearing in mind what has already been quoted from other pages will be easily understood. After referring to certain testimonies, he remarks: -

"In these testimonies it was revealed that he should be both the Son of Man and the Son of Deity. How this could be otherwise than is related in the New Testament, would be impossible to devise. 'Is there an *Eloah* without me?' saith the Spirit, 'Yea, there is no rock; I know of none.' - (Isa. 44:8). The manifestation therefore,

must be by the Spirit of Deity, or not at all; ..... and 'when the fulness of time was come, the Deity sent forth His Son made of a woman, begotten not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, but of Deity; by Holy Spirit coming upon her, and power of the Highest overshadowing her;" therefore, also, that holy thing she bore was called the Son of God. - (Luke 1:31,35).

Here we see the Dr. recognises in full the heavenly origin of Jesus, though his reasoning is not of such a character as to overthrow the balance of these testimonies which pertain to his perfect humanity, such as we see recorded in Paul's letter to the Hebrews: "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise partook of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; ..... of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold, &c." "Made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people, for in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." - (Heb. 2:14-18). While giving to these testimonies their due weight and importance, recognizing the entire humanity of Jesus, as to his nature, the Dr. did not place him on a level with mankind; because notwithstanding all the power which the adversary brought to bear upon him, in order to cause him to fall, he proved invincible at every point. This showed a marked superiority over any other individual of the human race that ever lived. But this superiority was of *mental* and *moral attributes*; not a superior kind of flesh to that which the children were possessed of. (And this moral superiority was due to his paternity. - R.R.)

In contemplating this vast subject, which the apostle Paul styles "a great mystery, Deity manifest in the flesh" - the Dr. was careful not to crowd all the testimonies relating to it into one period or space of time; seeing that manifestation was a process of development, having certain stages or degrees of progression. He contemplated the Son of God from the earliest stages of existence "begotten by the Holy Spirit," "made of a woman," "born of the Virgin Mary" with a nature like her own. Increasing in wisdom and stature as he advanced in years; of quick understanding in the fear and the knowledge of Jehovah; as exhibited by him at the age of twelve years when reasoning with the doctors in the temple. Subsequently, when the *Logos* abode upon him in unmeasured fulness at the waters of his baptism, he was the "Word made flesh." His body was then the temple of the indwelling presence of the glory of *Yahweh*, which as the veil, concealed it from view, even as typified by Moses, when he covered his face with a veil, because the people could not look upon the glory which shone upon his countenance. The period of labour and suffering having passed, "the veil, that is to say his flesh," was rent upon the cross, which divided the period of suffering from the period of glory, or a period of glorified bodily existence. The lamb, the burnt offering, the sin offering, the peace offering, had passed through through the fire with acceptance to the Deity, and the Father again begat him to a new life with a spiritual body, consubstantial with Himself.

Sis. Lassius, The Christadelphian, 1879, Pgs. 64-66

## GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH

Many reflections, by inference and insinuation, have been cast upon the doctrines we hold concerning the subject of the manifestation of the One Eternal God in human nature. These reflections have resulted from wrong impressions taken up, which have been allowed to grow up into firm convictions on the part of those who cast them upon us, and those who have received them.

"The manifestation of the One Invisible Eternal God in human nature," has always been one of the fundamental elements of the gospel, as we have learned it according to the apostle Paul. "Divine unity, in plural manifestation," has been proved the one grand basis of the "things concerning the name of Jesus Christ," the teaching concerning which has been so potent, in our enlightenment, in regard to the foundation corner stone of that glorious and fearful name, "YAHWEH ELOHIM."

Without considering all the "strifes about words", which have "darkened counsel," we come to the "subject itself," as expressed in the well-known little pamphlet, entitled *Phanerosis*, which will probably express our views better than we can. There, we find, the teachings of Moses and Paul brought into harmonious relations and agreement. On page 56 (New Edition pg. 63) we select the following:

"Paul, as well as Moses, declares, 'there is no other God but One,' and having so said, proceeds to remark, 'For though there be that are called gods, whether in the heaven or upon the earth (as there are gods many and lords many); but to us there is One God the Father, out of whom all things, and we for Him; and One Lord Jesus Anointed; on account of whom all things and we through him. Howbeit the knowledge is not in all.' - (1 Cor. 8:4-7.) Here, then, we have good authority for saying that in the universe there are many gods and many lords; but that over and above them all is ONE SUPREME, who is styled the Blessed and Only Sovereign; King of kings, and Lord of lords; the only one having deathlessness, 'inhabiting light unapproachable, whom no man hath seen, nor can see.' - (1 Tim. 6:15-16.) He is God of gods, whose existence He Himself admits in saying to Israel, 'I am Jehovah, thy *Elohim*. ..... There shall not be to thee other *Elohim* above me.' Thus far Moses and Paul are in agreement. They both teach one supreme Deity, and the existence of others beside; but that these others are not to be made objects of worship by dwellers upon the earth. Now, Jesus of Nazareth is perfectly Mosaic in his teaching upon this subject. When a certain Scribe asked him, 'which is the chief commandment of all?' he answered in the words of Moses, so often referred to by the Jews of our day, when disputing the claims of Jesus, 'The first of all the commandments,' said he, 'is Hear, O Israel, YAHWEH our ELOHIM, is ONE YAHWEH. And thou shalt love *Yahweh* thine *Elohim* with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like as, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.' 'Well, teacher,' said the scribe, 'Thou hast said the truth: FOR THERE IS ONE DEITY; and there is no other but of Him.' - (Mark 12:29-34.) Now Jesus was one, and the Father was another. 'I can of mine own self,' said he, 'do nothing.' 'My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me;' and it is written in the law of Moses that the testimony of two men is credible. 'I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father who sent me (the other witness). 'He beareth witness of me.' - (John 5:30; 7:16; 8:17-18.) Here, then, are TWO PERSONAGES. In the days of the patriarchs and prophets, the typical altar was temporarily sanctified; but in the days of the apostles, and consequently now also, Jesus is the sanctifier, as Paul teaches in Heb. 2:11, saying that 'Both he that sanctifieth, and they being sanctified, are all out of one' (Father); and in chapter. 13:10-13, he plainly identifies Jesus as the sanctifying altar, of which none have any right to eat who, while holding on to the types, reject the things they shadow forth."

[Page 47 (New Edition pg. 54)] - "THE GERM OF THE NEW MAN IS THE IDEAS OF GOD. Jesus saith, 'My words are spirit, and they are life.' John saith, 'THE WORD WAS MADE FLESH AND DWELT AMONG US.' It is the Father Spirit whom Paul refers to in 1 Tim. 6:16, whom no man hath seen in His unveiled splendour. Veiled in flesh, 'the veil of the covering.' - (Exod. 35:12.) He that discerned him who spoke to Philip, 'saw the Father.' - (John 14:9; 12:45.) But, veiled or unveiled, the Father Spirit is substantial. Speaking of the unveiled Father

Spirit, Paul says, in Heb. 1:2,3, that the Son is the *Character* of his *Hypostais* - χαρακτήρ της υποστάσεως αὐτοῦ - rendered in the common version, 'express image of his person.' The Son, then, is the *character*, or exact representation, and the Father is the *hypostasis*. In reference to the former, the Father says, in Zech. 3:9, 'Upon one stone shall be seven eyes: behold I will engrave the graving thereof (that is, of the stone), saith He who Shall Be.' The graving engraved on the stone is termed, in Greek character, an impress wrought into a substance after some archetype, or pattern. This archetype is the *hypostasis*, so that *hypostasis* is the basis or foundation of character. Wherefore, the same apostle in Col. 1:15, styles the character engraved, the image of *Theos* the Invisible. Seth was the image of Adam, and Adam the image of *Elohim*. - (Gen. 1:26; 5:3). Like Seth, Jesus was an image of Adam *but only in the flesh*. Adam the First was image of *Elohim*, and this was in relation to bodily form. Body and Form were the *hypostasis* of Adam and Seth - that is they were the basis and foundation of the images so named. Where body and form do not exist, there can be no image; therefore, where image is predicted of *hypostasis*, that *hypostasis* must have body and form. The Father Spirit unveiled is then a bodily form, and as all things are out of Him, He is the focal centre of the universe, from which irradiates whatever exists."

The Scriptures furnish an abundant testimony concerning the elementary principles, both in regard to oneness and the form of Deity. "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see? The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and His ears are open to their cry." - (Psa. 34.) They also tell us about the place of his habitation, the glorious attributes of His character, and the immensity of His power. They also tell us, concerning the elements of that "great mystery," "God manifest in the flesh," in terms plain, precise and clear. They tell us of the Spirit, and also of the flesh, the latter being "compassed with infirmity," suffering and affliction.

However innocent one may be of any actual transgression, the consequences of sin, by hereditary transmission, are resting upon him. Therefore we see infants die, and adult persons, who have never sinned "after the similitude of Adam's transgression," pass a life of bodily suffering from diseases, transmitted from their forefathers, until death comes to their release. Mental maladies, also, frequently descend from one generation to another; and, wherever we may cast our eye, we are met with the stern reality that the whole race lieth under the bondage of sin and death, whatever may be the grade, degree, or station to which certain individuals or the race may have attained. And we are made to realise that "none can, by any means, redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him." - (Ps. 49:7). But thanks be to His holy name, "He has laid help upon one who is mighty," and "exalted one chosen out of the people." This exaltation, we are informed, was the result of the operation of His Holy Spirit upon flesh and blood. We also learn from the record that his operation of the Holy Spirit was not all concentrated in one point of time, but appeared at different periods in the life of Christ. The exaltation, being a work of time, developed in the course of over thirty three and a half years. The exaltation proceeded, side by side, with great suffering and affliction; and the higher the exaltation of the inner life, the more intense became the suffering of the flesh, until finally rescued from the power of all suffering by further operation of the Spirit power from above, in being begotten again from the grave, to realise the full power of the Spirit's birth.

John Carter, Delight in God's Law, pgs. 273-275 (The Christadelphian, November, 1953)

## THE WORK OF THE SKILLFUL EMBROIDERER

Two words in Psalm 139:15 start an interesting thought trail, at the end of which we can look again at the Psalm and be assured of its meaning. "My substance", says David in spirit, "was not hid from thee when I was made in secret and *curiously wrought* in the lowest parts of the earth." When the tabernacle was fabricated God filled workmen with wisdom of heart, and one of those thus filled is described as "the embroiderer in blue and in purple, in scarlet and in fine linen." The workman particularly named as thus endowed was the companion of Bezaleel, one Aholiab, son of Ahisamach (Exod. 35:35; 38:23). The word "embroiderer" is the same as "curiously wrought" (these are the only occurrences) and the skillful intertwining of the strands of blue, scarlet and purple in the linen is thus defined. But this fabric was used for the vail, which Paul says represented the flesh of Christ. Interwoven in that flesh were elements corresponding to the colours of the vail. It was scarlet flesh indeed, "sin's flesh" in Paul's phrase, but the blue and purple denote royal and divine features, while the linen betokens righteousness in perfection. These elements are peculiar to the man Christ Jesus; he had a divine paternity, a royal descent on both sides, and while sharing our nature manifested the righteousness which was of the very character of God Himself. Jesus presents us with a phenomenon without parallel among men. The fact of Christ is not simply the fact that he once lived, but that he was such a one as the composite picture of the four gospels portray. What is the explanation of him? It is simply expressed in the words that he was the Son of God - simple words which convey a profound truth. For the Holy Spirit overshadowed a virgin of David's line, and she conceived and bare a son, the son of God. The body thus prepared to be offered for the sins of the world, was uniquely fashioned. As a child bears the imprint of both parents, interwoven in the formative process from conception to birth, so the child Jesus not only inherited the flesh and blood of his mother, but uniquely he was "the express image of his (God's) person," to use the language of the A.V. On such a theme inspired words only can be a mould for thought.

The words "embroiderer" or the "curiously wrought" of the Psalm thus linked with the vail, enable us now to read the Psalm, and note that he is describing the wonderful development, hidden from human eyes, but known to the Creator, by which is fashioned the human child. The spirit of Christ speaks: "Thou has possessed my reins: thou has covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect: and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them" (versus 13-16). On this three further notes should be made: "the lowest parts of the earth" is measured from heaven where the Father dwells, and so is the lower parts, even the earth; and secondly, the word "unperfect" signifies "not fully developed"; and "curiously" here means "skillfully, with art." In this delightful way the Spirit in the Psalmist invites us to consider with wonder and with awe the most remarkable event in human history - when God's redeeming power, brooding as did His creative power at man's beginning, thus moved to bring into being a new man, not son of earth as Adam, but son of Mary, and thus son of man and Son of God.

God's power moved; His watchful eye never slept, as in secret the interweaving embroidery which belong to a divine manifestation went on, producing in the finish a man who bore the divine likeness, for the strands skillfully blended formed a cherubic figure.

**Christadelphian Unity In Australia, The Accepted Basis, pg. 78**

"It was here that Jesus differed from all men. Though born under the hereditary law of mortality, as his mission required, his relation to the Father, as the Son of God, exempted him from the uncontrolled subjection to unrighteousness."

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 cleaning in nature which was done after resurrection."



H.P.Mansfield, The Logos, December 1953, Pgs. 113-114.

## DID CHRIST INHERIT DIVINE CHARACTERISTICS ?

.... The unique circumstances of Jesus' begettal caused him to be named Emmanuel or "GOD with us" (Matt. 1:23). Paul taught: "For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God (did)" (Rom. 8:3). God accomplished in Jesus what the flesh unaided could not do. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself" (2 Cor 5:19). The means of reconciliation were designed and implemented by God who revealed himself in Christ to that end. Thus looking at Jesus we see not merely the flesh - death doomed and in need of redemption - but also God in manifestation. He was the son of man whom Yahweh "made strong for Himself" (Psa 80:17), the one upon whom He "laid help" (Psa. 89:19), the mighty one strengthened by the Divine arm (v. 21), "God manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. 3:16).

It is true that upon him was bestowed the Holy Spirit without measure, and that this helped to make him "quick of understanding in the fear of Yahweh" (Isa. 11:2-3), but there had to be that bias toward divine things that would make the bestowal of the Holy Spirit really effective, and this the Lord inherited from his father, constituting him in truth "God manifest in the flesh." The fact that it required one born by divine interposition, inheriting Divine characteristics, before a truly righteous member of the human race was revealed, demonstrates the folly on placing any confidence in the flesh. It shows conclusively that if we would be righteous, we must seek the strength that cometh from God alone: "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of power may be of God, and not of us" (2 Cor. 4:7).

Could Jesus have sinned? Was God alone responsible for his character? To the first of these questions, the answer, undoubtedly, is in the affirmative. He was "tempted in all points", and temptation is only possible where exists the possibility of sin. To the second question we reply that the virgin birth, the bestowal of the Spirit without measure, created the means whereby Christ could overcome, but without his willing co-operation, the spirit of self sacrifice and humility that he revealed, this would have been impossible. Therefore the character manifest was Jesus' character - a reflection of the Divine. But it can also be stated that if the foundation, or predisposition towards Divine things was not in Jesus, as a result of the virgin birth, the development of an entirely righteous life would have been impossible. Thus in the son we see the impress of the Father.

.... Jesus inherited from his Father those characteristics that with proper training and effort, supplemented by the effluence of the Holy Spirit, developed into the wonderful man revealed in the word. His nature was the same as our own: "He was human as to the substance of which he was made; but divine as to the source from which he came; the spirit from which he derived his wisdom; and the pattern of character which he possessed" (Christadelphian Instructor, Answer 44).



## **PART D**

# **The Sacrifice of Christ**

## The Condemnation of Sin in the Flesh

As Children of Adam, we inherit his condemnation, but we did not forfeit our lives in him. We have forfeited our lives since by transgression. In addition to inheriting Adam's condemnation, we are personally transgressors, and therefore cannot of ourselves escape from the law that appoints death as the penalty of transgression. But Jesus was not personally a transgressor. Hence, though he inherited the condemned nature of Adam, God could "justly" deliver him from death after he had died. His death met the requirements of the Adamic and Mosaic curses which were both on him: his personal sinlessness ensured his resurrection. And thus is apparent the answer to the question: "Has the fact (that God was the Father of Jesus) no value?" Great value indeed. We could not have been saved but for this. God thus saves us. God is the saviour by Christ. If Jesus had not been the Son of God, Jesus would have been a mere sinner, as shown by the fact that all men born of the flesh are sinners without exception. The value of Christ's divine extraction lies in its result - the sinlessness of the Lamb of God. Was any other man ever sinless? How came this man to be without sin? "By sheer determination," says the new theory; but (supposing the gracelessness of such an answer is passed over,) how came he to be possessed of a "sheer determination" that no other man ever possessed? Christ supplies the answer: "Ye (the Jews) are from the beneath: *I am from above*. Ye are of this world; *I am not of this World*..... I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things, and *He that sent me is with me*..... I speak that which I have *seen with my Father*, and ye do that which ye have *seen with your father*..... If God were your Father ye would love me, for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but He sent me." - (John 8: 23,28,42). "The son can do nothing of himself but what he seeth the Father do; for *whatsoever things He doeth*, these things also doeth the Son likewise." - (John 5:19). The secret of Christ's power lay in him connection with the Father, both by begettal and subsequent indwelling of the Spirit, which established unity between them. This it is that makes Christ's work the Father's work - God in him and by him, "through the eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14), accomplishing the work of reconciliation.

And here it is that the glory is to God *manifest in the Flesh* and not to man. God produced a sinless man. Granted the sinlessness was due to the volition of the man Jesus, but this volition was the result of what God did in the womb of Mary and afterwards on Jordan's banks. And this sinless man so produced was condemned in human nature, as even the new theory now concedes.

The suggestion that Jesus "inherited Adam's nature" without inheriting Adam's life is absurd! What is the nature of Adam? Paul tells us: "The first man, Adam, was made a LIVING soul." "Living soul," therefore, defines his "nature:" the living element is a part of it, without which it ceases to be Adams' nature, but becomes the inorganic dust from which it was at first fabricated.

A strained distinction between life and the organism which develops it, will logically land in immortal-soulism. Condemnation fell on "Adam's flesh?" as evidenced in the words of the sentence, "Dust THOU art." Adam's flesh was Adam, containing blood which was the life of the flesh, oxygenised from without, and supplied with food from the elements of vital combustion. It was not Adam's life in the abstract that was condemned; it was his flesh; his nature: by affecting which, its *tenure* of life was

shortened. The life of all flesh, in the abstract, is the same, and is of God, and cannot, in the abstract, be condemned. It may be compared to water in a vessel. Make a hole in the glass, and the water runs out. Condemnation is knocking a hole in the vessel. Or steam in an engine: derange the parts, and it works crankily, while the same steam will work a sound machine all right.

If Jesus inherited Adam's nature (which is admitted), he certainly inherited Adam's life, which is the principal element of that nature. God built a man from Mary's nature who would meet all the requirements of the situation, in view of His purpose to save the condemned; of which we shall see more anon.

Adam's nature was condemned to die, and Jesus was a divine form of that condemned nature for the meeting of the condemnation in a way that would admit of its salvation. The production of this form was no ordinary operation, and is not to be judged by the laws of physiology. It was the act of the Eternal Spirit which antecedes, and has made, and when need be, overrides the laws of physiology. All we know and need to know in the matter is, that the Spirit quickened Mary's womb, impressing on the human ovum a certain latent impress of the image of the Invisible, on the basis of which, the babe came forth the Son of God, in the nature of Adam - the whole nature of Adam, not a part - for the bearing of the condemnation inherited by that nature. This was "the body prepared," and this the purpose.

That purpose is indeed the key to the whole matter. What is the purpose? To save men from a law of God's own imposing, but on a principle that does not upset or compromise it, and that while upholding the majesty of God's own government, presents Himself in the front, as the Benefactor of man, that the glory may be to Him (as it in reason ought to be) and not to man, who, as a mere creature existing by Him, cannot take the glory.

What does this new theory say? That God destroyed life that ought not to have been destroyed; in consideration of which, He is to allow to live a million lives that ought not to live. This is the old orthodox heresy of substitution, the only difference being, that death instead of torment is accepted in "satisfaction." It is the old insult to God, representing Him as winking at the violation of His own laws; accepting a compromise; destroying where He ought not to destroy, and saving alive where He ought not to save alive.

We have been delivered from this blasphemy by the revival, in our day, by the instrumentality of Dr. Thomas, of the sublime doctrine of God manifestation in the flesh, for the condemnation of sin the flesh, that the poor flesh may be saved, without stultifying the working of God towards it, or leaving it room to glory. The doctrine is a true one, and not to be imperilled by parley with a plausible but hostile theory that comes as an angel of light; to whom we give place by subjection, no not for an hour.

The evidence of it is complete in the few facts already conceded, if there were no other. The Spirit so to speak, arrays itself with the nature of Adam which is the nature condemned. The Son of God is thus no substitute, but the very bearer of the condemnation. Though personally sinless, he was by constitution condemned, and had therefore to offer for himself and his brethren.

This is proved in various ways. There is the declaration of Paul that God sent him forth in the flesh and blood of the children to *condemn sin in the flesh* (Rom. 8:3).

Next, the corresponding statement that he took on him the seed of Abraham that "THROUGH DEATH he might *destroy* that having the power of death." (Heb. 2:14, 17). Next the statement of Peter that he bore our sins *in his own body* on the tree. - (1 Pet. 2:24). Next Paul: He hath *made him to be sin* for us who knew no sin. - (2 Cor. 5:21).

Then there are those statements which show that Jesus had himself to be saved: "In the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to *save him from death*, and was heard in that he feared." Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things that he suffered. And being made perfect - (He was perfected on the third day when he rose to immortality) - he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." - (Heb 5:7-9). "By his own blood, (that is, by death) he entered at once into the holy place, *having (thus) obtained eternal redemption*" ("for us," is not in the original.) - (Heb. 9:12).

Then we have the declaration of Paul that Christ "needeth not DAILY, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, *first, for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people, for THIS he did once*" - (Heb 7:27). Paul's statement is that Jesus did *once* what the typical high-priests 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 recognised that he was under Adamic condemnation, inhering in his flesh.

Finally, and conclusively, is the sort of evidence obtainable from that Mosaic system of things which Paul says has its substance in Christ (Col. 2:17) - is a shadow of good things to come (Heb. 10:1) - is "the form of knowledge and of the truth," (Rom. 2:20), "the pattern of things in the heavens (Heb. 9:23). Jesus expounded to the disciples, from the LAW OF MOSES, the things concerning *his death*, saying, "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer." - (Luke 24: 44, 46). We have, therefore, a good example for applying to the same source on the same subject. And we do so under excellent guidance; for Paul, by the Spirit, has give us sundry hints, which as so many keys, open up to us the significances that are contained in "the example and shadow of heavenly things." - (Heb. 8:5).

For instance, he tells us that the veil of the sanctuary was representative of the flesh of Christ: "a new and living way, which he hath made new for us through *the veil*; that is to say, HIS FLESH." - (Heb. 10:20). This is confirmed by the fact recorded, that at the moment of Christ's death, "the veil of the temple was rent in twain." - (Luke 23:45). Now what was the composition of the symbolic veil, which had its spiritual substance in the body of Christ? We are informed at Ex. 26:31: "Thou shalt make a veil of blue, and purple, and *scarlet*, and fine-twined linen." What is the significance of these colours? We are not without guidance. Blue is healing (Prov. 20:30), expressing that aspect of the body of Christ, "by whose stripes we are healed;" purple is royalty (John 19:2,5; Jug. 8:26); showing his extraction from a kingly house: scarlet, what is the moral significance of this as a type? Sin always. "Though your sins be as *scarlet*." - (Isa. 1:18). "*Scarlet-Coloured* beasts." - (Rev. 17:3). The new theory make no provision for this. His being the sin nature of the condemned Adam explains it: but this the new theory denies, and, in so doing, denies the truth. The fine-twined linen finds its counterpart in the righteousness of Christ.

Again; Paul writes: "The bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary, by the High Priest for sin, are burnt WITHOUT THE CAMP. Wherefore,

*Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.*" - (Heb. 13:11-12). Here is a parallel between the burnt bullocks, as the type, and the slain body of Jesus as the antitype. Now, let us mark the facts connected with the "bodies of those beasts," in their significance in regard to the body of Christ. "Speak unto the children of Israel that they bring thee a red heifer without spot, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke. And ye shall give her unto Eleazer the priest, that he may bring her forth without the camp, and one shall slay her before his face ..... And one shall burn the heifer in his sight: her skin and her flesh and her blood with her dung shall he burn. And the priest shall take away cedar wood and hyssop and scarlet and cast it in the midst of the burning of the heifer. Then the priests shall wash his clothes and shall bathe his flesh in water, and afterwards he shall come into the camp and the priests shall be UNCLEAN until the even ..... It is a purification for SIN. He that gathereth the ashes of the heifer shall wash his clothes and be unclean until the even." <sup>1</sup> Everyone who had to do with "the bodies of those beasts burnt without the camp" (for the purification of sins) contracted uncleanness by contact with the bodies. Now the type being wholly unclean, what is the uncleanness of the antitype? The 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? The answer is found in the 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."

So with the two goats (Lev. 16: 15, 21, 26): the one that was burnt without the camp was unclean necessitating ablution on the part of the man who carried out the body to be burnt; and the one that was allowed to escape alive into the wilderness, as the sin-bearer of the people, imparted uncleanness to the man who let her go. The sins were ceremonially put upon the goats before the goats were fit for sin-bearing, testifying beforehand that there is no such thing as substitution, but that death can only come where condemnation is, and that the antitypical sin-bearer must be clothed with the condemned nature before he could suffer the condemnation.

But not only the bodies of the beasts, *the whole system of the law had to be atoned for once a year* - (Lev. 16). Aaron was first to offer a bullock for *himself* and for his household. - (verse 6.) He was then to offer a goat for the people. - (verse 15.) He was then to make an atonement for the *holy place*. - (verse 16.) He was then to go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and make an atonement *for it*, touching it with blood - (verse 18.) In short he was to "make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar, and for the priests and for all the people of the congregation." - (verse 33.) As Paul expressed it (Heb. 9:22), "Almost all things are by the law *purged with blood*, and without shedding of blood there is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the pattern of things in the heavens (that is the things pertaining to the law) should be purified with these, but the *heavenly things themselves* with BETTER SACRIFICES THAN THESE." Now Jesus was the substance of all these. He was "the heavenly things" in compendium; and the testimony of the law, argued out by Paul, is that before his sacrifice, they were unclean, and had to be purified by his sacrifice. The exact meaning of this is not obscure when it

<sup>1</sup> Num. 19:2-10

is recognised that Jesus was the sin-nature or sinful flesh of Adam, inheriting with it the condemnation clinging to it; that sin being thus laid on him he might die for it. He bore in himself the uncleanness of the sanctuary, the altar, the high priest, his own house, and of the whole congregation; for he was born under their curse, being born in their nature, and could therefore bear it. A theory takes all this away, which says that he was not under the curse at all.

Jesus was born a Jew to redeem those that were under the law. How did he redeem them that were under the law? Was it by dying to compromise a law that had no hold on him? No. Paul states the matter clearly: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being *made a curse* for us:" how? "It is written, *cursed is he that hangeth on a tree.*" - (Gal. 3:13). So that in the mode of his death, he came under the *actual personal curse of the law*. Now, as brother Smith pithily asked: If it was necessary that Jesus should come under the actual curse of the law of Moses to redeem then that were under it, how can he redeem them that were under the Adamic curse except on the same principle, that is, of actually coming under it? The answer is obvious and fatal to a new theory, which, as Dr. Thomas says, "destroys the sacrifice of Christ."

The process of generating the new race began by God manifesting Himself in the nature of the old, for the condemnation of sin in a way admitting of its deliverance conformably with His ways; and surely it needs no great argument to prove that in the days of his flesh, in the days of his weakness, Jesus was not a specimen of the glorious, powerful, incorruptible and immortal race that will yet inhabit this globe under his visible leadership.

As has been said, "a mere babe in the word must know why Jesus came from Mary." The substitution theory cannot explain it. It would be satisfied with an uncondemned new man made fresh from the ground. But the truth requires the sin-nature of condemned Adam to suffer the death to which it is subject, in a Holy One whom the Father could raise, being well pleased with Him.

Jesus opened the way to life by perfect obedience. In plain words, though under condemnation, by the power of God, who he was in manifestation, he earned resurrection; for "by man came also the resurrection of the dead." By this blessed arrangement he could die under the condemnation, and yet look to the opened way of resurrection. "God raised him from the dead." The whole arrangement is the Father's own devising, of his abundant mercy, for our salvation, that the praise be to him.

Jesus was human stock divinely fashioned and used; the clay worked by the bands of the potter for the great work of honour and mercy purposed towards men. He was the antitypical altar of unhewn stone (Ex. 20:25), upon which the children of Israel were not to lift a tool. The stones were *the same* as those they used in building, but were to be in the form received from God's hand. The application of a tool to the stones of the altar defiled it; this was the type: the antitype is that if a man had been the father of Jesus, Jesus must have been a transgressor, and, therefore, not an acceptable altar of Sacrifice. Through Mary, he was the Son of David, son of Abraham (Matt. 1:1), and son of Adam (Luke 3:23-38).

He was therefore the flesh of sin, specially manipulated for the great work of putting sin away in its condemnation therein, and bringing resurrection by the personal righteousness of the sin-bearer. "Behold the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world!"



Ineffectual ultimately must everything that can be said against the sublime doctrine of God (in love) manifest in the flesh for the nullification of sin therein, that we may be saved in harmony with all His ways towards us; and vain all attempts to establish a theory which degrades the scheme of redemption to a man-glorifying and God-dishonouring commercial compromise. But apostasy once succeeded, and may again.

The words, "in him (Adam) all sinned" (Rom. 5:12), only amount to an "as I may so say," as in the case of Levi who is said to have paid tithes, (or more properly, "to have been tithed") in the loins of his father Abraham (Heb. 7:10). He says (verse 9), "As I may so say, Levi did so and so." That is, in an indirect sense, not to be practically pressed. Our sinning in Adam can be made to mean nothing more than that from him we were destined to be generated, and that his act affected our state when we should appear. But this is not the meaning of "sin," when we come to discuss "sin" as affecting individual destiny. Using the term in its correct sense, Paul expressly isolates Adam's descendants from Adam's sin. He says: "Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over *them who HAD NOT SINNED AFTER THE SIMILITUDE OF ADAM'S TRANSGRESSION.*" - (Rom. 5:14). The point of his argument is that "through the *offence of ONE many are dead,*" who sinned not after the similitude of that offence, being no "parties to the transaction," and not being "in at the job" - to use phrases whose allusions will be understood; but that the glory of God's race is to release penitent and reforming offenders from *many offences* through the righteousness of ONE. The new argument destroys this beautiful fact by huddling the millions of Adam's race all into one Edenic offender, and making them all "parties to the transaction" and "in at the job." Adam's descendants *have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression*; but are his companions only in the sense of being heirs of the consequences of his act; among whom was Jesus, who, however, being the begotten of God in the channel of those consequences, could annul them, in the bearing of them into a grave that God could open because of his holiness.

## THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST

### QUESTIONS ANSWERED ACCORDING TO THE TRUTH, WHICH IS NEVER TO BE "RENOUNCED."

*"Even as our beloved brother Paul, also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you, as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable, wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction. (2 Pet. 3:15-16).*

#### QUESTION 1. - Who was Jesus Christ?

*Answer.* - God manifested in the flesh (1), seeing whom, the beholder saw the Father (2), with whom Jesus was one (3). As a distinct personage, he was the Son of God (4). He was also the Son of Man, because born of the flesh of David (5).

1. 1 Tim. 3:16: "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in Spirit, &c."
  2. Jno. 14:9: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. How sayest thou, then, Shew us the Father!"
  3. Jno. 10:30: "I and my Father are one."
  4. Jno. 1:34: "This is the Son of God."
  5. Matt 16:13: "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?"
- 

#### QUESTION 2. - What is meant by "the Son of God?"

*Answer.* - That the personage so named was begotten by the Father of the Virgin Mary (1).

1. Luke 1:35: "The power of the Highest shall come upon thee, and THEREFORE, shall that holy thing that shall be born of thee be called the Son of God."
- 

#### QUESTION 3. - How was he begotten?

*Answer.* - By the Holy Spirit coming on Mary (1), and causing her to conceive (2).

1. Luke 1:35: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee."
  2. Matt 1:20: "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit."
- 

#### QUESTION 4. - Of What Substance or nature was the body of Jesus?

*Answer.* - He was of "the seed of David according to the flesh" (1), but as it was the Spirit of the Father that gave that seed the form or organisation called Jesus, he was more than the seed of David. He was the Word made flesh (2), and from the beginning thereof, full of wisdom, full of the wisdom, grace and truth of the Father (3).

1. Romans 1:3: "He was made of the seed of David according to the flesh."
  2. John 1:14: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us."
  3. Luke 2:40: "The child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him."  
Luke 2:47: "All that heard him (at the age of 12) were astonished at his understanding and answers."  
John 1:14: "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."
- 

**QUESTION 5. - What was the nature of his mother?**

*Answer.* - Flesh and blood of David's race (1), and consequently of the nature of Adam, from whom David descended (2).

1. Luke 1:27: "A virgin ..... of the house of David."
  2. Luke 4:32, 38: "David which was the son of Jesse, which was the son of ..... Adam."
- 

**QUESTION 6. - What is meant by the nature of Adam?**

*Answer.* - A nature identical with (1), because derived from Adam (2).

1. John 3:6: "That which is born of the flesh *is* flesh."
  2. 1 Cor. 15:48: "As is the earth, earthy, such are they also that are earthy."
- 

**QUESTION 7. - Was Adam immortal before he broke the Eden law?**

*Answer.* - He was neither mortal nor immortal, so far as declared destiny was concerned: he was in that state in which death would come with disobedience (1).

1. Gen. 2:17: "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."  
Rom. 5:12: "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin."
- 

**QUESTION 8. - Did this condemnation to death fall on Adam only, or on all his posterity also?**

*Answer.* - On all his posterity also (1).

1. Romans 5:12, 19: "So death hath passed upon all men ..... By one man's disobedience many were made sinners."
- 

**QUESTION 9. - What is meant by Adam's posterity?**

*Answer.* - All who have descended from Adam.

---

**QUESTION 10. - Was Jesus born of two human parents?**

*Answer.* - No: God was his Father (1) by the direct operation of the Spirit (2). Nevertheless, the substance generated during the nine month's gestatory period was Mary's (3), and, therefore, David's (4), and, therefore, the nature common to believers

(5).

1. Jno. 5:18: "He said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God."
2. Luke 1:35: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee."
3. Luke 2:6: "The days were accomplished that she should be delivered" (v.5), "Mary being great with child." Matt 1:20: "Conceived in her." Luke 1:35: "Shall come upon thee."
4. Rom. 1:3 "He was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh."
5. Heb. 2:14: "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, it became him likewise to take part of the same." Phil. 2:8: "Being found in fashion as a man."

**QUESTION 11. - Did the difference of birth make an essential difference betwixt Jesus and the posterity of Adam?**

**Answer.** - The question assumes an unscriptural distinction. Jesus, as the Son of Man (1), is as much included in the posterity of Adam as his brethren (2). Physically he was as much involved in Adam's transgression as they (3), for he inherited Adam's nature from Mary's blood (4), in which Adam's life existed, for the life of all flesh is in the blood thereof (5). But the purpose of God was by Himself (6) to raise up a sinless character (7), who should in the very nature under condemnation (8) suffer the condemnation of sin in the flesh (9) by death (10), and thereafter rise again (11) with life for offer (12) to all of the condemned race who should believe and obey him (13).

1. Mark 10:33: "The Son of Man."
2. Heb. 2:11: "both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren."
3. 2 Cor. 13:4: "Crucified *through weakness*." Isa. 53:4: "He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." Rom. 8:3: "On account of sin, condemned sin in the flesh." Heb. 2:16: "He took on him the seed of Abraham ..... in all things made like unto his brethren."
4. Gal. 4:4: "God sent forth his Son, *made of a woman*."
5. Lev. 17:11: "The life of the flesh is in the blood."
6. Isa. 59: 15,16: "He saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor, therefore his arm brought salvation unto him." Isa. 45:22: "Look unto ME, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth ..... Unto ME every knee shall bow and every tongue confess." Isa 53:1: "To whom is THE ARM OF THE LORD revealed; for he (that is, Jesus) shall grow up before him." Rom. 3:19: "That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God ..... But now the RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD without the law is manifested ..... by faith of Jesus Christ unto all men and upon all them that believe. For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by HIS GRACE, through the redemption *that is in* CHRIST JESUS, WHOM GOD HATH SET FORTH." 1 Cor. 1:29: "That *no flesh* should glory in his presence, but of Him (God) are ye in Christ, who OF GOD is made unto us, wisdom and righteousness, &c." 2 Cor. 5:19: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself."
7. 1 Pet. 2:22: "Who did no sin." Heb. 1:9: "Loved righteousness and hated iniquity." 1 Jno. 3:5: "In him is no sin." Heb. 7:26: "Holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners." Heb. 4:15: "Without sin."
8. Heb. 2:17: "For verily, he took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham."
9. Rom. 8:3: "On account of Sin, condemned sin in the flesh."
10. Heb. 2:14: "That through death he might destroy that having the power of death."
11. Jno. 10:17: "I lay down my life that I might take it again." 1 Cor. 15:21: "By man came also the resurrection of the dead;" (verse 20) "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that sleep." Rom. 4:25; "Raised again for our justification."
12. 1 Jno. 5:11: "This life is in His son; he that hath the Son of God that life." Jno. 17:2: "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given him." Jno. 14:6 "I am the way, the truth and the life."
13. Heb. 5:9: "The author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." Heb. 7:25: "Able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him."

## QUESTION 12. - Why was Jesus called "the last Adam?"

*Answer.* - Because he was to sustain the same federal relation to the race of mankind that Adam the first did. In Adam, mankind were involved in sin and death (1). In Jesus, they are delivered from both (2) without any subversion of the law that condemned them in Adam (3). He was truly the founder of a new race, but he was not in the days of his flesh (4) a specimen of that new race; for then he was weak and mortal (5); whereas the new race are to bear the glorious image of the immortal state (6) in which he now exists (7).

1. 1 Cor. 15:22: "In Adam all die."
2. Eph. 1:7: "In whom (Christ) we have redemption through his blood."
3. Rom 3:26: "That he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." 2 Cor. 5:21: "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Rom. 4:25: "He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification."
4. Heb. 5:7: "In the days of his flesh he offered up supplication with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared. Though he were a Son yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."
5. 2 Cor. 13:4: "Crucified through weakness." Matt. 26:38: "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." Isa. 53:12: "He poured out his soul unto death." Heb. 2:17: "Made in all things like unto his brethren."
6. 1 Cor. 15:49: "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."
7. Acts 13:34: "God raised him from the dead, now no more to see corruption." Rom. 6:9: "Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more: death hath no more dominion over him." 2 Cor. 13:4: "He liveth by the power of God."

## QUESTION 13. - Was Jesus "in Adam" in the sense of being Adam's Son?

*Answer.* - Yes. Though the Son of God (by the Spirit) he was the son of man (Adam) by Mary, (1) partaking of the very nature transmitted from Adam through David and Mary (2).

1. Mark 6:3: "Is not this..... the son of Mary?" John 5:27: "The Father hath given him authority to execute judgment also because he is the son of man."
2. Heb. 2:17: "He took on him the seed of Abraham; wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren."

## QUESTION 14. - Why was Christ made in Adam's nature?

*Answer.* - That he might die for those involved in the condemnation of that nature (1), being put to the proof of obedience under which Adam failed (2). If it had *merely* been a question of putting him to the proof of obedience, there would have been no reason for his being born of Mary. It would have sufficed for such an object that he had been made out of the ground, direct, a full grown adult as Adam was. But the plan was to condemn sin in its own nature (3), after the type of the serpent in the wilderness. The bitten Israelites were asked to look at the biter impaled, at the condition of being healed. Jesus said this had to be fulfilled in him (4). Human nature as the sinner was the biter, and in him, it was lifted up on the cross.

1. 1 Pet. 4:1: "Christ hath suffered for us *in the flesh*;" 1 Pet. 3:18: "Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God;" Romans 8:3: "God sent his own

- Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and on account of sin, condemned sin in the flesh.
2. Rom. 5:19: "By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Heb 5:8: "He learned obedience by the things that he suffered." Phil. 2:8: "He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."
  3. Rom. 8:3: "Condemned sin in the flesh."
  4. John 3:14: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up."
- 

**QUESTION 15. - In temptation, did Jesus fail or conquer?**

*Answer.* - Thanks be to God, he conquered, for God was with him.

---

**QUESTION 16. - What power did Jesus earn by his obedience unto death?**

*Answer.* - This question ignores the relation of God to the operations of the Lord Jesus. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself," is Paul's definition; confirmed by Peter's statement on the day of Pentecost that the things done by Jesus, "God did by him" (1). If the question is to be answered categorically, it must be answered in these words: "Being made perfect he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him" (2).

1. See abundant testimony quoted in proof of answer to Question 11.
  2. Heb. 5:9.
- 

**QUESTION 17. - Was the life of Jesus his own?**

*Answer.* - As the lives of all creatures are "their own" while they have them, the sense would have to be defined before a categorical answer could be given. If the question is, "Was Jesus immortal?" the answer is, No; for in that case he could not have died. If it be: "Had he personally established a claim to life?" the answer is, Undoubtedly, for where Adam had disobeyed, Jesus had accomplished obedience, and "and as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." - (Rom 5:19). If it be asked, Could he have given it for the sins of the world if it had not been his own (in the earned sense), the answer is, He might have given it, but it would have been of no avail, because the law of sin would have condemned him personally, and barred the way to his resurrection, in which case, Paul says, Christ would have died in vain. His words are "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain and ye are yet in your sins." - (1 Cor. 15:17).

---

# QUESTION 18. - Did God or man give life to Jesus?

*Answer.* - "God giveth unto ALL life and breath and all things;" (1) consequently the question is not specific enough to make its meaning apparent. If it be meant, Did Mary have any participation in the impartation of life to the child born of her, the answer is, Yes; for he was the seed of David according to the flesh. Every one having knowledge is aware that in foetal life, the child's life is the mother's life, ministered by her blood through the umbilical cord; and that the child, so to speak, is by this connection built out of her blood. And as "the life of the flesh is in the blood," a child cannot partake of her blood, without partaking of her life. Consequently, Jesus, though developed from a divine germ, was framed out of his mother's substance, and, consequently, was both Son of Man and Son of God (2).

1. Acts 17:25
2. See the numerous proofs in support of Answer to Questions 4,5,10 and 11.

# QUESTION 19. - The body of Christ, then, was not under condemnation?

*Answer.* - Certainly it was; just as much as Mary's, from which it was formed. As the seed of David according to the flesh, it was weak and mortal (1). Paul gives prominence to this; and it forms a vital element of the testimony concerning the Messiah. If he was the seed of David according to the flesh, he stood, in the days of his flesh, in all the relations of David, but had some superadded relations, by reason of being the root of David, as well as his offspring (2). To say that "God sent His Son, not in sinful flesh, but in the likeness of it," is to deny the doctrine which John made necessary for acknowledgment among the first century believers. He said "many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. Look to yourselves that ye loose not those things which we have wrought" (3). If it be asked, In what flesh did Jesus come, the answer is, David's flesh (4); for he is the son of David (5). Still more decisive is the declaration of Paul that he took part of "the same" flesh and blood as that possessed by his brethren (6). Paul does not contradict this in saying that "God sent forth His Son in the *ομοιωματι* of the flesh of sin." (7) The word *ομοιωματι* is truly translated "likeness," but it is likeness in the sense of identity, and not in the sense of such a resemblance as should leave room for it not being "the SAME." This is evident from the derivation of the original word. It comes from the verb, *ομωο*, to *join together*, which, when united with a substantive termination, gives the idea of a *joining together*, resulting in a producing of *the same*. This is illustrated in *ομοιομητριος*, born of *the same* mother; *ομοιοπατριος*, sprung from *the same* father; *ομοιοουσιος*, of like substance, that is, the same substance; *ομοιολογια*, uniformity of speech, that is *the same* speech; *ομοιοαρκτο*, beginning *alike*; *ομοθυμος*, of *one* mind; *ομοθεν*, for *the same* place. If the word "like" be substituted for the word "same," in all cases, we shall have the sense in which Paul speaks of Jesus being sent forth in the *likeness* *ομοιωματι* of the flesh of sin. It is the sense expressed in his other declarations, that Jesus partook of THE SAME flesh and blood as the children, and that he was the SEED OF DAVID according to the flesh. Even of the brethren, of whose absolute identity with the flesh of sin no question will be raised, Paul uses the apparently loose expression, "We have borne the IMAGE of the earthy." - (1 Cor. 15:49). "Image of the earthy" and "likeness of sinful flesh" are of equal force, and both mean an actual participation of the nature spoken of. The fact that

ομοιωματος, is sometimes used in the sense of resemblance, cannot exclude the evidence, that as applied to Jesus, in the matter of sinful flesh, it means *resemblance in all particulars* "the SAME." To say that "God sent His Son, not in sinful flesh, but in a likeness of it," is to wrest the word. God sent His Son in the flesh of David, and as that is what would be called "sinful flesh," Jesus was sent in sinful flesh - THE SAME.

1. See numerous proofs in support of Answers to Questions 12 and preceding questions.
  2. Rev. 22:16: "I am the root and offspring of David."
  3. 2 John 7.
  4. 2 Tim. 2:8.
  5. Matt. 1:1.
  6. Heb. 2:14.
  7. Rom. 8:3.
- 

**QUESTION 20. - If Christ had been begotten by Joseph, could he be a redeemer from death?**

*Answer.* - No, because he would have been an actual transgressor; albeit God is the Redeemer by Christ (1).

1. 2 Cor. 5:18: "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ."
- 

**QUESTION 21. - Had Christ owed his paternity to Adam through Joseph, what would have been the consequence?**

*Answer.* - He would have been a mere man and a transgressor, and of no more value to us than any other interesting friend.

---

**QUESTION 22. - How would this constitutional sin have affected Christ?**

*Answer.* - Answered above.

---

**QUESTION 23. - In that case could he have laid down his life for his friends?**

*Answer.* - He might have laid it down, but he could not have taken it up, and herein would have lain the future; for "if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, and ye are yet in your sins (1).

1. 1 Cor. 15:17.
-



**QUESTION 24. - In offering himself, did Christ offer for his own sins?**

*Answer.* - It depends upon what is meant. Jesus had no personal offences to offer for. Nevertheless, as antitype of the high priests, who "offered first for his own sins, and then for the people's" (1) there must have been a sense in which he did so, even as Paul says, "THIS he *did once*, when he offered up himself" (2). The sense in which he did so is obvious in the light of the forgoing answers, that the body offered on Calvary being the nature that transgressed and was condemned in Eden, was offered under condemnation that affected both itself and those for whom the sacrifice was made.

1. Heb. 7:27.
  2. Ibid.
- 

**QUESTION 25. - If Christ had been a son of Adam, what would be his character?**

*Answer.* - Christ was a son of Adam (1), but not a Son of Adam merely. He was Son of God as well (2). The question is identical with Question 20, and is, therefore, met by the same answer.

1. Luke 3: He was "the Son of David, which was the Son of ..... Adam."
  2. Jno. 1:49: "Thou art the Son of God."
- 

**QUESTION 26. - Had Christ been under the penalty of death on account of Adam's transgression, could he have risen from the dead?**

*Answer.* - God raised him from the dead, after suffering for sin, because he was without sin (1). If the suggestion contained in the question had any force, it would prove that Christ never could have been raised at all; for if the one offence of Adam could have prevailed to keep Jesus in the grave, what shall we say to "the iniquities of us all" which God "laid upon him?"

1. Acts 2:24: "Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it;" Acts 13:35: "Wherefore he saith also in another Psalm, Thou shalt not suffer Thine holy one to see corruption."
- 

**QUESTION 27. - Was the sacrifice of Christ an offering for himself?**

*Answer.* - Answered in the reply to question 24.

---

**QUESTION 28. - What would have been the consequence had Christ died a natural death?**

*Answer.* - Without doubt, had the will of God been so, his resurrection would have followed immediately and our salvation equally secured; for the triumph lay here, that he rose after dying for sin. "If Christ be not raised your faith is in vain, and ye are yet in your sins." But a natural death would not have been the same trial of Christ's obedience as his crucifixion. It pleased God to make the captain of our salvation perfect

through suffering (1). He was obedient unto (submission to) death, even the death of the cross. It does not appear that the mode of death would have made any difference to the result regards us, except in so far as might have been borne on the question of Christ's obedience.

1. Heb. 2:10.
- 

**QUESTION 29. - Then Jesus did not die on the cross to save himself?**

*Answer.* - This is a mere repetition of questions 24 and 27; see answers thereto.

---

**QUESTION 30. - Was not the death of Christ necessary to purchase immortality for himself?**

*Answer.* - This is a mere repetition in another form of questions 24, 27, and 29.

---

**QUESTION 31. - Why was Christ a Jew?**

*Answer.* - Because he could not otherwise have been heir to the throne of David, whose seed he was according to the flesh. Nor could he otherwise have been of the seed of Abraham. Nor could he otherwise have been "made under the law," and therefore he could not have "borne the curse of the law" for his brethren. "Salvation is of the Jews," Jesus said; and if he had not been a Jew, he could not, in God's plan, have been the Saviour.

---

**QUESTION 32. - If Jesus was neither a sinner by constitution nor an actual transgressor, in other words, free from sin, was he not therefore immaculate?**

*Answer.* - The question is founded on premises not conceded in the foregoing answers. Jesus certainly was not immaculate, if by that is meant incorruptible nature; or, a nature free from impulses in a sinful direction. He was not an actual transgressor. All the desires of the Adamic nature which he and in common with ourselves were kept in absolute subordination to the Father's will. But he partook of the flesh of sin (*English version* - sinful flesh); and if this is what is meant by "a sinner by constitution," then he was a sinner by constitution. His mission required that he should be in the nature of the transgressing race. The blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin (1), because they had nothing to do with the transgression. The nature of angels had nothing to do with the transgression. Therefore, "he took not on him the nature of angels;" but the seed of Abraham was the transgressing and condemned nature. Therefore, he took on him the seed of Abraham, and was "made, in all things, like unto his brethren." (Heb. 2:17).

1. Heb. 10:4.
-

J. Thomas, *The Christadelphian*, 1873, pgs. 323-324

## DR. THOMAS'S MIND ON THE SUBJECT

In a private letter to a friend, who has put the questions on the subject in 1869, Dr. Thomas wrote as follows:

"The Lord Jesus said: 'I pray not for the world, but for them which Thou hast given me, that they may be one, being sanctified through the truth; that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us, as we are one, made perfect in One.' - (John 17). This unity of spirit in the bond of peace (Eph. 4:3), is what John styles *our fellowship*, the fellowship of the apostles, resulting from sanctification through the truth. Hence all who are sanctified through the truth, are sanctified by the second will, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once. For by one offering he hath perfected for a continuance them that are sanctified (Heb. 10:10, 14), which one offering of the body was the annulling and condemnation of sin, by the sacrifice thereof. - (Heb. 9:26). This body, which descended from David 'according to the flesh,' was the sacrificial victim offered by the Eternal Spirit. - (Heb. 9:14.) If David's flesh were immaculate, this victim, descended from him, might be spotless; but, in that event, it would not have answered for the annulling and condemnation of sin in the flesh that sinned. - (Rom. 8:3.) If it were an immaculate body that was crucified, it could not have borne our sins in it, while hanging on the tree. - (1 Pet. 2:24.) To affirm, therefore, that it was immaculate (as do all Papists and sectarian daughters of the Roman Mother) is to render of none effect the truth which is only sanctifying for us by virtue of the principle that Jesus Christ came **IN THE FLESH**, in that sort of flesh with which Paul was afflicted when he exclaimed, 'O, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?' - (Rom. 7:11, 24.)

It is not my province to issue bulls of excommunication, but simply to show what the truth teaches and commands. I have to do with principles, not men. If anyone say that Jesus Christ did not come in the flesh common to us all, the apostle John saith that that spirit or teacher is not of God; and is, therefore, the anti-Christ, and abides not in the doctrine of Christ; and is, therefore not to be received into the house, neither to be bidden God speed. - (1 John 4:3,2; 2 John. 7,9,10.) I have nothing to add or take from this. It is the sanctifying of the truth of the things concerning 'the name of Jesus Christ.' All whom the apostles fellowshiped, believed it; and all in the apostolic ecclesias who believed it not - and there were such - had not fellowship with the apostles, but opposed their teachings; and when they found they could not have their own way, John says 'They went out from us, but they - the anti-Christ - were not of us; for if they had been of us (of our fellowship), they would have continued with us; but they went out that it might be made manifest that they were not all of us.' - (1 John 2:19.) The apostles did not cast them out, but they went out of their own accord, not being able to endure sound doctrine. - (2 Tim. 4:3.)

Then preach the word, &c., and exhort with all long-suffering and teaching. This is the purifying agency. Ignore brother this and brother that in said teaching; for personalities do not help the argument. Declare what you as a body believe to be the apostles' doctrines. Invite fellowship upon this basis alone. If upon that declaration any partake the bread and the wine, not being offered by you, they do so upon their own responsibility, not on yours. If they help themselves to the elements, they endorse your declaration of doctrine, and eat condemnation to themselves. For myself, I am not in

fellowship with the dogma that Jesus Christ did not come in the flesh, or that he died as a substitute to appease the fury and wrath of God. The love of God is manifest in all that He has done for man. 'When all wish to do what is right,' the right surely is within their grasp. I trust you will be able to see it from what is now before you. And may the truth preside over all your deliberations, for Christ Jesus is the truth, and dwells with those with whom the truth is. Where this is I desire to be.

If I believe the truth as it is in the Jesus Paul preached, and fellowship the doctrine of an immaculate Jesus Paul did not preach, in celebrating the death of the latter with those who repudiate the maculate body set forth by God for a propitiation, is affirming one thing and practising another. 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."

J.. Thomas, *Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come*, 1860, and reprinted in the *Christadelphian*, 1943, pg. 96.

We do not deny "the perfect sinlessness of Christ" .... We believe and teach that he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," and that "He was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin." This was his intellectual and moral status; yet he was not perfect. This he says of himself, and, therefore, we may safely affirm it of him. He tells us that he was not perfected until the third day, when he was perfected in recompense for his obedience unto death. That which was imperfect was the nature with which the Logos that came down from heaven to do the Father's will clothed itself. That nature was flesh of the stock of Abraham, compared in Zech. 3:3 to "filthy garments," typical of "the infirmity with which he was encompassed." For this "infirmity" called "himself" and for all of the same infirmity associated with him by faith in the covenants made with Abraham and David, and in him as the Mediator thereof, he poured out his blood as a covering for sin. Upon the principle "His own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree" sins borne in a body prove that body to be imperfect and characterise it as sin's flesh. Sin's flesh is imperfect, and well adapted for the condemnation of sin therein. Sin could not have been condemned in the flesh of angels, and, therefore, the Logos did not assume it, but clothed itself with that of the seed of Abraham. Hence "the Deity sent His own Son in the identity of sin's flesh and for sin condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." This condemnation accomplished, the body slain was made alive again, and perfected, so that it now lives for the Aions of the Aions, as "the Lord the Spirit."

## THE SUBSTANCE OF THE MATTER

That the Father is the Redeemer of man. No second person redeems us from Him; but He redeems us from sin. He does it on a principle that (1) excludes the glorying of the flesh, and (2) preserves a harmony between His work in condemnation and His work in salvation.

*Illustration of the first point* - He manifests Himself by the Spirit in the nature condemned. The result was a Son in whom He was well pleased, holy, harmless and undefiled. God was in him for the work of reconciliation. Apart from the Father, Christ was and could do nothing. He was the Word made flesh, and the Word was God. The result of his work is therefore of God and not of man, that the praise might be to the glory of *His grace*. Had he been merely a man as Adam the first was, the glory would have been to man; but the last Adam was the Lord from heaven - God manifest in the flesh.

*Illustration of the second point:* - Man condemned in Adam must bear the condemnation, for God in his ways is without variableness or the shadow of a turning. But, if man is left to bear the condemnation himself, it destroys him, because his own transgressions stand in the way of escape. Therefore God provides him one who can bear it and be rescued from it after it is inflicted. This required one in the nature of the transgressor, for in God's ways, sentence upon man cannot be borne by angel or beast, but by him only on whom it lies. Jesus was such an one, for he partook of the very flesh and blood of Adam's condemned race through Mary. Yet the sufferer, though in the nature of the transgressor, had to be personally sinless, otherwise God could not raise him. Hence it was necessary that God Himself should manifest Himself in the seed of Abraham, thus producing a sinless character in the condemned nature of the first man. This was done by the miraculous conception of the Son of Mary, who "*through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself to God.*" - (Heb. 9:14). Raising His Holy One from the grave, he offered all men forgiveness by faith of what had been done in Him, and obedience to His commandments.

He who renounces this, renounces the truth, and repeats the history of first-century declension.

## CHRIST SAVED FROM DEATH

"A comparison of Heb. 5:7 with Heb. 2:14,15 is sufficient to prove that Jesus, in common with his brethren, was born under the Adamic curse, and that consequently, he himself had to be saved in the first place (1 Cor. 15:23) before others could be saved through him. - (1 Cor. 15:17,18). The first portion of Scripture referred to reads thus: "Who (Jesus) in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save him from death, and was *heard* in that he feared." Now what Paul says Jesus prayed to be delivered from was certainly not, according to most commentators, the death on the cross (Matt. 26:39), else it could not be said, "He was *heard* in that he feared." He prayed to be saved out of the death state - that his soul might not be left in the grave, *and was heard (and delivered) from that which he feared*. "And was heard in that he feared" is not a correct rendering of the sense conveyed by the original, *και εισαχουσθεις απο της ευλαβειας*, the literal translation of which is, "and was heard from the fear." De Wette renders the clause thus: *ist aus der Furcht erhoret (un befreiet) worden*: and the French version reads: *fut exauce et delivre de ce qu'il craignot*, which renderings are similar to that above in italics. Diodati's Italian version is literal: *ed essendo stato esaudito dal timore*. Now that Jesus was, in this respect, made like unto those for whom he died and rose again, is evident from what Paul tells the Hebrews (2:14,15): "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who, *through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage*." The devil (serpent) is here said to have the power of death, that is, over all who have Adam's nature, and since the Book does not tell us that he had this power over man *before* he sinned, but quite the contrary, as is taught by Paul (Rom. 5:12), it follows that Jesus having that nature, feared lying under the power of death (Heb. 5:7), after death had passed upon it, being as a son of man, in the same condition as those who are declared to have been *all their lifetime subject to bondage*. The Father hearkened to his dear Son's supplication, and delivered him from death. The Son asked life and the Father gave it unto him, even the length of days forever and ever. - (Psa. 21:4). Let us give thanks for this, for IF CHRIST BE NOT RAISED, *our faith is vain, we are yet in our sins, and they who have fallen asleep in Christ ARE PERISHED.*" - Communicated.

R. Roberts, The Christadelphian, 1875, pgs 139 - 140,

## **"FOR HIMSELF, THAT IT MIGHT BE FOR US."**

The statement of Paul in Heb. 7:27 is, that Christ did "once" in his death what the high priests under the law did daily, viz., offered "first for his own sins and then for the people's." But here is all the difference between the two cases that there always is between shadow and substance. Christ's "own sins" were not like the sins of the priests; they were not sins of his own committing. He was without sin, so far as his own actions were concerned. Yet as the bearer of the sins of his people - whether "in Adam" or otherwise, he stood in the position of having these as "his own," from the effects of which he had himself to be delivered. Consequently, he offered first for himself; he was the first delivered. He is "Christ the first fruits." He obtained eternal redemption in and for himself, as the middle voice of the Greek verb *ευραμενος* (Heb. 9:12) implies. (The "for us" is not in the original.) He was brought again from the dead "through the blood of the everlasting covenant." - (Heb. 13:20). But this offering for himself was also the offering for his people. The two aspects of the double typical offering were combined in one act. He had not twice to offer for himself. "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Yet, though combined, the two relations of the act are visibly separate. Christ was the first saved from death (Heb. 5:9); "afterwards, they that are Christ's at his coming." - (1 Cor. 15:23). In this way the Mosaic type has its counterpart. There is no inconsistency whatever between these facts and the constant declaration that "Christ died for us." All that Christ was and did was "for us." It was "for us" he was born; "for us" he bore sin; "for us" he came under the curse of the law; "for us" he died; and the fact that personally he was without sin where all were transgressors, gives all the more point to the declaration. It was "for us" that he came to be in the position of having first to offer for himself. The "for us" was our own position. "He was made sin for us who knew no sin;" and does not sin require an offering? The matter might be simplified by supposing the case were leprosy instead of sin, and the cure to be passing through fire instead of death; but that the fire should only possess the power of cure where the disease existed without the virus of the disease, and that in all other cases the effect of the fire should be to destroy. Let the leprosy be death in the constitution brought about by sin, and the virus, actual sin itself. By this illustration, all mankind are under the power of leprosy, which cannot be cured by the fire, owing to the presence of the combustible virus, which will catch fire and destroy the patient. If only one could be found free from the virus, he could go through the fire and save the rest: but he cannot be found. God interposes and produces such a one among them, one in whom the leprosy exists without the virus, that the rest may be cured by joining hands with him after he has gone through the fire. He goes through the fire "for them;" but is it not obvious that he goes through it for himself in the first instance? For if he is not delivered from the leprosy first, how will his going through the fire avail them? It is "for himself that it might be for them." He is now "separate from them," but he was not so in the first instance.

## THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST

It was, doubtless, "absolutely necessary that Christ should die before he himself, Abraham, or anyone else could inherit the promises." If there were no other proof, it is so shown by Paul's statement in Heb. 9:23, that it was "necessary that ..... the heavenly things themselves (should be purified) with better sacrifices than" the Mosaic. Now "the heavenly things themselves," of which the Mosaic arrangements were but the patterns or types, all centre in Jesus, out of whom we have no relation to them. He was the offerer, the priest, the sacrifice, the altar, the veil, the mercy seat, the tabernacle and much else besides, in the arrangement for our salvation, of which these elements of the Mosaic *kosmos* were the shadows. All these elements of the Mosaic *kosmos* were, by the law, purged with the blood of goats and bulls. They were regarded as unclean and declared to be so, as anyone may see by reading Lev. 16 and cognate portions of the law. In this they prefigured the seed of David according to the flesh, of which Jesus partook, which is a mortal and unclean thing because of sin, and had, in the wisdom of God, to be purified by death and resurrection, before glorified and eternal fellowship with the Creator could take place. This purification was accomplished in Jesus personally, and we obtain the benefit by association with him if he accepts us. In this way it is easy to understand Paul's statement that "the heavenly things themselves" had to be purified with "better sacrifices" than those offered under the law, even the offering of the body of Jesus once for all. Jesus is the beginning of the purification - the foundation of the building - the Head of the family. Deny the necessity in his case, and you displace him from his position in the arrangement, and destroy the reason for his being a partaker of our common nature. In fact you bring a cloud over the sacrifice of Christ and hide the wisdom and righteousness of God as exhibited therein, and substitute the confusion of the sectarian "atonement," which has, in ages past, caused many strong men to fall. All this is plain enough, but as for "harmonising the differences" on the subject which have been created among professors of the truth, through the flood of vain talk that has been poured forth, that is not so easy an accomplishment. ....



## The Antitypical Significance of the Consecration of Aaron and his Sons.

.... The word "necessity", it will be perceived, occurs frequently in the course of Paul's argument (Heb. 9:23). The necessity arises from the position in which men stood as regards the law of sin and death, and the position in which the Lord stood as their redeemer from this position. The position of men was that they were under condemnation to die because of sin, and that not their own sin, in the first instance, but ancestral sin at the beginning. The forgiveness of personal offences are the greater barrier. Nevertheless, men are mortal because of sin, quite independently of their own transgressions. Their redemption from this position is a work of mercy and forgiveness, yet a work to be effected in harmony with the righteousness of God, that He might be just while justifying those believing in the Redeemer. It is so declared (Rom. 3:26). It was not to be done by setting aside the law of sin and death, but by righteously nullifying it in one who should obtain this redemption in his own right, and who should be authorised to offer to other men a partnership in his right, subject to required conditions (of their conformity to which, he should be appointed sole judge).

How to effect this blending and poising of apparently opposing principles and differing requirements - mercy and justice; forgiveness and righteousness; goodness and severity - would have been impossible for human wisdom. It has not been impossible with God, to whom all things are possible. We see the perfect adjustment of all the apparently incompatible elements of the problem in His work in Christ, "who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30).

We have only to receive the simple facts testified in the case to reach the end of all difficulty. With immortal soulism and eternal torments, the solution is impossible. With the doctrine of human mortality, it is otherwise. We see Jesus born of a woman, and therefore a partaker of the identical nature condemned to death in Eden. We see him a member of imperfect human society, subject to toil and weakness, dishonour and sorrow, poverty and hatred, and all other evils that have resulted from the advent of sin upon the earth. We see him *down in the evil* which he was sent to cure: not outside of it, not untouched by it, but in it, to put it away. "He was made perfect through suffering" (Heb. 2:10), but he was not perfect till he was through it. He was saved from death (5:7), but not until he died. He obtained redemption (Heb. 9:12), but not until his own blood was shed.

That statement that he did these things "for us" has blinded many to the fact that he did them "for himself" first - without which, he could not have done them for us, for it was by doing them for himself that He did them for us. He did them for us only as we may become part of him, in merging our individualities in him by taking part in his death and putting on his name and sharing his life afterwards. He is, as it were, a new creature of healthy life, in which we must become incorporate before we can be saved.

The antitype of the cleansing of the holy things with blood is manifest when we look at Christ as he now is, and contrast him with what he was. He was a mortal man: he is now immortal. He was a sorrowful man: he is now "full of joy with thy (the Father's)

countenance". He was Adamic body of death, corruptible and unclean: he is now a spiritual body, incorruptible, pure, and holy. What lies between the one state and the other? His own death and resurrection. Therefore, by these, he has been purified, and *no one else* has been so purified as yet. Anyone else delivered will be delivered by him, as the result of what he did in himself.

If there was one injunction of the law more strenuous than the other, it was that contact with death in any form, however remote or indirect, was defiling. Even to touch a bone made a man unclean: or to be touched by a man unclean from such a cause had the same effect. We have the perfect antitype in the Lord born of a death bound woman, and therefore made subject to death: it was "that he, by the grace of God, might taste death for every man;" but he was the first to taste, in the process of redemption from it. He was a "body prepared" for the work: prepared as to its power to evolve sinlessness of character, but prepared also as to subjection to that death which it was designed to abolish (2 Tim. 1:10). In him were combined the antitypical "holy things" requiring atonement, "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins."

The reverence for Christ commands respect which leads some men to consider him immaculate in all senses and in no need to offer for himself, but it is not "according to knowledge." It is not consistent with the divine objects in God "sending forth his son in the likeness of sinful flesh." All these objects blend together, but they are separable. One of them was to "condemn sin in the flesh," as Paul says (Rom. 8:3). The stumblings that have taken place over this expression are doubtless due to that other truth, that Christ did no sin, and in this sense was the "Lamb of God without spot." But the stumblings do not get rid of the expression as affirming a truth. Some would explain it as meaning the moral condemnation of sin by Christ during his life. This cannot be the meaning in view of the statement with which it is conjoined that what was done was "what the law could not do". The law condemned sin so thoroughly in the moral sense that it is called "the ministration of condemnation." Then some have suggested that it means the flesh of the sacrificial animals. This is precluded by the intimation that Christ was sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh" for the accomplishment of the work in question - the condemnation of sin in the flesh. This is, in fact, the reliable clue to the meaning. That he 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 protection is precluded by the use of the same term as 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." Paul, in Heb. 2:14-17, declares the likeness to have been in the sense of sameness; "Forasmuch as the children as were partakers of flesh and blood, it became him likewise to partake of the same."

The statement remains in its undiminished force that "God sent his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for (as an offering for) sin condemned sin in the flesh". It is, in fact, a complete a coherent statement of what was accomplished in the death of Christ, and a perfect explanation of the reason why he first came in the flesh, and of the reason of why John the apostle insisted so strenuously on the maintenance of the doctrine that he had so come in the flesh. Possessing sinful flesh was no sin to him, who kept it under perfect control, and "did always those things that pleased the Father." At the same time, being the sinful flesh derived from the condemned transgressors of

Eden, it admitted of sin being publicly condemned in him, without any collision with the claims of his personal righteousness, which were to be met by an immediate and glorious resurrection.

There was a purpose in it, which is variously stated. These various statements conjointly admit us to what may be called Gods objects in the case - apart from which, there can be no understanding in the matter. With those objects in view, it is not only intelligible and admirable. But those objects cannot be discerned or appreciated apart from *God Himself*. The subject begins there. That is why the subject remains dim, so long after other parts of the truth are understood. We cannot understand God, yet we can have some idea of the relation between the Creator and created. We may know that the rights are all on the side of the Creator, and that the reasonable attitude of the created is that of absolute submission, and that any departure from this attitude is treason, and that death is just in the case of treason. We may also find it easy to recognise that though He is kind, and ready to forgive, He cannot grant forgiveness apart from such an *ammende honourable* as will preserve in tact the mutual relations of Creator and created. This, in simple language, is the explanation of the entrance of death by sin, and the granting of life by forgiveness for Christ's sake, after "setting him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood" (Rom. 3:25). We are "justified by his blood" if we believe - (see Rom. 5:9; Acts 13:38-39). There is no difference between the shedding of blood of Christ, and the condemnation of sin in the flesh. For this blood-shedding is otherwise expressed as "the pouring out of his soul *unto death*." And what is death but the condemnation of sin? Christ did not sin, but he inherited the condemnation of sin in deriving his nature from a daughter of Adam, the condemned: and he was considered as having the sins of his people laid upon him, insofar as the sins of his people were to be forgiven for the sake of what should be done in him. "He shall bear the sins of many." "God hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all." "He was wounded for our transgressions." "He was made sin for us, who knew no sin." "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world."

For this view of blood-shedding we are indebted to the explanation vouchsafed in the law, as to the requirement of blood in sacrifice. This explanation is as follows: "the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul" (Lev. 17:11). The pouring out of the blood was therefore the pouring out of the life - therefore the infliction of death: and therefore an illustration of what was due to sin, and an acknowledgement on the part of the offerer that it was so. That being the blood of an animal that had nothing to do with sin, it was only a typical illustration or declaration of God's righteousness in the case. It was not a condemnation of sin in its own flesh, but a mere shadow which God was pleased to establish in Israel's midst, in educational preparation for the actual condemnation which was to be carried out in His own son, in whom, "sent forth in the likeness of sinful flesh" for (as an offering for) sin, He "condemned sin in the flesh."

This sacrificial condemnation of sin in the eyes of all the world (for by record and report, all the world has seen Jesus on the cross), is otherwise said "to declare the righteousness of God for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God" (Rom. 3:25). These terms are as lucid as profound. They constitute an inspired definition of the object in a case. No view can be right that cannot be brought within the terms of that definition. It is, the final easement of all difficulty, where the mind is able to rise to the Divine point of view involved in the statement. The crucifixion was a Divine declaration and enforcement of what is due to sin, and as it was God's

righteous appointment that this should be due to sin, the infliction of it was a declaration of God's righteousness.

If we limit our view to the individual "man Christ Jesus," and look at him in the light of what is due to individual character as between man and man according to the "justice" of common parlance, we may have a difficulty in seeing how the righteousness of God was declared in the scourging and death of a righteous man. But this is not looking at the subject in which it is prophetically and apostolically exhibited. It is not looking at it in the character that belongs to it. Jesus did not come into the world as individual, but as a representative, though an individual. In this sense, he came "not for himself", but for others, though he was included in the coming. And it was to carry out Divine objects towards all. As he said, "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me". He speaks of the work which the father had given him to do. This work was to establish salvation by forgiveness, but forgiveness on conditions, and these conditions involved the declaration of the Father's righteousness in the public condemnation of sin in its own flesh in the person of a guiltless possessor of that flesh. Paul declares it was so, and controversy really ends in his words.

It only remains that we realise how completely the fact is in harmony with the statement. We cannot see this unless we recognise that Jesus was a wearer of Adam's condemned nature, and the bearer of the sins of the people - not that Christ might be punished for others, but that God's righteousness might be declared for others to recognise, that they might be forgiven. The gospel provides an opportunity of close identification with what was done: "Buried with by baptism into death;" "Crucified with Christ." In this posture, they receive the remission of sins "through the forbearance of God" (Rom. 3:25). This is the other great fact of the case - God's forbearance, His kindness, His readiness to pardon *when His claims are conceded*. This excludes the popular view of vicarious suffering. If Christ paid our debts there would be no forgiveness, but action, and thus would be blotted out the crowning glory of the apostolic proclamation. God is kind and will forgive, but God is great and will be exalted: and in the matter of eternal life He has provided His own method both of exalting Himself and humbling us; and in the presence of it, there is nothing left for us but to bow in reverence - before the crucified but resurrected son of His love.

We may appear to have wandered far away from the sacrificial blood sprinkled on the sanctuary and the altar, and the laver, and on Aaron "to make an atonement for them." Not really have we done so. The operation was a type of Gods work in Christ, and it helps us to understand that work rightly, and especially in that one aspect of it which the doctrine of human immortality has made it so difficult for moderns to receive, viz., that Christ himself was included in the sacrificial work which 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 ?

The necessity for Christ coming personally into the operation first, comes out very clearly - perhaps more clearly than anywhere - in the study of Paul's statement concerning Israel: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." The method of this work is before us without any fog. First Paul says he was *made under the law* that he might work the work that was to be done for others in that position. Not only so, but in bearing the curse of the law away, it had to *act on himself*. This will be seen if we ask how he took the law away; he did it by bearing it: "being made a curse for us." How? Instead of us? No: by himself coming under it. This is Paul's teaching. "As it is

written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree." It might seem in Moses that the clause about the cursedness of hanging on a tree means mere human infamy: but we must suspend our impressions in the presence of the spirit of God in Paul. Mere human infamy is not the curse that Christ has redeemed us from, but the curse of God, as evident from his statement in the immediate context: "As many are of the works of the law are under the curse, for it is written, Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them" (Gal. 3:10).

Christ was cursed by the law in the mode of his death. He could not be cursed in any other way, for he was not a transgressor of the law, but in this way, he was cursed. And it is probable that this clause was inserted in the law for this very purpose - that Christ might innocently die under the curse of the law, and so take it away: for the law can do nothing more than kill. When he died he was no longer under the law, which was made for mortal men, and had dominion over a man only as long as he lived (Rom. 7:1). When he rose, he was free from the curse of the law - redeemed by his death. It is by union with him as a resurrected free man that we obtain this redemption wrought in him. This is what Paul says: "Ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to him that is raised to the dead." He was born under the law and redeemed from the law that we might be redeemed by sharing his redemption. This view of the matter enables us to understand Paul's allusion to what the death of Christ accomplished in relation to the law: that he "abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of the commandments contained in ordinances" (Eph. 2:15); "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross" (Col. 2:14). But the result was achieved *in himself*.

This is the whole principle: redemption achieved in Christ for us to have, on condition of faith and obedience. It is not only that Israel are saved from the law of Moses on this principle, but it is the principle upon which we are saved from the law of sin and death, whose operation we inherit in deriving our nature from Adam. Christ partook of this nature to deliver it from death as Paul teaches in Heb. 2:14, and other places: "for as much as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Understanding by the devil, the hereditary death-power that has reigned among men by Adam through sin, we may understand how Christ, who took part in the death inheriting nature, destroyed the power of death by dying and rising. We then understand how "he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." We may also understand how "our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed" (Rom. 6:6), and how he "died unto sin once," but now liveth unto God, to die no more (verses 9-10).

All of which enables us to understand why the typical holy things were purified with sacrificial blood, and why the High Priest, in his typical and official capacity had to be touched with blood as well as anointed with the holy oil before entering upon his work. 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 effect.

R. Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1895, pgs. 23-24

## Jesus In The Psalms Confessing Sin

B.A.N. and J.B.D. - Your letters are duly received, and the pamphlet entitled "Christadelphians' Faith," with mark at the sentence, in which the writer alleges that Jesus had to acknowledge "his own sin." We cannot suppose that this is more than a misleading form of speech, as the same paragraph, six lines further down, acknowledges that Jesus, though tempted in all points like his brethren, was "without sin." If he meant Jesus was a sinner, then is the pamphlet issued in a false character, in professing to be a statement of Christadelphian faith. No true Christadelphian would own a statement containing such a feature. But this cannot be his meaning. We do not wonder the brethren should be troubled by it: but it must turn out to be a war of words. The dispute seems to turn on Psa. 69 which is applied to Christ in Jno. 2:17: and Matt. 27:35. The difficulty is in the application of verse 5: "Thou knowest my foolishness and my sins are not hid from Thee." The difficulty vanishes when all the facts are in view. Though Jesus was personally righteous, he stood as the representative of chosen sinners in two senses - first, as to the possession of the sin-nature weak in itself and condemned because of sin, and which it was the Father's purpose to put to death in Christ, as the foundation of mercy; and secondly, as to the relation of his work to the forgiveness of the sins of his people. God's purpose was to forgive them for Christ's sake. Therefore, in the language of the Mosaic type, "God laid on him the iniquity of us all." He was considered as the bearer of the sin to be taken away; "the antitypical Lamb of God that *taketh* away the sin of the world." In the process of taking them away, he therefore made them his own, in the sense of patiently enduring that which the Father appointed as the condition of their forgiveness. The Psalms reveal the sufferings of Christ through the Spirit-employed feelings and experiences of David in the first instance. The one foreshadows the other in the sense severally pertaining to each. David had to confess actual personal sins; Jesus had to confess only in the sense of having made the sins of others his own, as in the case of Daniel, who in prayer of Israel (Dan. 9:5) associates himself with the sins and iniquities of which Israel had been guilty. Jesus is as much identified with his people as Daniel was with Israel. Christ and his brethren - as head and body - are always considered as one in the work achieved by Christ. They cannot be separated. It is the separation of them that causes much of the difficulty that some experience. If we understand that the speaker in the Psalms, though first David, is secondly Christ in head and body, represented by the personal Christ, we shall find a place for all elements of truth without conflict. If men agree that Jesus "did no sin," yet that God laid our sins upon him in begetting him of human stock, and putting him to death, there should be an end of controversy.

R. Roberts, *Diary of a Voyage* 1896 pgs 66-69, *The Christadelphian*, 1896, pgs 339 - 442, and reprinted in *The Christadelphian*, 1907, pgs 458-459, and 1937, pgs. 552-554.

## The Nature of Man and the Sacrifice of Christ

.... But the Cornish view, which is the Roman Catholic in a modified form, repudiates this arrangement of divine wisdom, and from feelings of mistaken reverence (presumably) revolts at the idea of Jesus having been in any way related to sin. This is a zealous antipathy not inspired by knowledge. The statement that Christ will "appear the second time *without sin* unto salvation" looks back upon the fact that at his first coming he was "made sin for us who knew no sin" and "died unto sin once." Feeling might just as well revolt at the idea of his having been related to man at all, for it was nothing but humiliating and defiling to be born of a woman, which was part of the Edenic penalty (that Eve should have children in sorrow). It is a mistake to allow sentiment to have place in the matter at all. It is truth and fact that we want, and in this matter, it is only by testimony that we can get at them. The testimony is plain: that Jesus was our very nature "in all points," but a divine form of that nature for its redemption from death by death in righteousness. It is impossible to improve upon the definition of Paul that Christ died, that He (God) might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus (Rom. 3:26). The sacrifice of Christ shows us the justice of God working under the inspiration of the love of God, that the way might be open for forgiveness "through the forbearance of God" until life eternal.

All this is twisted out of shape by the Cornish view, which says - "Christ died because he was killed: it was not necessary for the forgiveness of sins." We cannot better demonstrate the serious nature of this departure from Gospel truth than by exhibition of the following: -

- 1) That death entered into the World of mankind by Adam's disobedience. "By one man sin entered into the World, and death by sin" (Rom. 5:12). "In (by or through) Adam all die" (1 Cor. 15:22). "Through the offence of one many are dead" (Rom. 5:15).
- 2) That death came by decree extraneously to the nature bestowed upon Adam in Eden, and was not inherited in him before sentence. "God made man in his own image ..... a living soul (a body of life) .... very good" (Gen. 1:27; 2:7; 1:31). "Because thou hast harkened unto the voice of thy wife .... unto the dust shalt thou return" (Gen. 3:17,19).
- 3) Since that time, death has been a bodily law. "The body is dead because of sin" (Rom. 8:10). "The law of sin in my members ..... the body of this death" (Rom. 7:23,24). "This mortal ..... we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened" (1 Cor. 15:53; 2 Cor. 5:4). "Having *the sentence of death in ourselves*, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raiseth the dead" (2 Cor. 1:9).
- 4) The human body is therefore a body of death requiring redemption. "Waiting for the adoption, to with the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23). "He shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His own glorious body" (Phil 3:21). "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Rom. 7:24). "This mortal (body) must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15:53).

- 5) That the flesh resulting from the condemnation of human nature to death because of sin, has no good in itself, but requires to be illuminated from the outside. "In me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18). "Sin dwelleth in me" (Rom 7:20). The law of sin which is in my members (Rom 7:23). "Every good and perfect gift is from above and cometh down from the Father of Lights" (James 1:17). "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts" (Matt 15:19). "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption" (Gal. 6:8). "Put off the old man which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts" (Eph. 4:22).
- 6) That God's method for the return of sinful man to favour required and appointed the putting to death of man's condemned and evil nature in a representative man of spotless character, whom He should provide, to declare and uphold the righteousness of God, as the first condition of restoration, that He might be just while justifying the unjust, who should believingly approach through him in humility, confession, and reformation. "God sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3). "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14). "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body to the tree" (1 Pet. 2:24). "Our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed" (Rom. 6:6). "He was tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15). "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the World" (Jno. 16:33). "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God, to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:25-26).
- 7) That the death of Christ was by God's own appointment, and not by human accident, though brought about by human instrumentality. "He that spared not His own Son, but *delivered him up for us all* (Rom. 8:32). "Him being delivered by the determinate council and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts 2:23). "Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together for to do *whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done*" (Acts 4:27-28). "No man taketh it - my life - from me, but I lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father" (Jno. 10:18).
- 8) That the death of Christ was not a mere martyrdom, but an element in the process of reconciliation. "You that sometimes were alienated in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled *in the body of his flesh through death*" (Col. 1:21-22). "When we were enemies, we were *reconciled to God by the death of His Son*" (Rom. 5:10). "He was wounded for our transgressions: he was bruised for our iniquity: that chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed" (Isa. 53:5). "I lay down my life for my sheep" (Jno. 10:15). "Having therefore boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, *by a new and living way*, which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, *that is to say, his flesh*, let us draw near" (Heb. 10:20).
- 9) That the shedding of his blood was essential for our salvation. "Being justified by *his blood*, we shall be saved from wrath through him" (Rom. 5:9). "In whom we have redemption *through his blood*, even for the forgiveness of sins"



(Col. 1:14). "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb. 9:22). "This is the new covenant in my blood, *shed for the remission of sins*" (Matt. 26:28). "The lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (Jno. 1:29). "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in *his own blood*" (Rev. 1:5). "Have washed their robes and *made them white in the blood of the Lamb*" (Rev. 7:14).

- 10) That Christ was himself saved in the Redemption he wrought out for us. "In the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to *save him from death*, and was heard in that he feared. Though he were a son yet learned he obedience by the thing which he suffered. And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him" (Heb. 5:7-9). "Joint heirs with Christ" (Rom. 8:17). "By his own blood he entered once into the Holy place, *having obtained eternal redemption*" (Heb. 9:12). "Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect, &c." (Heb. 13:20).
- 11) That as the anti-typical High Priest, it was necessary that he should offer for himself as well as for those whom he represented. "And by reason hereof, he ought as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins. And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he that said unto him, &c." (Heb. 5:3). "Wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer" (Heb. 8:3). "Through the Eternal Spirit, he offered himself without spot unto God" (Heb. 9:14). "Who needeth not *daily*, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins and them for the people's: for *THIS he did once* when he offered up himself" (Heb. 7:27). "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens (that is, the symbols employed under the law), should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices), but the *heavenly things themselves* (that is, Christ who is the substance prefigured in the law), with better sacrifices than these" (that is, the sacrifice of Christ - Heb. 9:23).

J. Carter, *The Christadelphian*, 1938, pg. 263

## The Prince's Sin-Offering

*"In Ezekiel's prophecy of the Temple of the Future and the sacrifices (45:22) we read that the Prince shall prepare for himself and all the people of the land a bullock for a sin-offering. Why is it necessary for the Prince, Christ, to offer a sin-offering for himself?"*

ANSWER. - We believe the Prince of these chapters is Messiah the Prince who was "cut off" in sacrifice. He was a sharer in the benefits of his own sacrifice, as Paul declares (Heb. 9:12,13; 13:20). He was himself a sin-offering, for "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:30). By the way, we should not unite the last phrase with hyphens: Paul does not say God condemned sin-in-the-flesh; He condemned Sin, and by using a capital we bring out the personification in the language. Where was it condemned? The answer is: "in the flesh," where the law of sin wars in the members against the law of the mind (7:23), where sin "dwells" (7:17,18). Because Jesus was sinless as well as possessing "the likeness of sinful flesh" he was fitted to be the sin-offering. For God's objects included not only the upholding of His law against sin, but the resurrection of the Saviour. And so his "soul was made an offering for sin," and his days were prolonged (Is. 53:10). In the past he partook of the Passover; he kept the law in all its requirements: he was baptized; he died without the camp, hung on the tree as was required of him.

Before he suffered Jesus appointed the bread and wine as memorials of his broken body and shed blood. He also said he would "not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God." In Ezekiel's vision, the prophet witnesses the coming of the glory of the Lord, entering by the east gate (43:2-4). This gate is then reserved for the Prince, who is the manifestation of the LORD, the God of Israel, who "shall sit in it to eat bread before the Lord." But this "bread" must not be restricted to the loaf, for in verse 9 God speaks of "my bread, the fat and the blood."

We find no difficulty in the thought of the bread and the wine forming part of the ceremonies of the future. We know from many scriptures that a sacrificial system will be reintroduced in the age to come. In view of the fact that for the suffering of death the Lord has been crowned with glory and honour, why should not an offering for the Prince be made as a memorial of his work, in the same form as will be required of all the subjects as an expression of faith on their part in the redemptive work of the Lord for the forgiveness of sins. Sacrifices in the past were prospective - in the future they will be retrospective of the one great offering. It is fitting that God should be sanctified in the approaches of mankind; to Him belongs the appointment of the form. In keeping with that is the Prince's own memorial offering.

J. Carter, *The Christadelphian*, 1939, pgs. 228-230

## **"THE CHRISTADELPHIAN" On the Nature of Man and the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ**

We believe that because of the disobedience Adam was sentenced to return to the ground, and that this sentence brought him at last to death. "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin" (Rom. 5:12). "By man came death" (1 Cor. 15:21). Death "came by decree extraneously to the nature bestowed upon him in Eden," to use the words of brother Roberts; or, in other words of brother Roberts, "Death did not come into the world with Adam, but by him after he came."

We believe it is contrary to the meaning of Scripture to say (1) that the words "Dust thou art, to dust shalt thou return" described the condition of man when first created, and is therefore not a sentence of death subsequently passed by God upon Adam as a result of transgression; and (2) that the "death which has come by sin" is not the death common to all men, but the second death. The true teaching of the Bible, we assert, is that we are dying creatures, inheriting a nature which is "evil" (Matt. 7:11), in which "evil is present," which evil is further described as "a law in our members," "the law of sin in our members" (Rom. 7). Such phrases could not be used of Adam before he sinned.

The scriptures define sin, in the primary sense, as transgression of God's law (1 John 3:4) or, as in the R.V. with a closer reproduction of the original, "sin is lawlessness." In a few passages of Scripture the word "sin" is used in a secondary sense, by metonymy, of human nature. As Paul could speak of "sin that dwelleth in me" so he could describe the nature in which dwells "the law of sin" as "sin," inasmuch as it inevitably produces sin in all, with the exception of the Lord Jesus who always obeyed God. Thus Paul says, "God made Jesus *to be sin* for us who knew no sin" (2 Cor. 5:21); again, "He shall appear the second time *apart from sin*" (Heb. 9:28 R.V.).

Jesus possessed our nature, which is a condemned nature. Because of this he shared in the benefits of his own sacrifice, as Paul declares: -

Heb. 7:27: "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once, when he offered up himself."

Heb. 9:12: "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption."

Heb. 9:23: "It was therefore necessary that the pattern of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these."

Heb. 13:20: "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant."

We believe that we cannot consider Jesus alone in this matter, but must always remember that he was "the arm of the Lord," raised up for the work of reconciliation of

mankind who are perishing. God sent forth Jesus to declare His righteousness as a condition for the forgiveness of sins in the exercise of His mercy. To effect those objects it was necessary that Jesus should be of our nature, yet sinless. If he had not been of our nature which is under condemnation he could not have righteously died: had he not been sinless he could not have been raised from death to everlasting life. The wisdom of God is shown in the raising up of a Son who, though tempted and tried like all of his brethren, was yet without sin; who, therefore, by the shedding of his blood confirmed the new covenant for the remission of sins and obtained eternal redemption for himself and for us.

The denial that Jesus had our nature strikes at the root of the principle stated by Paul, that the righteousness of God was declared in his death; and because of this the apostles were insistent that believers should test all doctrines presented to them for acceptance, and that teachers of error and their doctrine should both be rejected. John says (1 John. 4:2):-

"Hereby know ye the Spirit of God. Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh* is of God."

Again (2 John 7-11):-

"For many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh*. this is a deceiver and an antichrist. Look to yourselves that we loose not those thing which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward. Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath born the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."

When John says "in the flesh" he means the same flesh as ourselves. These false teachers attributed some other nature to Jesus, different from our own. Because of this apostolic injunction we believe it is necessary to maintain the truth on this subject by declining to have fellowship with any who uphold the contrary.

The statement of the principle underlying the sacrifice of Christ in "The statement of Faith" is elaborated in the pamphlet *The Blood of Christ*, which, in our judgment, sets out the truth on this subject.

J. Carter, *The Christadelphian*, 1946, pg. 139.

## CHRIST'S OFFERING FOR HIMSELF AND FOR US

A Brother requests the reprinting of the statement appended written by brother Roberts during the controversy stirred up by the teaching of Edward Turney, some seventy years ago. The word quoted are much to the point today.

"In the moral sense, that is, as regards character, Jesus knew no sin, and was absolutely separate from sinners; but in the physical sense he was not separate from sinners, for 'he was made in the likeness of sinful flesh' (Rom. 8:3). he was 'made sin' for us who knew no such thing in his character (2 Cor. 5:21). He was made in all things like his brethren (Heb. 2:17), and possessed their very flesh and blood (Heb. 2:14). He was of the seed of David according to the flesh (Rom. 1:3). Therefore he was not separate from them physically, but their bone, and their flesh, and their blood - Son of Man as well as Son of God (John 5:27). This being so, he was a sufferer from the hereditary effects of sin; for those 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 of 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 attain 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 permits. This we do in baptism, in which we are made *partakers of his death*, as well as his resurrection. The orthodox and Renunciationist theory of Christ's death being substitutionary and the payment of a debt owing by us, is another affair altogether, and destructive of the wisdom of God as expressed in the death and resurrection of His Son, and of His mercy and loving kindness as manifested to us in the offer of forgiveness on approaching Him through the name of His slain and accepted lamb, who from birth to resurrection was provided 'for us,' 'the just for the unjust that he might bring us unto God.'"

John Carter, The Letter to the Hebrews, pgs. 80-83

## Christ's Fitness as High Priest

This high priest of ours "becomes" us; suits our case, and meets our every need. He excels all who have gone before. He is holy - saintly in character; he is guileless, harmless in his disposition, no evil in his thought. He never attributes wrong to those who approach as Eli did to Hannah. He is "undefiled." While Aaron's sons must avoid ceremonial defilement, and submit to extra precautions before the day of Atonement, Jesus is free from moral defilement, the spiritual counterpart of the ceremonial. He has been "separated" from sinners; in his life he was separate in his conduct, but now he is altogether beyond the influence or power of men, for he has ascended higher than the heavens to the Father's presence.

The ministry of this high priest surpasses that of the high priests under the law. They offered an annual sacrifice on the day of Atonement. Christ's ministry is daily, but he does not therefore need a daily sacrifice. His one sacrifice is sufficient for all time, emphatically once for all.

Aaron offered "for his sins, and then for the people's," in his annually repeated offerings. But "this" Jesus did once. What does "this" denote? Grammatically it is a disputed point. Two opinions by equally eminent scholars might be put side by side. "'This' refers only to offerings for the people" (Davidson). "'This' implies all that follows 'offer up'" (Nairne).

Certainly Paul did not mean that Jesus had need to offer for personal sins. He has affirmed that he was "without sin" (4:15); and in the context here speaks of him as holy and guileless. That there was a sense in which he must offer for himself would appear from the fact that Aaron had so to do before he offered for the people; and Jesus is the antitype. If it should be said that this was a necessary preparation in Aaron's case, it might be asked, was there no necessary preparation in Christ's case? There was; and the Scriptures give the reason. We get a clue in the words of Peter: "who his own self bare our sins *in his own body* on the tree" (1 Pet. 2:24). He was there as a representative, partaking of the nature that was common to all - a nature under sentence of death because of sin. He died to declare God's righteousness, as Paul says (Rom. 3:21-26); and this could not have been done if he could not righteously have died.

All the sacrifices of the law meet in him, including that which Aaron offered for himself as well as that which he offered for the people. But all the sacrifices are in his one offering. All concern redemption in one phase or another; and while Jesus is the redeemer he is so because he has obtained redemption (Heb. 9:12). The facts are not affected by whichever view is taken of what Paul meant by "this".

The difference between the priesthoods are brought to one point. Christ's offering is "once." There can be no repetition in the nature of the case. "For the law appointeth men high priests, having infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was after the law, appointeth a Son, perfected for evermore." A mere man, with weakness; or a Son, perfected for evermore; here is the difference which determines their respective values. And the Son is appointed to office by "the word of oath" which was spoken "after" the law, and being "after" was evidently intended to supersede.

J. Carter, *The Christadelphian*, 1956, pgs. 127-132

## SIN AND ITS CONDEMNATION

*"It might help us in our difficulties here, in dealing with extremists on both sides, if you would kindly reprint bro. John Thomas's definition of 'sin in the flesh' on page 9 of Clerical Theology Unscriptural - where Boanerges is speaking."*

Here then is the quotation from *Clerical Theology*. This, it might be said, is in the form of a dialogue which reproduced the substance of a discussion in which Dr. Thomas engaged in a train journey in 1850. It was at the time of the Gorham Controversy concerning baptismal regeneration, of which there was an echo only quite recently in the ecclesiastical courts. It was also the time when the Oxford Movement under J.H. Newman's leadership was publishing a series of pamphlets from which it was sometimes described as the Tractarian Movement, hence the allusion to Newman and Pusey. Dr. Thomas speaks in the dialogue as Boanerges, and says:

"O fie, Heresian; I thought you had more sense than to talk thus. You do not seem to know what *sin* is. If I did not know otherwise, I should have concluded that you had been studying tractarianism in the dark and mystic groves of Isis, among the Puseys and the Newmans of its cloistered halls. You ought to know the primitive sense of the word is '*the transgression of the law*'; and the derived sense that of *evil in the flesh*. *Transgression is to this evil as cause to an effect; which effect reacts in the posterity of the original transgressors as a cause 1, which, uncontrolled by belief of the truth, evolves transgression in addition to those natural ills, disease, death and corruption, which are inherent in flesh and blood*. Because he transgressed the Eden law, Adam is said to have sinned. *Evil* was then evolved in his flesh as the punishment of his *sin*; and because the evil was the punishment of the sin, it is also styled sin. 'Flesh and blood' is naturally and hereditarily full of this evil. It is, therefore, called 'sinful flesh', or flesh full of sin. Hence, an apostle saith, 'in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing' (Rom. 7:18). The absence of goodness in our physical nature is the reason of flesh and blood being termed '*sin*'. 'The Word was made flesh'; a saying which Paul synonymizes by the expression, 'God hath made Jesus *sin* for us who knew no sin' (2 Cor. 5:21); and Peter by the words, 'He his own self bear our sins *in his own body*'. (1 Peter 2:24). 'God made Jesus sin', in the sense of 'making him of a woman' (Gal. 4:4), or of flesh and blood; so that having the same nature, its evil was condemned in his flesh; and consequently the sins of those who believe the gospel of the Kingdom were then borne away, if they have faith also in the breaking of his body for sin (Rom. 8:3; Luke 22:19). Besides this, John says, that 'all unrighteousness is sin'; and another apostle, that 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin'. Now, Heresian, I should like you, or some of your spiritual lords, to inform me what sins, actual or original, are remitted to an infant in the 'baptismal regeneration' they talk so much about?"

The main contention of this is excellent, but on one or two details some comments might be made. After many years of patient effort to understand the Scripture and much reading of what our Pioneers have said, we venture some further notes; but it were optimistic to expect that "extremists" of any side would all be satisfied. The subject has been discussed again and again in the past, but each generation must face anew the problems connected with sin and its condemnation.

In bro. C.C. Walker's pamphlet *The Atonement*, there are some brief comments of fundamental importance in understanding Paul's teaching in Romans 6-8. He says:

"'Sin is lawlessness' - that is the primary meaning of the word as given by the beloved disciple (1 John 3:4). But *there are secondary meanings, by figures of speech such as personification and metonymy*; and unless these are recognized confusion will result. Personification is a natural, graphic and highly intelligible figure of speech, common in the scriptures. Riches are personified as

---

<sup>1</sup> That is by the use of the figure metonymy the "evil in the flesh" can be called "sin". (J.C.)

'Mammon, a Master' (Matt. 6:24). Wisdom is personified as a beautiful and gracious Woman (Prov. 3:13,15; 9:1). The Spirit of God is personified as 'the Comforter' (John 16:7,13). And Paul in Eph. 2:2,3 has a striking parallelism which of itself almost explains the personification of Sin. Speaking of the work of God in Christ in the Ephesian disciples, he says: 'And you hath the quickened who were dead in *trespasses and sins*, wherein in time past ye walked according to:

the course of this world (aion of this kosmos)

the Prince of the power of the air

the Spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.'

This is but the reproduction and expansion of the Lord's own personification of Sin, as 'the Prince of this World' (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). 'Now shall the Prince of this world be *cast out*. And *I, if I be lifted up*, will draw men unto ME. This he said *signifying what death he should die*' (compare John 3:14). 'Hereafter I will not talk much with you; for the Prince of this world cometh, and *hath nothing in me*. But that the world may know that I love the father; and as the Father gave me commandment (compare 10:17,18), even so I do.' 'The Comforter ... Will convict the world of sin... (and) of judgment, because the Prince of this world *is judged*' (in the sense of 'cast out', condemned - compare ch. 12:48)."

Concerning the figure "personification" bro Walker says:

"As to the personification of Sin, in the New Testament the epistle to the Romans abounds with examples, which must not here be particularised at length. If the interested reader will mark the following places with a capital 'S' he will find the exercise enlightening: Rom. 5:21; 6:6,7,10,11,12,13,14,16,17,18,20,22,23; 7:7,8,9,11,13,14,17,20; 8:3."

On the subject of metonymy we might also hear bro. C.C. Walker:

"Metonymy (*meta*, change, and *onoma*, a name, or in grammar, a noun) is 'a figure by which one name or noun is used instead of another, to which it stands in a certain relation'. There is metonymy of cause, of effect, of subject, and of adjunct. Thus 'sin' and its synonyms are put for the effects or punishments of sin. The angels hastened Lot and his wife and daughters out of Sodom, 'lest', said they, 'thou be consumed in the *iniquity* of the city' (Gen. 19:16). That is in the punishment thereof, as in the margin of the A.V. See also Psa. 7:16; Jer. 14:16; Zech. 14:19: 'This shall be the *punishment* (marg. *sin*) of Egypt.'

In Deut. 9:21 Moses says, 'I took *your sin*, the calf which ye had made, and burnt it with fire, and stamped it and ground it very small, even until it was as small as dust; and I cast the dust thereof into the brook that descended out of the mount.' In Exod. 32:20, where the episode is originally recorded we read, 'He strawed it upon the water, and *made the children of Israel drink of it*'. 'The brook flowed from the smitten rock (Exod. 17:6) which 'was Christ' (1 Cor. 10:4), who said to Israel, "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink" (John 7:37). 'Let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely' (Rev. 22:17). Thus, by this remarkable figure, is the 'sin' of Israel associated with Christ.

'They eat up *the sin* of my people' (Hosea 4:8); that is in their licentious idolatry, see context. 'The high places of Aven, *the sin* (*cahttah*) of Israel, shall be destroyed' (Hosea 10:8). Here there is a double figure, for the word Aven itself means 'sin' ('Bethaven' - House of Sin, ch. 4:15). When Beth-el (House of God, Gen. 28:17,19) was defiled by the idolatrous institution of the calf-worship of Jeroboam (1 Kings 12:30), 'this thing became a sin', and the name, by the spirit of God in the prophet, was changed from Beth-el to Beth-aven.

These enable us to understand the like figures in the New Testament. 'The body of sin' is 'our mortal body' (Rom. 6:6; 8:11), mortal because of sin (Rom. 5:12). 'He hath made him (Christ) to be sin for us who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him (2 Cor. 5:21). That is, 'God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin (R.V., *as an offering* for sin) condemned Sin in the flesh' (Rom. 8:3). Or again, Christ 'himself likewise took part of the same (flesh and blood) that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil' (Heb. 2:14).



'Our old man was crucified with him' (Rom. 6:6). 'Jesus Christ by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world' (Gal. 6:41)."

Let us follow out the suggestion of substituting a capital "S" for the lower case "s" in the passages in Romans mentioned above. In Rom. 6:23 Paul says, "For the wages of Sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Here we have Sin represented as a paymaster - it may be that, since the word was used of soldiers' pay, we may think of Sin as a general under whom we have served. Certainly it is fundamental to the figure used that the wages paid have been earned. Paul's figure is very graphic: but what are the plain facts? Is it not that we have sinned in our disobedience of God's law, and God imposes death as punishment for sin. By putting the matter the way he does Paul is able to contrast more sharply the death we deserve with the gift of eternal life which God bestows in Jesus Christ.

In chapter 6 there are 14 references to Sin, all illustrating the figure of personification. In verse 2 Paul says that the believer "dies to Sin" (R.V.), and in verse 10 he uses the same expression of Christ: "For in that he died, he died unto sin once (for all)". In what way did Christ die to sin? He died because he was, through his mother, a sharer with the rest of mankind in a state of mortality. He was subject to the evil that had come through sin. And Paul personifies sin, and uses the word as expressive of that which came as the result of sin. Christ's death was necessitated by the entrance of sin into the world, and in his death he met all the claims of sin, and he rose to freedom from all its effects. But when we use this language we are using the language of personification. For, literally, sin can claim nothing. Sin is disobedience to law, or in the more comprehensive phrase of John, sin is lawlessness, and God, whose law is disobeyed, imposes the penalty of broken law. When Paul says sin has reigned unto death, sin is likened to a monarch whose sway extends to death. Literally, death is the punishment God inflicted for the disobeying of His Law.<sup>1</sup>

He that is dead is free from Sin - just as a master has no more power over a slave when the slave is dead, so by the death in baptism a man is freed from the ownership of Sin; he has been emancipated from it. We must remember that Paul is speaking of the power of Sin in the life of man; and that Paul found in Christ a new power in his life. "The love of Christ constraineth us;" "I have been crucified with Christ, yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." The "old man" is crucified with Christ (verse 6), the flesh and its impulses were nailed to the tree, with the object "that the body of sin might be destroyed." Here again Sin is personified as the owner of the body because Sin exercises its thrall in the flesh.

Sin is a monarch: "Let not sin reign in your mortal body;" neither should their "members" be placed at the service of Sin (verses 12,13); and the figure of Sin as a monarch continues in the verses which follow to the end of the chapter, where Sin is the paymaster.

In 7:5 Paul speaks of the motions of Sin which did formerly work in their members when his readers were "in the flesh." Observe that literally they were still "in the flesh," but now the word "flesh" is used by metonymy for the sinful life based upon fleshly desires. In verse 7 he asks, "Is the law sin?" - a bold utterance which means, Is the Law the cause of sin? - another illustration of metonymy. He then shows that sin did not spring from law but from the flesh where sin revealed itself, being provoked

<sup>1</sup> This paragraph is from the *Exposition of the Letter to the Romans*.

into virulence by the Holy law of God. "I am carnal - sold under sin" and therefore "sin dwells in me." Sin is owner, and house occupant: the power in resident possession. In this connection Paul speaks of the law of sin which is in his members. The context here guides us to the meaning which we must in this context attach to the word "law" - it is the habit which has the power of law within us - the proneness which inevitably overcomes, do as we will. But this law is in the flesh in its desires and cravings. It is not an objective decree but a way of behaving. Sin reigns.

When we come to 8:3 we must carry forward from the proceeding chapters the figure of personification of sin: "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." The law could not give life, it condemned the sinner, and since by the law is the knowledge of sin, and all have sinned, the law is described by Paul as a ministration of condemnation. But what the law could not do God has done. It is something that God has done that is the vital fact of Paul's comment. This is set out in four phrases:

- a) Sending His own Son;
  - b) In the likeness of sinful flesh;
  - c) and for sin;
  - d) condemned sin in the flesh.
- a) The first item calls for little comment beyond saying that the aim to be achieved was beyond unaided human power. It required divine aid which was given in keeping with the objects in view. Jesus was the Son of God and son of Mary; the sinlessness he achieved was clearly due to the fact of divine sonship, even though the precise effect of that sonship is beyond our understanding. Certain it is that Jesus issued the challenge to his adversaries that none could convict him of sin in the context of his claim to be the Son of God (John 8:38-47). There was thus a connection between the two facts.
- b) The translators have obscured this somewhat. The R.V. margin substitutes the literal translation "flesh of sin" for the text "sinful flesh." The A.V. text in a general way may indicate the meaning in most contexts; flesh under the ownership of Sin is flesh that sins, and hence sinful flesh. In the present context, however, it becomes clear that "sinful flesh" does not strictly set forth Paul's thought. It eliminates the figure that Paul is using, and from that point alone is a loss. In the phrase "flesh of Sin" Paul is carrying on the figure of personification that he has used in chapters 6 and 7. Sin is represented as the owner of the flesh, because men and women of flesh serve sin. In this fact we can see the reason for Paul's use of the word "likeness." We must give this word its full meaning; it is not resemblance, but likeness, that is identicalness. Why then, if that is so, does Paul so express the matter? If he had said that Jesus came in "the flesh of sin" it would have implied that Sin was the owner and therefore that Jesus served Sin. Neither could he say in this context simply that Jesus came in flesh, for he has just before equated "in the flesh" with the state where men serve the flesh (7:5); and in an immediate context the word "flesh" is used of a "me" in which dwells no good thing: "It is no more I, but sin that dwelleth in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not" (7:17,18). Paul was affirming two things: that Jesus shared our nature

with its mortality and susceptibility to temptation, yet at the same time he never yielded to sin. He achieves what he means by saying that the flesh of Jesus was identical with the flesh over which sin reigns, but it is only the physical nature he shares with other members of the race: he does not share their sinfulness. His flesh did not yield to Sin. Jesus had not to say with Paul that he failed to do what he would, or to bemoan that Sin dwelt in him. Jesus had not to say, "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." He knew the agony of the garden, he knew the flesh was weak, but he and not Sin was the master. His flesh was not enthralled to Sin, and so Paul must avoid saying it was the flesh owned by Sin while asserting its essential sameness as flesh. The word "likeness" is thus seen to be a strong and important word in the definition of Paul's thought.<sup>1</sup>

- c) "For sin" gives place in the R.V. to "as an offering for sin." Just as certainly as Paul intended to say, and did say, "offering for sin" here, so with equal certainty he did not say and did not mean "sin offering" when in 2 Cor. 5:21 he said that Jesus was "made sin," or in Heb. 9:21 that he comes the second time "apart from sin" (R.V.). The meaning of these two passages will be discussed later. The phrase Paul uses in Rom. 8:3 is in constant use in the LXX to describe "sin offering." The R.V. is here a distinct gain.
- d) "Condemned Sin in the flesh." Let us keep in mind the personification which Paul is using and also remember that this condemnation of sin by God was beyond the ability of the Law. The Law could reprove sin and could condemn the sinner: it declared God's disapproval of sin. Both these ideas are therefore excluded from the meaning of Paul's words. The condemnation of sin in the purpose of God called for the Son of God sharing in the flesh of men, for it was in this way that Sin was to be condemned *in the flesh*. The key to Paul's meaning is in the figure he is using. Sin has been personified as a paymaster, as an owner by purchase, and as a ruler over subjects - expressive figures of man's slavery to Sin. But another figure is now introduced; he has spoken of being made free from Sin, of becoming slaves of Righteousness; but none of these figures deals with the vanquishing of Sin. In Rom. 8:3 Paul pictures a contest at law, in which Sin claims a title to all mortal sons of Adam. But the case goes against Sin. Sin is condemned by God the judge, and the issue is decided in Christ. Since Christ has not yielded to sin, Sin has lost his claim in the very domain that he regarded as his own - the domain of the flesh. So Paul's figure runs. But the force and significance of "in the flesh" now emerges. The conflict takes place in the flesh - there Sin is overcome, and then as the final act, the very climax of the conflict, Jesus lays down his life as a sin offering. In this was shown the fitness of the flesh for the divinely decreed end of death, and God's righteousness was declared; but in this very way Christ provides the conditions upon which sins are forgiven (he is the sin offering) and so Sin loses its hold on forgiven and redeemed men and women. Since God has passed sentence of condemnation on Sin its final extirpation is assured. Its death warrant has been signed, for because of the obedience of Christ unto death God has highly exalted him and to him *every knee* shall bow, and therefore none ultimately will serve Sin.

Some of these matters have been argued out more than once in the past in articles in

---

<sup>1</sup>. In the context of John's words, Paul would of course affirm that Christ came in the flesh, but his use of "flesh" in this context makes him avoid it. He is about to affirm that they "that are in the flesh cannot please God." Paul is using "flesh" in a moral sense in Rom. 8 - (J.C.)

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN. Among the ablest of these is the discussion of the meaning of sin and sin-offering (*hamatias* and *peri hamatias*) must be put two or three contributions by the late W.J. Young. In THE CHRISTADELPHIAN of 1913 and 1915 are contributions on the same subject. Bro. Young's careful study of "The Condemnation of Sin" on page 343 of the latter year begins with a series of quotations from *Elpis Israel* which are relevant to the present discussion. He says:

"Over sixty-five years ago, Dr. Thomas in the providence of God, revived in *Elpis Israel* the Truth revealed in the Holy Scripture concerning Sin in the Flesh and concerning the Nature of the Lord Jesus. 'Man's defilement,' he says, 'was first a matter of conscience, and then corporeal' (pg. 166). 'Sin made flesh ... is the Wicked one of the world ... Satan's kingdom is the kingdom of Sin.'<sup>1</sup> It is a kingdom in which "Sin reigns in the mortal body," and thus has dominion over man' (page 95). 'The carnal mind, or thinking of the flesh, unenlightened by the truth, is the serpent in the flesh' (page 91). 'The scripture says that it was not possible for the blood of animals to take away sins. It was impossible because sin was to be condemned in sinful flesh.'<sup>2</sup> This required the death of a man, for the animals had not sinned' (page 161). 'The great principle to be encompassed was the condemnation of sin in sinful flesh innocent of actual transgression. This necessitated the manifestation of one who ... would be Son of God by origination, and Son of man by descent, or birth of sinful flesh' (page 161). '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' (page 128). Through good and through evil report the Household of faith has remained steadfast to these elements of Divine truth, in opposition to the churches and to all who hold that sin has no place in the flesh of Christ."

Bro. Young then gives a definition of the phrase "Sin in the flesh" which we reproduce:

"Since there exists a tendency in certain quarters to use terms in a sense different from that which we believe to be the true sense, it may be well to define clearly what we hold to be the Bible teaching about Sin in the flesh. This may do as follows:- Sin in the flesh is that principle existing in our fallen human nature which causes the life-processes of the organism to produce thoughts, feelings, and actions out of harmony with the mind of God. Sin became an inhering principle in human nature as a consequence of the first transgression, and has been transmitted by natural descent to all succeeding generations. One would think that this doctrine was the one perhaps the most clearly taught in the Word, but unfortunately there is no teaching of scripture that has not been perverted; this is no exception to the rule, for some people tell us there is no such thing as Sin in the flesh, that emotions are naturally good, that our flesh is clean as far as sin is concerned. Surely, the universal experience of mankind should be sufficient answer to such a contention."

To the above we would add an "answer" of bro. Roberts in THE CHRISTADELPHIAN of 1895, pg. 24:

" 'Sin in the flesh,' is not quite synonymous with 'sinful flesh.' 'Sin in the flesh'<sup>3</sup> is that peculiarity in its physical constitution that inclines to self gratification, regardless of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Observe the Personification of Sin - (J.C.)

<sup>2</sup> From what has proceeded it is evident that by Dr. Thomas's use of the text of the A.V. "sinful flesh", instead of the literal "flesh of sin", some of the precision of Paul's thought is lost. It is of course true that in general "flesh of sin" is "sinful flesh." "Sinful" is a moral term. (J.C.) - Bro. Thomas makes this distinction in "The Bible Doctrine Concerning the Tempter Considered" on pgs 44-53 of this collation - (Editor).

<sup>3</sup> Not "sin-in-the-flesh" as a compound term, but "Sin, in the flesh", as the italicized words below show. - (J.C.)

law of God. 'Sinful flesh' is a generic description of human flesh in its total qualities. It is not quite so analytic as the other phrase. God sent forth his own Son in the likeness (or strictly the identicalness) of human flesh that he might 'in the body of that flesh through death,' condemn sin in the eyes of all the world - *sin in the abstract, sin as the wont and rule of human nature, except in the specially prepared man in whom the sinful tendencies of the flesh were held in check by the superior enlightening power with which he was clothed.*"

We need now to look very briefly at two other passages where the word "sin" is closely connected with Jesus. In 2 Cor. 5:21 we read (R.V.): "Him who knew no sin he hath made to be sin on our behalf that we might become the righteousness of God in him." As we have said above "sin" in this passage cannot be translated "sin offering." In Rom. 8:3 Paul used the technical current term for sin offering; here he does not do so. He says "sin" - the word is the same in the contrasted clauses, and one of them cannot be treated as referring to something other than sin. That does not mean that both words are to be understood in the same sense. From 4:18 onwards to 5:21 we have a long series of paradoxes, and in 5:21 we have sin used in its primary sense and then by metonymy in a secondary but related sense. Jesus knew no sin in that he was sinless; he was made to be sin *on our behalf*, but that cannot mean that he was made a sinner on our behalf. The metonymy is that of effect - he bore the effects of sin in his nature and in his offering himself to "bear iniquities," first in that he shared the mortality that has come by sin, and then in a voluntary death exhibiting that mortality was a righteous appointment of God. Upon that declaration of His righteousness God forgives us our sins and they are therefore described as being borne in his body to the tree.

This was the work of his first advent: it was done once for all. He is now immortal, death has now no more dominion over him. He comes to bring the salvation he wrought out by his sacrifice, to them that look for him. His second advent will be "apart from sin" whether applied to his nature or to his suffering any other effects of sin.