

**CC Walker, John Carter, W.H. Boulton
Henry Sulley, et al.**

**Articles from *The Christadelphian*
1906-1943**

“Our Sins Imputed to Jesus”, C.C Walker, 1933.....	2
Sin, Sins, and Sin-Offering, John Carter 1938	4
The Imputation of Sins – John Bell’s Teaching, CC Walker, 1931.....	6
A Time to Heal, John Cater, 1940.....	8
Winds of Doctrine, John Carter, 1943	12
Epistle to the Hebrews, W.H. Boulton, 1912	14
“A Disposition To Deny That Jesus Offered For His Own Sins”, Henry Sulley, 1912.....	17
Clothing, Flesh and Spirit, CC Walker, 1906.....	18
The Atonement, Henry Sulley, 1921	21
“The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animals”, Robert Roberts, Reprinted 1926	24
Our actual transgressions borne in his body?, HP Mansfield	33
What Edward Turney Renounced in 1873.....	34

“Our Sins Imputed to Jesus”, C.C Walker, 1933

CC Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1933, Page 76-78

“OUR SINS IMPUTED TO JESUS”

P.H.—This, as you truly remark, is quite an unscriptural form of speech, and reflects upon the justice and goodness of God. God does not impute the sins of bad men to a good man. When Israel sinned in the matter of the golden calf, in the days of Moses, and Moses interceded for them, he said, “Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now if thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not, blot me I pray thee out of thy book which thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book. Therefore now, go, lead the people unto the place of which I have spoken unto thee: behold mine Angel shall go before thee: nevertheless on the day when I visit I will visit their sin upon them” ([Ex. 32:31–34](#)). There was no substitution. God would not accept the Mediator of the old covenant as a substitute. Neither does he accept Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant as a substitute. His ways are “equal.” “The soul that sinneth it shall die” ([Ezek. 18](#)). The house of Israel misrepresented God by an offensive proverb which seemed on the face of it to have some show of scripture and reasonableness. But God rebuked them by the prophet, and exhorted them to repentance.

To “impute” is 1, “to charge; attribute; ascribe; reckon as pertaining or attributable.” And there is another dictionary meaning, 3, “to attribute vicariously; ascribe as derived from another: used in theology.” It is here that “theology” is wrong. In the New Testament “impute” is one of several different renderings of the verb *logizomai*, others being “numbered, reckoned, counted, laid to the account of,” etc. But among all the occurrences of “imputed” there is not one that speaks of “our sins being imputed to Jesus.” We read of righteousness being “imputed” or “counted” to Abraham ([Rom. 4](#); [Jas. 2:23](#); [Gen. 15:6](#)). This was because of *his belief in God’s promises*. But we never read of God’s imputing our sins to Another.

In *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, No. 146, and under the text, “By his own blood he entered in once into the Holy place” there occurs the following verse, referring to [Isa. 63](#).:—

“O Saviour, who for Man has trod
The winepress of the wrath of God,
Ascend and claim again on high
The glory left for us to die.”

According to this the crucifixion was the treading of the wine press!

In another book, *Hymnal Companion* (No. 55), we are exhorted to remember that, on Calvary,

“For us he bore the weight of woe,
For us he gave his blood to flow
And met his Father’s anger.”

But the death of Christ was the manifestation of the Father’s *love for the world* ([John 3:16](#)). And it is not “his blood” but “their blood” that flows from the winepress ([Isa.](#)

63:3); his enemies' blood that is to flow to fulfil this word. And when one treads the winepress ("treading down peoples in anger"), he is not himself trodden to death!

But, it is retorted, Is it not written, "He bare the sin of many"? (Isa. 53:12). It is so written; but that is a very different thing from "our sins being imputed to him." The contrast is drawn quite distinctly and sharply in the context. "Surely he hath borne *our grief*, and carried *our sorrows*: yet *we did esteem him* stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But *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. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all . . . although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit found in his mouth."

What is the New Testament exposition of this divine language? How did the Lord "lay upon him the iniquity of us all"? How did he "bear the sin of many"? There is only one true answer, In bearing the *consequences* or *effects* of sin, by obedience even unto *death*; and putting them away by righteousness in resurrection to life eternal. This is obvious even in the context of Isa. 53:12, "and made intercession for the transgressors." "He *ever liveth* to make intercession" (Heb. 7:25); so by reason of his bearing of sin he is himself "saved out of death" (Heb. 5:7. R.V., marg.); "through death" (Heb. 2:14); "through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (13:20). Peter, referring to this matter, holds up the Lord as an example:—"Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow in his steps: Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who when he was reviled reviled not again; when he suffered he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously. Who his own self bare our sins *in his own body* on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."

Originally the words were spoken by the Spirit in the prophet some seven hundred years before the birth of Jesus. The "we," "us" and "our" of the prophet's day were of course not the same as those of the apostles' day, much less of our remote times. The thing in common to all these passing generations of mortal sinners is *the flesh*, and the prophecy concerned the manifestation of the long promised Lamb of God.

There was no divine "imputation of the sins of" any to the Lamb of God, either of past generations or of his contemporaries, and certainly not of generations to come centuries afterwards. But "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," says John. "He took part of flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil" (Heb. 2:14). God "hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. 5:21). It is true that Jesus died "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant" (Heb. 9:15); but upon a very different principle from that of the hypothetical "imputation of the sins of the fathers to Jesus"! Let us "speak as the oracles of God," as we are commanded (1 Pet. 4:11) and not as the "oracles" of the apostasy.

Sin, Sins, and Sin-Offering, John Carter 1938

John Carter, *The Christadelphian*, 1938, Page 127.

(*He is not ashamed to call them brethren.*—Heb. 2 : 11)

Sin, Sins, and Sin-Offering

In *The Christadelphian* of December last we reprinted some words written by brother Roberts on “The Nature of Man and the Sacrifice of Christ.” This was done to set forth once more the teaching of the Bible on a subject upon which there has always been some confusion of thought. The subject is at the heart of most religious controversies, and this is true in connection with the history of the Truth in the last days. The synopsis by brother Roberts was plainly written and well supported by Scripture, and was chosen for these reasons. But we are now exhorted by correspondents, who apparently do not agree with this synopsis, to go back to Dr. Thomas. But a series of propositions which are demonstrated by Scripture quotations takes us back to the final authority on the matter. All that is true in the writings of Dr. Thomas is based on the Word of God, and he would be the first to say, Prove all things by the Scriptures. But what has he to say on the nature of man and Christ’s relationship to that nature? In *Elpis Israel* he says:—

“Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and ‘that which is born of the flesh is flesh,’ *or sin*. This is a misfortune, not a crime. They did not will to be born sinners. They have no choice in the case; for, it is written, ‘The creature was made subject to the evil, not willingly, but by reason of him who subjected it in hope.’ Hence, the apostle says, ‘By Adam’s disobedience the many were made sinners’; that is they were endowed with a nature like his, *which had become unclean, as the result of disobedience.*”

“Mortality was in disobedience as the wages of sin, and not a necessity.”

“The word *sin* is used in two principal acceptations in the Scripture. It signifies in the first place, ‘the transgression of law’; and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and the resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh ‘which has the power of death’; and it is called *sin*, because the development, or fixation, of this *evil* in the flesh, *was the result of transgression*. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled ‘sinful flesh,’ that is, ‘flesh full of sin’; so that *sin*, in the sacred style, came to stand for the substance called man.”

It is possible that having now quoted Dr. Thomas someone will write to say he wrote something else which differs or appears to differ from what we read in *Elpis Israel*. It may or may not be so. But the issue is not whether he wrote on one occasion that which contradicted what he had written elsewhere. Our concern is to get the teaching of the Scriptures; this, we believe, is faithfully given in the extracts quoted.

“Sin is lawlessness,” said John; it is a state where law is not recognised and obeyed: hence “everyone that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness.” With but one exception all the race of mankind have sinned—have transgressed God’s law. Some in John’s day professed a regard for God’s law but made light of sin; but the apostle dismisses this with the assertion that these are opposites—sinfulness is lawlessness. Because all needed the forgiveness of sins Jesus was “manifested to bear sins,” to do which he must be sinless; hence John adds, “and in him is no sin”—no lawlessness, no disobedience. It is of actions and disposition that John is speaking, as the context both before and after the words

show; for John adds, “Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.” Jesus is an example, and those abiding in him follow the life exemplified by him.

It is doing violence to John’s context to take the words “in him is no sin” as proof that Jesus had not the physical nature which Paul describes as “sin¹.” John is thinking of sin in moral terms; but he does not contradict Paul who uses the word of physical condition. In fact, John makes the belief that the physical nature of Jesus was like ours a test of fellowship. “Every spirit (teacher) that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God,” but antichrist. “Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. . . If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.”

We must discriminate between “sin,” “a sin,” and “sins.” Paul says God “hath made Jesus *to be sin* for us, who knew no sin” (2 Cor. 5 : 21). This does not mean that Jesus was a sinner; Paul excludes that, saying in effect, Jesus was made to be sin but was not a sinner. Neither does it mean that Jesus was made a sin-offering. We are aware of the translation of the *Emphatic Diaglott* and of Macknight, and also of Bullinger’s comments. But facts are unaffected by the mistakes of these translators and writers. We can offset them by the names of Weymouth, Goodspeed, the R.V. and others: and then we have to find Paul’s use of the words. Usage in the Septuagint had fixed a phrase as the equivalent of “sin-offering.” When Paul wanted to say “sin-offering” he used the language which had become fixed by the circulation of that version, just as the A.V. has fixed a number of idioms in the English language. He uses the phrase in Rom. 8 : 3 where the R.V. has substituted “for an offering for sin” for the words of the A.V. “for sin.” The *Diaglott* recognises this in this place. Vaughan, a patient Concordance worker, has said “the idea is defined by the constant recurrence of the phrase in the Septuagint (more than 50 times in the book of Leviticus alone) for a sin-offering.”

But while Paul says “for a sin-offering” in Rom. 8 : 3, he says “sin” and not “sin-offering” in 2 Cor. 5 : 21. The same is true of Heb. 9 : 28: “So Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time *apart from sin*, to them that wait for him.” He was not “apart from sin” at the first advent when he was offered to bear sins. The reason is evident: if he had not had our physical nature he could not have been the Redeemer.

In what sense then was Jesus “made sin”? In the sense that “he himself likewise took part of the same” flesh and blood as all the other children who are given him. Therefore “he died unto sin,” having all his life “condemned sin” so that he might be an acceptable “offering for sin.” If we ask where sin was condemned? the apostle says “in the flesh”; on which Dr. Thomas appositely remarks: “Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there.”

The law could not condemn sin; neither can the best of men condemn sin. They loathe it, repudiate it; but are only too painfully conscious of that “evil present with them” which led Paul to describe himself as a “wretched man” because of this body of death. God condemned sin, sending His own son in the likeness of sinful flesh that this might be

¹ Will any dare accuse brother Carter of teaching alienation by nature? Perhaps they do not understand the title of this article.

done. Sin being condemned the way was provided for the forgiveness of the sinner for Christ's sake.

The truth on these matters has been before the Brotherhood for two generations in the following clauses from the Birmingham (Central) Statement of Faith:—

V.—That Adam broke this law, and was adjudged unworthy of immortality, and sentenced to return to the ground from whence he was taken—a sentence which defiled and became a physical law of his being, and was transmitted to all his posterity.

VIII.—That God's promises had reference to Jesus Christ, who was to be raised up in the condemned line of Abraham and David, and who, though wearing their condemned nature, was to obtain a title to resurrection by perfect obedience, and, by dying, abrogate the law of condemnation for himself and all who should believe and obey him.

The literature of the Truth has maintained this teaching. For the sake of those who would examine the subject further we recommend: *The Blood of Christ* (the best exposition of the subject, in our judgment), *The Atonement* (which collects the passages which bear on the subject), and articles contributed to *The Christadelphian* by W.J.Y., ni 1913, p. 531; 1915, p. 106; 1915, p. 343; 1921, p. 489; 1922, p. 310.

The Imputation of Sins – John Bell's Teaching, CC Walker, 1931

CC Walker, The Christadelphian, 1931, Page 364

Theology

An editor brother writes:—"On coming into the brotherhood, having accepted the Truth, with many others, we understood that theology had been abandoned, and the plain and simple teaching of the Scriptures was sufficient." Seeing that the teaching of the Scriptures *is* theology—divinely orthodox theology, this misunderstanding ought not to have been printed and published. Theology (from *theos*, God; and *logos*, doctrine), is the accurate setting forth of the Truth concerning God. It is not *all* "plain and simple"; but, as Paul affirmed, contains a confessedly "great mystery" (1 Tim. 3:16). This was the manifestation of God in the flesh, concerning which there has been disputation between various schools of theology from the days of Jesus in the flesh until now. And Christadelphians are included in this disputation. They ought to be well skilled in theology, in the sense of being able to set forth from the Holy Scriptures the true doctrine concerning God, in relation to the Divine will and purpose concerning the Earth and Mankind.

When Mr. Elliott, the author of *Horae Apocalypticae*, excused himself for the scanty treatment of the opening vision of the Apocalypse, on the ground that "The subject is one rather for the minister, or the theologian, than the prophetic expositor" (see *Eureka*, Vol 1, preface), Dr. Thomas retorted as follows:—

"Mr. Elliott errs in supposing that the primary vision does not come within the scope of the prophetic expositor. The distinction he makes between a minister, theologian, and prophetic expositor, in relation to the interpreter of the Apocalypse, is artificial and unscriptural. No such distinction can be admitted. The book has its beginning in theology, and requires to be theologically interpreted throughout . . ."

Dr. Thomas was good in theology, and his comment on [Psa. 51](#). (which is the occasion of this remark on theology), is greatly to be preferred to some modern utterances thereupon:

“Speaking of the conception and preparation of the Seed, the prophet, as a typical person, says, ‘Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.’ This is nothing more than affirming that he was born of sinful flesh; and not of the pure and incorruptible angelic nature. Sinful flesh, being the hereditary nature of the Lord Jesus, he was a fit and proper sacrifice for sin; especially as he was himself ‘innocent of the great transgression,’ having been obedient in all things.”

Thus Dr. Thomas spoke in *Elpis Israel*. And the saying is unquestionably true. Paul says of Jesus: “He (God) hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him” ([2 Cor. 5:21](#)). In what way did God make Jesus to be sin, other than in making him “of the seed of David according to the flesh,” as Paul otherwise expresses it ([Rom. 1:3](#))? Thus Jesus “took part of the same” flesh and blood ([Heb. 2:14](#)). He was “not of the pure and incorruptible angelic nature,” as Dr. Thomas truly says. Brother Wauchope errs in saying that “the Holy Child Jesus, ‘was holy, harmless, undefiled, and *separate from sinners*’ in the days of his flesh.” He was then not so. [Heb. 7:26](#) is not speaking of “the days of his flesh,” but of the *everlasting priesthood* which he entered by resurrection and ascension to heaven—the “unchangeable priesthood” (v. 24)—“consecrated for evermore” (v. 28). In “the days of his flesh,” he was *in character* “holy, harmless, undefiled,” but in nature “sin,” which he “put away by the sacrifice of himself.”

No Christadelphian says that Jesus was a sinner, like David; but all true Christadelphians admit that being “made of the seed of David” he was “made to be sin.”

The Late Brother Bell and “Error”

Brother Wauchope errs in saying that we declared that brother Bell “did not hold error.” We declared the contrary. He printed and published the statement that Jesus in the days of his flesh was “holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners *in every sense of the term*.” This was and is *error*.

It was alleged that the deceased changed his mind, and we said that we would print and publish anything that might be produced from his papers to show that such was the case.

In the *Shield*, for June, 1931, p. 121, we are now referred to the issue for February, 1906, p. 28, whence the following extract from brother Bell’s writings is quoted:—

“We have said that we hold Jesus to have been clean ‘*in every sense*.’ Much exception has been taken to this by those who are resolved to make us heretic, even at the cost of misunderstanding wilfully or stupidly what we are contending for. Our contention was, *and is*, that in his [Jesus’s] make-up or constitution God used *only clean material*, so that he was *in structure clean*, and that he kept this cleanness undefiled by personal sin right till the end, being thus fitted for a perfect sacrifice. As against this it is held [by others], that an element called “sin in the flesh” was worked into the make-up of Jesus by inheritance from Adam, into whom God implanted it as a punishment, so that he [Jesus] was involuntarily defiled. We say this is not only false in fact, but violates the requirements of reason . . . **But if it be held that Jesus was defiled because of the imputation to him of all the national sins as prophesied in [Isaiah 53](#), and that so he had to be cleansed, let it be clearly understood that we neither object to this, nor**

have we ever taught contrary to it. All that we ask is that men would discern between such an external imputative defilement and that of an unclean composition.

Therefore we should perhaps not have said that we held Jesus undefiled ‘in every sense’ and modify our sayings to that extent.”

This, then (says brother Wauchope), is “chapter and verse,” in one instance, asked for by brother Walker, and we are pleased to be able to produce it to prevent further misrepresentation of our deceased brother Bell.

We have fulfilled our “promise”; but the extent of the late brother’s “modification” of his “sayings” must be left to the judgment of our readers. For ourselves the “modification” is as unsatisfactory as the original “sayings.”

A Time to Heal, John Cater, 1940

John Carter, *The Christadelphian*, 1940, Pages 564-566

A Time to Heal

Careful readers of *The Christadelphian* from December, 1937, onwards will have noticed that there has been a certain emphasis on the Bible teaching concerning the Nature of Man and the Sacrifice of Christ. These are subjects upon which much dispute has arisen in the past—particularly during the early seventies, and at one or two periods later.

Some ecclesias in the U.S.A. for some years have been separated from the ecclesias represented by *The Christadelphian* because of doubts about the teaching of a brother now deceased, and of the attitude of ecclesias to the question of fellowship. The publication of the recent articles on the disputed subject has awakened hopes of a possible reunion of the ecclesias divided on this matter, and already some reunion has been effected. The Petersham ecclesia (Australia) asked the Arranging Brethren of Birmingham Central ecclesia whether they endorsed the statements published in *The Christadelphian* concerning both doctrine and fellowship. They at once replied that in their considered judgment the article in *The Christadelphian*, May, 1940, pages 228–230 set forth the truth in regard to doctrine and fellowship. With this assurance the Petersham ecclesia resumed fellowship.

The Los Angeles ecclesia sent out an appeal (in March, 1940) that in view of the articles published in *The Christadelphian*, ecclesias in America should heal the wounds of division where no grounds for it existed. They circularised the ecclesias in the U.S.A. and Canada quoting the articles in recent issues showing that the barriers to fellowship were now removed, and urging that steps be taken to close up the breaches.

The response to this effort of the Los Angeles brethren has led them to send out a second appeal. In it they indicate the nature of the responses, the desire on the part of most for reunion, and the doubts, sincerely held, in the minds of some whether the right conditions exist for reunion.

This appeal is fourfold in form:

1. To ecclesias who separated from us in 1923, it is wisely pointed out that it would be profitless to engage in discussions on what a deceased brother may have believed and to demand a statement declaring his teaching to be erroneous, especially when some are not sure what the brother taught, but are quite clear what they themselves believe and are in absolute agreement with the Birmingham

Statement of Faith. It urges that if there is doubt about the position of a neighbouring ecclesia they should ask if the statements put forward in the second portion of this appeal are approved.

2. The second portion is addressed to ecclesias who have remained in fellowship with Birmingham Central ecclesia throughout the controversy. It sets out in four items the doctrines to which objection was taken in 1923:

1. That the nature of Christ was not exactly like ours.
2. That the offering of Christ was not for himself, and that Christ never made any offering for himself.
3. That Christ's offering was for personal sins or moral impurity only. That our sins laid on Christ made him unclean and accursed of God, and that it was from this curse and this uncleanness that Christ needed cleansing.
4. That Christ died as a substitute; *i.e.*, that he was punished for the transgressions of others and that he became a bearer of sin by suffering the punishment due for sins.

In six items the truth is set forth:

1. That death came into the world extraneously to the nature bestowed upon Adam in Eden, and was not inherent in him before sentence.
2. That the sentence defiled him (Adam) and became a physical law of his being, and was transmitted to all his posterity.
3. That the word "sin" is used in two principal acceptations in the scriptures. It signifies in the first place "the transgression of law", and in the next it represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death and resolution to dust.
4. That Jesus possessed our nature, which was a defiled, condemned nature.
5. That it was therefore necessary that Jesus should offer for himself for the purging of his own nature, first, from the uncleanness of death, that having by his own blood obtained eternal redemption for himself, he might be able afterward to save to the uttermost those that come unto God by him.
6. That the doctrine of substitution, *i.e.*, that a righteous man can, by suffering the penalty due to the sinner, free the sinner from the penalty of his sin, is foreign to scripture and is a dogma of heathen mythology.

The ecclesias addressed in this portion are asked to state their assent to these statements of truth and to give assurance to ecclesias now separated, and to help reunion.

3. The third portion is addressed to the Birmingham Central Ecclesia. The soundness of this ecclesia is recognised and it is asked to give a clear cut statement that fellowship is only recognised when the truth is held. The readiness to give the assurance when asked by Petersham is approved, and it is urged that fifty ecclesias are now involved, and that to publish a repudiation of the four erroneous statements and an endorsement of the six positive statements of truth, would give immeasurable help to reunion.
4. The fourth portion is addressed to the Editor of *The Christadelphian*. It expresses appreciation of the articles on the controverted subjects which have been published, and asks support in the appeal made for reunion.

We desire to help. In making a further effort, we would like first to try to clarify the position on the doctrines set out. Objections have sometimes been raised that the Statement of Faith is man-made. It is man-made, but how otherwise could we have a statement of what we believe to be the teaching of the Bible? It is because there are great differences among people who acknowledge the authority of the Bible that a definition of what we believe it to teach is essential. Every lecture is, in a way, a statement and demonstration of our belief as to what the Bible teaches. It does not consist of nothing but the words of Scripture, but of propositions attested by citations of Scripture. A statement in the words of Scripture could be accepted by every professing Christian who reserved the right to attach his meaning to them. The objection that it is man-made is not a good one.

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

The need for definition is seen from certain terms which have been the cause of much strife of words. One of these is the word "mortal". As a simple opposite of the word "immortal", we are logically compelled to say that since Adam when made was not immortal, he must have been mortal. But then we have at once to define what we mean by mortal. If we say "capable of dying" it must be admitted that Adam was such. But if we say "subject to death", then it must be denied that Adam was in that state when made. Hence the necessity that terms be clearly defined, and if ambiguous, avoided when an effort is made to set out controverted truth. The matter might be illustrated by the word "perfect". If a thing is not perfect it must be imperfect; but the want of perfection may be due to some marring element, or merely to the fact of being unfinished, which is expressed in Scripture by the word "unperfect". There is the imperfection of flaw and the imperfection of incompleteness.

Some have objected to having one form of words imposed: we have heard objections to the Birmingham Statement being used by other ecclesias. Wise men will not insist about the use of one particular form of words if the same thing is meant. On the other hand, when a particular form of words has come to be recognised and accepted as stating certain truths, wise men will not create doubt or risk misunderstanding by insisting on the liberty of saying the same thing in words of their own choosing, particularly when grave issues are involved.

We willingly declare again our attitude as Editor of *The Christadelphian*, in the hope of helping forward the present effort for reunion. We believe the Statement of Faith to be the best compiled to set out the teaching of the Scriptures. We accept it without reservation and believe it sets forth the minimum that should be believed as a basis of

fellowship. As concerning *The Christadelphian* and fellowship, we have declared that we do not knowingly publish Intelligence from ecclesias who do not accept the teaching set out in the Statement of Faith. We believe that if a man or woman changes their belief it is the honourable course to say so, and resign from fellowship. It is not less so when ecclesias do not subscribe to the doctrines which are commonly believed among us, and which are accepted as the basis upon which fellowship and co-operation can be maintained.

The six statements, acceptance of which is asked, are from the following sources:

(1) is quoted in *The Christadelphian*, 1937, page 553; (2) is the fifth proposition of the Statement of Faith; (3) is from *Elpis Israel*; (5) is from bro. Roberts in *The Christadelphian*, 1873, page 468; (4) and (6) are statements of fact.

We have no doubt that the Central ecclesia will frankly indicate its position. We do not doubt ecclesias in Great Britain are doctrinally sound on this issue. We join in the appeal that ecclesias in Canada and U.S.A. should willingly re-affirm their position if by so doing this division can be healed. It is a time for doing all possible to remove misunderstanding, and so bringing union where there is oneness of mind.

It is a duty to withhold fellowship when error is taught; it is a duty to extend fellowship when "all speak one thing".

The following reply has been sent by the Arranging Brethren of the Birmingham Central ecclesia:

November 17th, 1940.

To the Arranging Brethren of
Los Angeles ecclesia.

Dear Brethren,

We have read carefully your "Second appeal to the ecclesias of the United States and Canada", and in reply to the section addressed to ourselves, we would say that in our judgment the four items of doctrine to which objection is taken in your appeal, are contrary to the Truth, and the six items in which you state the opposite view, are the Truth.

The teaching set out in these six items is embodied in Clauses III. to X. of The Statement of Faith.

We have already declared, as you know, our attitude to these questions in reply to an enquiry from the Petersham ecclesia, and accepting as we do the doctrines set out in The Statement of Faith, we regard them now and have always regarded them as the basis upon which fellowship should be maintained.

We hope that this declaration will help in your efforts to restore the harmony among the ecclesias in America, and our best wishes are with you in what you are doing.

With fraternal greetings,

Sincerely your brother in Christ,

G. T. FRYER,

Recording Brother.

Winds of Doctrine, John Carter, 1943

John Carter, *The Christadelphian*, 1943, Page 195

Winds of Doctrine

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

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

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

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

of death'; and it is called *sin*, because the development, or fixation, of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression." Can it be established that *sin* has this secondary meaning of sinful flesh?

It must be noticed that both the A.V. and R.V. translate **2 Cor. 5:21**, that Jesus "was made to be sin"; but in **Rom. 8:3** the A.V. "and for sin" is changed in the R.V. to "and as an offering for sin." Why have the Revisers in the one place changed "sin" into "offering for sin" and not in the other? The answer, which is fatal to all claims that "sin" means "sin offering" in **2 Cor. 5:21**, is that Paul did not use the same words in both cases. In **2 Cor. 5:21**, he used *hamartia*, but in **Rom 8:3** he used *peri hamartia*. The two statements are therefore not "similar." Were then the Revisers justified in retaining "sin" in **2 Cor. 5:21**? They were justified by the established usage of words. Concerning *kai peri hamartias* (**Rom. 8:3**) it has been truly said "Literally, *and concerning sin*. But the idea is defined by the constant recurrence of the phrase in the Septuagint (more than fifty times in the book of Leviticus alone) for *a sin offering*." When Paul wanted to speak of sin-offering the established phrase was to hand, and he used it. But when he used *hamartia* without *peri* it was because he did not mean sin-offering. Had he meant sin-offering in **2 Cor. 5:21** he would have used the same phrase as in **Rom. 8:3**. The fact that he did not is incontrovertible evidence that he meant something else. That something else was not personal transgression, which is excluded by the words "who knew no sin." "Sin" therefore in the phrase "He made him to be sin," whatever other facts may be included, must, as Dr. Thomas said, mean that he was sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh"; it cannot mean "sin-offering." The usage of *peri hamartia* in the Septuagint can be checked by anyone who has access to Hatch & Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint*. These facts were amply demonstrated in THE CHRISTADELPHIAN 1915, pages 106 and 343 by bro. W. J. Young. But truth needs constant re-assertion.

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

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

Epistle to the Hebrews, W.H. Boulton, 1912

W.H. Boulton, *The Christadelphian*, 1912, Page 160

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Chapter XIII

SACRIFICE.—SHEDDING OF BLOOD.—THE BASIS OF ITS EFFICACY.—PUTTING AWAY SIN

IN accordance with a promise made in the previous chapter, we have now to look at the question of sacrifice with the object of seeing wherein the sacrifice which ratified the New Covenant was superior to those which were offered up in connection with the old. The matter has already received some slight attention in relation to the argument concerning priesthood, but it needs to be considered now in reference to the portion of the epistle at which we have arrived.

Sacrifice is the earliest appointment of religion; its origin is found in the opening chapter of human history. Sin, which caused a breach between God and man, made some means of approach to be necessary, and sacrifice from the earliest times has been the basis of that means. Although not specifically referred to it doubtless took place when coats of skins were provided for Adam and Eve. Throughout patriarchal times it was constantly practised by those who were faithful to God. Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, all built altars and offered thereon sacrifices which God accepted. With the institution of the Mosaic law it became incorporated by divine enactment in the national code of Israel. Daily, weekly, monthly, and annual sacrifices were commanded, and every festival had its accompanying offerings.

It has already been pointed out that this constant repetition of the same sacrifices contained a lesson as to the weakness of the institution in relation to the taking away of sin. To what extent this was realised by the thoughtful Israelite is not clear. One cannot but think that observing the provision for constantly repeated sacrifices, and yet knowing of prophecies which provided for sins being remembered no more, it must have been realised that something far beyond the provisions of the Law was necessary. Those who thus reasoned may perhaps have wondered how such a consummation could be achieved. The New Testament supplies the only answer to the problem.

A first principle in relation to the removal of sin is expressed in the words: "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" (*Heb. 9:22*). This was no new doctrine, for the Law just as clearly expressed the same truth "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul. . . . For it is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life thereof" (*Lev. 17:11, 14*). In harmony with the principle thus enunciated blood was constantly offered upon Israel's altars. But notwithstanding the agreement between the statement and the practice it is said of the latter that "the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered every year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. . . . For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. . . . Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices that can never take away sins" (*Heb. 10:1, 4, 11*). Shedding of blood was essential to the remission of sins;

blood was constantly shed in accordance with the Mosaic legislation; yet it did not avail to the end in view. Why?

The answer to this question is of paramount importance, and nowhere is it more effectively answered than in the Epistle to the Hebrews. That answer may be gathered from two passages, as under, from which, after setting them out, we will endeavour to draw our conclusions.

(1) "But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself . . . So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. 9:26, 28).

(2) "Wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me . . . Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:5, 7).

Two points stand out in these passages, and it was because they were combined in Jesus of Nazareth that he was the one sacrifice for sins for ever, whilst on the other hand neither of them could be associated with the animal sacrifices of the Law. In order to have a right appreciation of the subject, it will be necessary to look somewhat closely at these two points.

1. *In the offering of himself Jesus put away sin. In orthodox circles this statement of the Bible is usually supposed to mean that in some peculiar way which cannot be defined the accumulated sins of all mankind were placed upon Jesus by imputation, and that thereby they were taken away in virtue of his death. Any further meaning is not simply ignored, it is repudiated with scorn. But a little reflection will show that if this were all that was needed, they could have been "imputed" to any Mosaic sacrifice, as indeed, by a figure, they were. There would, therefore, in this respect be no difference between the sacrifices of the Old and New Covenants.* Consequently, this cannot be the meaning of the statement before us. Besides, the law was only a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things. If it were the case that the association between Christ and sin were precisely similar to that which existed between all previous sacrifices and sin, then shadow and substance would be identical in this most essential point, and that would be absurd. No shadow, nor any multiplicity of shadows, can ever equal the substance, which must be real, whilst the shadow is but intangible, though expressive of the substance. The statement that "He put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," clearly implies that in some way sin was associated with Jesus Christ; it is, however, explicitly declared that he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," yet he was the antitype of the High Priest who "offered up sacrifice first for his own sins, and then for the people's" (Heb. 7:26, 27).

The difficulty, if such it may be termed, is only apparent. Sin is a term of double import in the Scriptures; it has a physical as well as a moral meaning. When Adam and Eve were first created sin had no application whatever to them. They were very good. But when, by the sophistry of the serpent, they were led to disobey the command not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, a principle was established within them which is later defined as the law of sin and death. Their nature was defiled, and on the principle that none can bring a clean thing out of an unclean (and such they had by sin become) all descended from them became partakers of their defiled or sinstricken nature. The apostle

Paul is very definite in his references to the matter of sin in the sense of a physical principle innate in human flesh—“The body of sin” (Rom. 6:6). In the seventh chapter of his epistle to the Romans, he writes, “Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence” (verse 8), “sin revived” (verse 9), “sin deceived me” (verse 11), “that sin, by the commandment, might become exceeding sinful” (verse 13), “it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me” (verses 17 and 20), “the law of sin, which is in my members” (verse 23).

The following quotations from *Elpis Israel* will illustrate the point.

“The word sin is used in two principal acceptations in the Scriptures. It signifies, in the first place, ‘the transgression of law,’ and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh ‘which has the power of death,’ and it is called sin, because the development, or fixation, of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled ‘sinful flesh,’ that is, flesh full of sin; so that sin, in the sacred style, came to stand for the substance called man” (page 113).

‘Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature. Hence, the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean. It is therefore written, ‘How can he be clean who is born of a woman?’ ‘Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.’ ‘What is man that he should be clean? And he which is born of a woman that he should be righteous?’ . . . This view of sin in the flesh is enlightening in the things concerning Jesus. The apostle says, ‘God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin’; and this he explains in another place, by saying that He sent His own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh” in the offering of his body once. Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there. His body was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for; for he was born of a woman, and “not one” can bring a clean body out of a defiled body, for “that,” says Jesus himself, “which is born of the flesh, is flesh” (page 114).

The importance of this teaching cannot be over-estimated. John’s warning is most explicit. “Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world” (1 John 4:2, 3). As a member of the race, partaking of sin’s flesh (Heb. 2:14), Jesus was in a position, in harmony with the righteousness of God, which indeed was declared thereby (Rom. 3:25), to receive in himself the sentence pronounced against sin. Thereby “in that he died, he died unto sin once” (Rom. 6:10), and “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” (Rom. 8:3).

The matter is illustrated by the analogous case of the curse of the law. That rested upon every Jew, for the law hemmed him in at every point, and was therefore an effectual barrier to life eternal. That curse needed to be removed, and the method of its removal is indicated in the letter to the Galatians, “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree” (Gal. 3:13). By means over which he had no control, which involved no shadow of fault or responsibility, and which were only incurred by his obedience to the Father in

fulfilling his mission, Jesus was brought under the curse of the law, and was thereby able to bear it away. His birth brought him into relation with the Adamic curse, his death with the Mosaic, and thus the one final act of obedience enabled him to become the Redeemer from both.

Of all Bible teaching concerning Jesus Christ, this is the doctrine upon which orthodoxy mostly stumbles. It is felt that the very suggestion is derogatory to him. Yet why should it be? No one is held responsible for the circumstances into which he is born. The possession of sin's flesh is no disgrace, and implies no stigma. The real effect of the reception of the truth upon this matter is to greatly enhance our appreciation of Jesus. The temptation of an impeccable and immaculate Jesus, and his refusal to yield to such temptation, would convey very little comfort or exhortation to one suffering the enticement of lust ([James 1:14](#)). The triumphant emergence of one who could be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, because he was tempted in all points, like as we are, is a real incentive to every earnest follower who is learning, amid many failures, to crucify the flesh with his affections and lusts.

He once temptation knew,
That he might truly find
A fellow-feeling true
For every tempted mind.

There are many considerations arising out of this fact concerning Jesus Christ which deserve attention. An appreciation of them will strengthen faith, for in this matter the Truth is distinct from every teaching of the Apostasy, and some of the worst troubles in connection with the revival of the Truth in the latter days have arisen through an imperfect understanding of the doctrines regarding sin and its removal through Christ. It is not intended to enter upon an exposition of them here; they are set out in such works as *Elpis Israel*, *The Law of Moses*, *The Slain Lamb*, and *The Blood of Christ*. A perusal and study of these will be helpful to all who wish to realise the beauty of the Divine plan of atonement, a plan which, above all else, reflects the glory of God, and teaches true humility to man. Such a course will lead to the frame of mind exhibited by Paul. "O, the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out! . . . For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever, Amen."

The second reason adduced for the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ must be dealt with in another contribution, as it would considerably extend the present if it were entered upon now, and it is not desirable to pass it by without sufficient consideration.

W. H. BOULTON.

"A Disposition To Deny That Jesus Offered For His Own Sins", Henry Sulley, 1912

Only one thing seemed somewhat to becloud our visit, like a distant fog creeping up over the horizon, *i.e.*, a disposition in some quarters to deny that Jesus offered for his own sins as well as for those of his brethren ([Heb. 7:27; 9:7](#)); which is equal to denying that Jesus came in the flesh; a denial which lies at the root of the first century apostasy from

apostolic doctrine, leading to the doctrine of substitution, namely, that Christ died instead of us, rather than for us.

The passage homeward over the ocean was delightful from every point of view; charming weather, although the time occupied in crossing was extended in consequence of the fact that one of the turbines went out of use during the outward journey of the *Lusitania* to New York. There were plenty of opportunities of interesting conversations with the fellow passengers upon things nearest the heart, especially with a Jewess of a frank, open mind.

Our delight at meeting with the brethren again at Nottingham, on the 24th of June, was great, a sentiment fully reciprocated by them and duly appreciated by us.—HENRY SULLEY.

(The Christadelphian, 1912, Page 561-562. Birmingham: Christadelphian Magazine & Publishing Association.)

Clothing, Flesh and Spirit, CC Walker, 1906

CC Walker, *The Christadelphian*, 1906, Pages 216-218

CLOTHING, FLESH AND SPIRIT

IN some latitudes clothing is a necessity for the preservation of life, but not in others. It was not so in Eden, for the Persian Gulf, at the mouth of the Euphrates, is one of the hottest places on earth. Adam and Eve existed without clothing until sin entered into the world. Clothing was therefore, in the first place, a moral and not a physical necessity. It was a covering for flesh defiled by transgression; and the Lord God, discarding the fig-leaf devices; provided clothing by bloodshedding (the skins of animals), thus early introducing the great principle that “*without shedding of blood there is no remission.*” Thenceforward, in the divine economy, clothing (appointed by God) represented God’s covering for sin, and consequent forgiveness; while nakedness represented sinful flesh given over to shame and death by God.

In the Mosaic economy “linen garments to cover their nakedness” were appointed for Aaron and his sons; and they were to wear them in their ministrations, “*that they hear not iniquity and die*” (Ex. 28:42, 43).

In the natural order of things clothing requires to be changed and washed because it is defiled by the flesh; and, as concerning the natural order of things, no one could make so great a mistake as to affirm that the flesh is clean. It is not without considerable exertion that mortals maintain even a tolerable degree of decency.

So in the divine symbolism, the flesh is always regarded as unclean and defiling; and “filthy rags” (Isa. 64:6), “filthy garments” (Zech. 3:3), “garments spotted by the flesh” (Jude 23, 8–10), “defiled garments” (Rev. 3:4), are representative of “iniquity,” moral corruption, and a dead-alive state like the majority of the ecclesia at Sardis.

Hence a change of raiment and the removal of such garments is the removal of “iniquity,” the end being eternal life. Thus, to the “few” in Sardis, the Lord said, “They have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white for they are worthy.” And the explanation of the “white raiment” is immediately added: “I will not blot out his name out of the book of life” (Rev. 3:5).

Throughout the scriptures the change from flesh to spirit is symbolised by a clothing with new garments. Thus, in [Psa. 132:16](#), it is said of Zion, “I will also clothe her priests with salvation; and her saints shall shout aloud for joy.” Of these priests “clothed with salvation” JESUS is the head, and the firstborn of their order. Of him it is said prophetically by the spirit of Christ in Isaiah, in the chapter which the Lord Jesus quoted in the synagogue at Nazareth concerning himself, “I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God, for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation” ([Isa. 61:10](#)). This “clothing with the garments of salvation” is the subject of the vision of [Zech. 3.](#), where Joshua, the high-priest of the past restoration in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, is represented as a sign of Joshua (JESUS) who shall at last give Israel rest in the Restoration to come. Joshua was “clothed with filthy garments,” which, by the command of God, were taken away: “Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment.” And in the context the angel declared to Joshua that he was a “*sign*” of Yahweh’s servant the BRANCH, who is also the STONE of Israel, and through whom the iniquity of that land is removed “in one day.” This is JESUS, who declares himself to be the Branch or offspring of David, the Stone rejected of the builders of Israel, and the sin-bearer of God’s appointment.

In the days of his flesh Jesus was the subject of a symbolic glorification shortly preceding that actual glorification before symbolised in the prophets. This was the “transfiguration,” concerning which brother Meakin speaks to our edification in another place in this issue. On “the holy mount,” with Moses and Elias, Peter, James, and John, “as he prayed the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glistening.” And Moses and Elias spoke of *his decease* through which he should enter into “*his glory*” thus revealed in symbol beforehand.

Later on, when the time of “his decease” had fully come, he was led out to Golgotha, and, being stripped of his clothing (which was divided among the four soldiers, with the exception of the “coat,” for which they cast lots, according to the scriptures), he was nailed up naked to die! Then was fulfilled his own prophecy to Nicodemus: “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.” There was nothing of “the serpent” in Jesus as concerning the *character* (as there was with the serpents and generation of vipers who crucified him), therefore it can only represent human nature, *i.e.*, sin’s flesh. There was no “iniquity” in Jesus in the sense of *actual transgression*; but there was in the sense of his *partaking of flesh and blood*, of being “made sin for us.” In this *sacrificial putting to death of sin’s flesh*, sin was condemned in the flesh; and in the resurrection of the Holy One to life eternal, “the judgment of this world” and the “casting out of the prince of this world” was perfected ([John 10:18](#); [12:31](#); [14:30](#); [16:11](#)).

On the third day Jesus rose again. He appeared alive and clothed to many witnesses; and afterwards ascended to the divine nature, and at last to the right hand of the majesty on high. While in the flesh he was, in the language of [Hebrews 8:2](#), “the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man.” When his mortality was swallowed up of life, he was, in the language of Paul ([2 Cor. 5.](#)), “clothed upon with his house from heaven.” Thus the *clothing is identified with the nature*. Afterwards he appeared to Paul on the road to Damascus, and “his glory” struck Paul blind. In the symbolic language of the

Apocalypse, he was now “*clothed to the feet,*” or completely enswathed in holy-spirit nature.

Thenceforth *his name* became the covering for sin revealed by God; and believers of the Gospel, in obeying the faith in baptism, were “washed from their filthiness,” “washed away their sins,” in “putting on Christ.” They were thus clothed with Christ as with a garment of fine linen, and the work before them was to keep that garment “unspotted by the flesh” in keeping themselves “unspotted from the world.” To do the works of the flesh, enumerated in [Gal. 6:19–21](#), is to “defile the garments” while to make dead or “mortify” the flesh, in doing the works of the Spirit, enumerated in verses [22–23](#), is to “keep the garments.” Hence the Lord’s exhortation and promise: “his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame” ([Rev. 16:15](#)). A disobedient believer, upon rising from the dead, or being called away to judgment in the land of the living, will find himself morally naked—a thing which Paul contemplated as a dreadful possibility ([2 Cor. 5:3](#)). Such will be left naked—*i.e.*, they will be given over to shame and contempt, and at last to “the second death.” But an obedient saint will be “clothed upon,” like his Lord, with an immortal nature befitting his character, and exalted to the glory and honour of the kingdom of God. Therefore, let us heed the exhortation concerning Jesus, to “Consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, that endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of God.”

To the criticisms on [Zec. 3.](#), appearing in the *Shield* for Feb., pp. 26–28, we feel bound to make a few references.

It is objected that Joshua clothed with filthy garments does *not* represent Jesus burdened with mortality. And Dr. Thomas’ exposition is discarded as though it rested on his *ipse dixit*. It is not so. Dr. Thomas’ reasons are good reasons, as we have shown above.

The vision as a matter of fact had a bearing upon the time and circumstances of the restoration of Ezra and Nehemiah’s days, upon the time of Jesus in the days of his flesh, and upon the restoration that is to come. But the kernel of the whole is JESUS personally.

In Ezra and Nehemiah’s days Joshua was the high priest, and the Satan was the adversary that hindered the work. But Joshua himself was not the subject of any such salvation as was *signified*; and was certainly not exalted to equality with the angels (“places to walk among these that stand by”).

The application to Jesus is shown above, and by Dr. Thomas, and the specification is so clear in the scripture itself, that it has naturally found a place even in the heading of the chapter, no matter what false ideas may be connected with it.

The question, therefore, is only concerning *how* Jesus can be understood to be the subject of a process described in the words, “I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee”? The answer has been indicated above. The flesh is a “body of death” because of sin. Hence, to “partake of the flesh” in the case of Jesus, was to be “made sin for us.” In this way (*and in no other*), “the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all” ([Isa. 53:6](#)). We do not give our “opinions.” We have no “opinions.” “Opinion” implies doubt. We have no doubt. We know. We cite *an apostle’s exposition* of the prophet’s phrase. Peter says: “Who *his own self carried up our sins* IN HIS OWN BODY *to the tree*, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed” ([1 Pet. 2:24](#)).

Therefore to say, as the *Shield* says—that Jesus “had no iniquity to be clothed with”; that “there is no parallel between Joshua and Jesus in [Zech. 3](#).”; and to talk of “*external imputative defilement*,” when the apostle is at pains to indicate *internal actual sin-bearing* “*in his own body*”—all this is to contradict alike prophet and apostle, and to proclaim oneself quite incompetent rightly to divide the word of truth on the matter. To refer slightly to “the theory of an unclean Jesus”; and to “contend” that “in His make up or constitution God *used only clean material*” is to say that *sin’s flesh is clean* and to take a good step on the road with those who at last made the Virgin Mary immaculate. **The *Christadelphian* cannot possibly give place to such doctrine, which was resisted over thirty years ago. If the *Shield* shelters error, the sword of the spirit will certainly be wielded against it, if not by the *Christadelphian*, at least by some of those who fight the good fight of faith, without malice, and without respect of persons.** The *Lamp* that shed the light-that-was-darkness upon the troubled scene thirty years ago has long since flickered out. So it will be with all error; only the truth is abiding. But the present interaction of truth and error is educating the children of God. It was ever thus, and will be so till “sin and death shall curse the earth no more.”—ED.

The Atonement, Henry Sulley, 1921

Henry Sulley, *The Christadelphian*, 1921, Pages 534-537

THE ATONEMENT

BY BROTHER H. SULLEY

(Continued from page 502.)

“*In all points tempted like his brethren yet without sin*” ([Heb. 4:15](#)).

JESUS must have fully understood why his Father required him to die. A reason aptly expressed in subsequent apostolic comment on his sacrifice, thus: “God *condemned sin in the flesh*” ([Rom. 8:3](#)). “He *hath made him sin* for us who knew no sin.” Obviously, these two testimonies shew that there is a *state* of sin, or “*constitution* of sin” in human nature. That which leads to sin being described as sin. Consequently, impulses in man contrary to the will of God are sinful. Does this truth imply that temptation is sin? By no means. There is no law against impulses aroused by temptation if those impulses are resisted, therefore sin is not imputed to those who experience them, otherwise temptation would be *sin*. Of temptation we read:

“Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and *enticed*.”

“Then when lust hath *conceived*, it bringeth forth *sin*; and *sin*, when it is finished, bringeth forth death” ([Jas. 1:14, 15](#)).

Here reference is made to three processes:

1. *Every man is tempted when he is enticed by lust, or desire*. Into this state every man comes involuntarily.

2. *When desire hath conceived it bringeth forth sin*” ([Matt. 5:28](#); [1 John 3:15](#)), *whether the object of desire is attained or not*.

Thus it is written: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart” (Matt. 5:27, 28). “Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer” (1 John 3:15).

These testimonies are startling indications where sin *begins*, and are sober invocations to righteousness, because Jesus said: “Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 5:20). [Here it may be observed that under the Mosaic law judgment was meted out against overt actions, but those “under law to Christ” will be judged for wicked words and evil thoughts. (See Matt. 5:21–30; Acts 8:18–23.)]

3. *Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death*” (James 1:15; Rom. 6:23).

In Jesus we see one who, according to the first condition, was made sin, *i.e.*, was constituted of sinful flesh or of human nature, but never passed into the second state, for he instantly repelled any and every impulse contrary to his Father’s will, as illustrated in temptation by the devil, by Peter, and in the garden of Gethsemane.

4. Into the third state Jesus passed voluntarily, not as a *penalty*, because he never transgressed God’s commandments, but in order that he might be delivered from the power of sin in himself, “in that he died, he died unto sin once” (Rom. 6:10), and also that he might deliver others, “So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time *without sin* unto salvation” (Heb. 9:28).

Now it is written that “The law was our schoolmaster unto Christ” (Gal. 3:24). It may also be said that it was *the schoolmaster* to Christ, because “the law was ordained to eternal life” (Rom. 7:10; Luke 10:25–27). It called forth in him perfect obedience, obedience which necessitated faith and self-sacrifice, because of the precept: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength”; and the precept. “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Mark 12:29–31) involves self-sacrifice. In fact, if those two precepts are observed, to die for others is a necessary corollary.. By the exercise of this faith it may be said that Jesus earned eternal life, for he manifested perfect faith and complete and whole-hearted subjection to the mind and will of God in loving response to the manifestation of the love of his Father to him. He kept the first commandment, *i.e.*, He loved God with all his heart, soul, and strength, always doing that which pleased his Father. He kept the second commandment, loving his neighbour as himself by permitting himself to be slain—pouring out his soul (blood) unto death—yea, in anticipation of the event, saying, This is my blood, shed *for the remission of sins*, and this is *my body*, broken for you.

Now also it is written that although the law was ordained to eternal life it was powerless to effect that result and to condemn sin because of the weakness of the flesh. “What the law could not do,” God did in Jesus, when “by His determinate counsel and foreknowledge He delivered him to be slain” (Rom. 8:3; Acts 2:23). Seeing then that the life blood must be poured out in order to deliver from sin, seeing that Jesus did not sin, notwithstanding the weakness of the flesh, it was impossible for the Father to leave His son in the grave (Acts 2:24), “because he (Jesus) saw the Lord always before his face, he was on his right hand that he could not be moved.” Therefore, “his heart always rejoiced.” Moreover, the flesh of the Anointed One “rested in hope,” because his Father

“would not leave his soul in hell, neither suffer *His Holy One* to see corruption” (*ibid.* verses 25–27).

In permitting himself to be crucified, Jesus, by his obedience of the law came under its curse, therefore the law which cursed an obedient, righteous man is abolished, and the gift of eternal life becomes available upon the principle of “the righteousness of faith.” Jesus fully exhibited that righteousness, for what greater faith can a man exhibit than permitting himself to be slain, believing that God will raise him from the dead. In this way, Jesus becomes a medium for delivering from death those who transgressed under the first covenant (**Heb. 9:15**). Thus it is written that he “*Abolished in his flesh the enmity, the law of commandments in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, making peace.*” “And that he might reconcile both unto God in one *body* by the cross, having slain *the enmity* (Marg., *in himself*)” (**Eph. 2:15–116**).

Now, after transgression Adam was a body of sin. This “old man” Jesus and his brethren inherit from him. Physically, Jesus was one with his brethren in this respect—an extension of Adam’s being—“made of a woman” (**Gal. 4:4**). Therefore, our “*old man* crucified with him that *the body of sin might be destroyed,*” is that flesh and blood nature whose impulses led Adam to transgress God’s laws.

A dual result was accomplished in the death of Jesus, viz., deliverance from the power of sin (**Heb. 2:14**) and the abolition of the law (**Gal. 3:13**).

The method adopted by the Father for removing the evil which ensued in consequence of Adam’s transgression illustrates his *righteousness* and *unchangeableness*. Without abrogating the law of sin and death, the bestowal of the Mosaic law opened the way for the removal of its effects by causing its precepts to meet on Jesus, who fulfilled that law in its minutest details. In obedience to that law he freely offered himself as a sacrifice, and thus came under its curse, “for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree” (**Gal. 3:13**). Since the law cursed a righteous man, its abolition in Christ was a justifiable procedure. “He hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross” (**Col. 2:14**), Sin being crucified in Jesus, “Who magnified the law,” and honoured his Father in his death. Therefore, “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**).

Thus was illustrated another law, viz., “The righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all that believe” (**Rom. 3:22**). “Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: 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 which believeth in Jesus” (*ibid.* verses 24–25).

In this we have the most remarkable illustration of the way in which one law may be neutralised by another, after the example of the law of Medes and the Persians. Mordecai was not permitted to alter the edict given under the King’s Seal for the destruction of the Jews, but another edict permitting them to defend themselves brought to nought the evil designs of the enemy. Similarly, “a law” in our members which leads to sin and death is neutralised and its ultimate effects removed in the case of those who are redeemed in Jesus Anointed.

Yet again, if even the Son of God, who was righteous, could not be delivered from the motions of sin in human flesh without dying, the law of sin in our members cannot be

a barrier to the gift of eternal life to those who do “not sin after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.” For: “God hath set forth (Jesus) to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; To declare at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus” (Rom. 3:25, 26). Just upon the same principle that death passed upon all men on account of one that sinned, so the righteousness of one brings eternal life upon all that believe in Jesus (Rom. 5:12–21). In the one case all men are helplessly involved in the results of the sin of one man, through no fault of their own (Rom. 8:20). In the other case they become entitled to eternal life through the righteousness of one, by voluntarily confessing their own personal sins and belief in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead (Acts 2:38; 22:16; 8:12).

The idea of a trinity of gods discussing ways and means of saving fallen humanity, and one of the three asking the others to be sent on a redeeming mission, would, apart from its tragic consequences, be very comical. For this third party in the trinity to contract and come forth as a babe from Bethlehem, like the genie of some Arabian story, must invite ridicule in those who expect a reason for the hope of the believer. The fact is that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself (2 Cor. 5:19), so that from the very beginning when sin came into the world by transgression, the means of deliverance was promised to the woman. She was told that her seed would bruise the head of the serpent (Gen. 3:15) and the manner of accomplishing this was foreshadowed in the antitypical covering of skins obtained from slain animals (*ibid.* verse 21). In due time the medium of reconciliation was manifested. Thus we read: “He (Jesus) made of a woman, a man approved of God by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you. . . Him, being delivered by *the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God*, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain” (Acts 2:22, 23).

In this way Jesus became the Sin-bearer, the Lamb *provided by the Father*, for delivering from sin and death those who come unto God through him. Moreover, the deliverance from death through the righteousness of faith precludes any glorifying of the flesh (1 Cor. 1:29; Rom. 3:20–22). “For God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all.” “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!” “How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!” “For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?” (Rom. 11:32–36). “Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?” “For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever.” *Amen.*

“The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animals”, Robert Roberts, Reprinted 1926

Robert Roberts, *The Christadelphian*, 1926, Page 357

QUESTIONS AND QUESTIONS

OVER fifty years ago, namely, in 1873, certain wrong ideas concerning the nature of Christ and of his sacrifice were introduced which are briefly defined in *Robert Roberts: An Autobiography*, pp. 333–5, and in the “proposition” quoted below. Although the main errors were overcome and rejected at the time, fragments thereof continue to crop up, and

it seems to be well to reprint these “questions” and arguments to meet these at the present time. It may be well to add that we know of no one anywhere who would now contend in favour of the “proposition” as here stated.

QUESTIONS AND QUESTIONS

For the consideration of all who believe the Renunciationist theory, as defined in the following proposition.

That the body of Jesus did not inherit the curse of Adam, though derived from him through Mary; and was therefore not mortal; that his natural life was “free”; that in this “free” natural life, he “earned eternal life,” and might, if he had so chosen, have avoided death, or even refused to die upon the cross, and entered into eternal life alone; his death being the act of his own free will, and not in any sense necessary for his own salvation; that his sacrifice consisted in the offering up of an unforfeited life, in payment of the penalty incurred by Adam and his posterity, which was eternal death; that his unforfeited life was slain in the room and stead of the forfeited lives of all believers of the races of Adam.

1.—It is written, that “Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to CONFIRM THE PROMISES MADE UNTO THE FATHERS” (Rom. 15:8). It is further written, that “He is *the mediator of the new covenant*, that BY MEANS OF DEATH . . . they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance; for where a testament is, *there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.*” Confirmatory of these declarations, Jesus, at the last supper, in handing the wine to his disciples, said, “This is the new testament IN MY BLOOD” (Luke 22:20). *Query:* Could the covenants of promise have been brought into force without the death of Jesus the testator?

2.—If not, how could Jesus, without dying, have obtained his portion of the covenant? seeing the promises (to Abraham) were “to thee and to THY SEED,” “which,” says Paul (Gal. 3:16), “IS CHRIST”; and the promise to David was, “I will establish the throne of *his kingdom for ever*” (2 Sam. 7:13).

3.—Jesus being included in the covenants of promise, and the covenants being of no force without his death, did he not in this sense, in dying, die for himself, as well as for all others interested therein?

4.—Jesus tells us (Jno. 10:18) that he had received a commandment from the Father, to lay down his life, by submitting to be crucified. If Jesus had disobeyed this command, would he not have committed sin? If so, could he have been saved? How was it possible, then, that he could “enter eternal life alone”?

5.—And seeing his obedience unto death (Phil. 2:9) was a necessity to his own acceptance with the Father, did he not in this obedience, obey for himself as well as for the joint heirs (Rom. 8:17)? And seeing that obeying in this case was dying, did he not in dying, die for himself as well as for his brethren? (Other questions will bring it closer than this.)

6.—Jesus, in speaking of his death, says, “*For this cause* came I unto this hour” (Jno. 12:27); further, that “the Son of Man is come to give his life a ransom for many”; further, that this was the will of Him who had sent him, and whose will he had come to do. He was introduced to Israel as “The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world” (Jno. 1:29) “by the sacrifice of himself” (Heb. 9:26); and Paul testifies that he was made a little lower than the angels, expressly *for the suffering of death* (Heb. 2:9). Does it not appear on the evidence, that the very work he was sent into the world to do was *to die*?

Could he have “earned eternal life” without doing the work the Father sent him to do? If not, could he “earn eternal life” without dying? If not, is it not a violation of the wisdom of God for anyone to speak of the possibility of his claiming eternal life before his death, and entering into the enjoyment of it alone? (If Adam in Eden had been appointed to die, could you have said his life was “free”? Who can make “free” from the appointment of God?)

7.—Peter testifies that “Christ hath suffered for us *in the flesh*” (1 Pet. 3:18; 4:1). What flesh was this? Was not this the flesh of his brethren? (Eph. 5:30; Heb. 2:16). If so, was it not mortal flesh? And if “mortal flesh,” was it not as much under destination to die as the mortal flesh of all men? If not, how can it be the flesh of “the children”?

8.—Is not our destination to die an inherited physical law in the flesh, resultant in the first instance, from the sin of Adam, and, therefore, called sin? If not, in what sense has death passed upon all men? But it is not a matter of argument. We see every day that a fixed tendency to dissolution is a quality of the flesh of Adam. Can a man partake of the flesh of Adam and not partake of this? Where is the testimony that he can? (An opinion is worth nothing.)

9.—Why was Jesus “put to death in the flesh” of Adam? Paul says it was that “THROUGH DEATH he might *destroy that having the power of death.*” If “that having the power of death” was not in his body, how could he “through death” destroy it? On the other hand, how could he be a body of the flesh of Adam without also having in himself that which was “the power of death” in it?

10.—You say that the body of Christ was not sinful flesh, but “a likeness” of it? In what did the *likeness* flesh consist of if it was not of the same sort? It is testified that he was made in “the *likeness* of men” (Phil. 2:8). Would you, therefore, say he was “not a man, but a likeness of one?” If not—if you say he was a man, though Paul says he was made in the likeness, why not say he was sinful flesh though Paul says he was sent in the likeness of it?

11.—Paul says that God, sending forth His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, “*condemned sin in the flesh*” (Rom. 8:3). How could this have been if there be no such thing as “sin in the flesh,” and if Christ was “not sinful flesh but a likeness of it”?

12.—Moses says that Adam begat a son “in his own *likeness*” (Gen. 5:3). Does this mean that the son so begotten was, in any sense, of a dissimilar nature to his father? If you say No, as you are bound to, why do you contend that a “likeness of sinful flesh” is dissimilar to sinful flesh itself?

13.—When Christ spoke of laying down his life, did he not refer to his voluntary (as regards men) submission to a violent death? If he meant that he was not mortal, and that away from a violent death, he would not have died, how are we to understand John’s exhortation to “lay down our lives for the brethren?” (1 John 3:16). Did John mean that in the ordinary course, those to whom he wrote would not die?

14.—Peter says, “He bore our sins in his own body on the tree” (1 Pet. 2:24; Isa. 53:6).

Does this mean the very acts of disobedience themselves or their effects? As the former is inadmissible, it must be the latter. If he bore their effects in his body, was not his body mortal which is the effect of sin?

15.—If you say that our sins were laid on him in the same way as they were laid on the sacrificial animals in the Mosaic system of things (which was a mere

ceremonial or artificial imputation), how comes it that those sacrifices never could take away sins? (Heb. 10:2); and where, then, is the substance of the shadow? The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animals was the type; the real putting of sin on the Lamb of God in the bestowal of a prepared sin-body wherein to die, is the substance.

16.—Paul says that they who commit transgressions are “worthy of death” (Rom. 1:32), and that “the end of these writings is death” (Rom. 6:21). Is there any difference in point of fatality between sentence of death for these things, and the hereditary sentence of death upon Adam?

17.—As you will not say that death is more fatal than death, howsoever incurred, tell me how it is that you think that death on Adam’s account would have destroyed Christ, while believing that death because of our offences had no such effect?

18.—Even if we “sinned in Adam,” in the personal sense contended for on behalf of your theory, did Christ not bear the effect of that as well as all our other offences? If so, did he not come under Adamic condemnation? If not, is our sin in Adam untaken away, and in that case, how can we be saved?

19.—John testifies that Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2), and this reaches backward before Christ’s time, as well as forward; as is evident from Paul’s statement that Christ died “for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament.” On what ground is Adam to be excluded from the scope of this provision? Did not the coats of skin provided in Paradise (Gen. 3:21) convey an intimation that his sins could be covered? Is it not evident from this consideration that Adam’s condemnation, as well as ours, rested on Christ?

20.—David was a mortal man. Was not Jesus “made of the seed of David according to the flesh”? If so, was not the flesh of Jesus mortal likewise? If so, why? Was it not the effect of hereditary condemnation? If he was not mortal, how could it be the flesh of David which *was* mortal?

21.—Was not Jesus the son of David? If you believe this, which you cannot deny in the face of so much explicit testimony, are you not bound to admit that he was son of Adam? If David was son of Adam, and Christ was son of David, is not Christ the son of Adam also? Does not Luke carry his paternity back to Adam? (Luke 3:31). His sonship to Adam through Mary being unquestionable, does it not follow that equally with us, he inherited mortality from him?

22.—Did Adam experience evil before disobedience? You are bound to answer No. What parallel then can there be between him in that state, and Jesus in the days of his flesh, experiencing weakness, grief, pain and death?

23.—If Jesus did not hereditarily participate in these effects of sin, how came they to be his portion in the days of his weakness, down even to the particular of eating his bread by the sweat of his brow? (Mark 6:3).

24.—If he had not patiently endured these things for the joy set before him, would he have been accepted? As you must say, “No,” does it not follow that in this sense he suffered them for himself, while for us also?

25.—Were they not results of sin, and though he was personally righteous, did he not suffer them in himself for his own proof? and if he had working within him *one* result of sin, upon what principle will you deny the presence in him of its one great result—hereditary mortality in the flesh?

26.—If Jesus Christ, in the days of his flesh, was in the same position as Adam before disobedience, why did Christ experience evil and Adam not? How could he be in the same position in which Adam was before disobedience, seeing he was born of a woman who inherited the results of that disobedience, and that which is born of the flesh is flesh?

27.—Paul says, “God hath made Jesus to be sin” (2 Cor. 5:21). How is this to be understood, if death, the wages of sin, had no hold on him? Was he not made sin in being made of a woman, who was mortal because of sin, and could only impart her own sinful flesh to a son begotten of her?

28.—Paul says (Heb. 9:28) that Christ will appear the second time *without sin* unto salvation. This is equivalent to saying that the first time was not without sin. In what sense did he come the first time with sin if his flesh was not sinful flesh, and the law of sin had no hereditary claim?

29.—If you say it means a sin-offering, can you explain how it comes that a sin-offering is expressed by the word “sin,” if the sin-offering is in no sense sinful? and how do you in that case understand Paul’s statement (Rom. 6:10), that when he died, he died *unto sin* once? He did not die unto a sin-offering; but in making himself a sin-offering, he died unto sin. If the hereditary law of sin wrought in his members unto death, as in the members of his brethren, we can understand how in dying, he died unto sin; for, as Paul says (verse 7), “he that is dead, is freed from sin,” sin having no more claim after that; but how can you understand it?

30.—Then, suppose we accept your paraphrase of it, and read for “sin,” “sin-offering,” in what did the sin-offering consist? Was it not his body, even as Paul says, that “we are sanctified through the offering of *the body* of Christ once?” (Heb. 10:10). And in what sense can his body be called sin, if it was clean from the hereditary effects of the sin-nature from which it was extracted?

31.—Paul says (Gal. 4:4), that Jesus in being born of a woman, was “made under the law,” which law he tells us in 2 Cor. 3:7, was a “ministration of death.” Now, why was Jesus made under this death-ministrant law? If you answer according to Paul, you will say, to redeem them that were under it. Does it not follow from this, that in the divine process of redemption, the Redeemer had to be personally subject to the law to be redeemed from?

32.—How, on your theory of redemption, as applied to the Edenic law, can you make out this to have been necessary? If the life of a free, uncompromised man, standing outside the Edenic law, could be accepted in substitution for that of offenders under that law, why could not the life of a free, uncompromised man, outside the Mosaic law, have sufficed, in the same manner, to redeem those who were under it?

33.—Does not your new-Adam theory, in fact, require that Jesus should have been born not under but outside of the law?

34.—Not only so, but consider how redemption from the Mosaic law was effected. You are aware that under this law, “he was made a curse,” though he never broke it. You are further aware that this being made a curse did not simply consist in dying, but that it laid personal hold on him through the mode in which he was killed. “He that hangeth on a tree is accursed of God.” Presuming you will not say that any of God’s ways are unnecessary, are you not bound to admit from these premises, that before Jesus could deliver those who were under the curse of the law of Moses, it was necessary that he himself should come under that curse, though guiltless?

35.—If so, was it not equally necessary that he should come personally under the operation of the Adamic curse, in order to redeem those who were under it?

36.—As a matter of fact, did he not come under that curse in precisely the way we do, in being born of woman condemned?

37.—For what is the curse? Is it a sentence passed on us personally, or is it an inherited condition of our physical nature? The former you will not maintain, and the latter you are obliged to accept.

38.—Upon which comes the question, Was not Christ's physical nature the same as ours? In saying "Yes," which you are obliged to do if you speak according to the Word, you concede the whole question, and must renounce the Renunciationist theory.

39.—If you take refuge in the new-born quibble about life, I must ask you What is life in relation to us? Is it not organism in a vital state?

40.—Can you have human life without human organism? And is not the character of the life determined by the character of the organism? Thus, out of the same materials, does not dog organism generate dog life, horse organism horse life, and human organism human life? (assuming the distinction between life and organism merely out of accommodation to the theory).

41.—These things being undisputed does it not follow that the body of Jesus was the Adamic organism, generated in the womb of Mary, in the ordinary gestatory period, possessed and manifested Adamic life? (employing that phrase merely out of accommodation to the new theory).

42.—How can a man's flesh be condemned without the life generated in it being condemned also?

43.—And if the flesh of Christ was not condemned, how could the flesh of Christ be the flesh of David, Moses and Abraham, seeing that the flesh of these fathers was in that state of death-constitution through extraction from Adam?

44.—You seem to consider hereditary mortality in Adam more fatal than death incurred by individual delinquency. In other words, you call it "eternal death" apart from a Redeemer. If in this you are right, how comes it that the law of Moses would have given eternal life if the flesh had been equal to the keeping of it? Paul says it was "ordained to life" (Rom. 7:10). Showing that this meant eternal life, Jesus, in answer to the question how eternal life was to be attained, said, "What is written in the law? How readest thou? Keep the commandments. This do, and thou shalt *live*." But Christ was the only man that ever kept the law without fault, and he was God-manifest in the flesh by the Spirit, for the purpose. All others were unable to keep it. Hence the law was "weak through the flesh." If men had been able to keep it, obedience would have led to resurrection after Adamic death, as in the case of Christ. God does not hold us individually responsible for Adam's offence. We inherit the effects, but could have been redeemed from them by obedience, if that had been possible. But how, according to your construction of Adamic death, could obedience have led to "eternal life"?

45.—Besides, if the Adamic penalty was eternal death, and the death of Christ was the suffering of that penalty in our stead would not his resurrection, in that case, have been impossible?

47.—It is truly testified that Christ died "for us"; but it is evident that the phrase "for us" means on account of us, and not instead of us. It is not only testified that he died for us, but that he died for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3). Does this mean instead of our sins? So

while it is said that he was sacrificed for us (1 Cor. 5:7), it is also said he was sacrificed for sins (Heb. 10:12). Should you understand he was sacrificed instead of our sins?

48.—It is testified (Luke 1:69) that God “hath raised up *for us* a horn of salvation.” Does this mean raised up instead of us?

49.—It is testified (Rom. 4:21) that Christ was raised again *for* our justification. Does this mean instead of our justification?

50.—It is testified (Rom. 8:34) “that Christ also maketh intercession *for us*.” Does this mean instead of us? (See also Heb. 9:24; 10:20.)

51.—So also with the statement, “Christ died *for them*” (2 Cor. 5:15). If this means instead of them, how are we to understand the following statements: “I pray *for them*” (John 17:9); “He ever liveth, to make intercession *for them*” (Heb. 7:25); “Spirits sent forth to minister *for them*” (Heb. 1:14, etc.)?

52.—But though the appearance of Jesus in the flesh, and all that he went through, was “for us,” surely you will not deny that in all he did *for us*, he was individually comprehended as the elder brother of the family. For instance, his birth was for us; “hath raised up *for us* an horn of salvation in the house of his servant, David;” but was his birth not for himself also? If he had not been born, where would have been the Messiah and the glory to be revealed? I could understand a Trinitarian saying that it was unnecessary for him to be born for himself; but one believing that Christ was the Son of God from his mother’s womb, and that the Deity in him was the Father, is bound to recognise the fact that Christ was not only born for us, but born for himself as well.

53.—Again, Christ was obedient for us, as is manifest from the testimony, “*By one man’s* OBEDIENCE many shall be made righteous;” but was he not obedient for himself as well? If he had been disobedient, would HE have been 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” (Heb. 5:7).

54.—So he died *for us*; but did he not die for himself also? How otherwise could he have been made free from that sin which God laid upon him in sending him forth in the likeness of sinful flesh? Paul says that “he that is dead is freed from sin,” and that, “in that Christ died, he *died unto sin once*,” being raised from the dead, death hath *no more* DOMINION *over him* (Rom. 6:7, 9, 10). Is it not clear from this that the death of Christ was necessary to purify his own nature from the sin-power of death that was hereditarily in him in the days of his flesh?

55.—If to this you object, let me call your attention to Paul’s definition of the priesthood which Christ took not to himself, but received from the Father: “Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, for that he himself also is compassed with infirmities, and by reason hereof, he ought, as for the people, *so also for himself*, to offer for sins” (Hebrews 5:2, 3).

56.—Again, if Christ’s offering did not comprehend himself in the scope of it, how are we to understand the statement of Paul that he “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. 7:27).

57.—As Christ was the antitype of the high priest who “went alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered *for himself* and for the errors of the people” (Heb. 9:7), is it not required that his sacrifice should comprehend himself as well as his people in the effect of its operation?

58.—If you deny this most obvious conclusion, how do you explain the fact that the Messiah Prince in the future age, at the restored feast of the Passover, “shall prepare *for himself* and for all the people of the land a bullock for a sin offering”? (Ezek. 45:22). Do you deny that the sacrifices in the future age are memorial, like the breaking of bread, of what has been, in the same way as the sacrifices under Moses are typical of what was to be? Presuming you are scripturally enough informed to give the right answer to this, let me ask how the Messiah’s offering for himself, as well as for the people, can be a memorial offering, if Christ in dying for us did not die for himself as well?

59.—To put it in a simpler form, in whatever sense our sins were laid on Christ, did they not, for the time being, become his; and, if so, did it not require his death that he might be purified from them, and in this sense, in dying for us did not he die for himself as well?

60.—It is testified that he rose again for our justification, but was it not for his own justification as well? If not, how do you understand Paul’s declaration, that in rising, he was “justified in the Spirit”? (1 Tim. 3:16).

61.—He ascended to heaven to appear in the presence of God for us (Heb. 9:27); but was not this also for his own exaltation and glory? If not, what mean the words of Peter and Paul, “that because of his obedience, God hath highly exalted him” “to his right hand” (Phil. 2:9; Acts 2:33: 5:31).

62.—He is coming again for us (John 14:3; Heb. 9:29); but is he not coming for himself also, that he may see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied (Isa. 53:11), and be glorified and admired in all them that believe? (2 Thess. 1:10).

63.—It is all “for us,” but is he not included, as the first-born among the many brethren, whom, as captain, he leads to glory? (Rom. 7:29; Heb. 2:9).

64.—Your theory alleges that Christ in dying, paid the debts we owed on account of our sins. If this unscriptural representation of the case were true, would it not follow that forgiveness was ours as a matter of fact, as soon as he died? and if so, how comes it to pass that remission of sins is only attainable by believing and obeying the gospel?

65.—And in that case would not forgiveness be a right to be claimed. If another man pays my debt, can I not of right claim exemption from the demand of my creditor? And if divine forgiveness is of this order (viz., remission because of satisfaction obtained), how comes it that Paul says that “the remission of sins that are past” is “through the FORBEARANCE of God?” (Rom. 3:25). And how are we in that case to understand the class of declarations abounding in the apostolic epistles, of which the following are examples: “God hath shut up all in unbelief, that he might have MERCY upon all” (Rom. 11:32). Again, “According to his MERCY he saved us” (Titus 3:4). “The FAVOUR of God that *bringeth salvation*, hath appeared” (Titus 3:11), “being *justified freely by his GRACE*, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 3:24). “God was in Christ *reconciling the world unto HIMSELF*, not imputing their trespasses unto them” (2 Cor. 5:19). Again, “Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ TO HIMSELF, *according to the good pleasure of his will*, wherein HE hath made us accepted in the beloved” (Eph. 1:5). Do not these scriptural representations exclude the idea that we are saved, because Christ has “satisfied” God by “paying our debts?”

66.—Do you believe God is just and righteous? How then can you accept a theory which represents Him as requiring the death of one who under no law of His could righteously be required to die?

67.—If Christ inherited Adamic mortality, was not his death in that case in harmony with the righteousness of God?

68.—Wherein lay the “help” laid upon Christ by God for us? Was it not in the power of obedience in conception imparted to him, for was it not his obedience that brought resurrection and life? If you say the “help” lay in “free life” (a thing about which the Scriptures are silent), are you not committed to the conclusion that our “help” vanished when that “free life” was destroyed in death?

69.—I could understand the possibility of “free life” being “help” if it was necessary for the deliverer to be exempt from death, but seeing the necessity lay just the other way, that is, that he should “taste of death,” is it not absurd, as well as unscriptural, to call his life “free”?

70.—Was not Jesus God manifest in the flesh? If you say that Adam was God manifest in the flesh as well (but surely no one would go to such a depth of meremanism), how comes it that the only place where Christ is called Adam, introduces Christ as *a contrast* to Adam, saying, “The first man is of the earth, earthy, the second Adam is *Lord from heaven?*”

71.—If Jesus was God manifest in the flesh and Adam was not, is it not clear that you are precluded from drawing that parallel between them which your new theory assumes throughout?

72.—Does not the difference lie here, that in Adam man loses himself, and in Christ, *God* saves him, that salvation may be of grace and not of works, lest any man should boast?

73.—If Christ be a new Adam, merely succeeding where the other failed, was he not a mere man, and in that case is not Renunciation mere-manism of the most definite character?

74.—Your theory compels you to teach that the flesh is not a sinful but a good thing. How do you reconcile with such a doctrine the continual disparagements of the flesh with which the Scriptures abound? Thus, “If ye walk after the flesh ye shall die” ([Rom. 8:13](#)); “He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption” ([Gal. 6:8](#)); “In my flesh dwelleth no good thing” ([Rom. 7:18](#)).

74a.—Paul says the substance of the law or things foreshadowed in it are to be found in Christ ([Col. 2:17](#); [Rom. 2:20](#); [Heb. 9:23](#); [10:1](#)). This being so, can your theory furnish the antitype to the High Priest offering for himself? ([Lev. 16:6](#)).

75.—Can your theory furnish the antitype to the scarlet which entered into the composition of the vail (that is to say, his flesh)? ([Heb. 10:20](#)).

76.—Can your theory furnish the antitype to the uncleanness-imparting bodies of those beasts burnt without the camp? ([Heb. 13:11](#)).

77.—Can your theory furnish the antitype to the making atonement for the holy place? ([Lev. 16:16](#)).

78.—Can your theory furnish the antitype to the atonement for the altar? ([Lev. 16:18](#)).

79.—Can your theory furnish the antitype to the atonement made for the holy sanctuary? ([Lev. 16:33](#)).

80.—Can your theory furnish the antitype to atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation wherein God dwelt? ([Lev. 16:33](#)).

81.—If you attempt an answer, do not content yourself with “Yes”; but show us wherein all these things which were typical of Christ, have their counterpart in a theory which teaches he had not the condemned nature on him and therefore, needed not to offer for himself.

82.—Paul says that as it was necessary that these pattern-things in the Mosaic system should be purged with blood, so it was necessary that the things signified should be purged; but with a better sacrifice, that is the sacrifice of Christ ([Heb. 9:23](#)). The Christ of your theory needed no “purging”: therefore does it not follow that he is not the Christ of Paul, who required purging from the law of sin and death, by his own sacrifice?

83.—Paul says of Christ, “It is of NECESSITY that this man have somewhat also to offer” ([Heb. 8:3](#)). You say of your Christ, that he was under no necessity to offer himself; but might have refused to die, and entered into eternal life alone. is it not clear that your Christ is not Paul’s Christ, with whom it was a necessity that he should offer up himself, for the purging of his own nature, first, from the uncleanness of death, that having by his own blood obtained eternal redemption ([Heb. 9:12](#)), he might be able afterwards to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by him ([Heb. 7:25](#)).

84.—Jesus said he would be to the generation contemporary with him, “the sign of the prophet Jonas,” in being “three days and three nights in the heart of the earth” ([Matt. 12:40](#)). He also said, in reference to his death, “I have a baptism to be baptised with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished” ([Luke 12:50](#)); and “the cup which my Father hath given me to drink, shall I not drink it?” ([John 17:11](#)). How agrees with these sayings a theory which speaks of the possibility of death having been omitted from the work of Christ, and of his entering eternal life alone, the very gate to which lay through death?

Our actual transgressions borne in his body?, HP Mansfield

H.P. Mansfield, *Atonement: Salvation Through the Blood of Christ*, p. 195

Our Sins and Christ’s Offering

But does not Peter teach of Jesus that “his own self bare our sins in his body on the tree” ([1 Pet. 2:24](#))? He does, but the statement does not mean that our actual transgressions were borne in his body! Indeed, that would be an impossibility, seeing that he died nearly two thousand years before we were born, and that, in any case, our sins of omission and commission could not be transferred to the body of another. Would it be fair to do so even by imputation? Does the teaching which claims that God put to death a completely obedient man merely to pay the penalty of sins committed by others witness to the righteousness of God? By no means.

What Edward Turney Renounced in 1873

In the first place, it should be remarked that Jesus was not made in the nature of angels, but in that of "flesh and blood." Paul says "it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren." This likeness was of sin's flesh, in which "dwells no good thing."—(Rom. viii. 3; vii. 18.) In Paul's teaching, sin is identical with human nature. As the Christ was fore-ordained to be an effectual sin-offering, it was imperative that he should be invested with a sinful body, in order that sin might be condemned in sinful flesh. Had not the flesh of Jesus been the same as that of Adam, the sin contracted by that flesh would not, by the offering-up of Jesus, have been removed therefrom. The victim, to be efficient, must needs be brought under the curse. Bulls and goats were offered for sin, according to the rites of Moses, but still "it was not possible that they could take away sin;" because it was not a bull or a goat that had sinned, but a man. Hence the apostle's statement in 2 Cor. v. 21: "For he hath made him sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." If it be asked what Paul means by "made him sin," he replies "flesh and blood," or "sin's flesh." It is undeniable, then, that sin was an element of the flesh of the Son of God, unless we had rather take the apostacy than Paul for our guide in the matter. The doctrine that Jesus was immaculate renders him of no service at all as a sin-offering. The *Logos* was made flesh of Mary's substance and, like her, obnoxious to the penalty of death. In it was "no soundness" or enduring principle. It was "filled with a loathsome disease," which is sin, and the inevitable end, death. The redeeming power was the divine character resident in the Son of Man.

From *Diabolism*, 1872 by Edward Turney, p. 41

The book *Diabolism* was distributed and endorsed
by brother Robert Roberts (*The Christadelphian*, 1872, p. 309, 592)
See also *The Christadelphian*, 1874, volume 11, Page 127

“sin was an element of the flesh of the Son of God,
unless we had rather take the apostacy than Paul for our
guide in the matter” – Edward Turney 1872

"Bro. [Richard] Stone had taken the day off in order to have a chat. He tackled me upon the sacrifice of Christ. **He takes the stand adopted by the late Bro. [Harry] Fry that Christ died only for himself in the sense that the sins of his fellows were imputed to him.** I told him, as is a fact, that his teaching would be looked upon as clean-flesh in Australia. He was shocked at this. I assured him that it was so, and then proceeded to question him as to why the altar had to be cleansed by blood before it could be used, why the tabernacle, and holy vessels, had so to be cleansed" (H.P. Mansfield, *Logos*, June 2001, p. 352).