

Graham Hill  
PO BOX 725  
ROCKHAMPTON QLD 4700

6th November 1989

Bro. John Martin  
7 Milner Street  
PROSPECT SA 5082

Dear John,

Warm greetings in the Hope which we share,

The purpose of my writing at this time is because I have recently been given a copy of your book entitled "Saved by His Life". John, I would be less than honest if I did not say that I am very unhappy with some of the things that the book contains.

As you know, coming from Queensland as I do, we have had a constant battle in countering the "Clean Flesh" problem there over many years, and in a number of respects your book is far from helpful in that regard. In Rockhampton we have already had your talk at the Adelaide meeting with Bro. Harry Tennant and Bro. Michael Ashton used against the Truth, and your Book simply compounds our difficulties.

With the greatest respect, having examined your book, I believe that on a number of points your exposition is wrong, and it is certainly not what I believe the Truth to be on the subject of the Atonement.

John, I do believe that there was an element in Christ's sacrificial offering which provided the means whereby he could be raised from the grave and given immortality. On the basis of his own sacrifice, the Lord obtained eternal redemption. Consequently I believe that Christ offered for himself in that his sacrificial death was a necessary element in the purification of his sin nature. I believe that the Lord's sacrificial offering was NOT just "for us".

Bro. Walker in the "Christadelphian" for 1921 at Page 313 said -

"To say that (Christ's sacrifice) was "for us" and "not for himself" is to contradict the Word of God, AND TO TAKE A STEP AT LEAST TOWARDS THAT DOCTRINE OF THE ANTI-CHRIST THAT DENIES THAT CHRIST HAS COME IN THE FLESH. This is a form of error that has persisted from the days of the apostles until now."

I am sorry to have to say John, that having reviewed your book, I believe that you have at least taken a faltering step in the direction that Bro. Walker indicates.

Nothing indicates more clearly to me that you have taken this step, than your latest exposition of Hebrews 7:27 which is in disagreement with expositions on the same verse provided by Bro. John Carter, Bro. J. Thomas, Bro. Robert Roberts, Bro. H.P. Mansfield and other leading Christadelphian expositors. The fact that you are in fundamental disagreement on the teaching of this verse with such a group of noted brethren should sound warning bells that something is wrong. Certainly it does that for me.

I believe that what you have done in trying to redress what you perceive to be an imbalance, has led you into a serious state of imbalance yourself.

Again with respect, I also feel constrained to say that I am very disappointed that your book is being distributed in circumstances where you know that respected brethren in the brotherhood are not happy with some of the things you have been teaching on this most important subject. What circulating the book has done, is force people like myself to say with humility, but nevertheless openly and publicly, that I am strongly opposed to a number of things which you advance in the book.

Such debate would have been far better kept private while the matter was sorted out, but in a number of ways you have taken the matter into the public arena, and frankly that is a tragedy.

So John, I am very sorry to find that I am in disagreement with you, but there are a number of things in your book which are either wrong or expressed in a way which is very misleading, and this will bring comfort to those that are already in error, and is likely to lead others into error.

The following comments on aspects of your book are designed to respectfully do a number of things, viz.

1. Be helpful.
2. Explain some of the difficulties which I see in your exposition.
3. Express what I understand to be the Truth on the subject.
4. Redress some of the imbalance which your book contains.
5. Show the need for the book to be withdrawn from circulation.

Some of the matters I will raise are of more significance than others. However they are expressed in sequential order and not in order of importance.

### COMMENTS ON THE BOOK "SAVED BY HIS LIFE"

#### PAGE 20 - THE TRANSPARENCY ENTITLED "JESUS WAS"

The second point on this transparency says that Jesus was "under the dominion of sin". I do not believe that the Lord was ever under the dominion of SIN. Scripture says that the Lord came under the dominion of DEATH and that is quite different from saying that he was under the dominion of sin. The Lord never succumbed to sin. Sin never ever had dominion over him. It never reigned in his life. What Romans 6:9 says is that after resurrection "DEATH hath no more dominion over him". DEATH had dominion, but now it doesn't.

#### PAGE 24 - THE TRANSPARENCY - "JESUS BENEFITED BECAUSE"

I am not happy with this transparency because it is deficient in that it does not provide for the fact that the Lord benefited because he himself "OBTAINED ETERNAL REDEMPTION" (Hebrews 9:12).

The matter is expressed in the Unity Book on a number of occasions. On page 78 of the Unity Book it is put this way -

"He was a sufferer from the hereditary effects of sin; for these effects are physical effects. Death is a physical law in our members implanted there through sin ages ago, and handed down from generation to generation. Consequently, partaking our physical nature, he partook of this, AND HIS OWN DELIVERANCE (as 'Christ the firstfruits') WAS AS NECESSARY AS THAT OF HIS BRETHREN. In fact, if Christ had not FIRST BEEN SAVED from death (Heb 5:7), if he had not FIRST OBTAINED ETERNAL REDEMPTION (Heb 9:12), there would have been no hope for us, for we obtain salvation only through what he has accomplished in himself ....."

Any balanced presentation of the benefits the Lord received through his death would have to include the fact that HE OBTAINED ETERNAL REDEMPTION. Indeed this is an important feature of the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith which says in Clause 8 -

That the Lord wore our condemned nature, and that BY DYING, he abrogated the law of condemnation FOR HIMSELF and all who should believe and obey him.

This is THE KEY feature of the Lord's benefit from his work, but with respect you appear to be at pains to avoid it.

#### PAGE 25 - JESUS BENEFITED BECAUSE ....

I believe that there is a problem in the explanation provided on this page. The problem arises because an emphasis is placed on the Lord's OBEDIENCE without linking that obedience with HIS SACRIFICE.

This is done in the second paragraph (even though Philippians 2:8-9 is quoted) and again in the third paragraph. It is done again at point 6 of the summary on this page.

The reason I am raising this matter is because in my experience people with 'Clean Flesh' ideas tend to emphasize the Lord's obedience and depreciate his sacrifice. They do this because they do not see the Lord benefiting himself BY HIS SACRIFICE. They want to divorce the Lord from his sacrifice as much as possible.

I am sorry to have to say that this seems to be the intention of Pages 24 and 25 of your book as well. In any event the presentation is unbalanced because the LORD'S BENEFIT FROM HIS SACRIFICE in OBTAINING ETERNAL REDEMPTION is not even mentioned.

In Philippians 2:8 Paul emphasises that the basis upon which the Lord was cleansed physically from his mortal nature was because of an obedience that took him "UNTO DEATH even THE DEATH OF THE CROSS". On the basis of that death, God has highly exalted him. It is equivalent to saying that "BY HIS OWN BLOOD he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Hebrews 9:12).

Obedience which did not incorporate SACRIFICIAL DEATH involving the shedding of blood, would not have provided redemption for mankind (of which the Lord was part), and in which redemption he himself participated (Hebrews 9:12).

It is expressed on page 81 of the Unity Book this way

"As a sufferer from the effects of sin, (the Lord) had himself to be delivered from those effects; and as the mode of deliverance was BY DEATH ON THE CROSS, that DEATH WAS FOR HIMSELF FIRST, not for sins of his own committing, but for deliverance from the (effect of the) sin of Adam from which he suffered in common with his brethren, and from the sins of his brethren which were laid upon him".

Here we have a clear, unambiguous statement of how the Lord benefited from his death. The crucial aspect in its accomplishment was an obedience that led to a SACRIFICIAL DEATH.

So John, I believe that there are two fundamental errors here in your book. Firstly the Lord's benefit from his death in obtaining eternal REDEMPTION is totally omitted. An element in the Lord's sacrificial death DID involve sacrifice FOR his sin-prone nature. Secondly stress is laid on the Lord's obedience RATHER THAN ON his obedience which led to HIS SACRIFICIAL DEATH. On the basis of that sacrifice the Lord was raised, and cleansed physically from his mortal nature.

#### PAGE 41 - THE PURPOSE OF GOD AND THE REPRESENTATIVE CHARACTER OF CHRIST'S SACRIFICE

Christ was our representative and therefore I agree that Christ should not be "separated from the work which (he) came to perform for his brethren" (page 37). Further I have absolutely no difficulty with the concept that "he did these things for himself that it might be for us" (page 41).

Yet in reading page 41 of your book, there seems to be a degree of imbalance. That imbalance comes about, I think, because while acknowledging that the Lord did benefit from his sacrifice, you again largely distance him from his sacrifice by saying that the Lord DID NOT BENEFIT on account of his sacrifice for his sin-prone nature. That of course, I believe to be error.

Having done that you then highlight on this page the words 'our need' and 'that we might be saved'. The problem is further compounded because while talking about the purpose of God, you OMIT to say that God manifestation not human salvation is the purpose of the Eternal Spirit. So to my mind there is an impression of imbalance in treating with the subject.

It was for HUMANITY (i.e. the human race) that Christ went to the cross. "God so loved THE WORLD that he gave his only begotten Son". His sacrifice provided for the RACE of which the Lord was part -

1. Conditional forgiveness of sins, and
2. The means whereby mortal bodies can be redeemed.

The Lord was part of the HUMANITY of which he was the REPRESENTATIVE. But the Lord did NOT require forgiveness of sins. He was sinless. But in common with ALL HUMANITY he did require redemption from mortality. Consequently when scripture speaks of how the Lord himself benefited from the work which he performed FOR the HUMANITY of which he was part, it says -

1. He himself obtained eternal redemption (Hebrews 9:12).
2. He was brought from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant (Hebrews 13:20).
3. He became the firstfruits of them that sleep (1 Corinthians 15:20).

Consequently his CLEANSING OF NATURE came for him as a result of his own offering on the basis of which he was raised from the dead. He was redeemed from the state of mortality. He was redeemed from death which had dominion over him. This was his benefit from his work on behalf of the humanity of which he was part. God's PURPOSE in providing him was that God might be manifest in a multitude of the human race. What Christ did, he did so that his Father's purpose might be accomplished in A MULTITUDE of which HE WAS THE FIRST. In this understanding of things there is absolutely no separation of Christ from his work.

What Christ did, he did as a REPRESENTATIVE of the HUMAN RACE. "He also himself likewise took part of the same" (Hebrews 2:14). He was thus a true and proper representative. And when we talk about the representative nature of Christ's sacrifice we need to be clear about what we mean. A representative is one who acts on behalf of himself AND others. The idea which lies behind the word 'REPRESENTATIVE' is seen in the 'House of Representatives' in Australia's political system. The laws which are made in that place by the 'Representatives' are not made just for THEMSELVES. Nor are they made just "FOR US". They are made for ALL THE PEOPLE - THEMSELVES INCLUDED. Nor do they make laws for themselves FIRST and THEN for us.

And in an imperfect way that illustrates the representative nature of the sacrifice of Christ.

WE ARE SAVED through the work of the Representative of the race. We do not separate him from his work. But the fact that his work had an affect so far as he himself was concerned in that he was redeemed FROM DEATH AND CLEANSED IN NATURE ON THE BASIS OF HIS SACRIFICIAL OFFERING, is indisputable.

#### PAGE 42 TRANSPARENCY - TWO FALSE DOCTRINES THAT SEPARATE THE LORD FROM HIS WORK

In correctly stating the ERROR of 'Clean Flesh' in one of the boxes of the transparency you have "Jesus - No personal sins so NOT INVOLVED IN HIS SACRIFICE".

But are not the explanations provided in your book akin to this wrong doctrine? Are you not arguing that the Lord IS NOT INVOLVED IN HIS SACRIFICE in the way we have always understood it in the Truth? Are you not SUBSTANTIALLY removing the Lord from his sacrifice by statements in your book? Statements such as -

- P25. "Jesus did not have to sacrifice for his sin-prone nature ...."
- P41. "The fact that our Lord did benefit from his own work has also confused some into thinking that this benefit was on account of the acceptable sacrifice made for his sin-prone nature".
- P49. "(Hebrews 7:27) is often quoted to support the contention that Jesus had to sacrifice for his sin-prone nature ....." (but with this you disagree).

Bro. Roberts in the 'Christadelphian' for 1873 at Page 405 said

"Paul's statement (Heb 7:27) is that Jesus did ONCE what the typical high-priest did DAILY. What was that? 'Offered first for his own sins and then for the people's.' It follows that there must be a sense in which Jesus OFFERED FOR HIMSELF also, a sense which is apparent when it is recognised that he was under ADAMIC CONDEMNATION, INHERING IN HIS FLESH".

And again, Bro. Roberts in the 'Christadelphian' for 1895 page 262

"Christ required REDEMPTION FROM ADAMIC NATURE equally with his brethren, and the mode of redemption which God had ordained was a perfect obedience CULMINATING IN A SACRIFICIAL DEATH."

Bro. H.P. Mansfield in the 'Herald' "Christ's Death and your Salvation" says (Page 76, February, 1968 edition) (Page 12, July, 1988 edition)

"Jesus as a representative man, who BORE IN HIS NATURE the same flesh-promptings as all other men but conquered them, WAS IN NEED OF REDEMPTION FROM THAT NATURE (not for sins for he never committed any) as are all mankind. HE OBTAINED THIS BY HIS OWN OFFERING. This is the clear teaching of Heb 13:20. Hebrews 9:12 states THAT BY HIS OFFERING he obtained eternal redemption".

Now clearly the teaching of your book is in disagreement with these quotations from Bro. Roberts and Bro. Mansfield. And such quotations could be multiplied.

Although you may not realise it John, you have stepped away from the Truth and taken a step towards the ideas advocated by people who believe the 'Clean Flesh' error. You have substantially removed the Lord from his sacrifice.

#### PAGE 46 - TRANSPARENCY - CHRIST OUR REPRESENTATIVE

I respectfully suggest that this transparency is unfortunate. It is unfortunate because it is the transparency which people tend to take notice of and not the accompanying explanation. The statement under Andrewism that "he did these things for himself AND for us" is ERROR, ONLY IF understood as Andrewites understand it. The Andrewites are totally WRONG in their understanding that "includes (Christ) in his own sacrifice, but with a SEPARATE need because his sin-prone nature (is) regarded as ACTUAL SIN".

However, the REPRESENTATIVE nature of Christ's work DOES MEAN that "he did these things FOR HIMSELF AND FOR US" in the way that has been explained earlier. Now certainly when Christ went to the cross he was NOT thinking of himself. He was entirely self-less. He was intent on doing his Father's will. He was intent on seeing God MANIFESTED in a multitude. That involved the SALVATION of a multitude. He knew far better than we that 'God manifestation not human salvation was the purpose of the Eternal Spirit'. And because the salvation of the race was bound up in what was accomplished IN HIMSELF (e.g. crushing the serpent's head, breaking the bonds of death etc.), the Pioneers are quite right when they say that "he did these things for himself that it might be for us".

But to understand that that which Christ did, he DID FOR HIMSELF AND US, does NOT make a person an Andrewite. Properly understood and taking the words with their normal meaning it is TRUE to say that Christ did these things FOR HIMSELF AND US. Bro. Roberts affirmed in the Andrew debate that -

Christ offered FOR HIMSELF AS WELL AS FOR US (Question 716).

Christ died FOR HIMSELF AS WELL AS FOR US (Question 715).

#### PAGES 48 AND 49 - HEBREWS 7:27

I believe that the transparency on page 48 headed "JESUS OUR REPRESENTATIVE" is wrong for reasons that have already been explained. There is an apparent contradiction in the transparency where under RIGHT it says "as our true representative he died FOR US" but in the circle below it says "JESUS AND HIS BRETHREN". The circle containing the words "Jesus and his brethren" is right but I believe the caption above it which says "As our true representative he died FOR US" to be wrong. The inference in the caption is that there is a separation between the Lord and us in his work.

I have no difficulty with the transparency headed HEBREWS 7:27 on page 48. But I do have difficulty with the explanation which accompanies it on Page 49. The explanation says in connection with Hebrews 7:27 that "this is often quoted to support the contention that Jesus had to sacrifice for his sin-prone nature as well as for the sins of his brethren". But with this use of the verse you now disagree.

Certainly this verse has often been used to show that the Lord was involved in his own sacrifice - that in some way his sacrifice had an effect so far as he was concerned. He was righteous. He had no sins. He needed no forgiveness. But he did need the redemption of his body. His nature did need cleansing. That surely was how in TYPE, the SHADOW which was seen in the case of Aaron offering FOR HIMSELF AND THE PEOPLE was fulfilled.

Bro. John Carter uses Hebrews 7:27 in this way. He writes in his "Letter to the Hebrews" (page 81) as follows -

"His one sacrifice is sufficient for all time, emphatically once for all.

"Aaron offered for his own sins, and then for the people's", in his annually repeated offerings. But 'this' Jesus did once .....

"THAT THERE WAS A SENSE IN WHICH HE MUST OFFER FOR HIMSELF would appear from the fact that Aaron had so to do before he offered for the people; and Jesus is the antitype. If it should be said that this was a necessary preparation in Aaron's case, it might be asked, was there no necessary preparation in Christ's case? THERE WAS; and the Scriptures give the reason. We get a clue in the words of Peter: "who his own self bare our sins IN HIS OWN BODY on a tree" (1 Peter 2:24). He was there as a representative, partaking of the nature that was common to all - a nature under sentence of death because of sin. He died to declare God's righteousness, as Paul says (Rom 3:21-26); and this could not have been done if he could not righteously have died.

"All the sacrifices of the law meet in him, INCLUDING THAT WHICH AARON OFFERED FOR HIMSELF as well as that which he offered for the people. But all the sacrifices are included in his one offering. All concern redemption in one phase or another; and while Jesus is the redeemer he is so because he has obtained redemption (Heb 9:12)."

There was only ONE offering. But as Bro. Carter points out, if the antitype is to be given its proper weight "THERE WAS A SENSE IN WHICH (THE LORD) MUST OFFER FOR HIMSELF" within that ONE offering. The Lord's involvement in the offering is connected with the fact that the Lord had a mortal body which needed redemption - a nature that needed cleaning. This came by his own shed blood (Hebrews 9:12).

Other highly respected Christadelphian expositors are in agreement with Bro. Carter as to the meaning of Hebrews 7:27, including Bro. J. Thomas, Bro. Roberts, and Bro. H.P. Mansfield.

It is with sadness and concern John, that I find you in disagreement with them. Differing on one verse would perhaps not matter but your difference on this verse is the inevitable OUTCOME of other more FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES which you have with them. That is the tragedy of it.

#### PAGES 51 TO 64 - EXCERPTS FROM THE ROBERTS/ANDREW DEBATE

The Roberts/Andrew debate is a debate which must be used with great care. It is easy to misuse it. At the time, some of the brethren and sisters and Bro. Andrew, thought that some of Bro. Roberts' answers were different to what he had taught on other occasions. Had Bro. Roberts changed his mind? No he had not, as he explains in the 'Christadelphian' for 1894 at page 347, where he says -

"It is a total misapprehension on the part of the 'Advocate' to allege or suggest that we have altered our position with regard to the sacrifice of Christ. We hold absolutely by all we wrote 20 years ago at the time of the Renunciationist controversy .... Where it might for a moment seem otherwise is where we refuse to consider the case of Christ apart from the race for whose salvation he was brought into being. The reason for this is explicitly stated in answers 393 and from 706 to 724 - namely, that if THERE HAD BEEN NO HUMAN RACE to save,

there would have been no Christ; and if there had been, he would not have been in the position he stood in as a member of that race. Even in the Renunciationist tussle, we recognise this reasonable distinction (see article in Christadelphian for March, 1875 page 139 the very heading of which is "For himself that it might be for us"). Run through the Christadelphian for 1874 or 1875, and you will find abundant corroboration of what we now say. If you want particular reference, see Christadelphian 1873, pages 402-409; also 434 to 468; Christadelphian for 1874, page 139; also 140-2, and many other places too numerous for citation."

I will refer to some of this material later.

But before that, something else needs to be said about the Roberts/Andrew debate. Firstly the debate was not primarily about the Atonement but about resurrectional responsibility. And secondly Bro. Roberts had to accommodate himself in his answers to Bro. Andrew's questions, bearing in mind Bro. Andrew's wrong, technical, and peculiar understanding of things.

And Bro. Roberts makes this second point in his preface to the published debate. He says Bro. Andrew used "inexplicit phraseology, technical terms and phrases, which are always open to more than one construction."

This explains why care must be used in quoting Bro. Roberts answers, because unless one knows the Andrewite doctrine (and it is not fully or adequately explained in your book), then it is easy to be mistaken as to what Bro. Roberts is saying. Bro. Roberts is often answering bearing in mind Bro. Andrew's problem of attributing wrong technical meanings to words.

It is also interesting to note John, that in your book you quote some 44 questions from the first night of the debate, but only 13 from the second night. But it is on the second night that Bro. Roberts was able to clarify some of the things which were said on the first night.

Further, you seem to use the material from the debate very selectively. In dealing with the Representative nature of Christ's work where Bro. Roberts rightly refuses to separate the Lord from his work, Bro. Roberts directs his readers attention to questions 393, and from 706 to 724. (See the quotation from the 1894 Christadelphian given above). But when you deal with it you omit questions 711, 712, 715, 716, 717, and 719.

Here are all the questions Bro. Roberts recommends if we want to understand his mind on the matter.

Bro Andrew asks the QUESTIONS

Bro Roberts supplies the ANSWERS

Q. Why did you say that Christ did not die for himself, apart from others?

A. Because you were asking me to consider him in his individual capacity, **DETACHED FROM THE HUMAN RACE**, and I refuse to consider him in that capacity.

Q. What is the antitype of making an atonement for the holy place in regard to Christ?

A. **CLEANSING AND REDEEMING HIM FROM ADAMIC NATURE UTTERLY.**

Q. Shedding of his blood and raising him from the dead?

A. **THE WHOLE PROCESS**

Q. In relation to himself, personally **APART** from his position as a sin-bearer for others?

A. You cannot take him apart from that position.

Q. Have you not taken him apart from that position formerly?

A. Never.

- 708 Q. Not in the argument with Renunciationists?  
 A. That is too general a question altogether. **THERE NEVER WOULD HAVE BEEN A CHRIST IF THERE HAD NOT BEEN A SIN RACE TO REDEEM.** If he **HAD BEEN BY HIMSELF**, he would not have required to die at all, **IF HE HAD BEEN DISCONNECTED FROM OUR RACE.**
- 709 Q. What do you mean by that?  
 A. I mean if he had been **BY HIMSELF - A NEW ADAM - HAVING NO CONNECTION WITH THE RACE OF ADAM FIRST; NOT MADE OUT OF IT.**
- 710 Q. But if as a descendant of Adam, he had been the only one to whom God granted the offer of salvation, would he not have had to die before he could obtain that salvation?  
 A. I refuse to answer the question in that form because it is an impossible 'if. He was not sent for himself, but for us.  
 Q. Is it not clear that Christ, as a necessity, must **OFFER UP FOR HIMSELF FOR THE PURGING OF HIS OWN SIN NATURE?**  
 A. As a son of Adam, a son of Abraham, a son of David, **YES.**  
 Q. **FIRST FROM THE UNCLEANNES OF DEATH THAT HAVING BY HIS OWN BLOOD OBTAINED ETERNAL LIFE HIMSELF, HE MIGHT BE ABLE TO SAVE OTHERS?**  
 A. **CERTAINLY.**  
 Q. Then he died for himself **APART FROM** being a sin-bearer for others?  
 A. I do not admit that: I cannot separate him from his work.  
 Q. Was he not so separated 20 years ago to refute the free life theory?  
 A. Not by me, it might be by you.  
 Q. **HOW COULD JESUS HAVE BEEN MADE FREE FROM THAT SIN WHICH GOD LAID UPON HIM IN HIS OWN NATURE, "MADE IN THE LIKENESS OF SINFUL FLESH," IF HE HAD NOT DIED FOR HIMSELF AS WELL AS FOR US?**  
 A. **HE COULD NOT.**  
 Q. **THEN HE OFFERED FOR HIMSELF AS WELL AS FOR US?**  
 A. **OH, CERTAINLY.**  
 Q. Is it not clear then **THAT THE DEATH OF CHRIST WAS NECESSARY TO PURIFY HIS OWN NATURE FROM THE SIN POWER?**  
 A. **CERTAINLY.**
- 718 Q. That was hereditary in him in the days of his flesh?  
 A. No doubt of it.
- 719 Q. And he **AS THE FIRST ONE HAD TO UNDERGO PURIFICATION THROUGH HIS SHED BLOOD AND RESURRECTION?**  
 A. **CERTAINLY, I HAVE NEVER CALLED THAT IN QUESTION IN THE LEAST.**
720. Q. Did you not say on Tuesday night that he did not need to shed his blood for himself?  
 A. That is upon your impossible supposition that **HE STOOD APART FROM US, AND WAS A NEW ADAM ALTOGETHER.**
721. Q. I never introduced that position.  
 A. You are unfortunate in not conveying your ideas to me.
- 722 Q. I never introduced that idea to you.  
 A. You asked me to consider him **APART FROM US.**
- 723 Q. Apart from us but still a descendant of Adam.  
 A. That is my point, that you cannot separate him from the work he came to do. **THERE NEVER WOULD HAVE BEEN A CHRIST AT ALL IF IT HAD NOT BEEN FOR THAT WORK.**

John, these answers of Bro. Roberts to Bro. Andrew's questions accurately represent my mind on this subject. I have not the slightest quibble about any of them.

I remind you that these are the questions which **AFTER THE DEBATE** Bro. Roberts recommended as representing his mind on the fact that the Lord **WAS NOT SEPARATED FROM HIS WORK.**



I ask you to look again at ALL the questions and answers cited above, but in particular I ask you to note the ones you have NOT used namely 711, 712, 715, 716, 717 and 719. Are they not fatal to your position? With great respect, I believe that they are.

Bro. Roberts' answers stand IN DIRECT OPPOSITION to the statement you make on page 41 of your book (a point repeated on page 49) where you say -

"The fact that our Lord did benefit from his own sacrifice has also confused some into thinking that this benefit was on account of the acceptable sacrifice FOR his sin-prone nature. This is not so".

On page 63 you say that "taken on face value (the idea that) Jesus had to offer FOR his sin-prone nature is totally unscriptural." Bro. Roberts disagrees with you. In Questions 706 to 724 Bro. Roberts teaches that -

1. The Lord must OFFER UP HIMSELF FOR THE PURGING OF HIS SIN NATURE.
2. THAT HE DIED FOR HIMSELF AS WELL AS FOR US.
3. THAT THE LORD OFFERED FOR HIMSELF AS WELL AS FOR US.
4. That the DEATH of Christ was necessary TO PURIFY HIS OWN NATURE FROM THE SIN POWER.
5. That Christ died to undergo PURIFICATION THROUGH HIS OWN SHED BLOOD AND RESURRECTION.

Unquestionably Bro. Roberts taught that Jesus Christ had to offer FOR his sin-prone nature. He had to offer up himself FOR the purging of his own nature. And none of those things which Bro. Roberts affirms separate the Lord from his work. I ask you to look again at what I have said on the matter of REPRESENTATION in my comments concerning page 41 of your book.

With respect, John, it is you who is separating the Lord from his work.

Before leaving this topic I should briefly quote some of the material from the articles in the 'Christadelphian' which Bro. Roberts recommended to his correspondent AFTER his debate with Bro. Andrew. Some of it has already been quoted in this letter e.g. his exposition of Hebrew 7:27. But here is some more -

Bro. Roberts in the 'Christadelphian' for 1873 at page 405

"The Son of God is thus no substitute, but the very bearer of the condemnation. Though personally sinless, he was by constitution condemned, AND HAD THEREFORE TO OFFER FOR HIMSELF AND HIS BRETHREN."

Bro. Roberts in the he 'Christadelphian' for 1873 at page 465

"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 the sending him forth in the likeness of sinful flesh? Paul says that "He that is dead is free from sin" and that "in that he died he died unto sin once" being raised from the dead, death hath no more dominion over him - (Rom 6:9,10). 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?"

Bro. Roberts in the 'Christadelphian' for 1873 page 468

"Paul says of Christ, "it is of NECESSITY that this man have somewhat to offer" - (Heb 8:3) ..... 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).

Now perhaps that leaves me to canvass one other question, namely -

**DID CHRIST DIE FOR US?**

Certainly he did. And the scriptures give abundant testimony to this fact. No one who understands the subject of the Atonement in its fullness and in its purity should have any difficulty in repeating Paul's words in Galatians 2:20

**"I live by the faith of the Son of God WHO LOVED ME AND GAVE HIMSELF FOR ME."**

But it needs to be said again that GOD'S PURPOSE in providing the Lord Jesus Christ was that His own mental, moral, and physical characteristics might be manifested in a multitude. GOD MANIFESTATION not human salvation was the purpose of the Deity. In order that that purpose might come to fruition God provided His own glorious Son so that salvation might be available TO MANKIND.

Now that means that through God's purpose salvation has been provided in Christ FOR US. And we are a greatly privileged people. We have the most marvellous benefits in the Truth. God has done great things FOR US whereof we are glad.

And while the marvellous benefits that WE receive through the grace and love of God must be freely and fully acknowledged by US, there was a METHOD or PLAN of salvation which God instituted whereby we could be saved without God having to abandon His righteousness. It is when we come to examine that PLAN that we see how God's righteousness was upheld in the whole process of reconciliation. It was upheld in that God provided His only begotten son who was made in all points like his brethren. And while the Lord was not a sinner and never therefore alienated from his God, nevertheless as one of the human race, like us he had a body that needed redemption - a nature that needed cleansing.

Because of that, God could justly require him to die. Because of that he was involved in the redemption that was provided for MANKIND through his sacrifice. That doesn't separate the Lord from his work. That doesn't detract from his work. Rather it magnifies his work, because it reminds us that while burdened down with mortality - while having a sin-prone body like ours - the Lord was obedient unto death even the death of the cross. And now we are privileged to have a merciful and faithful high priest.

**GOD MANIFESTATION NOT HUMAN SALVATION - A MISSING ELEMENT IN YOUR EXPOSITION**

So we must acknowledge the marvellous benefits we have in Christ. But the moment too much emphasis is placed on US you will be out of balance because we are ONLY INCIDENTAL to God's purpose TO MANIFEST HIMSELF. And, John, the subject of God manifestation is a subject which is missing from your book. If the subject of the Atonement is looked at from man's point of view rather than GOD'S you will get it wrong. It is that mistake that has led the churches of christendom astray on this subject. With respect you seem to making a similar mistake.

**CONCLUSION**

You will understand from what I have said John, that I feel very strongly about some aspects of your book and the inevitable damage that the book will do.

The very best thing that could happen would be for the book to be withdrawn. I am fearful of what will happen if it is not.

John, in view of the fact that you have taken the matter into the public arena, I want to respectfully say, that I will be making my letter to you available to Ecclesias and brethren who I feel will be interested in this most vital matter.

I trust that you will understand that nothing that I have said in this letter should be taken personally. I am very sorry that it has been necessary for me to write this letter at all. I do not like conflict. I do not like having to disagree with someone of your standing in the Truth. But the Truth is the truth, and I have a duty to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints".

I have thought for quite some time that you had started down a **DIFFERENT ROAD** on the subject of the Atonement, and I blame myself for not speaking earlier, even though at that time I could not see clearly the direction in which you were heading. I do see it now, and I believe it to be wrong, and destructive of the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

It is my prayer that unity of thought may yet prevail on this most important subject.

Your brother in Israel's hope,

A handwritten signature, possibly the name 'S. J. ...', written in a cursive style.