

RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

DEBATE

HLLD

On TUESDAY and THURSDAY, APRIL 3rd and 5th, 1894,

IN

ESSEX HALL, ESSEX STREET, STRAND, LONDON,

*Between R ROBERTS and J J ANDREW, on the Question of who will come forth to
Resurrection Judgment at the Appearing of Christ*

FROM SHORTHAND NOTES REVISED BY THE DISPUTANTS

BIRMINGHAM 139, MOOR STREET

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE AUDIENCE WHO HEARD THE DEBATE

1894

PREFACES BY THE DISPUTANTS.

THE proposal for this Debate came from certain brethren in South London. Although disadvantageously situated for such a conflict—being occupied in business 9 to 10 hours every day—I consented to the proposal for the purpose of defending a portion of Bible truth. The teaching of the Bible on the subject in question, defended by me, is here presented in a somewhat fragmentary form. The reader who desires to see a more complete exposition is invited to peruse the pamphlet entitled, "The Blood of the Covenant," advertised on the cover.

J. J. ANDREW.

26, Douglas Road, Canonbury, London, N.

I agree that the subject cannot be exhaustively dealt with in a debate on the Socratic method which, though convenient for test, is liable to draw off the disputants to side issues which occupy time disproportionately. The more formal exhibition of it in the pamphlet referred to by brother Andrew, and in the reply which I have published to that pamphlet under the title, *The Resurrection to Condemnation: Who will come forth to it?* will enable the reader to see the bearings of the subject in a clearer light.

Also, the form in which the theme of the Debate was stated, I felt to be inconvenient. It is not one that I would have chosen, for a variety of reasons. It is of brother Andrew's wording. I was obliged to submit to it from the representation made to me that if I did not consent to it, the Debate would not come off. I proposed a question that would have brought the issue before the meeting in a more direct and simple form. It seems to me an unnatural association of ideas to make the infliction of condemnation depend upon the attainment of reconciliation (which is the central idea of justification by the blood of Christ). I deem it necessary to say this, because I felt all through the Debate that the wording of the subject placed the issue in a false light, and led to a method of treatment entirely foreign to the moral essence of the thing.

I also think it necessary to advert to other points which the absence of a closing rejoinder put it out of my power to notice.

Some of the discrepancies between brother Andrew and myself in the questions and answers that were exchanged were due, I feel sure, to his employment

of inexplicit phraseology, technical terms and phrases, which are always open to more than one construction. Take for example, "Adamic sin," "inherited sin," "sin in the flesh." Only one of these—the last—is a scriptural form of speech, and that is used only once (Rom. viii. 3), and with a sense, not having the scientific precision with which brother Andrew appeared to use it. The vagueness of his argument was not dispelled by his preliminary definition of terms. "Adamic sin," said he, "I shall use as sin in the flesh." But this explanation had to be further explained: "Sin in the flesh I shall use as expressing the desire to do evil which is in fallen human nature." According to these definitions, Adamic sin is *desire to do evil*. Answering his questions according to this definition, I was obliged to maintain that it is not removed till the resurrection, since the desire to do evil remains unchanged to the last, as Paul declared to be his own experience. Answering it according to my own conception (which is a larger conception, while including brother Andrew's conception), I was obliged to make the same answer. My conception is this, that death became a physical law of Adam's nature in consequence of Adam's sin; that it became so by the power of the sentence of death operating physically upon him, as the sentence of life at the judgment seat will operate physically upon the bodies of the accepted, causing them to become incorruptible; that becoming a part of his being, it was therefore necessarily transmitted to all of Adam's posterity who partook of that death-stricken being by physical descent, and became in them also a tendency to moral corruption; that, therefore, as the whole mischief originated in sin, taking effect in the flesh, it could, by casual language, and on the principle of metonymy (putting cause for effect), be described as sin in the flesh: "sin that dwelleth in me."

Having this conception, I could not say otherwise than "No," when asked if we are justified from "Adamic sin" at baptism. Christ was "justified in the Spirit" (1 Tim. iii. 16) in the sense of being made right, or perfected physically in the Spirit—not in the sense of being pardoned, for he required no pardon. It was this sense of "justify" that I had before my mind when brother Andrew asked me about being "justified from sin in the flesh at baptism."

PREFACE.

I have always believed (and it seems to me impossible for any man having regard to meanings, and not to mere phrases, to do otherwise than believe), that this blessed change is effected only at the resurrection. "We shall all be changed." This corruptible and mortal, which has come by Adam, putting on the incorruptible and immortal through Christ. What is cancelled at baptism (and it is only cancelled potentially—for there is an "if" all the way through) is the condemnation resting upon us as individual sinners, and the racial condemnation which we physically inherit.

I have never diverged from this view, though brother Andrew seemed to think I had, from the quotation he made from the *Christadelphian* of 1878, p. 225. It is the employment of an ambiguous phrase—one of his own phrases—that leads him to think so, but the paragraph itself in which the phrase occurs, shows the meaning with which I used it. The contrast is between "legal" and actual mortality. The actual mortality of our experience is the result of the sentence passed on Adam, to which, as a race, we are related. Legal mortality would be that which is constituted, ordered, or determined upon by law. In this sense, we pass (potentially) from death to life at baptism,—which is a very important sense certainly, for without it there could be no hope of the physical deliverance that waits at the coming of Christ. But still, it has no binding force in the direction which is brother Andrew's whole contention in this argument. It cannot prevent the revival of a dead mortal being to a renewal of his mortal state if God require him to come forth—as is absolutely proved by the restoration of unjustified dead in past times.

Finally, I did not get the opportunity of pointing out the undue stress laid by brother Andrew throughout, upon the idea of "probation," as affording him an argument against the resurrection of rebels against the light. "Probation" is not even a scriptural technicality, and certainly it is not a scriptural conception with the limitations put about it by brother Andrew. It literally means "putting to the proof." Men are certainly put to the proof before God accepts them: but this does not express their whole relation to Him. It is not merely a question of whether they are worthy of a certain benefit: there is the question of God's claim upon them, and the whole evolution of judgment, nationally or individually, turns upon this.

God has not surrendered His claim on the sons of Adam, although death reigns among them. Had He said nothing after the sentence in Eden, undoubtedly the reign of death would have been undisturbed by any question of resurrectional responsibility. But He renewed relations with them after that sentence,

and this makes a great difference. It introduces a new accountability, the operation of which is determined upon some principle; for it is revealed that it does not operate on all.

What is the principle of its operation? This is the whole question. Whenever we ask for a scriptural definition of it, that is, a definition in the actual words of Scripture, we get the doctrine which brother Andrew is opposing. That is, we never can get in scripture words the doctrine he is advocating, but always the one he is opposing. If we ask who in scripture words are said to rise to condemnation it is "They who have done evil" (Jno. v. 29), "the unjust" (Acts xxiv. 15), "the wicked" (Job xxi. 30), &c. Brother Andrew cannot quote any scripture that says it is "those who have been justified from Adamic sin." He rejoins, "Then you prove the resurrection of all wicked, of all unjust, of all who have done evil." The answer is,—No, because the scriptures draw a line. If it be asked where? the answer is, at ignorance (Acts xvii. 30); no understanding (Psa. xlix. 20); blindness (Jno. ix. 41). If, on the other hand, the question is asked, What in the Scriptures is the formulated—the specifically alleged—ground of condemnation? the answer is invariable: "Light" (Jno. iii. 19); "the word spoken" (Jno. xv. 22); "Knowledge" (Jas. iv. 18); "to whom much is given" (Luko xii. 47). The reason of condemnation is always alleged to be disobedience. It is "Because *I have called*, and ye have refused. *I have stretched out my hand* and no man regard * * * Ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof" (Prov. i. 24 25). Or, as Paul expressed it, "To them that are contentious and do not obey the truth (implying it has been presented to them), but obey unrighteousness (there shall be) indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile * * * in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ" (Rom. ii. 9, 10, 16)

"Probation" has its place as a scriptural idea; but it is used unskillfully and with destructive results when it is made to hide the idea that God has property in sinful man, and will not be mocked by him when He stoops to the great condescension of addressing commands to him.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

2nd May, 1894, 139, Moor Street, Birmingham.

When consent was given by brother Roberts and myself to the publication of this Debate, I had no idea that he would supplement it by a written argument; but having done so, I must follow suit.

In saying that, according to my argument, "the infliction of condemnation" is made to "depend upon

PREFACE.

the attainment of reconciliation," brother Roberts conveys the impression that I deny "the infliction of condemnation" on any members of the race who have not been the subjects of reconciliation. This misrepresents me; many have so suffered. God "condemned Sodom and Gomorrah with an overthrow" by means of fire (2 Pet. ii. 6), as He had previously condemned the contemporaries of Noah to destruction by means of water (2 Pet. iii. 6). Other divine judgments are recorded in Holy Writ; but in such cases there was no resurrection to a judgment-seat, and this is the point now in dispute.

The expressions "Adamic sin" and "inherited sin" are, says brother Roberts, not scriptural forms of speech. This is immaterial provided they represent a scriptural truth. It is often advisable to use other than scriptural phrases to show in what sense certain inspired words are understood. The word "sin" is so frequently used to describe an act of transgression that it is necessary at certain times to show that this is not its only meaning. It is quite true that the phrase "sin in the flesh" only occurs once in the Bible—a remark obviously intended to minimise its importance—but that which it represents is described in other language. Thus, "every man's own lust" (Jas. i. 14); "the heart is deceitful above all things" (Jer. xvii. 9); "the minding (*i.e.*, thinking) of the flesh is death" (Rom. viii. 6, margin); "if ye live after the flesh ye shall die" (ver. 13), &c. The only cause of death is sin; when, therefore, conformity to "the flesh" is described as producing death, it is equivalent to saying that "the flesh" is one form of sin.

"Sin in the flesh" is treated by brother Roberts as being identical with the "physical law of death transmitted to Adam's posterity." This is not correct; the two things are related to each other as cause and effect, and they are so combined in the expression "corruption that is in the world through lust" (2 Pet. i. 4). When Adam was created he had no "lust" or evil desire; he was "very good" (Gen. i. 31), not "knowing good and evil" (Gen. iii. 5). But through yielding to outside temptation he came to "knew good and evil" (Gen. iii. 22), and henceforth evil desire became an element in human nature, transmitted from parents to offspring. To say that it is called "sin" because it leads to sin is misleading; this may be partly true, but the chief reason is, that it is the result of sin—that is, of Adam's disobedience. Hence, by the transmission of evil desire all the descendants of Adam are accounted as having "sinned" in him (Rom. v. 12); by the mere fact of inheriting his fallen nature they are "made sinners" (ver. 19), or placed under "condemnation" (ver. 18). These scriptural truths furnish the only explanation of the death of infants and of others who have

"not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (ver. 14).

"Lust" being the cause of physical "corruption," every member of the race is necessarily the subject of Divine condemnation by reason of its possession; and the removal of this condemnation is requisite before they can "have peace with God" (Rom. v. 1). This removal is a justification or acquittal; and from the time that it takes place, inherited "lust" ceases to be the subject of condemnation or accusation. It was not the "removal" of "lust" about which I questioned brother Roberts, but the removal of its condemnation—two distinct events. Lust continues to exist to the end of probation, but there is then "no condemnation" (Rom. viii. 1) for it; condemnation at the judgment seat can only be incurred for yielding to it. "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die" (Rom. viii. 13); "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption" (Gal. vi. 8).

"To be perfected physically in the spirit" is, according to brother Roberts, the only way of being "justified from Adamic sin"; not so, however, according to Apostolic teaching. This event is more correctly defined to be the consummation of a previous justification; failure to realise it can only result from "sowing to the flesh" (Gal. vi. 8), not from possession of the flesh. Therefore "the flesh" must have been the subject of a justification when probation commenced.

The bearing of these testimonies on Jesus Christ is obvious. He was made of "the same flesh and blood" as his brethren, "in all things like unto" them (Heb. ii. 14, 17). By being "made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4) he was "made sin" (2 Cor. v. 21), and thus when on the cross "God * * * condemned sin in the flesh" of "his own son" (Rom. viii. 3). It was this "sin" which Christ "put away by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. ix. 26). At birth "sin in the flesh" "had the power of death" over him, but "through death" he "destroyed" its power (Heb. ii. 14) over himself; and when he rose it could be said of him, prior to his change into spirit—"he that hath died is justified from sin" (Rom. vi. 7, *r.v.*). Believers who are "baptized into his death" (ver. 3) necessarily partake of that justification, but with this difference—that their probation is only beginning, whereas his was at an end; and they then receive forgiveness of individual transgressions, of which he was quite free. The two-fold aspect of their justification at this time is very concisely expressed in Col. ii. 13: "You, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." The phrase "uncircumcision of your flesh" is synonymous with "sin in the flesh" before justification. For this, as well as for individual "tres-

PREFACE.

passes" the brethren of Christ were once under "the power of death," but, having been "quickened," death cannot, for either the one or the other, "reign" over them; they have, like Paul, been "made free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2); if they enter the grave it cannot hold them.

The fact that the physical consequences of Adam's "offence" are not removed at baptism is no evidence that Adamic sin is not then the subject of justification; if it were, the continuance of the physical consequences of some individual "trespasses," such as disease caused by drunkenness, would prove that such trespasses were not forgiven. It is, therefore, erroneous for brother Roberts to confine justification from Adamic sin to the change from mortality to immortality; this must be preceded by a legal justification, as he himself recognised in 1878. The statement that he was using one of my phrases has not been substantiated: and, even if it had been, this would not be a valid defence. That he understood the phrase is shown by the way he illustrates it (see *Christadelphian*, 1878, p. 225). Without a legal justification condemnation remains in full force, and in such cases death must for ever "reign." "The law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2) is not invalidated by the restoration of some unjustified ones in the past; they were not freed from Adamic death, but only temporarily released from it. Not so with the rejected at Christ's judgment seat; they will be condemned to death solely for their own offences during probation—and this could not be if they were still under condemnation to death for inherited "sin" or for "trespasses" preceding probation.

It is true that *probation* is not a Scriptural word, but it nevertheless represents a Scriptural truth. The children of Adam, being "servants of sin," are "free from righteousness" (Rom. vi. 20), and in that condition can do nothing acceptable to God for attainment to eternal life. But when "made free from sin" they become "servants to God" (ver. 22), in which capacity alone can they be put to the proof in relation to eternal life. It is quite a new thing among the brotherhood to speak of men being under probation "before God accepts them." This, together with the denial that condemnation in Adam is legally taken away at baptism, deprives that ceremony of half its efficacy; one or two steps further in the same direction will render it superfluous.

The exclusion of unjustified sons of Adam from the judgment-seat of Christ does not affect "the question of God's claims upon them," because God has, for their wickedness, inflicted punishments in this life, and He will do it in the future. Those punishments are confirmatory evidence that unjustified men are, by condemnation in Adam, excluded from resurrection. Additional "light" undoubtedly brings additional responsibility; hence the supporters of the Papacy suffer greater Divine wrath than the benighted followers of Confucius; but this light is not sufficient, in itself, to bring them within the scope of resurrection to Christ's judgment-seat. The Jews to whom Christ spoke (Jno. iii. 19; ix. 41; xii. 48; xv. 22; Luke xii. 47) occupied a very different position from Gentiles in this generation. The former were the custodians of God's oracles (Rom. iii. 2), and as such they were required to believe and defend them; they believed part, but not sufficient; and this was the ground of their condemnation. They rejected, not the Abrahamic covenant, but its Mediator; and for this they were threatened with retribution. The mere fact of not believing (Jno. xii. 47, 48; Mark xvi. 16) made them amenable to Divine wrath. They rejected Christ because He did not fulfil their anticipations; but this is no evidence that they had previously insufficient faith to obtain, in conjunction with sacrifice, a justification from sin. Such justification, equally with that of faithful Jews, would be ratified by the blood of Christ; but their subsequent wicked deeds, of course, would not. In this respect they occupied, in relation to the name of salvation, the same position as unfaithful brethren of Christ, some of whom are spoken of in terms quite as severe (2 Pet. ii.; Jude ver. 12, 13), as those applied to the Jewish opponents of Christ.

The application to unjustified Gentiles of warnings addressed to Jews (Prov. i. 24, 25), or to Christ's brethren (Rom. ii. 9, 10; Jas. iv. 18), is most unwarrantable; it introduces the false principle which, in a portion of the Apostasy, nullifies "the difference between the holy and profane" (Ezek. xlv. 23).

J. J. A.

I have waived my right of rejoinder to remove a barrier from the way of the writing of the foregoing.

R. R.

RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

DEBATE AT ESSEX HALL, LONDON,

BETWEEN BRETHREN J. J. ANDREW AND R. ROBERTS, APRIL 3RD AND 5TH, 1894.

CHAIRMAN—BROTHER LAKE.

FIRST NIGHT.

THE CHAIRMAN:—I will read to you, brethren and sisters, the subject of discussion and the conditions of debate. The subject is as follows:—“That resurrection to the judgment seat of Christ will comprise some who have not been justified by the blood of Christ.” That proposition brother Roberts will affirm, and brother Andrew will deny. The arrangement for speeches is as follows:—There will be two quarter-hour speeches, followed by six quarter-hour speeches or questions as each disputant may prefer to employ that time. That is, on this evening, we shall open with two quarter-hour speeches, followed by six quarter-hour speeches or questioning as brother Roberts or Andrew may prefer, and the matter will be opened by brother Roberts. There is this condition attached to the debate, and it is understood that this condition is binding upon all of us: “No partial or complete account, description, or report of the debate to be printed or circulated, either separately or in any publication, without the consent of both disputants, and in the event of such consent being given, each disputant is to be permitted to revise same in manuscript.” I have only one other thing to say, and that is to ask you to express no opinion whatever, neither to approve or to disapprove of what you may hear, nor to interrupt the speakers. If any brother should interrupt either speaker, I shall add to that speaker's time what he may lose by the interruption.

I now call upon brother Roberts to open in a 15 minutes' speech.

BROTHER ROBERTS:—Dear brethren and sisters,—I need not say how far from gratifying it is to me, as probably to you, to be present on such an occasion, and for such a purpose. David says “How good and how pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.” The reverse condition must be of the reverse character. We have, in past times, dwelt together in unity as regards the particular issue

raised to night, and if there is any change, it rests—you know where—with brother Andrew, who thinks he has discovered that some things he used to think were true are not true. We need not enquire how he has come to think so. The question for enquiry is, whether his present thoughts are in harmony with the Word of Truth.

He has come to the conclusion that—not the wickedness of man, but the reconciling blood of Christ, is the basis of God's vengeance; that not “he that believeth not,” but he that believeth, shall be condemned; that not those rebels of mankind who utterly refuse to submit to God are to come under His retributive vengeance in the day of Christ, but those only who make some attempt to submit to His will by bowing down in the presence of His Son and accepting His yoke, confessing His name and seeking to serve Him.

He was not always of this mind. His change of mind might not have necessitated the present meeting, but he has taken steps which involve an attempt to coerce us into the reception of his views, first by propounding an amendment to the constitution in force amongst those with whom he is in fellowship, and, secondly, by issuing a pamphlet in which, like another before him, he says, though not in the same words, “I renounce what I have believed beforetime” as to the rule upon which God holds men responsible.

I have endeavoured to show reasons against the view which he now advocates. I have done so to an extent and in a form that I thought rendered a meeting like this superfluous. The argument is before us on both sides. We are more likely to come to a dispassionate conclusion in the matter by the quiet weighing of arguments than in the heat of personal contest. Nevertheless, it was strongly urged upon me that such a meeting as this was in the interests of the truth; therefore I consented—not under any conditions—the conditions that have been referred to are not mine. I thought that perhaps it might be that

the brethren's idea who asked me to come here would prove right, that such a meeting might be to the advantage of the truth.

I believe brother Andrew is perfectly sincere in the course he is taking, I hope he may be enabled to think that we who oppose him are not less sincere. However, it is an immaterial matter what we think of each other, the question is, what is the truth in this case? In a phrase, it is defined by Paul that "there shall be a resurrection of the just and of the unjust," and by Jesus that "those who have done evil," as well as those who have done good, shall "come forth at the resurrection."

If it had been left to human estimation as to what was expedient or suitable in the matter of resurrection, we might have come to the conclusion that a great many people in America have come to, and that is, that there need not be any resurrection at all of those who are to be rejected; that no purpose can be served by bringing again to life those who are to be put back into death again. But we dare not come to that conclusion. It is God's matter, not ours. We can form no opinion on such a subject of any value. It is a mere question of God's purpose, and what He has declared. Now He has declared the resurrection of the unjust and the evil, and the question is why? On what ground? I am sure I am within the recollection of everyone present, when I say that no ground is alleged in the Bible for resurrection to condemnation excepting unrighteousness and rebellion, and this not on any mechanical principle.

I have felt oppressed and depressed exceedingly by the mechanical nature of the theory propounded by the pamphlet which brother Andrew has written. I do not mean it in any irreverent or flippant sense, but it really seems to me to advocate salvation by machinery. God is kept out of view, and we have a system of mechanical law placed in the foreground. God makes the law certainly, and governs us by it, but there is a great difference between divine law and human law. In the case of human law, we are obliged to speak of it as an abstraction, as if it possessed powers of its own, because man is so weak because human memory is so frail, and because the men who appoint the law cannot keep pace with it, cannot be always present with its operation; cannot know those who are related to it either on the favourable side or otherwise. But it is totally different with God. God ever lives, and His power never fails, and His presence is everywhere, and His discernments are infallible and His rights are absolute. Law is but the expression of His wish and will, design and intention. You never can put the law above God. God is always above law. And you cannot tie Him by any law. If He gave the law of Moses, He took it away; if He gave circumcision, He took it away. If He gave

baptism, He will take it away when it has done its purpose. He can alter, or amend, or adapt, or adjust as He pleases, to accomplish the objects He proposes. Why, brethren and sisters, where is even the living man who, dealing with his own property, does not claim the right (any lord in his estate, or any petty landlord in any house, in appointing this and that to serve his purpose and convenience) to change his appointments? In making such a change it is not a change in himself, not a change in what he is, but a change in the methods he adopts according as exigencies arise. And so God has revealed to us it is with Him. He says, "At what instant I speak concerning a nation to pluck up and to pull down and to destroy it, if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will turn from the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation to build and to plant it, if it do evil in My sight that it obey not My voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them."

Now it appears to me that this, what you might call flexibility of Divine intelligence, is not sufficiently recognised by the arguments submitted to us in the pamphlet. Indeed there is an absence of that vivid sense of the living God which is the very essence of the whole system of Divine truth. We are liable to fail in apprehending His living relation to His works, because we see no actual manifestation of Him such as we see of man, and we are apt to feel as if there were no life or intelligence with Him such as there is with man. The fact is just the reverse of the appearance, as we shall see when we are subject to that process which Elisha prayed for the young man, "Lord, open the young man's eyes." Lord open all men's eyes, and they will see that He is the true living Essence and Principle and Power of the universe, and the true discriminating intelligence of all things—the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has appointed Him as the judge of the living and the dead.

BROTHER ANDREW:—I need scarcely say, brethren, that equally with Brother Roberts, I very much regret to have to appear here upon such an occasion as this. It is not because I have not made an effort to prevent it. I was twelve months in communication with him for the very purpose of preventing conflict. Contention is not a thing which I like, but rather dislike; when, however, conflict is forced upon me in defence of Bible truth, I shall not, and dare not, flinch from it.

Reference has been made to my change of attitude. Yes, a change from a position which I never deemed strong to one which I do deem strong. As to the cause of that change—reference to which has been

indirectly made without being specifically stated—I will state it. In contending for the view advocated by Brother Roberts it was said by some one that certain ones outside Christ would be raised to judgment through the blood of the covenant. In support thereof a statement was quoted from John's first epistle, chap. ii. ver. 2, that Christ's blood is a "propitiation for the sins of the whole world." That determined me to look into the matter thoroughly, for I could see that if it was capable of being supported by such testimony, it set aside fundamental principles of the truth. The proposition which has been mentioned was directed specifically against that particular contention, and as you are not all aware of the wording of it, I will read it.

"That Christ having been raised from the dead through his own blood, it necessarily follows that the dead in Christ will be raised through the same blood, and as a consequence that the blood of Christ is not available for the resurrection of any who have died in Adam."

I withdrew that resolution, not, as Brother Roberts says in his pamphlet, on condition that he replied to my manuscript. I gave no such promise to him. I simply promised to consider the matter. What he wanted me to do was to add some words to the proposition, and I did not see my way to do it. I did consider the matter, and I withdrew the proposition on the basis of the statement that had given rise to it being previously withdrawn. These are the simple facts, and they can be verified if necessary.

It was not for that purpose that brother Roberts came to London to see me. He came at my solicitation solely* in order that we might talk over the whole subject of the manuscript which I had sent to him, and he wrote the reply, because in the limited leisure I have, after being occupied in business all day, there was not time in two brief interviews to discuss the question fully.

Several passages have been quoted in the address to which you have just listened—"resurrection of just and unjust," and those "who have done evil" are to "come forth to the resurrection of condemnation." If I were contending that there was no resurrection of the unjust or no resurrection of those who have done evil, those passages would refute my position. But I do not so contend. I fully recognise resurrection to condemnation of certain ones who have "done evil," and certain ones who in the Scriptures are styled "unjust," and therefore these passages are no proof whatever.

Reference has been made to the "mechanical" nature of the "theory." Well, it may seem so to some minds, but I submit that that is not a correct definition. God is not excluded from my contention. God, and His ways, are the sole basis of all that I have to say upon the subject. How do we know God except by His laws as revealed in His word? How can we know Him in any other way? None whatever. He asks us to judge of Him by His word, and to act in accordance with the laws and principles which He has laid down in that word, and if we are so doing we are as much recognising God as if we were introducing His name into every sentence we uttered. It is not a case of salvation by machinery, or anything of the kind. Such phraseology is a complete misnomer, like many other statements and definitions which have been given of my position. The point is, what is necessary in the first instance in order to commence a probation for eternal life? Justification, says the Scriptures; otherwise there is scope for probation; no justification, no probation.

Nothing I have said invalidates God's prerogative to change His laws. I fully recognise that God has given laws and taken them away; He has a perfect right to do so, unless His promises preclude it. If He has made a promise which precludes the abolition of a law within a certain time, His faithfulness requires that that law shall be kept in operation until the end of that time. Baptism, to which reference has been made, is a case in point. God has laid it down for the present dispensation that baptism is essential for justification; therefore He is precluded by His own faithfulness from justifying any without baptism as long as that law is in operation. But the time will come when it will be taken away. For what object? To supersede it by other laws, embodying other ceremonies for attaining the same end. The "law of sin and death" is still in force; the "law of the spirit of life" has not yet brought the consummation for which it was designed; and therefore while these laws are in operation, God's faithfulness requires that He shall act in accordance with that which He has embodied in them.

In the course of this debate I shall have occasion to use certain expressions, and for that purpose I will give my definitions of them. It is one of the elements in a controversy to define your terms. "*Adamic sin*," I shall use as meaning "sin in the flesh"; "*sin in the flesh*," I shall use as expressing the desire to do evil which is in fallen human nature; "*the 'offence' of Adam*," I shall use as meaning his act of disobedience in Eden; "*Adamic condemnation*," as meaning the wrath or disfavour of God for the offence of Adam; "*Justification*," as acquittal from imputed or actual guilt; "*Reconciliation*," as the removal of divine wrath or

* I have since refreshed brother Andrew's memory on this point by showing him the words of his own letter written at the time, recognising the interview as due to my suggestion.—R. R.

See footnotes on page 36-37.—J. J. A.

disfavour for imputed or actual guilt, "*The blood of Christ*," to represent the sacrificial death of Christ as the consummation of an obedient life, unless for the purpose of argument I may divorce his death from that obedient life. The expression, "*In Christ*," I shall use as having reference to all who have entered on a probation for eternal life, whether living before Christ's death or afterwards, the term, "*The faithful*," as meaning candidates for eternal life who have pleased God; and the expression, "*The unfaithful*," for candidates for eternal life who have not pleased God.

A word or two upon the basis of sound exposition is advisable on approaching this, as other subjects. Fundamental principles must obviously regulate the interpretation of isolated passages. Thus, when a passage will bear two different interpretations, that one must be accepted which is in harmony with the fundamental principle relating to it. Take this for instance in 1 Peter 1:4, "An inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, reserved in heaven for you." If the fundamental principle were that the abode of the righteous is in heaven, it would be quite right and necessary to construe that "inheritance" as being the place of abode, but as that is not the fundamental principle, such a construction is opposed to the fundamental principle. Therefore we are compelled to adopt another construction which we all recognise, namely, that the "inheritance incorruptible in heaven" is the eternal life which dwells in Jesus Christ.

Another illustration is found in 1 Cor. xv. 52. "The dead shall be raised incorruptible." At one time it was thought that that embodied immortal resurrection. At the first glance, without taking into consideration other passages of Scripture, it appears to bear that construction. But we apply to that passage the fundamental principle in regard to the judgment seat, and we find that it cannot bear that interpretation, therefore we exclude it, and substitute for a false interpretation the correct one, that "raised incorruptible" extends from the time of coming out of the ground to the bestowal of immortality.

Another fundamental principle is, that "what the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law" (Rom. iii. 19). That is spoken of the law of Moses, but it is a principle applicable to what God has spoken under other circumstances as well. The writings of Moses and the prophets were a law to fleshly Israel, and what they said was spoken only to them. References there were, it is true, to outside nations, but these were specifically mentioned, and unless specifically mentioned, none but those that were under that law were under any obligation in regard to it. So likewise the apostolic epistles

are a law to the brethren of Christ. Hence what is said in those epistles, sometimes in the third person, unless those outside are specified, is applicable solely to the brethren of Christ.

[BROTHER ROBERT'S QUESTIONS BROTHER ANDREW]

1.—Brother Andrew, who are the unjust?—In the first instance all men are unjust, but the unjust referred to in connection with resurrection are those who have been justified, and subsequently become unjustified.

2.—What do you mean by subsequently becoming unjustified?—Sinning, and not obtaining forgiveness.

3.—Are we always to understand the phrase "the unjust" in the apostolic writings in that sense?—No, because we read of Christ dying for the unjust.

4.—Quite so, and it says there shall be a resurrection of the unjust. Now, then, why do you discriminate between one and the other?—Because in writing to the brethren of Christ, reference is made to both faithful and unfaithful, and the term unfaithful is identical with the unjust, who are spoken of as appearing before the judgment seat.

5.—Will the enemies of Christ be present at the resurrection?—Those who rejected Him, who did not believe in Him, who had no faith in Him?—The Jews living in his day will.

6.—I did not say the Jews, but the enemies of Christ?—I must ask you to define who they are.

7.—The enemies of Christ who rejected Him who did not have faith in Him. Will they be present at the resurrection?—What enemies?

8.—The enemies I have defined, who rejected him had no faith in Him. Will they be present at the resurrection?—Jews or Gentiles?

9.—You know, brother Andrew, what I mean. I mean Jews or Gentiles who had no faith in Him, who rejected Him, who were His enemies. Will any of them, Jews or Gentiles, be present?—The Jews will.

10.—They will?—Yes.

11.—Are they justified by the blood of Christ?—They were justified by the previous sacrifices they had offered up.

12.—Excuse me, that is not my question. Were they justified by the blood of Christ?—Justification by the blood of Christ after the blood has been poured out extends backward.

13.—Does it extend to the unfaithful?—Yes.

14.—Where is the proof of that, that the unfaithful are justified by the blood of Christ—the unbelieving?—In Heb. ix., verse 15, we are told "For this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which

are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

15.—Does not that refer to those who are to receive the promise?—Yes.

16.—Will the unfaithful receive the promise?—No.

17.—Does that refer to them?—It applies in principle to all who have been related to the promise.

18.—Does it refer to the faithful or unfaithful?—The faithful.

19.—Will the unfaithful be present at the resurrection?—The unfaithful will be present.

20.—Are they justified by the blood of Christ?—Through the sacrifices which they offered up.

21.—That is not my question. Are they justified by the blood of Christ—those who have no faith in Him?—Justified from Adamic condemnation.

22.—Without any faith in Christ?—Yes, but not from their subsequent individual transgressions.

23.—Are they in any sense justified by the blood of Christ?—Yes.

24.—Who have no faith in it?—Through the sacrifices they offered up.

25.—Who have no faith in it? Meet the question.—It was not necessary to believe in Christ's blood before it was poured out. The apostles themselves did not understand and believe it, and yet they were "clean" (Jno. xiii. 10) previous to it taking place.

26.—Do you say then that sacrifices under Moses could justify men from their sins unto life eternal?—Not without the blood of Christ.

27.—And how is the blood of Christ brought to bear? Is it not by faith?—Certainly, by faith; and sacrifice.

28.—These men had no faith. Christ said they had no faith?—They had some, for they believed in the resurrection.

29.—Excuse me, in Christ they had no faith, "Ye have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith." My reference is to these—Were they justified by the blood of Christ?—They believed in the resurrection.

30.—Answer my question. Were they justified by the blood of Christ?—Justified from Adamic condemnation.

31.—Yes, or no, brother Andrew?—Justified from Adamic condemnation through the sacrifices which they had offered up.

32.—That is not my question. My question is—By the blood of Christ?—From Adamic condemnation.

33.—Answer the question, Yes or no?—Yes, from Adamic condemnation.

34.—By the blood of Christ?—From Adamic condemnation, but not from their subsequent individual transgressions.

35.—From anything?—From Adamic condemnation.

36.—How was the blood of Christ brought to bear?—Through sacrifice.

37.—Not by faith?—They had faith in regard to the Abrahamic covenant, they believed in the resurrection, but they rejected Christ as the one through whom it was to come. They had faith, but it was not sufficient for eternal life.

38.—Were they justified by the blood of Christ?—Justified from Adamic condemnation.

39.—You are not answering the question.—I must define my terms, certainly.

40.—My terms are clearly defined, the issue is very simple. You wish to evade it, and go round it. Come to the point. Were these enemies of Christ justified by the blood of Christ?—Yes, when Christ died, His blood ratified the sacrifices which they had offered up, and thereby justified them from Adamic condemnation.

41.—Do you teach, then, that a man can be justified by the blood of Christ, who has no faith in it?—Not now, certainly. We live in a different dispensation.

42.—These Scribes and Pharisees—were they not contemporary with the blood of Christ?—Not before it took place.

43.—After?—Yes.

44.—Are they to be present at the judgment?—Yes.

45.—Were they justified by the blood of Christ?—No.

46.—Can you point me a case in the Bible where a sinner has been justified before Christ's death by Christ's blood?—The faithful, to whom reference is made in Heb. ix.

47.—I said sinners, the unfaithful. Can you point me to a case in the Bible where an unbelieving sinner before Christ, has been justified by the blood of Christ?—He is justified through the sacrifices he offered up.

48.—That is not the question. Can you point me to a case? Answer the question?—I am answering.

49.—No, you are not. Give me a case where a sinner, an unbelieving man, was justified by the blood of Christ, before the days of Christ by sacrifice or anything else?—Of course he was not justified by the blood before it was poured out; I never affirmed such an absurdity.

50.—You stick to that?—He was not justified previously.

51.—You stick to that?—Justification comes when Christ's blood is shed as the result of what a man did in his lifetime.

52.—Now then, will there not, amongst the unjust that are to be raised, be a large contribution from the generations before Christ?—O yes.

53.—Were they justified by the blood of Christ?—They were justified in shadow by the sacrifices which were offered up, and subsequently when Christ's blood was poured out they were justified in substance

54.—When? Justified in the grave?—What?

55.—Dead men justified? I am speaking of those who died before Christ came, who were unjust, were they justified by the blood of Christ?—They had entered the name of salvation.

56.—You are not answering the question. Were they justified by the blood of Christ?—Yes, when the blood was poured out.

57.—You said no before.—That they were not justified before Christ's blood was shed. They were justified by sacrifices, and the blood of Christ ratified these sacrifices.

58.—In the case of a sinner, of an unfaithful man, brother Andrew? Do you say that?—Justified from Adamic condemnation when he commenced his probation.

59.—An unfaithful man justified?—Justification was through the sacrifices he offered up, and the sacrifices were ratified by the sacrifice of Christ.

60.—Yes, but you are not dealing with a person, you are speaking of a process. An unbelieving, unjust man who died before the days of Christ, was he justified by the blood of Christ?—Not from his own sins.

61.—Was he justified by the blood of Christ? Is it not a plain issue?—Certainly.

62.—Say yes or no.—He was justified from Adamic condemnation.

63.—I have not asked in what sense. Yes or no?—It is necessary to define it.

64.—The time now is to answer questions, you can give explanations afterwards. Yes or no?—He is justified from Adamic condemnation.

65.—An unbelieving sinner was justified through the blood of Christ? What do you mean by an unbelieving sinner?

66.—You understand the terms.—I have never said an unbelieving sinner. It was necessary previous to Christ to enter into the Abrahamic covenant by belief and the offering of sacrifice. When that took place a man entered upon a probation for eternal life, and that act was subsequently ratified by the blood of Christ.

67.—My question relates to the unjust, brother Andrew, not to the faithful man at all, but the unjust who are to be present at the resurrection by your own admission. Were they justified by the blood of Christ?—From the sin.

68.—Yes or no? You can explain afterwards. Yes or no? Were they?—From the sin.

69.—You refuse to answer the question. Yes or no?—I am answering your question.

70.—You are evading it. Say yes or no. Do you refuse to answer? Were these men justified by the blood of Christ?—You define what you mean by unbelieving sinners.

71.—I have defined my terms. You understand what I mean. I ask you to say yes or no. Do you refuse to answer?—No.

72.—Then answer yes or no. You can explain afterwards.—I must explain in the answer.

73.—I want yes or no?—If you take unjustified sinners to be those who are justified in the first instance—Yes. Their justification by sacrifice was subsequently confirmed by the blood of Christ.

BROTHER ROBERTS:—Brother Andrew refuses to answer the question.

BROTHER ANDREW QUESTIONS BROTHER ROBERTS.]

74.—Who are the "some" not justified by Christ's blood who will be raised at judgment seat?—The enemies of Christ are one class.

75.—Any other class?—That is enough for you, is it not?

76.—Quite enough.

77.—Have you always held your present contention that enemies of Christ, or those outside Christ, will appear at the judgment seat?—Always.

78.—Without deviation or modification?—Without deviation or modification.

79.—Are all the descendants of Adam sinners by birth?—Seeing that a child before it is born cannot sin, I must ask you to say in what sense you mean.

80.—In the sense used by Paul in Rom. v. 19, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners."—Yes, I believe that all mankind have come to be sinners in consequence of what Adam did. He was instrumental in introducing evil into the world, and all his descendants are sinners in consequence.

81.—By birth?—As a result of birth from him. There is a distinction there.

82.—What is the distinction?—The distinction lies here. Your question implies "in the act of being born," whereas my answer is the state into which we are born, which is different.

83.—Does your definition "into the state into which we are born" mean that they had to do something before they became sinners?—They had to do something before they became sinners in the sense of transgressors.

84.—I did not say in the sense of transgressors?—I asked you to define your sense.

85.—I defined the sense.—You gave me a passage. You did not define it.

86.—Very well. "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." It does not say became sinners, but "were made?"—The terms are identical in the original, "became" and "were made," "became flesh," it is the same verb.

87.—What became flesh?—The Word became flesh,

88.—If a man to do something to become flesh?—I did not say man, I said the Word.

89.—But we read the Word became flesh. Had Christ to do anything to become flesh?—The Word had.

90.—I am speaking of Christ.—I am not.

91.—The Word became flesh. Was not Christ made flesh?—Well, that is a mere mode of description.

92.—Was he “made of a woman?” (Gal. iv. 4).—Yes.

93.—Was he “made sin?” (2 Cor. v. 21).—Yes.

94.—Did he do anything himself in order to become such?—He had to be born.

95.—Did he do it himself?—Do what himself?

96.—Did he do that himself?—Did he beget himself, do you mean?

97.—Did he do anything in order to be made of a woman?—O! brother Andrew, put me wise questions.

98.—It is a question based upon your definition.—No.

99.—To be made is to become something.—Your understanding of any statement must be in harmony with the facts, as you said, and the fact is a man cannot sin until he is a man.

100.—The question is not whether a man can sin, but whether he was made or constituted a sinner by the offence of Adam.—By Adam's offence he was brought into such a state of things that his being a sinner was inevitable. That is the fact of the case, and you must harmonise the facts and your maxims.

101.—That is not an answer to my question. The question is, are the descendants of Adam “sinners” by birth?—Well, I have already answered that, and I shall be repeating myself to answer it again.

102.—Have they “sinful flesh?”—Yes, they have.

103.—Is not that equivalent to saying they are “made sin” by the offence of Adam?—Quite so, when you understand what is meant. Sinful flesh comes as a result of what he did.

104.—By birth? A man, of course, has not to do something in order to be made of that “sinful flesh”?—Certainly not; the question need not be put.

105.—Men are sinners before they can do anything of themselves?—That is a matter of technical description. Let us have the facts.

106.—Is it necessary for the shedding of blood to take away the sinful condition associated with birth?—The object of the shedding of blood was to declare God's righteousness as the basis of His offer of forgiveness.

107.—That is not an answer.—Yes it is. It is Paul's definition of the meaning of the shedding of blood.

108.—Is it necessary to cleanse from the sinful con-

dition which we all have by birth?—Understood in the apostolic sense, yes.

109.—What is the apostolic sense?—I have defined it.

110.—I ask for a further definition.—The definition is that God required the shedding of the blood of transgressing human nature, before His majesty in the case was sufficiently vindicated for Him to receive us back, and forgive our sins because of our faith. It is a moral operation, physically expressed.

111.—Is “sin in the flesh” the subject of justification through the blood of Christ?—It will be ultimately.

112.—Is it not now?—No; we have it with us now.

113.—Is that proof that it is not the subject of justification?—It depends upon what you mean by justification; there are different kinds of justification, moral and physical.

114.—I defined the term. I said “acquittal from actual or imputed guilt.”—I take a much wider sweep than you. I take in all the Bible facts.

115.—We will deal with one at a time.—We must deal with all.

116.—Let us deal with what we have before us.—Our sins are put away first of all in being forgiven.

117.—What do you mean by sins?—The “wicked works” which Paul says alienated from God (Col. i. 21).

118.—Are we not alienated from God before we commit a single wicked work?—Not in the same sense.

119.—Not in the same sense?—No, we are members of a sinful stock which will certainly bring forth wicked works left to itself.

120.—Is not the sinful condition which we have by nature in itself a cause of alienation from God?—The whole human race is in a state of alienation from Him; it can only become reconciled by coming into harmony with Him, and sinful flesh cannot be in harmony with Him.

121.—Is “sinful flesh” in itself the cause of alienation from God, before a single act has been committed?—It is the root of the mischief.

122.—Is it in itself a cause of alienation from God.—As we cannot consider the thing in itself, the question cannot be narrowed in that way.

123.—Why cannot we consider it in itself? Are there not human creatures born who die before they have committed a single act?—Yes, they are mere bits of animal organism.

124.—Were they not in a state of alienation from God at birth?—Alienation is only applicable to those who are capable of reconciliation.

125.—Is it not applicable to any who are unable to do right or wrong?—No; it is a moral relation—not affirmable of an unconscious babe.

126.—Then, if so, how is it that “sin in the flesh” requires justification which I understand you to have admitted?—Because, brother Andrew, we are going to be saved and be made incorruptible, and we could not be made incorruptible if “sin in the flesh” was not put away by a change to incorruptibility.

127.—Is there not a preceding justification from “sin in the flesh?”—There comes first the sense which I defined; sins are forgiven.

128.—I am not speaking of a man’s “wicked deeds.” I am speaking of “sin in the flesh.”—There are two stages in the process of being saved—one a moral and one a physical; one having to do with the mind, and the other with the body. That is the distinction. We are not justified from the physical until the resurrection. We are justified from the moral now.

129.—Are we not justified from “sin in the flesh” at the same time as from wicked deeds?—That is your way of putting it. I put the facts: that God forgives our sins when we are baptised, and takes away sin in the flesh when we are changed.

130.—In Eph. ii. we read, “And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins.” What do you mean by “trespasses and sins?”—“Wicked works.”

131.—Does it include “sin in the flesh” or the offence of Adam?—Certainly not.

132.—When it says in the 3rd verse, “Ye were children of wrath,” it does not of course mean they were children of wrath then, because it is in the past tense?—Yes.

133.—Does it mean they were “children of wrath” previously?—It means they were “by nature” such as became children of disobedience or wrath, such as sin, such as become transgressors.

134.—Previous to baptism?—Previous to baptism.

135.—Were they not children of wrath in consequence of their nature?—No doubt; I have already explained that.

136.—In consequence of “sin in the flesh”?—Yes, that is a mode of description: I prefer to understand things rather than to jingle phrases.

137.—It is not a jingling of phrases at all. Are those who possess “sin in the flesh” and have not committed a single wicked thing, children of wrath?—In the sense in which a young serpent would be an object of your repugnance: although it has not power to sting you, it will have by and bye if it grows.

138.—Is it not the subject of anger for its condition then? for its sinful nature?—To be angry with a thing for its condition is absurd.

139.—Do you then apply the term “nature” here to acts done subsequently?—No, by nature they were that which they were, and they became so through Adam.

140.—Were “Jews by nature” required to do anything to become Jews, or were they Jews by birth?—Both.

141.—Both? In Romans ii. 27 it says, “uncircumcision which is by nature.”—That is, Gentilism.

142.—Yes. Had they to do anything to become “uncircumcised by nature”?—No.

143.—Were they not uncircumcised by birth?—Yes.

144.—Then by parity of reasoning are not all of them “children of wrath” by birth?—Subject to the right explanation, yes.

145.—What is the correct explanation?—That when they grow up, they are wicked.

146.—But is not “sin in the flesh” in itself the subject of divine wrath?—It is “sin in the flesh” only in the sense of being that which will lead to sin afterwards. It is the impulse, but kept in subjection, it ceases to be the cause of wrath.

147.—Then is not “sin in the flesh” in itself under “condemnation” by God?—God is angry with the wicked. You never read of Him being angry with a man or a beast in a passive sense.

148.—For what was Christ condemned on the cross?—For the sins of the world.

149.—Was He not condemned for sin in His own flesh?—He was part of the sin stock, and stood there as the representative of the whole race, that all might afterwards come to God through Him in being crucified with Him.

[BROTHER ROBERTS QUESTIONS BROTHER ANDREW.]

150.—Who are the synagogue of Satan, Brother Andrew?—That is the 2nd or 3rd of Revelation, is it not?

151.—You need not refer to it. You know where it is. Who are the synagogue of Satan?—The brethren of Christ who had become unfaithful.

152.—Were they Jews?—Unfaithful.

153.—Were they Jews?—They said they were Jews, but because of unfaithfulness were not accounted as such.

154.—What?—They said they were Jews, which implied they were faithful Jews, but because of unfaithfulness they were not accounted as such.

155.—Did they cease to be brethren then?—No.

156.—How did they cease to be Jews?—That is an elliptical form of expression to describe unfaithfulness.

157.—That is your assertion. It is “those who are not Jews, but do lie.”—They claimed to be faithful Jews, but were not.

158.—It does not say unfaithful Jews. It is those “who say they are Jews and ARE NOT, but do lie.”—It is equivalent to having a name to live, but are dead.

159.—Does Christ describe His brethren as the synagogue of Satan?—Not while they continue faithful.

160.—If they are not Jews, they are not brethren, are they?—They are unfaithful brethren.

161.—Excuse me, unfaithful Jews?—Yes, unfaithful Jews.

162.—But Jesus says they were not Jews.—That is an elliptical statement.

163.—That is your assertion. Jesus says they are *not* Jews, but do lie. Are they to be present at the judgment?—Yes, and Jews living in the time of Christ.

164.—Very well, Jews living at the time of Christ are to be present at the resurrection?—Yes.

165.—Are they justified by the blood of Christ?—These Jews?

166.—No; the others you referred to, those living in the time of Christ?—They were justified by the sacrifices they offered up, and these were subsequently ratified by the blood of Christ, because all who had entered upon a probation for eternal life were given to Christ by God.

167.—Did these sacrifices have any virtue apart from that of Christ?—None whatever.

168.—How is the blood of Christ brought to bear?—Now?

169.—Then; any time?—The blood of Christ was brought to bear upon them, then, by their faith, in the first instance, and the offering up sacrifices for sin.

170.—Did these persons have faith?—They had faith at the commencement of their probation.

171.—Excuse me. "I never knew you." Had they faith?—"Thou wilt I profess unto you that I never knew you." He will treat them as if he had not known them. It is not an absolute statement that He never knew them, but "I will profess unto you." "I will treat you in consequence of your unfaithfulness to Me as if I had never known you."

172.—Will He profess that which is not true?—It is not a profession of that which is not true.

173.—He says I never knew you.—I will profess, I will treat you as if I never knew you.

174.—Will He say that which is not true?—No.

175.—Do you know that the word profess means to declare, to proclaim, to state?—Yes.

176.—Will He state that which is not true?—No.

177.—Will He say I never knew you?—He knew them in a certain sense.

178.—He says I never knew you, and they are there to be judged?—They are there through the sacrifices they offered up.

179.—Are these sacrifices of any use without the blood of Christ? and how is the blood of Christ brought to bear?—By God recognising the sacrifice

at the time, and subsequently ratifying them through the blood of Christ.

180.—How does the ratification come to the person?—How does the ratification come to a person?

181.—Yes.—By his having been introduced into the Abrahamic Covenant.

182.—Is it not by faith?—Now?

183.—Excuse me, you are speaking of then—the ratification.—Yes, by faith.

184.—These had no faith.—They had a certain faith.

185.—"Children in whom there is no faith."—Faith in the particular things that were being imparted to them at that time. They had not faith in that which Christ preached.

186.—Can a man be justified by the blood of Christ without having faith in it?—Previous to it taking place?

187.—Any time—before or after, yes or no? Can he be justified by the blood of Christ without having faith in it?—He was justified by believing the promise, and by the sacrifices which he offered up, which was a shadow of that of Christ.

188.—But those who offered the sacrifices and who rejected Christ, were they justified by the blood of Christ?—They were justified by the sacrifices they offered.

189.—Answer the question: Were they justified by the blood of Christ?—They were justified by the sacrifice by which they entered upon their probation, and thereby they came under the justification of Christ when His blood had been shed.

190.—Had those sacrifices any effect apart from Christ?—No.

191.—How then could they justify those who rejected Christ?—Because they were under probation and in a state of responsibility toward God, and God transferred them to Christ when He shed His blood.

192.—Transferred rebels?—Yes.

193.—That is a new doctrine.—Is it?

194.—Yes, quite.—Why will God raise the unfaithful?—Because they have been justified in the first instance from Adamic condemnation.

195.—For what purpose will He raise them?—Judgment.

196.—With what object in the case of the unfaithful?—They are raised to be judged.

197.—But what is the object of the judgment?—The judgment in their case will result in punishment.

198.—Why are they punished?—Because they were unfaithful.

199.—Unfaithful to what?—To the position of favour and responsibility in which they were placed.

200.—Is it not because they were disobedient?—The word "disobedience" may be taken as having two senses, and therefore I prefer not to use it. I

must ask you to define the sense, because obedience is used in reference to the act of immersion, and it is also used in reference to the course of conduct pursued after immersion.

261.—Precisely; is not disobedience the ground of punishment? Are they not raised because of disobedience?—For their unfaithfulness.

202.—For disobedience?—For their disobedience subsequent to entering upon probation.

203.—Is it not the fact that the punishment is for their disobedience?—Yes

204.—Why should He punish them for disobedience?—Because they deserve it, and because God had made known to them that they would be punished.

205.—That is supplementary. Who are the disobedient?—It depends in what sense you mean.

206.—“Because of these things, the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience!”—The world as a whole are sinners.

207.—I have asked the question in a particular form.—They are disobedient in the sense of being not obedient

208.—Are they not punished because they deserve punishment?—The world as a whole deserves to be swept off the face of the earth.

209.—We are speaking of a particular class, the children of disobedience.—Who do you mean by them?

210.—You have already recognised who I mean. Do not put it off.—The unfaithful.

211.—No, no. With regard to the unfaithful we have arrived at this point, that they are to be punished for their disobedience because they deserve it. Does not the world deserve punishment?—The world deserves sweeping out of existence.

212.—Does it not deserve punishment then?—It receives punishment.

213.—Does it deserve it?—It deserves whatever God gives it.

214.—Why hesitate? Does it deserve punishment?—Certainly it does.

215.—Will not God punish it?—God is doing so.

216.—Will He not in days to come?—Those who are living at the time.

217.—Why does He do it then?—Because of their iniquity.

218.—Yes, that will do. Then supposing Christ comes to-morrow, why of two sinners one of whom obeyed God in baptism, and another with equal knowledge refused to do so, why should God punish one and not the other?—Because the punishment of the one is on the basis of the law, the other is not under law.

219.—Is it not the law in both cases that disobedience deserves punishment?—One was under the law.

220.—Is not that the law of the case?—One sinned under law.

221.—Is not that the law of the case, that he is punished because he deserves it?—Because he sinned under law.

222.—Because he deserves it?—Because he deserves it by sinning under law.

223.—You have admitted the other deserves it, too, —Not the same punishment.

224.—He deserves it?—Not the same punishment.

225.—Then does it not come to this, that you make God punish a man who obeyed Him a little, and let a man go free who would not obey Him at all?—Suppose I do?

226.—Then you accuse God of iniquity?—I do not.

227.—I will not push that further.—I recognise the justice of God to the fullest extent.

228.—I have no doubt you intend to do so. You think knowledge makes no difference in a man's position as to responsibility?—Without justification from Adamic condemnation, it does not give him a resurrection to the judgment-seat.

229.—Why did God wink at times of ignorance?—You refer to the statement that God did wink?

230.—Why did He do so?—Because He chose to overlook the iniquity that was committed in times of ignorance.

[BROTHER ANDREW QUESTIONS BROTHER ROBERTS.]

231.—In writing to the Colossians, Paul says: “You being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh hath he quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses.” We have dealt with the expression “dead in sins” already, in Ephesians. You take those of course to be “wicked works” committed previous to baptism? Is that so?—I have answered that question.

232.—Then the expression “hath He quickened” applies to all that was previously dead, does it not?—It defines the change that had taken place in the position of the persons referred to. Before, they were under the unquestioned dominion of death, but now they were placed in a position of having been forgiven their trespasses.

233.—For the trespasses which had been the subject of forgiveness, could death hold them in the grave for ever?—Have I caught the question right?

234.—Could death permanently reign over them for the sins which had been the subject of forgiveness?—The subject of forgiveness?

235.—Yes.—Well, unless God chose to revoke His forgiveness because of their unfaithfulness, because Peter speaks of some who had forgotten they were purged from their old sins, and Paul, of some who had sold their birthright.

236.—Does God withdraw forgiveness?—In the sense of withdrawing His favour—sometimes.

237.—Does He withdraw His favour for sins committed subsequently to forgiveness?—In some cases certainly.

238.—But forgiveness from the condemnation, or divine wrath, is that withdrawn for sins committed subsequently to forgiveness?—I do not think that the offences of a previous time will be brought against men brought into judgment, except in the case of entire departure from the truth. God says that when a righteous man departs from righteousness, all his righteousness is forgotten. Forgiveness is part of his righteousness.

239.—Whatever punishment is inflicted is for sins committed subsequent to forgiveness?—Yes, I think so.

240.—Well then, that would apply to whatever is the subject of justification, would it not?—No doubt.

241.—Is not "sin in the flesh" the subject of justification at baptism?—No; it will be at the resurrection.

242.—Is it not included in the quickening in this verse?—Certainly not. "The body is still dead because of sin" (Rom. viii. 10.)

243.—When the apostle says "You being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh," what does he mean by "the uncircumcision of your flesh"?—He is writing of the Gentiles who formerly had no hope at all. They were more dead even than the Jews.

244.—But does not the expression "sins" describe their wicked deeds?—No doubt.

245.—Then does not the expression "the uncircumcision of your flesh" describe their condition by birth or nature?—Their Gentile state.

246.—Does it not describe their condition by birth or nature?—In the sense of my answer. They were formerly Gentiles who were called "the uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands" (Eph. ii. 11).

247.—Were they not in a state of death through the uncircumcision of their flesh?—They were dead because of sin.

248.—And is not that equivalent to saying through "the uncircumcision of your flesh"?—That is a technicality.

249.—It is a Scriptural technicality?—Yes, it has a meaning, but you are not putting the right meaning to it.

250.—They were dead on account of sin. Is not sin spoken of here in the sense of wicked deeds, and the sin nature?—Yes.

251.—Then they were dead on account of both these things?—No doubt, no doubt.

252.—Then the quickening must have had reference

to sin in both its forms?—Certainly not, the "body is dead because of sin." Paul said so to believers, and it is evident to anyone's common sense. There is not the least change physically until the resurrection.

253.—We are not dealing with physical change.—I am, if you are not, in this matter.

254.—That is the mistake you make.—No, it is your mistake.

255.—"You being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened." Is not quickening the antithesis to deadness?—No doubt.

256.—Does not quickening embrace all that is comprised in the deadness?—No doubt.

257.—Then it embraces wicked works and sinful nature?—In the sense of the deadness, but the sense is this, they were dead in having no hope.

258.—Were they not dead or under condemnation to death because of these things?—No doubt, but not actually dead yet.

259.—No it was a state leading to death.—Just so.

260.—I am not speaking of the physical. Does not "sin in the flesh" defile the body?—Since you cannot conceive of the body apart from "sin in the flesh," it seems an absurd question.

261.—If it is absurd, never mind, answer it.—I cannot answer an absurd question.

262.—Is not the body defiled?—It is an unclean nature. I hope the change will come in the midst of some of these wrangles.

263.—Is the body the subject of justification at the present time?—No.

264.—Then how does that which is defiled become holy?—I do not know what you mean.

265.—Does not the body of believers become holy at baptism?—In a moral sense only, not a physical.

266.—I do not mean physical.—Very well.

267.—Can it become holy morally, without the sin that defiles it being the subject of justification?—In view of the two senses of sin which you have introduced, I must ask which you refer to.

268.—I said "sin in the flesh."—You did not.

269.—I beg your pardon. When it becomes holy, is not "sin in the flesh" which defiled it the subject of justification?—No. "Sin in the flesh" is physical; justification from that is by the change that is to come at another stage, viz., at the resurrection. Justification is moral first, physical afterwards.

270.—I am speaking about the moral. Is not "sin in the flesh" the subject of justification in a moral or legal sense (I think legal is better)?—You are mixing up two terms. "Sin in the flesh" is a physical attribute, forgiveness is a moral relation. Do not confound the two things.

271.—Have not wicked deeds a physical consequence?—No doubt they have.

272.—Is there not complete forgiveness for wicked

deeds, without removal of the consequences of those deeds?—That is too nebulous a question for me to answer.

273.—Is it? I thought from what you had admitted it would be perfectly clear.—Nay.

274.—Are there not physical consequences from many wicked deeds?—The question is too general.

275.—A person gets drunk.—That is a physical condition.

276.—A course of drunkenness ruins the constitution. If one who has been an habitual drunkard during his life becomes Christ's by immersion into His name, is not all his drunken course of life blotted out and forgiven?—He is forgiven the sin of drunkenness.

277.—But the physical effects are not removed?—No.

278.—But they are not counted against him?—No, not his previous drunkenness.

279.—In the same way by parity of reasoning is not the offence of Adam in regard to each individual the subject of justification at baptism, although its physical consequences are not affected?—We are not held guilty of Adam's offence.

280.—Not legally?—I do not wish to deal in shadowy terms. I prefer the naked substance of truth. Adam sinned and was condemned, and we as his children inherit the mortality which was the consequences. God does not hold us responsible for what he did, but for our own sins.

281.—Does it require the shedding of blood in order to cleanse us from it?—The blood of Christ was shed in order to declare God's righteousness. So Paul teaches. (Rom. iii. 25).

282.—In order to cleanse us from sin in the flesh?—I gave you the apostolic definition.

283.—Give me yours.—It was to declare God's righteousness as the foundation upon which He would grant the remission of sins through His forbearance. It was a vindication of God's dishonoured majesty, for us to submit to as a condition of His favour, and not a mechanical process to cleanse us.

284.—I perfectly recognise all you quote; the question is as to its meaning. Did Christ require to die for Himself?—In view of the work He came to do, Yes; but if there had been Himself only, No.

285.—He would not have had to die for himself?—I have answered the question. He came as the representative of our condemned race to lay a foundation for our salvation, and for that reason it was needful He should take our nature and stand as our representative, and die as one of us, and we die with Him in being baptised.

286.—If He did not die for Himself, did He not die purely as a substitute?—By no means. He was of exactly the same stock and inherited the same consequences of Adam's sin as we.

287.—Was the shedding of His blood not necessary for Himself apart from others?—Since we cannot contemplate Him apart from others, it is no use putting the question. He was one of the whole race.

288.—You put it, if there had been no others His death would have been unnecessary?—That is putting an abstract question which it is not convenient to discuss.

289.—It may be inconvenient, but it is necessary. Since you cannot separate Him from others, we cannot so consider Him. Had He stood by Himself—a new Adam—His position would have been totally different.

290.—But did He not fulfil the Aaronic type of offering for Himself and then for the sins of the people?—No doubt.

291.—What was it in relation to Himself for which He had to shed His blood?—He stood there as bearing the sins of His whole brethren.

292.—Did he have the sin-nature Himself as well as the sins of His brethren which required the offering of Himself as a sacrifice?—He had no sin except the possession of a nature which leads to sin, but which in Him did not lead to sin.

293.—Did it not require blood-shedding to cleanse Him although it did not lead to sinning?—In order to declare God's righteousness is Paul's explanation, which to me is the all-sufficient explanation, and to me profoundly philosophical. Any other is so much cloud of dust.

294.—We do not want to take surface views of matters; that is why I ask these questions as to whether Christ's own sin-nature required the shedding of blood to cleanse it?—I have answered the question.

295.—I insist upon a yes or no.—What is it you ask me to say yes or no to?

296.—Did Christ's own sin nature require blood-shedding in order that He might be cleansed?—As you cannot put him apart from others, it is no use asking the question.

[BROTHER ROBERTS QUESTIONS BROTHER ANDREW.]

297.—God winked at times of ignorance. Would He have winked at times of knowledge?—The question implies no.

298.—What would He have done?—Inflicted such punishment as He himself might deem necessary.

299.—Why inflict punishment?—Because He would deem that they deserved it.

300.—What is the ground of deserving punishment? Is it not refusing to do the will of God when it is known?—Yes, that is one basis, it is not the only basis.

301.—Can you give me any case of a man that will be punished for any other reason than this, that he refused to do the will of God when knowing it?—God punishes the wicked who do not know what His will is.

302.—That is making the case worse.—He has done so in the past.

303.—You are going the other side of the line, keep on this side, please. Can you give me a case where God will inflict punishment where that element is absent, knowing His will?—Not at the judgment seat, certainly.

304.—Is not that the cause of punishment at the judgment seat, knowing the will of God, and refusing to do it?—Yes, for those who are under probation.

305.—That is your addition. I am now dealing with a principle of general application. You have laid it down as a general principle applicable to all mankind. Now you seek to circumscribe it.—If I give a general answer without defining the sense in which I use it, you can turn round and say it applies to another case as well.

306.—I only wish to see the basis clearly defined, to know whether the reason of punishment is not refusal to do the will of God when you know it?—Yes, for those who are under probation.

307.—Were the Gontilos under probation?—Not those who did not enter Christ, certainly.

308.—Did He punish them?—Yes, in this life.

309.—Then He punishes them without probation?—I have already admitted that.

310.—Why does He do so?—Because of their wickedness.

311.—Why is wickedness the reason for punishing them?—Because God is righteous.

312.—Why does His righteousness call for their punishment?—It answers itself.

313.—Because they deserve it?—Oh, yes.

314.—Very well, we are discussing the ground of resurrectional punishment. Why do you object to the application of that principle to resurrectional punishment, that men who know God's will and refuse to do it, will be brought up then?—I do not object to it in relation to those in Christ.

315.—I am not speaking of those in Christ, but those who know the will of God, and refuse to do it?—They will not be raised.

316.—Do not they deserve it?—They deserve whatever punishment God will give them.

317.—Do not they deserve resurrectional punishment?—It is for God to say whether they do.

318.—Have you an opinion?—They deserve whatever punishment God may inflict upon them. He has not threatened resurrection to judgment against them and therefore He will not give it them.

319.—It says "the wicked shall not be unpunished,

they shall come forth to the day of wrath," "those who have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation?"—And the greater proportion of those who have had a probation have been wicked, and have done evil. "Many are called but few are chosen."

320.—Then comes in the question, why does He discriminate between one class and another? Why bring up some to punishment and others not? Is it not because He winks at times of ignorance?—He brings some to punishment because He has constituted a judgment seat specially for them.

321.—Is not Christ the judge of all?—He is judge of all who have been given to Him.

322.—Has He not power over all flesh?—Dead men are not flesh. He will have power over all flesh when He comes to take possession of His inheritance. That is the sense in which He has power over all flesh.

323.—God hath appointed a day in which He will judge the living and the dead?—Those responsible.

324.—Why keep out the dead because they are not flesh?—Because power over all flesh has reference to the time when He will exercise power over all men.

325.—Will his judgment be brought to bear upon all who are responsible to it?—Of course. His judgment when he comes is of two kinds. First it has relation to his judgment seat when all candidates for immortality will be judged, and secondly, it has reference to the wicked living on the earth.

326.—My question relates to those who rise. Will not the judgment be for those who receive and those who reject His words?—Yes, understanding that they are probationary.

327.—Can a man be probationary who rejects Christ altogether?—Certainly, there were certain in Peter's day who denied the Lord that bought them.

328.—Did Christ refer to them when he said "He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him, the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day?"—He referred to Jews living in his days.

329.—Did he refer to those who once recognised him?—Those who recognised Moses and the prophets, but rejected the Messiah.

330.—That is not my question. My question is, will not those who reject Christ altogether be present at his judgment seat to be condemned by Him?—Yes, Jews and Gentiles under probation.

331.—Can a man who rejects Christ be under probation?—Certainly he can.

332.—Give me a case.—The Jews in Christ's day. Many of them looked forward to Christ appearing, accepted the baptism of John, but when Christ came they were disappointed and rejected Him. That did not invalidate the justification which they already had from previous sins.

333.—By John's baptism do you mean?—Yes, and

by the sacrifices offered up under the Mosaic law. That brought upon them a special condemnation for rejecting Christ.

334.—Let us be clear. If they were justified by the sacrifices of the Mosaic law, what need for the baptism of John?—That was a special justification ceremony.

335.—Was it superfluous?—No.

336.—Was it necessary?—Seeing that God appointed it, it was.

337.—Would it have been necessary if their sins had been forgiven before?—Their sins by John's baptism were forgiven in the same way that other sins had been previously forgiven.

338.—Were they forgiven previously?—They were forgiven in shadow.

339.—Were they forgiven at all?—Yes.

340.—Then why go to John's baptism?—Because under the Mosaic law, seeing everything was in shadow, its ceremonies could be repeated time after time.

341.—Was John's baptism substance or in shadow?—It was in shadow, because it presaged Christ's own death and resurrection.

342.—Why was it necessary to go from one ceremony to another?—Because God appointed it.

343.—Does God appoint things without reason?—Oh dear no.

344.—Did He send them to John to get remission of sins which were already remitted?—They were constantly sinning.

345.—Did they require a sin remitting ceremony each time they sinned?—Certainly, that was required by the Mosaic law, whether they became defiled legally or by actual transgression.

346.—Is a man's baptism vitiated by sinning afterwards?—Not at all.

347.—Why not?—Because after baptism he has a high priest, and he goes to God through that high priest and asks forgiveness on the basis of the blood which was applied to him at his baptism.

348.—That is a very beautiful answer, but we are getting away from the question. Where is the case of a rejector of Christ being under probation?—Some of Christ's own followers in His day were under probation, and in consequence of the hard things which He spoke they forsook Him, and that means, they rejected Him.

349.—Then if a man had not followed Christ in the sense of your present explanation, he would not be one, would he, that was under probation?—O yes he would.

350.—What is the point of your answer then?—There were the Pharisees.

351.—Define it.—At that time it was to be in the Abrahamic covenant.

352.—What was?—Probation. Previous to John's appearing, those who were under probation were in the Abrahamic covenant. They entered that covenant by faith and sacrifice.

353.—Was that sacrifice of any value to them apart from their acceptance of Christ?—It was of value to them for the time being. It could not give them eternal life without Christ.

354.—It could not give them eternal life without receiving Christ?—No.

355.—Would it give them responsibility to the judgment seat then?—Yes.

356.—Why?—Because they were in covenant with God. They had been brought into a state of reconciliation with Him.

357.—A state of reconciliation to life eternal?—With a view to life eternal, certainly.

358.—What was necessary to complete it?—The same that is necessary for us, that they should continue faithful.

359.—Must we not recognise Christ first?—Now, certainly.

360.—Can we make a beginning without it?—No, we cannot.

361.—Can we be under probation without it?—No.

362.—How then can those who reject Christ be probationers?—Now they cannot.

363.—Could they then?—Previous to Christ's coming they could be probationers without believing in Christ individually, in the same way that some of his followers were.

364.—I am speaking of rejectors. "He that rejecteth Me and receiveth not My words hath one that judgeth him, the word that I have spoken shall judge him." Does not that define the basis of condemnation—the rejection of the authority of Christ?—Yes, in regard to those to whom it was applied.

365.—Why do you say that those who know about Christ and believe that He is the Lord of the living and dead, and refuse for their own convenience to be subject to the law of God, to whom therefore Christ has spoken, that they will not be judged by His words? Why?—They have not had a probation for eternal life; they have not been justified from the offence of Adam, and they have not been given to Christ for resurrection and judgment purposes in the future.

366.—What is the reason why they are to be exempt from the punishment of a law they know?—Who are the "they" that know?

367.—Those who know the will of God and will not obey it?—Outside Christ?

368.—Yes. Why are they exempt from the punishment of a law they know?—Because they are born under condemnation to death, and when they die that condemnation takes its effect upon them.

[BROTHER ANDREW QUESTIONS BROTHER ROBERTS].

369.—In Heb. xiii. 20, it says that Christ was brought from the dead by the blood of the everlasting covenant. Was the blood of the everlasting covenant necessary for Christ to be brought from the dead?—With the meaning already defined, yes.

370.—If, after the Last Supper, He had died without shedding His blood could He, on Scriptural principles, have been brought from the dead?—No, because He would have been disobedient.

371.—Then the shedding of His blood was absolutely necessary for His restoration to life?—When properly understood, yes.

372.—I will listen to what you have to say about properly understood.—You don't mean me to make a speech?

373.—No.—You had better proceed with the questions. If disobedient, Christ could not have been raised from the dead, and, of course, He could not have received eternal life.

374.—You recognise that He was immortalised by His blood?—Immortalised by His blood? No, not as a literal description. It is a figure of speech. It is your figure, not even the Bible's. Blood is a perishing thing. God immortalised Him because of obedience. God required of Him that He should suffer a violent death as a vindication of God's righteousness, and as a foundation on which to offer us forgiveness.

375.—Heb. ix. 12, "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place." Is not that equivalent to saying that He was immortalised by His blood?—I am not here to strive about words; it is facts that are in question.

376.—Is not the holy place here immortality?—"Heaven itself," Paul says. (Heb. ix. 24).

377.—Does it not mean immortality?—Not apart from heaven; it is involved, no doubt.

378.—Is not immortality the antitype of the most holy place in the Mosaic law?—It embraces it, but primarily it is heaven itself.

379.—Were not the holy and most holy places in themselves heavenly places, that is, heaven-like places?—As patterns of things in the heavens, they were.

380.—Are not we now in the heavens in the sense in which it is spoken of in Hebrews and Ephesians?—Perhaps I misunderstand you.

381.—Are we not in the heavens now, in that we are in the antitypical holy place?—Only in the sense in which we are come to Mount Zion, to an innumerable company of angels. We have become related to them.

382.—Did not the flesh separate the holy from the most holy place? You are now mixing up literal and

figurative language. The holy and the most holy were the literal things of the Mosaic tabernacle.

383.—I thought it would be sufficient to put the matter concisely.—I do not catch your meaning.

384.—Did not the veil which separated the holy from the most holy represent the flesh of Christ?—Yes.

385.—Then when He entered into the most holy was He not beyond the flesh?—No doubt.

386.—When it says He entered into the most holy by His blood, does it not mean that He entered there on the basis of having shed his blood?—No doubt, understanding that in relation to the will of God.

387.—That is the only sense in which I have used the expression.—No, you detached the bloodshedding from its surroundings.

388.—I do not — You seem to do.

389.—You have misrepresented me by saying so.—We are liable to mistakes, you know.

390.—I used the expression "by His blood" to mean on the basis, or principle of.—To me blood is a passive thing. It does nothing, and therefore to represent it as doing something stultifies my understanding. You must give literal facts.

391.—What was the object of His shed blood?—It was to declare God's righteousness as the basis of reconciliation.

392.—That is fully recognised. The question relates to the basis. Did not Christ enter into the most holy place or immortality on the basis of the shedding of His blood? Does not that mean that He could not enter in without? Does it not also mean that the blood cleansed Him individually from corruption which was an impediment to His obtaining eternal life?—I do not deny that.

393.—Why did you say that Christ did not die for Himself, apart from others?—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.

394.—Is it impossible to conceive of the Aaronic high priest offering for his own cleansing in the first instance?—No.

395.—Then is it not equally possible to consider Christ offering for His own cleansing apart from the cleansing of others?—What is the use of discussing a case that does not exist?

396.—It does exist.—His work is the saving of mankind, and you cannot discuss Him apart from that.

397.—If we have two things presented in type, can we not look at the two things separately in the antitype?—That is a matter of intellectual enterprise; it does not determine the truth of the case.

398.—Is it not part of the understanding of this question?—It may be, but you do not help it by introducing it.

399.—I do. We both recognise Christ did not commit transgression, and that His blood was not required in regard to Himself for anything of that kind. Yet He did shed His blood for Himself. What was it then for which He shed His blood for Himself?—I have answered that several times, brother Andrew. He was a mortal man, inheriting death from Adam.

400.—You have answered it by evading it. —By no means. I have not answered in your precise terms, which conceal meanings.

401.—Did He not require to shed His blood to cleanse Himself from His own sin nature, and has not God made that the basis by which those in Him may be justified from the sin of that nature, and have forgiveness of sins?—I prefer the scripture description of what was done by the death of Christ. The scriptures never use the word cleanse in that sense.

402.—Never use the word cleanse in regard to physical sin?—Not in that connection.

403.—Did not the inanimate things of the Mosaic tabernacle require to be cleansed, justified, or atoned for by bloodshedding?—Yes, as a shadow, doubtless

404.—Was there any moral guilt attaching to them?—You do not require me to answer that, of course?

405.—Then it was for imputed guilt?—It was a ritual prophecy.

406.—Does it not teach that the sin nature, which in the first instance has no moral guilt, requires bloodshedding in order that it may be cleansed or justified?—Bloodshedding is never spoken of except in connection with actual sin.

407.—Transgression, you mean?—I mean to say the scriptures never give it the merely chemical action that you do.

408.—It is not a chemical relation. I express it as it appears to me.—You represent it as being brought to bear upon physical nature to produce physical results. It is always related to moral results. We are justified by faith and are washed from our sins in His blood in the sense of being forgiven because of our faith in it.

409.—Do we not read about justification and washing?—I have not denied that.

410.—Did not Paul say to the Corinthians, "Ye are washed, ye are justified?"—That is irrelevant to what I have said.

411.—It is quite relevant.—No.

412.—In Romans v. we read, "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation." Can that condemnation be taken away without a justification relating to that which brought the condemnation?—Certainly not. When that statement is understood in its full development, there is no difficulty. The judgment was first upon Adam as a person.

413.—And did not that judgment bring condemnation upon all his descendants for his offence?—It established a condition of things in which, if posterity ensued, they were necessarily sinners and therefore condemnation became the universal rule, and there can be no remission of that condemnation or forgiveness of sin without a preliminary vindication of God's authority in the shedding of blood.

414.—Are they not under condemnation for the offence of Adam before they do anything themselves, right or wrong?—They are mortal because of Adam's sin.

415.—That is not an answer. Are they not under condemnation for the offence of Adam before they do anything, right or wrong?—God condemns no man for Adam's offence in the individual sense. Condemnation comes through it, which is a very different idea.

416.—Do you deny the statement, "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation?"—No, I do not deny it.

417.—You do.—No; I explain it.

418.—Was not the offence of Adam the ground for condemnation of all men?—Of men that did not exist?—Yes. Do not charge God with folly.

419.—It is Scriptural. —Yes, as a matter of terms it may be. You know it is said you can prove anything in that way. You must rightly divide the word of truth.

420.—When babies die, do they die under condemnation?—They were not particularly considered in the sentence.

421.—Do they not die as a result of that condemnation?—Yes, as a result of the conditions established through it.

422.—Are they not "children of wrath," and do they not die under the condemnation under which they are born?—They are children who would grow up to be men who would provoke God's wrath by disobedience if they lived, but as babies the wrath is not begun.

423.—On what ground do they die?—Because they are mortal.

424.—Why are they mortal?—Because of the condemnation to death that Adam brought upon himself through disobedience.

425.—What does that mean?—It means that Adam sinned and Adam was condemned to death, and they come from him and naturally partake of the mortal condition established in his nature by the sentence of death.

426.—Does it mean they were condemned in him?—Do you mean to say they were individually considered?

427.—No, but that he is the federal head of the community, all of whom were in him, and all were condemned.—In the Scriptural sense, yes, but not in the sense you are attempting to establish, namely, the sense of every individual being contemplated in the sentence.

428.—I did not say so.—You did not make your meaning clear.

SECOND NIGHT.

THE CHAIRMAN (BROTHER LAKE):—I will read again brethren and sisters the subject of debate, and the conditions of same. The subject is "That resurrection to the judgment seat of Christ will comprise some who have not been justified by the blood of Christ." The time this evening will be occupied in this way. The first six quarters of an hour, either brother Roberts or brother Andrew may speak or question the other. The last two quarters of an hour to be filled with speeches.

I now call upon brother Roberts to open to-night's discussion by questioning brother Andrew or a speech.

BROTHER ROBERTS :—Dear brethren and sisters,—I am afraid that in the dust raised by our somewhat hurly-burly proceeding on Tuesday evening, the general outline of the argument was obscured from view, and I will make use of the brief quarter of an hour at my disposal now to bring it into view, so that the bearing of the questions and answers may be perceived.

Brother Andrew contends that no man, however much deserving of punishment, can come forth to the resurrection of condemnation, unless he first be released from the sentence of death hereditarily derived from Adam; that that sentence bars the way—that so long as it is on, he cannot rise, and he must remain in the grave.

The first answer to that is, that it must be wrong because it is in collision with the fact that men in that position have already been raised by God himself. The resurrection of such shows that God does not regard the Adamic sentence as a barrier if His purpose in any case require the coming again to life of any son of Adam.

The second objection is that the view involves the moral enormity that of two men, both deserving punishment, one deserving it a little and the other deserving it more, the one who deserves it the more is left unpunished, and the other only comes forth to the anguish of the second death.

We can realise such a doctrine in its practical application perhaps better than putting it abstractly. Suppose you have two sons, William and Henry. They both grow up to manhood, and they both know God's demands in the Gospel. William recognises that if he accedes to these commands, it will be highly inconvenient for him in a variety of ways, interfere with his business, interfere with his pleasure and advantage, and he deliberately says, "I will have nothing to do with it. I know it is God's will, but

that is nothing to me." Henry knowing the same says, "Yes, it is God's command. The Word of God has come to me and I will try to obey it." He submits to Christ in putting on His name in baptism and in the undertaking of his service. In the course of time he is overcome, falls away. The resurrection comes. You are there and you see Henry and you do not see William. You say, "Henry, my lad, you tried your best, you failed, and here you are. Where is William? He defied God out and out, and he is not here." That illustrates the second point, the moral enormity. It is an imputation against God, who is just and true in all His ways.

The next answer is, that Brother Andrew's idea cannot be right, because the enemies of Christ who hated Him, who disbelieved in Him, who rejected Him, are to come forth to be condemned by Him, and to be punished by Him. Brother Andrew says, Yes, but they were justified from sin by the sacrifices under the law, retrospectively acted upon by Christ's death. I say, What! Brother Andrew? Is it possible that men who hate Christ, that have no faith in Him, that refuse to submit to Him, can be justified by His blood, which means reconciled, which means brought into favour, which means to stand in God's grace? Brother Andrew himself was appalled at the issue. If he said "Yes, they can," then he committed himself to this monstrous idea, that the enemies and rejectors of Christ are reconciled by His blood. And if he said "No," then he was obliged to admit that men not justified by His blood will appear before the judgment seat of Christ. He saw the dilemma, and therefore he did not go straight to it. He would not say yes or no, but compelled me to do a little of that shouting which is the result of physical weakness and for which I apologise, and which I never indulge in except through stress of that kind, where there is a refusal to meet the naked issues of truth.

Now, I wish to show that Brother Andrew's idea is entirely wrong, that the law of Moses in none of its appointments had any power to justify men from their sins or release them from death, and in taking very confident and absolutely strong ground there, I am not advocating a theory of my own. I am not going all round gathering remote and nebulous inferences from obscure facts and trying to weave them into a consistent theory. I rely upon the explicit assertions of Paul, who was guided by the Spirit of God,

To his statements I call your attention. They are not few, and they are not ambiguous. "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight." Thus we read in Romans iii. 20. "If righteousness," or justification, "come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain" (Gal. ii. 21). "A man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ. . . for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (verse 16). "As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident.' That is a direct negation of the contention.

Now the question is, what was the law given for? Brethren and sisters, for a purpose that of itself entirely excludes the possibility of the very thing that brother Andrew is contending for. Not that they might be saved, but that they might be condemned. "What the law saith it saith to them that are under the law," not in the sense of keeping the Gentiles out of its benefits as brother Andrew suggested, but that Israel also, the very seed of Abraham, might be brought under condemnation—"that every mouth may be stopped, and *the whole world become guilty* before God." Not the Gentiles only—the Gentiles were already condemned—the Jews as the seed of Abraham had a possible position of justification. The law came to condemn them. It is so written. I will read the statements. "The law entered that the offence might abound" (Rom. v. 20). The law is a "ministration of death." The law is a "ministration of condemnation." These two statements are both made in 2 Cor. iii. 7, 9. "The law worketh wrath." "By the law is the knowledge of sin." "I had not known sin but by the law." The law was given that sin might appear "exceeding sinful." All these are apostolic declarations.

On the face of them, they may appear strange. At first sight, it is scarcely intelligible that God should give a law for such a purpose, but when the fact is taken in connection with the plan of which the law was a part, it appears in a different light. We then see the plan as a whole. Brethren and sisters, we must take this subject as a whole, and not in bits. It is through doing it in bits that brother Andrew is making his mistakes. The plan as a whole is outlined in one of these statements. "The law entered that the offence might abound, that where sin abounded, grace might much more abound." "He hath concluded all under sin, that He might have mercy upon all."

BROTHER ANDREW :—I desire to supplement what was said on Tuesday concerning the expression "I

never knew you." The word "knew" in the Greek and English is an elastic word. Sometimes it means a mere matter of knowing facts; at other times it has a more comprehensive meaning. An illustration of the latter occurs in John xvii. 3, "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." To "know" here is not the mere knowledge of a fact; it embraces an understanding of God and His Son, and all that follows from that understanding.

Then in regard to the Greek word it is defined as follows in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon :—"To know, perceive, to gain knowledge of, mark, person or things, to be aware of, understand." Secondly, in Attic prose, "to examine, form an opinion, to decide upon, determine, *approve*." Evidently the secondary meaning is the one Christ had in His mind then. He did not use it as a mere matter of knowing that these ones who claimed to be His disciples were such, but that in consequence of their unfaithfulness He would declare to them that He never approved of them.

I think in the confusion last Tuesday there was one question which I did not fully answer, and that was something to this effect. Can you mention any wicked or unfaithful man in the Old Testament who was justified through the blood of Christ? It is not, as suggested by brother Roberts, that I was appalled by that or any other question, and that I saw the dilemma which was involved. I was actuated solely by a desire to be explicit, and to show in what sense I understood that which was involved in the question. I will now state it again, or more completely. First of all I gave this brief answer to the question: That all the unfaithful in the Abrahamic covenant previous to the time of Christ, were justified in shadow during the time that they lived, and that that was subsequently ratified by the blood of Christ. As regards the enemies to which attention has been called, last Tuesday I pointed out, in answer to the questions, that it was not necessary at that time to believe in the blood of Christ, that the twelve Apostles themselves did not believe or understand it, and yet they were accounted as "clean" (Jno. xiii. 10). It was necessary for Jews to believe in the Abrahamic covenant, and to believe in resurrection as a preliminary to the fulfilment of that covenant; they did so believe, and they partook of justification in shadow through circumcision, and the sacrifices which they offered up. Therefore the argument that because they hated Christ and had no faith in Him is pointless. They hated him because he did not realize their expectations, and their hatred brought upon them condemnation in addition to that which they had previously incurred through disobedience to the Mosaic law.

The passages which have been quoted in regard to the deeds of the law not justifying are not at all at variance with my contention. I never did contend that the deeds of the law of themselves could justify or that the sacrifices and other ceremonies could of themselves justify. My contention has been that that justification was in shadow, just in the same way as Christ's own circumcision on the eighth day was in shadow, but that these things were subsequently confirmed by the blood of Christ when He died and rose from the dead.

[BROTHER ANDREW QUESTIONS BROTHER ROBERTS.]

429.—And now I will ask brother Roberts whether he believes that David and other faithful men who lived under the law of Moses are included in this expression in Rev. vii. 14: "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb?"—Yes.

430.—Were not David and those faithful ones justified, or will they not at that time have been justified from their sins by the blood of Christ?—I have never raised any objection to the faithful; my objection was to wicked men.

431.—Does not that justification include justification from the Adamic condemnation which they inherited?—Are you speaking of the righteous or the wicked?

432.—I am speaking of the righteous.—I have no issue with you as to the righteous.

433.—Still, I would like a more specific answer.—That is the fact. It is on the wicked we differ.

434.—Are not wicked and righteous both in the same condition before they came into reconciliation with God?—Unquestionably.

435.—Then as to the faithful who lived under the law, did they not at birth require justification from the condemnation which they inherited from Adam?—You limit your question too narrowly.

436.—Never mind whether it is narrow. It is a question.—A baby has no spiritual relations whatever.

437.—Does not a baby require justification?—You cannot justify a baby.

438.—Then how is it that Jewish male babies were subjected at eight days of age to circumcision?—God chose to establish that as a token of His covenant with them as a nation.

439.—Was not that a justification in shadow?—What do you mean by a justification in shadow?

440.—Was it not a justification in shadow from the sin nature which the child possessed?—What do you mean by "in shadow"?

441.—In contradiction to substance?—Do you mean reality?

442.—Well, reality in Christ?—Then I do not know a justification that is not real.

443.—Was there not justification under the Mosaic law in shadow in any way whatever?—What do you mean by justification in shadow. I do not know such a thing. That is one of your inventions.

444.—Was there not atonement in shadow?—The same remark applies.

445.—Is not the word atonement used in reference to the Mosaic sacrifices?—Yes.

446.—Then when these sacrifices, which are described as atonement, were offered up, was there not atonement in shadow?—No, the atonement was real to the extent to which it went.

447.—And is not that the same as atonement in shadow?—I do not know what you mean by atonement in shadow.

448.—I mean a representation of the reality that was coming?—If you mean a prophecy I can understand it.

449.—I mean more than a prophecy?—Then we do not agree.

450.—Then there is a vital difference?—Yes.

451.—In Heb. ix., 13, we read, "If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" What is meant there by the blood of bulls and goats sanctifying to the purifying of the flesh?—Establishing a legal cleanness from uncleanness created by the law of Moses, which was a fictitious thing.

452.—Legal cleanness?—Yes.

453.—Was all the uncleanness which, was the subject of a cleansing ceremony under the law of Moses, a fictitious thing?—No.

454.—Was there any uncleanness which was not fictitious?—Yes.

455.—Will you mention some?—The uncleanness of nature, as involved in child-birth, for example.

456.—That was not fictitious. Is it not the unclean nature spoken of here, when the apostle says, "The blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh?"—Impossible, for the law never did cleanse sin nature.

457.—Never did cleanse sin nature?—The cleansing of sin nature is reserved for the resurrection.

458.—Is not this statement made in reference to the law?—Yes.

459.—Then what was the nature or effect of the purifying of the flesh which is spoken of here?—

Those who were purified were recognised as legally clean. It was a shadow cleanness—all types and shadows.

460.—All types and shadows, but there was a legal cleanness?—In the sense in question it was real—a really recognised legal cleanness.

461.—That related to the flesh?—Yes, as in the case of the leper. There it was both real and fictitious, but in the case of touching an unclean thing, it was fictitious.

462.—Was not the uncleanness of the flesh a real thing?—Yes.

463.—Then if the uncleanness of the flesh was a real thing, is not the uncleanness of the flesh, which the apostle speaks of here, a real thing?—He does not speak of it. That passage just draws the distinction that is before my mind. There is a great difference between the law and Christ.

464.—Is not the purification of fleshly uncleanness involved in verse 14?—Read it.

465.—“How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.”—There is not a passage in the New Testament that more completely disproves your contention. Paul draws a distinction between the ceremonial purification of the law and the spiritual purification achieved in Christ.

466.—Does not “how much more” mean in addition to?—No.

467.—Does not “how much more” include the purification of the flesh as well as purging the conscience?—No; it is a comparison of two things.

468.—Then if the flesh under the law was unclean, and required a shadowy purification, where was the shadow, or, where was the prophecy, if you so like it, in regard to Christ, if our nature does not require cleansing through bloodshedding?—Our nature does require cleansing. It will be cleansed at the resurrection, and that will be because of Christ's obedience unto death.

469.—By immortalisation, do you mean?—Unquestionably; it is not cleansed until then.

[BROTHER ROBERTS QUESTIONS BROTHER ANDREW.]

470.—Brother Andrew, are men who “die in their sins” justified from them?—Do you mean those out of Christ?

471.—I mean just what I say.—Men who die in their sins I understand to be men who die in Adam.

472.—I have not asked that. Please answer the question.—Then I must ask for it to be defined, and I will give a specific answer.

473.—Do men who die in their sins die in a state of justification?—That expression is used by Paul in

regard to those out of Christ—men who die in Adam.

474.—Quite so. I have not forgotten that. Answer the question, Do men who die in their sins die in a justified state?—Not out of Christ.

475.—Very well. Do you not know that Jesus said of the Pharisees, “Except ye believe that I am He ye shall die in your sins”?—Yes.

476.—Did He not also say that they should give an account in the day of judgment?—Yes.

477.—How, according to your theory, are these two things to be reconciled?—Because they were unfaithful men who had partaken of justification, in shadow, from Adamic condemnation.

478.—Excuse me, they “died in their sins”?—Yes.

479.—Not justified, how can they awake!—They had become unjustified after being justified.

480.—Did they lose it then?—Lose justification?

481.—Yes.—They became unjustified.

482.—By whatever means?—Yes, they became unjust.

483.—You said that is the meaning of unjust, those who lost justification.—Yes.

484.—How much better off is a man who has lost a thing than a man who has it not?—In the long run he is no better, but in his relationship to God and Christ he is in a very different position.

485.—How so, if his justification is absent, and that you say is needful for him to awake?—Because of the justification in the first instance; on that basis he entered upon probation for eternal life; he was then “bought” from the power of the death that came through Adam; and his sins committed subsequently have not been the subject of adjudication.

486.—Then you said, I think, that men were not justified by the blood of Christ until Christ had died? Yes.

487.—Then what is the position of all who died before Christ?—Those who died without having entered upon a probation for eternal life remain in the grave for ever.

488.—You say no men were justified before Christ shed his blood, and they died unjustified. If this is not correct, correct me?—I do not quite catch your meaning.

489.—It is very plain, brother Andrew. I will try and explain it. You said a man could not rise from the dead unless he was justified?—Yes.

490.—Now you say they died unjustified, and yet they are to rise. How is that?—O, but there is a distinction between those who died previous to Christ's coming without having entered upon a probation for eternal life, and those who did.

491.—I am fixing your mind on the condition you express by justification?—Yes.

492.—I ask you were they justified or not when they died?—Those who died without a probation were not, and will not rise.

493.—That is not my question. Before Christ died were they justified?—They were justified in shadow when they entered upon a probation for eternal life.

494.—Is justification in shadow a justification in reality?—No.

495.—Does it require justification in reality to open the grave?—Yes.

496.—Then how can men come out of the ground who have no real justification?—They cannot for the purpose of appearing before a tribunal that has to do with the dispensation of rewards and punishments.

497.—I have not asked for any purpose; I did not qualify it in any way. I make it simple. You see you do not like its simplicity?—I must qualify it.

498.—Were they justified or not before Christ died?—In shadow they were.

499.—Is that real?—No, but it is made real by the death and resurrection of Christ.

500.—When?—When Christ rose from the dead.

501.—At the moment of their death, was that in force for them?—No, only in shadow.

502.—Then they died unjustified?—Not unjustified entirely.

503.—Excuse me, they were either justified or not?—They died justified in shadow.

504.—But that is not real?—No.

505.—It is the real that is necessary.—Yes.

506.—Then they died without being in the real state of justification that opens the grave?—Now that you say real, I say yes. Previously you simply said justified, and, therefore, I qualified it by saying justified in shadow. You confuse me with the varied words of your questions.

507.—It is the subject which confuses you. Did those who died before Christ's death die justified or not?—Not really.

508.—Does it require real justification to come out of the grave?—Yes, for judgment.

509.—How can they come out if they have not had real justification?—Because the justification effected through Christ's blood ratified the shadow justification which they had before they died.

510.—They had not got it when they died?—They had a shadow justification. The shadow is transformed into reality when the real justification in Christ took place.

511.—Yes, but my question relates to the time of their death.—They had not real justification then.

512.—Then how can they come out of the grave according to your theory seeing it requires real justification when a man dies?—Because they had been justified through their sacrifices in anticipation of what Christ would do,

513.—If so, they died really justified, did they not?—There can be no reality in the matter until the justification in Christ has become a reality.

514.—Then they died in a justification not real?—Certainly.

515.—Can a justification not real bring a man out of the grave?—No.

516.—Then they could not come out?—Yes, they could.

517.—Very well, we will leave that. I ask another question. Would Christ's blood have been of any justifying effect without His resurrection?—No.

518.—Then where is the justification power of a sacrifice, with which no resurrection is connected?—It had none except shadowy.

519.—What is shadowy?—Do not deal with clouds.—Like the shadow of my hands on this wall.

520.—It is a prophecy therefore. The real thing is your hand.—That is so, but the shadow pictures the outline of the substance.

521.—It is a prophecy?—It is more than a prophecy.

522.—Then it was justification if it was justification.—In shadow it was. It served for the time being. It is all that was necessary at that time.

523.—You are aware, brother Andrew, how continually in the apostolic writings the demands of the truth when complied with are called "obedience." I will read one or two illustrations of that.—The act of baptism, you mean.

524.—That is part of it.—If you mean that, I will accept it without your reading.

525.—I prefer to read it. I do not want to deal with shadows. The apostleship was instituted "for obedience to the faith," Paul says "among all nations" (Rom. i. 5). The gospel was "made known to all nations for the obedience of faith" (xvi. 26). He speaks of his ability "to make the GENTILES obedient, by word and deed." He speaks of the Romans having "obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to them." We read of a great company of the priests who were "obedient to the faith." Peter says they "purified their souls in obeying the truth." Does not that imply that God had commanded the Gentiles something?—Yes.

526.—What did He command?—To repent.

527.—Were they not bound to obey?—The command to obey? Certainly.

528.—Were they not bound to obey?—After belief.

529.—Were they not bound to obey?—After believing.

530.—Were they bound to obey?—Yes, after believing.

531.—Did God send the command to believing nations?—No.

532.—Did He send a command to the nations?—Oh, yes.

533.—Is it not those to whom the command is sent that are bound to obey?—Yes.

534.—Were not the unbelieving nations bound to obey?—Yes, after believing. I am obliged to put that in, or else it may be construed into obeying without belief.

535.—Excuse me. God has commanded all men everywhere, has He not?—Yes.

536.—Is not that contrasted with times of ignorance?—Yes.

537.—Are not all men bound to obey when they know it?—Yes.

538.—Can they mock God with impunity?—Not if He exercises His right.

539.—Can they at all mock God with impunity?—Not if He exercises His right.

540.—Will He not exercise His right?—He has not said so in the passage which you quote.

541.—Has He said it anywhere else?—He has not said so in reference to Gentiles.

542.—Let us see. “What shall the end be of those who obey not the gospel?”—What passage is that from?

543.—You do not dispute the words, do you?—No, I want the connection.

544.—You must remember it surely. It is in Peter. Is Peter a bad authority?—No, but I want the connection. “For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God, and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?” That is the disobedient under probation.

545.—I am asking you a question.—I thought I was answering it.

546.—What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel?—On those spoken of there it will be retribution.

547.—When?—At the judgment seat of Christ.

548.—Is not their “end destruction”?—Yes.

549.—The enemies of the cross of Christ?—Yes.

550.—Are the enemies of Christ believers in Christ?—Some of them have been.

551.—“Enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction?”—What passage is that from?

552.—O, brother Andrew! surely you do not want to refer to it?—I want the connection.

553.—It is in Philippians iii. 17-18, “For many walk, of whom I have told you often and now tell, even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is destruction, whose God is their bully, whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.”—That is unfaithful brethren.

[BROTHER ANDREW QUESTIONS BROTHER ROBERTS.]

554.—In I Cor. xv. 12 Paul says “Now if Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?”

What was the thing that was denied by the Corinthians?—The resurrection that Paul preached.

555.—What was the resurrection that Paul preached?—Do you require me to say? The resurrection of men to life eternal, and to condemnation if unworthy.

556.—Then the resurrection which they denied was restoration to life?—Nay, nay, it is never used in that limited sense in the Bible.

557.—Is not resurrection used in that limited sense in regard to the unjust who are to be raised again to life?—No, it includes much more than that. It is the resurrection of condemnation.

558.—Does not that involve restoration to life?—It involves it, but that is a different thing.

559.—Then it means it, does it not?—By involution.

560.—Does the apostle refute what the Corinthians denied?—Most effectually.

561.—Then that which they denied, restoration to life, he refutes?—Excuse me, you are limiting it to restoration to life. I do not admit that.

562.—Does he not prove his point by referring to the resurrection of Christ?—Certainly.

563.—Does he not show that the resurrection of Christ was necessary to justify those in Him?—Christ's resurrection was necessary to salvation for all Christ's disciples afterwards. He did not cut it up into bits. It was a question of being saved or not.

564.—Yes, but does he not say that without Christ's resurrection they died in their sins, and as a consequence are perished?—Certainly.

565.—That is equivalent to saying Christ's resurrection is necessary for their resurrection?—No doubt of it.

566.—For their restoration to life?—You are changing the terms. I do not accept your narrow way of putting it.

567.—When Christ says “I am the resurrection and the life,” does he not mean I am the raiser to life and the bestower of eternal life?—No, He does not divide it up in that way.

568.—Why does he use two different words?—Because there are two things in it.

569.—You must rise before you can have life, and and is He not the means of both?—He is the means of both, the life being eternal life.

570.—Is not He “the life” on the basis of blood shedding?—Oh, brother Andrew, speak as the oracles of God.

571.—I use His blood shedding as I defined it in the first instance as being the consummation of an obedient life—I take it as the Scriptures put it. The shedding of the blood of Christ is only a part. His resurrection is the great thing, it covers all.

572.—That is not disputed—Very well.

573.—But was He not raised, or rather did He not become the bestower of immortality on the basis of His having shed his blood and having been raised from the dead?—Not on the basis of that only. You do not put the basis broad enough. It was “by one man’s obedience” over his whole life.

574.—At the commencement of last Tuesday evening I gave as one of my definitions this, That “*the blood of Christ* I shall use to represent the sacrificial death of Christ as the consummation of an obedient life, unless for the purpose of argument I may divorce his death from that obedient life.” Is it necessary for me to repeat that definition every time, I use the expression “*the blood of Christ*?”—Because of the unscriptural use you make of answers given to a limited question, it is.

575.—I am not aware of having made an unscriptural use of the answers at all—I do not think you are. I believe you are thoroughly honest, but you have got into a bemuddled state of mind on this question.

576.—Not at all. Then you think that the dead in Christ, if Christ had not been raised, would perish absolutely?—Certainly. There would be no resurrection; there would be no judge.

577.—Are not those who die out of Christ in the same position as those in Christ would be if Christ had not been raised?—By no means, because there is a living Christ who has power over them all to inflict the judgment and wrath of God upon those who deserve it.

578.—Those who have not died in Christ?—All flesh, absolutely.

579.—Are the dead “flesh?”—Oh, brother Andrew, He is Lord both of the dead and the living.

580.—Who are the dead and the living spoken of in Rom. xiv. 9?—It means those over whom he has jurisdiction, which is co-extensive with the operation of light, as he says, “This is the condemnation that light is come.”

581.—In Rom. xiv. 7-8 it says, “None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live we live unto the Lord: and whether we die we die unto the Lord, whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord’s.” Does not that describe all in the same position as the Romans?—It is a glorious truth, I wish we realised it more.

582.—“To this end Christ both died and rose, and revived that He might be Lord both of the dead and living.” Is not the expression “dead and living” there applied to those in the same position as the Romans, and no others?—No.

583.—Thou context is no guide to the interpretation of single phrases?—O yes, sometimes, but not always.

584.—Is it not so here?—Certainly not, because

“dead and living” is an open phrase. The extent is to be gathered from other passages.

585.—How did these Romans become the property of Christ?—You know how they became so. They gave themselves to Christ in the way appointed, by belief and obedience.

586.—Did not He become their Lord at that time?—No doubt he did in a special sense, but He had been their Lord before, in the sense of having authority over them.

587.—Where is your proof He was their Lord before they were immersed into His name?—I prove it by such statements as God has given Christ power over all flesh.

588.—That does not say He is their Lord.—I am not going to quarrel about a word. If power over all flesh is not lordship over all flesh I do not understand you.

589.—Peter says some “denied the Lord that bought them” (2 Peter ii. 1).—Yes.

590.—Was He their Lord? Were they His before they were bought?—He was their Lord before they were bought.

591.—Did He not become their Lord at the time they were bought?—If you will tell me in what sense you use the word Lord I will answer you.

592.—In the same sense as in Rom. xiv. 9, and the passage in 2 Peter ii. 1, as being the Lord of life.—He is the Lord of life in relation to every one if they will come and have it.

593.—Is he actually now their Lord, the Lord of life, to everyone?—Certainly. He is the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever. His Lordship is not interfered with by human refusals.

594.—Is He Lord of life in reference to everyone before they are bought by Him?—He is the Lord of life absolutely. I cannot draw it into a narrow channel.

595.—The Scriptures so draw it.—No, you do; not the Scriptures.

596.—“In Adam all die, in Christ shall all be made alive.” Who are the dead in Adam?—Everyone who dies.

597.—Who are the “all in Christ” made alive?—All in Christ.

598.—Who are the all in Christ?—All those who are become incorporate with Him in the plan God has formed. He is the head; they become constituents of His body.

599.—Whether faithful or unfaithful?—No, there is a distinction there which Paul does not look at for the moment. He does not speak of the unfaithful in that chapter at all, brother Andrew being witness in articles in the *Christadelphian*. It is immortalisation before his mud.

600.—“In Christ shall all be made alive,” does that mean only the faithful?—Yes.

601.—Do not the unfaithful remain in Christ until the judgment seat?—In a technical sense. They are not really in Him. The Scriptures exhort brethren to continue in Christ. Christ says, “Abide in me.”

602.—Does not the antithesis of this imply that as all in Adam die, all in Christ come out of the grave?—I have answered that question.

603.—You have not answered it in that form.—Make your meaning clear.

604.—Is not the antithesis as all in Adam die, so all who pass out of Adam into Christ rise from the grave?—Paul is speaking of two great divisions. In Adam all die, all, absolutely everyone. So in the other Adam, they will be made alive—made immortal, but none out of Him. None out of Him will be made alive in the sense of these terms, immortalisation.

605.—Is not “made alive” used as a parallel to “the resurrection of the dead?”—That question is too general to answer. If you will tie me to a case I will answer.

606.—I mean in verse 21, “By man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.”—Yes, in a particular sense. By the resurrection of the dead is meant life for ever.

607.—Does not the resurrection which is to come through man, or by man, include also the resurrection of the unfaithful?—It includes it. It is a more momentary episode.

608.—Are the unfaithful raised on the basis of Christ’s death and resurrection?—They are raised by Christ. God gave Him the power.

609.—Are they raised on the basis of Christ’s obedience, death, and resurrection?—Properly understood, yes.

610.—Are the unfaithful raised on the basis of Christ’s obedience, death, and resurrection?—Everything Christ does is on that basis.

611.—Substantially both faithful and unfaithful are raised on the basis of His shed blood?—You put it too narrowly. Paul says, His blood was shed in vain if He had not risen.

612.—Then when the Scriptures say that certain ones had washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb, is not that too narrow a form of describing it?—Not in that connection. They are represented in a perfect state, and the question is, How did they get there. In a figure, they were washed, not literally, but by a figure. We want to know what is behind the figure, and that is that Christ submitted to an ignominious death because the Father required it, as the basis of approach to men for proposals of reconciliation.

613.—Although a figure is distinct from that which

is literal, does not a figure represent a reality?—Doubtless.

614.—If the Scriptures use a figure of speech to describe a reality, is it not permissible for me to do so?—It all depends on how you do it. “This is my body” is a Bible figure, but the Roman Catholics use it in a wrong way, and you are using this phrase in a wrong way.

[BROTHER ROBERTS’ QUESTIONS BROTHER ANDREW.]

615.—When Christ said concerning the Gospel which He sent the apostles to preach “He that believeth not shall be condemned,” what do you think He meant?—I believe he meant that the Jews to whom the apostles were then sent, if they did not believe, should be condemned.

616.—Would it not apply to all those to whom the Gospel was preached?—Not to Gentiles.

617.—Was not the same Gospel preached to Gentiles as to Jews?—Yes, but the Jew was already in covenant with God, and were required to believe that which was afterward submitted.

618.—Was not the Gospel a savour of death unto death to Gentile as well as Jew?—In the sense used by the apostle.

619.—What sense is that?—That is a long passage and it would take some time to go into the full explanation.

620.—Give it as briefly as you can. Tell it me in substance, you know.—He is writing to those in the truth, and his preaching was in regard to those a savour of death unto death in the unfaithful, and of life unto life in regard to the faithful.

621.—Excuse me, he says “in them that perish.” Is that a description of those who have been justified?—They that perish are Gentiles out of Christ.

622.—Quite so, and to the one, that is those who perish, “we are the savour of death unto death.” What is the meaning of it?—“In them that are saved” applies to the faithful, “them that perish” to the unfaithful.

623.—Excuse me, you have changed your answer.—How so?

624.—I appeal to the shorthand writer.—I said it before I saw the connection.

625.—Then you think them that perish is a description of people who are justified?—In that case.

626.—Who are “those that are lost?”—Is that here?

627.—Never mind where. Tell me what is the meaning of it?—I like to see the connection.

628.—“Them that are lost.” Do not you know where it is?—I forgot now.

629.—The next chapter but one.—“Hid to them that are lost.”

630.—Who are they?—Those outside.
 631.—What is the difference between “them that are lost” and “them that perish?”—Those outside who are lost never attain to anything beyond the present condition.
 632.—Would they perish?—Yes.
 633.—What is the difference then between them that are lost and them that perish? Is there a difference?—There is a difference this way. There will be perishing at the judgment seat for those who are condemned.
 634.—Is that what Paul means?—I think so.
 635.—You are not sure?—I think it is. I won't be sure. The passage is based upon a Romish custom, the full details of which I cannot just call to mind. It is figurative language, and must be interpreted in accordance with the custom upon which it is based.
 636.—My question is not related to any custom, but to whom is meant. Who are they?—Those outside.
 637.—Them that perish are not those outside?—In this connection I think not.
 638.—You are not sure?—I won't be sure.
 639.—Very well. Let us take another case. What was the terror of the Lord that Paul preached?—To Jews?
 640.—What was it?—The coming retribution upon them as a nation.
 641.—Did he teach that in his Gospel preaching?—Yes, he and Peter speak of it.
 642.—“Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men.”—In that case it refers to those in Christ.
 643.—What is the terror of the Lord for them?—Condemnation at the judgment seat of Christ.
 644.—The second death?—Yes.
 645.—“Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men.”—Yes.
 646.—Did He persuade brethren?—Yes, He was persuading or exhorting the Corinthians at that time.
 647.—Did He not persuade Gentiles?—Ah, He is not speaking of that persuasion here.
 648.—Did he persuade them?—Certainly.
 649.—About the terror of the Lord?—He spoke to them about it, He included it.
 650.—What terror had the judgment seat to them, if they had no relation to it?—He did not preach the judgment seat as a terror to the Gentiles. You cannot adduce a passage of Scripture to that effect.
 651.—Did he preach the gospel to Felix?—He did, at least he spoke to him of “righteousness, temperance and judgment to come.”
 652.—Was not that the Gospel?—Oh yes, you can get the Gospel out of it.
 653.—Paul did not know anything else than the Gospel in his preaching did he?—No.

654.—He preached the Gospel to Felix?—Yes.
 655.—Did Felix tremble?—Yes.
 656.—Why?—Because of what Paul spoke.
 657.—What about?—He roused the conscience of a wicked man and made him tremble.
 658.—Why?—Because of the picture which he drew of coming judgment.
 659.—What picture did he draw that could affect Felix?—He could draw a picture of judgment to take place which would affect Felix, seeing that he was connected with the nation upon which they were to come.
 660.—Felix might die next day, then he would have no relation to it?—Yes.
 661.—Did Paul speak of a judgment that possibly had no relation to him?—It was quite possible for Paul to picture coming judgments in such a way as to frighten Felix. Felix need not necessarily believe that he would die next day. It is not likely he did.
 662.—No; but my question is, that Felix recognized that the judgment to come of which Paul spoke had a bearing upon him because he trembled?—Yes.
 663.—You put it that possibly it had none?—O, no.
 664.—Certainly you admitted it?—It might or might not.
 665.—Exactly. Then Paul spoke to Felix about a judgment that might not come upon him?—If Felix, as a natural man, looked forward to living to that time, it would affect him, especially as his wife was a Jewess.
 666.—I know that is what you say. It is very unlike Paul's talking about judgment. I will give you a few specimens of his allusions to judgment.—I daresay I am familiar with them.
 667.—Can you give me one case in which he speaks of judgment to come upon the nation?—I cannot call one to mind. I think Peter does.
 668.—I refer to Paul, either in speeches or letters.—Paul was sent to Gentiles.
 669.—I am speaking of Paul's attitude to a Gentile, and I ask you whether, in Paul's letters or speeches, he speaks of such a judgment as you refer to?—Both he and Peter speak of God's vengeance or judgment being poured out at that time.
 670.—Where? Paul please.—Wont Peter do?
 671.—No; not for this particular case, because it is Paul that is in question. We see Paul reasoning before Felix of judgment to come, and you say he is speaking of a thing he never speaks of in any of his letters or speeches, and I ask you on what ground you say he talked to him about the destruction of Jerusalem?—On that occasion?
 672.—On what ground, seeing that there is a judgment to come, which he does speak of, and he never speaks of the one you say he referred to. Why

do you come to that conclusion? Is it not your theory that compels you?—Not necessarily.

673.—What then?—Because it was within a few years of that event, and Felix was associated with the nation very closely through his wife.

674.—Was not that a very immaterial “judgment to come” compared with the terror of the Lord connected with the judgment seat of Christ?—It was not very immaterial to the Jews who underwent it.

675.—“Compared with!” are my words—compared with the terror of the Lord that you have admitted is associated with the judgment seat?—It was not equal to that.

676.—Do you think he spoke of the smaller terror, and left out the larger?—It was a large terror to the nation involved in it.

677.—I am speaking of Felix.—Felix was living in the land where these judgments were to be poured out.

678.—Then you cannot prove that Paul spoke to Felix of the destruction of Jerusalem. Can you?—I can no more prove that than you can prove he spoke of the judgment seat of Christ.

679.—I can, for that was all his talk, and he was here engaged on his one business with Felix. That will do on that. Why do you draw a distinction between them that are lost and them that perish? I think I know the reason, but I ask you?—Well, the same word is not always used in reference to the same person or thing in different passages.

680.—That is not answering the question.—In regard to them that are lost, obviously it refers to those outside, because “the Gospel is hid” from them.

681.—Quite so. You saw that, when you looked at the context, and you think that when Paul was speaking a few verses before of them that perish he meant a different class to them which are lost. Why do you draw the distinction? Is it not your theory?—No, it is the context.

[BROTHER ANDREW QUESTIONS BROTHER ROBERTS.]

682.—Is a man, when baptised, legally freed from Adamic condemnation?—What do you mean by “legally freed?”

683.—I mean that the wrath of God or condemnation pertaining to him as the result of his being descended from Adam is taken away.—It is commenced to be taken away, but nothing more. It all depends; it is a process.

684.—But is it not taken away in a legal sense without affecting the physical consequences of that condemnation?—God forgives sins; that is the apostolic description, and I believe it.

685.—Yes, but have you never taught that Adamic

condemnation is legally taken away at baptism?—I am not aware that I have.

686.—Do you recognise this from the *Christadelphian* of 1878? : “Legally a man is freed from Adamic condemnation at the time he obeys the truth and receives the remission of sins, but actually its physical effects remain until this mortal (that is this Adamic condemned nature) is swallowed up in the life that Christ will bestow upon his brethren at His coming. Those whom Christ at that time does not approve are delivered up to death again because of their sins and not because of Adam. Although reconciled in Christ, we remain under the physical effect of Adam’s sentence till we are changed in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump” (page 225).—I fully endorse that.

687.—Then a man at baptism is legally freed from Adamic condemnation, and receives, as an additional thing, the remission of his own individual sins. Is that so or not?—You see how nicely you can put a question when you see the point. I mean to say I fully endorse that statement. The word “legally” is a little hazy. I am not quite sure whether I did not borrow that from you, brother Andrew.

688.—I do not think that is from me at that time.—What is the date?

689.—1878.—Yes, it is from you then. It was used at the time of the Renunciationist controversy, in which you took a prominent part. I accepted your terms then without particularly considering them, because you were fighting on the right side, but now they are used as the basis for constructing a new theory. I have looked round them, and see what they mean.

690.—Do you adhere to this statement that he is legally freed from Adamic condemnation?—I understand God gives the obedient believer a clean slate, as you might say.

691.—What is wiped out?—Everything that stands against us in any way, whether from Adam or ourselves.

692.—Then there is a passing out of Adam in Christ at baptism?—Certainly.

693.—When a man passes into Christ, what has he in Adam that he loses when he passes into Christ?—His relation to the whole death dispensation which Adam introduced. There is a preliminary deliverance at baptism, but it is not actual till the resurrection.

694.—Does he not realise, in a legal sense, a justification from the condemnation which he derived from Adam?—The apostolic proclamation of the Gospel has almost nothing to say about that, brother Andrew, but about forgiveness of our sins. If I have expressed an opinion there that favours your present contention, it must have been in reference to some special question put with that phraseology in it which you introduced.

695.—Is not a believer, at baptism, made to endorse and morally participate in the condemnation of sin in the flesh which Jesus underwent when he was crucified?—Certainly. He is baptised into the death of Christ in the sense of morally endorsing all that that involves.

696.—Is not that endorsing and morally participating in the condemnation of sin in the flesh?—You use a hazy phrase. I agree with Paul's use of it, but not with yours.

697.—This is your phrase in the *Christadelphian* for 1870.—But not in the way you put it.

698.—Is not a believer when he is baptised made to suffer the penalty?—No.

699.—Is not he?—No.

700.—Do you withdraw from this statement, "Paul says, Know ye not that so many of us as were baptised into Christ were baptised into His death? Therefore, in the very act of putting on the name of Christ for the obtaining of the blessings promised, he is made to endorse and morally participate in the condemnation of sin in the flesh which Jesus underwent in the body prepared for the purpose. In this way we are made to suffer the penalty while obtaining the blessings promised." The *Christadelphian*, 1870, p. 23.—Ah! "in that way."

701.—That is the way I spoke of before.—That is to say, we identify ourselves with all that was accomplished in Christ. It is not done in us. We merely go through the water, and water does nothing, but God has required it of us.

702.—Is there not a doctrinal efficacy in connection with going through the water?—There is a change in God's mind towards us, if that is what you mean by such language.

703.—Is there not a doctrinal efficacy in it?—I do not know what you mean by doctrinal efficacy.

704.—What is the antitype of making an atonement for the holy place in regard to Christ?—Cleansing and redeeming him from Adamic nature utterly.

705.—Shedding of His blood and raising Him from the dead?—The whole process.

706.—In relation to Himself, personally, apart from his position as a sinbearer for others?—You cannot take Him apart from that position.

707.—Have you not taken Him apart from that position formerly?—Never.

708.—Not in the argument with Renunciationists?—That is too general a question altogether. There never would have been a Christ if there had not been a sin race to be redeemed. If He had been by Himself, He would not have required to die at all, if He had been disconnected from our race.

709.—What do you mean by that?—I mean if He had been by Himself—a new Adam—having no con-

nection with the race of Adam first; not made out of it.

710.—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?—I refuse the question in that form, because it is an impossible "if." He was not sent for Himself, but for us.

711.—Is it not clear that Christ, as a necessity, must offer up for Himself for the purging of His own sin nature?—As a son of Adam, a son of Abraham, a son of David, yes.

712.—First from the uncleanness of death that having by His own blood obtained eternal life himself, He might be able to save others?—Certainly.

713.—Then He died for himself apart from being a sin-bearer for others?—I do not admit that: I cannot separate Him from His work.

714.—Was He not so separated twenty years ago to refute the free life theory?—Not by me; it might be by you.

715.—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?—He could not.

716.—Then He offered for Himself as well as for us?—Oh, certainly.

717.—Is it not clear then from this that the death of Christ was necessary to purify His own nature from the sin power?—Certainly.

718.—That was hereditary in Him in the days of His flesh?—No doubt of it.

719.—And He as the first one had to undergo purification through His shed blood and resurrection?—Certainly, I have never called that in question in the least.

720.—Did you not say on Tuesday night that He did not need to shed His blood for Himself?—That is upon your impossible supposition that He stood apart from us, and was a new Adam altogether.

721.—I never introduced that position.—You are unfortunate in not conveying your ideas to me.

722.—I never introduced that idea to you.—You asked me to consider him apart from us.

723.—Apart from us, but still a descendant of Adam?—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 He had not been for that work.

724.—Then as a descendant of Adam, it was necessary for Himself to shed His blood in order to obtain eternal life?—I have already answered that question several times.

725.—Do you not think it inappropriate for those outside Christ, rejectors of the word, to be brought before the judgment seat with members of His house-

hold?—It is not I who am responsible for that inappropriateness. With the servants came the rebels. “Those mine enemies who would not that I should reign over them, bring them hither and slay them before me.”

726 —Have you never thought it was inappropriate? —I have no recollection of having done so.

727 —Do you recollect this in *Christendom Astray* (1884), “Rejectors of the word, who do not come under the law to Christ by belief and obedience may be reserved till the close of the thousand years. It does not seem reasonable that those who put away the counsel of God from them selves should be passed over without judgment, and yet, since they do not become constituents of the household of faith, their resurrection at the time when account is taken of that household would seem inappropriate. May they not be dealt with at the end?” (p. 108) —Ah, that is a more question as to when they will be dealt with.

728 —Is it not inappropriate for them to appear at the judgment seat?—As a mere expression of opinion as to when, it is nothing. I did not remember having expressed that opinion. It is nothing more than a suggestion upon an immaterial point. My views are much more matured now than they were then, much more certain and definite. That was thirty years ago.

729 —It is *Christendom Astray*, only ten years ago, thoroughly revised and rewritten (Preface, p. 4). —Intended to be so, but it was not thoroughly done, owing to incessant other occupation and indifferent health.

730 —Then you would not write that now?—It is probable I would not. It is an immaterial point altogether. It is the fact of the resurrection of the disobedient that we want.

731 —Was not the law of righteousness which came into operation with Abraham the basis of resurrectional responsibility after his time?—Do you mean to say there was no such basis before?

732 —No, I do not. I am applying it to that time. —Certainly, God laid the basis of His plan concerning Christ in Abraham.

733. —Was not that, after the time of Abraham, the basis of resurrectional responsibility?—If you mean that there was no absence of that basis before Abraham’s time I am at liberty to answer. The basis was the same, only a new development.

734 —Do you believe that all Jews by birth were in the Abrahamic covenant?—Certainly.

735 —Are they all to be raised from the dead?—No.

736 —But if you say it is on the basis of the law or covenant with Abraham that resurrectional responsibility existed, must not all be raised from the dead?

—No I will say why if you wish it. A man must know the covenant before he is held responsible to its obligations. Millions of Jews know nothing about it to this day, therefore they are not responsible.

737 —Do you consider it honourable to publish a reply to a manuscript which has been withdrawn?—Certainly not if it has been withdrawn absolutely.

738 —Was it not withdrawn absolutely?—It was withdrawn as inadequate. If you had not said you were going to rewrite it I should have been glad to put it in the fire.

739 —Has not an author a right to withdraw a manuscript without giving his reasons if he wishes to revise it?—If he wishes to withdraw it absolutely, certainly. You did not do so.

740 —If he withdraws it for any reason whatever, has he not a right to do so, and does it not preclude the publication of a reply to it?—Not if he had not retired from the position represented by the writing.

741 —Would you commend that act in another directed against yourself?—I should not ask such a thing of anybody.

742 —Have not I or anyone else the same right to revise, amend, or rewrite before publication, which you have exercised times without number?—Certainly.

BROTHER ROBERTS —I should like if I were able in the time remaining to develop what I consider the much larger aspect of this question than what has appeared through the haze of our argumentation. The question of human responsibility has a deeper root than most men recognise. You have to go far back to get at it. You have to go back to the time when there was no man upon earth to wrangle, when there was nothing but an empty planet. God has placed a race upon the earth for His own purpose. God made man for Himself. Man is very much of an abortion as we see him now. But we do not see him now in his final form. When we see him in his final form we see the triumph of the principle that has been before God’s mind, but not before man’s, during all these weary ages of futility and turmoil.

You see it in connection with the very first man. Adam was not there in the Garden of Eden merely to enjoy himself. He was there to give pleasure to God as well. God had made man for His own pleasure and He takes pleasure in those who fulfil the design of creation. The condition of that pleasure is not the performance of ceremony, not technicality, but compliance with His will, the rational subjection of an independent will to God’s will. And so He said to Adam “Thou shalt not eat.” It was the simplest form in which the principle could be brought to bear, and Adam when passing that tree would remember “I must not touch that. It was God who commanded me not to.”

Now, has that principle been set aside? O, brethren and sisters, look at the terrible history of man since then—disorder, confusion, disorganisation of man with man, tears and blood, the misery of man great upon him. He was sent out of Eden because he rebelled against God's will. The penalty was heavy both in its living form and in its finish, in a state of trouble to which he was banished and in the ending of that trouble in death.

But God did not leave the thing there. If the thing had been left there, there would have been nothing for it but death, and I grant then, no possibility of anyone coming out of the grave afterwards, if God had done and said no more. He did not surrender His claim on man's submission. He had a plan even in man's fall. He was "made subject to vanity by reason of Him who hath *subjected the same in hope.*" There is hope in that purpose from the beginning. God had it before His mind from the very beginning. But along with that hope, there was the other side. Privilege always brings responsibility. To whom much is given, of them much shall be required. We see this principle illustrated all down the stream of the ages since. For although Adam's posterity were condemned to death, death reigned over them although God did not hold them accountable for Adam's sin, as it is said, "they had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," yet He had spoken to them as He did to Adam, and they were responsible to what He said.

We are not much enlightened in regard to the amount and extent of His communications from Adam to Noah, but we know He did speak, for all flesh corrupted His way upon the earth. What was the finish of it? The flood, the destruction of them all. But was that a complete closing of the account? No. Noah was saved from that flood, but Noah will be saved with another salvation. People were drowned in that flood, but Enoch tells us that "the Lord cometh with ten thousand of His saints, to *execute (another) judgment upon all*, to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him." To what extent that second judgment will be administered we cannot say. Nobody knows to what extent individuals forming that population knew God's will. God is a reasonable being. He is the very essence of reason. That servant which knew his Lord's will and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes if he did it not. (Brother ANDREW:—The servant?) Yes; but, brother Andrew, it is a parable mind you, and illustrates a principle. Beaten with many stripes because he knew, whereas the other, who did not know, is beaten with few. There is the principle—knowledge. "This is the condemna-

tion, that light is come . . . and men loved darkness rather than light." This is the ground of condemnation. Christ says, "If ye were blind, you should have no sin."

Leaving the flood, we come down to Sodom and Gomorrah,—Lot vexed with the unrighteous conversation of the wicked. God did not regard them as beasts that perish. He never rained fire and brimstone on elephants and tigers, but he did upon the corrupt inhabitants of Sodom, which shows He held them responsible.

The same remark applies afterwards concerning that coming destruction and judgment, although the extent of it we cannot know, because of our ignorance of the application of this reasonable rule that knowledge makes men responsible. "I did it ignorantly," says Paul, "therefore I obtained mercy." The theory which we are invited to adopt just clouds that all over, and makes God disregard knowledge. That is to say, "Go into the water and I have got hold of you, but if you defy me to the extent of setting Me and My Son at utter defiance, and you keep out of the water, I cannot touch you." It is absurd!

Come down to the seven nations of Canaan. Here we have the same principle. "Ye are not going into this land because of your righteousness," said Moses to Israel, "but because of *the wickedness of those nations.*" "Do not as they do, because of their abominations have I visited the wickedness of these nations upon them." God demurred to these nations enjoying His beautiful land without reference to His will, to the pleasure of which all things should be subordinated.

Israel went in. They had special privileges. The same principle brought special retribution. "Jerusalem has changed My judgment more than any nation." "You only have I known of all these families, therefore I will punish you for your iniquities," that is, in a very special way. He did not mean He would not punish the others, for He expressly says He will punish the others. "Behold, I begin to bring evil upon the city which is called by My name, and shall ye be unpunished? You shall not be unpunished. I will call for a sword upon all the inhabitants of the earth."

Now we come to the apostolic age, when we have the incipient fulfilment of the prophecy of "the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it." The final manifestation is reserved, but it began then, so there was an extension of divine operations. Those of the families God had not "known," He now proposed to know. That is Paul's expression. "After ye have known God, or rather, are known of Him, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements." "We are ambassadors for Christ as though God did beseech you by us. We

pray you in Christ's stead be reconciled to God." Nay, He commanded them to repent. "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men in that He hath raised Him from the dead." So the responsibility of the Gentiles towards God which had not existed before comes in. But it is regulated by the reasonable principle which God regards, "If ye were blind ye should have no sin." The man "who understandeth not is like the beasts that perish." The man that "wanders out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead." We are not dealing with those cases, brethren, we are agreed about those, I think. The question is where the light comes. The question is where the understanding exists. The case in question is where the Word of God comes to a man's door. God knocks at his door. "Behold! I stand at the door and knock." The man knows God is there, knows what God says, and replies, "No, I won't."

I beg to make one personal explanation, referring to the representation of brother Andrew, on Tuesday night. It is really very unimportant, I almost feel humiliated to refer to it, but as it is possible this discussion may be published, the whole facts of the case ought to appear. It is that brother Andrew has forgotten the facts about my visit to London. It was I that proposed it, on receiving his voluminous manuscript, for I shrank from the task of writing the answer it would have required, and I had such confidence in brother Andrew's lucidity I felt sure that if we came face to face, I should succeed in dispelling the mists of the paper. I therefore proposed to see him. I admit that he consented with great alacrity, and proposed to pay the expenses. I said, "No, I cannot consent to that," but we made a compromise, by which he paid half and I paid the other half. We came together twice. He spoke as it was his proposal. It is not so. I have his letters and he has mine and it is just possible that in the stress of so many things he may have forgotten how the case stood.

With regard to another matter, my statement that he withdrew his resolution on my consenting to answer his paper, is absolutely true. It was my proposal to brother Andrew. At the close of our conversation I said, "Well, brother Andrew, I will tell you what I propose. You withdraw that resolution, and I will undertake to answer your article in writing." He agreed to that, but truly he did require that some statement that had been made by someone else should be withdrawn before he did so. Brother

Andrew would not cause me willingly to appear in a light that is not true. I fully recognise his honesty, and I think I have given him cause to admit mine during very many years.

BROTHER ANDREW. If these statements can be borne out, I will admit I have forgotten some of the circumstances to which brother Roberts refers, but according to my present memory, I did propose for him to come and see me, but I will let that remain in abeyance.

I cannot, however, recognise the statement that the writing of his reply was based upon any promise of mine to withdraw my resolution. I promised to consider the matter. I made no specific promise at the time.

At first sight this subject may seem to be an unimportant one, that is the question as to whether any outside Christ shall be raised from the dead. But a closer examination leads to a different conclusion. It affects not only the question of unbaptised rejectors of the Word but the position of baptised believers, first as to the change which takes place when they enter

* Since the debate, reference has been made to the correspondence between brother Roberts and myself, with the result of showing that he first mooted "the possible need of a conversation" between us about the MS. I had sent him and that thereupon I invited him to London for that purpose. No mention is made of my ecclesial resolution, indeed, I did not know that he was aware of it until after his arrival.—J. J. A.

The words, "possible need of" are brother Andrew's words quoted from his rejoinder to my letter of proposal. They are not mine. They may represent the impression made upon his mind by my proposal. They do not represent the spirit of my proposal. This is correctly stated in my speech above, and would doubtless appear from my letter of July 11th, 1892 if he could produce it. As to my proposal that he should withdraw the resolution of which he had given notice, this was made at the interview, and as the result of what passed at that interview. It was not made in the correspondence, as he seems to assume that I think I pressed the proposal upon him *en viâ voce*, offering if he would do so, to write a full answer to his MS. He withdrew the resolution. I wrote the answer. It does not matter much, but these are the facts.—R. R.

The following extracts are all that we can find on the matter.—"July 22nd, 1892. Dear brother Roberts,—I received yours of the 11th inst., and as you mention the possible need of a conversation, I write to say that I go to the seaside to-morrow for a fortnight, I return on the 6th August, and after that date shall be ready to see you if an interview be desirable. Unfortunately, I cannot come to Birmingham, but if you will come here, I will pay your expenses and accommodate you for one or more nights.—J. J. A." "July 29th, 1892. Dear brother Andrew,—I thank you for the invitation to London, and for your offer to pay my travelling expenses. It is too kind. To the latter proposal I must not submit, but to come and see you I may arrange later should it appear the best thing to do.—R. R." No mention was made of my ecclesial proposition, previous to brother Roberts's arrival, and when he introduced it in conversation, he wanted me to add some words to it. This I declined, and said that I would rather withdraw it, but that this would be contingent on the withdrawal of the statement made in the *Islington* ecclesia, which gave rise to it. The only promise I gave was to consider the matter. I did so, I asked if the statement in

on their probation, and second as to the relationship that they occupy to Christ during probation. That is to say, previous to probation are they under God's wrath for what they have done and for what they have inherited? If they are, then the baptism takes away the wrath in both cases. If they are only under God's wrath for what they have done, then there is no need for the taking away wrath for anything else; in fact, there is no wrath to take away, in regard to what they are by inheritance or nature. Apparently, that is the distinction which this question has brought to the front as to the respective beliefs of different brethren.

According to the teaching of the scriptures the wrath of God rests upon men by their birth, as well as subsequently by their evil deeds. By their birth they are under condemnation to death. At baptism the wrath is taken away, and consequently the condemnation in a legal sense, in regard to both aspects of sin, is also taken away. They then stand in Christ completely clothed with His righteousness, no longer tainted legally with that which they had previously, whether sin committed or sin inherited

question could be withdrawn, received an affirmative reply, and, as a consequence, withdrew the proposition.—J. J. A.

Our memories are not in accord as to details, but I have no suspicion of brother Andrew intentionally misrepresenting facts. It is easy to forget when men are so fatiguingly busy as both brother Andrew and I are. In this case, where documentary proof was available, brother Andrew's memory was not proved the best. *Per contra*, I was more likely to have a correct memory of my own movements and objects than he. I should not have troubled about his MS. if it had not been for his ecclesial proposition—threatening division; and the getting rid of the latter was my anxiety.—R. R.

Brother Roberts's letter of July 11th (which I had forgotten at the time of the debate) was written after reading a portion only of my MS. and before he was likely to have known of my ecclesial proposition. It was written, while from home, on a letter-card, and being apparently unimportant, was doubtless destroyed by me as soon as answered. My reply reflects its tenor, and, I believe, also its phraseology, and gives definite shape to the suggestion it contained for a conversation on the subject matter of my MS.—J. J. A.

I can fully endorse brother Roberts's version of the incident, having, prior to the above correspondence, sent him a copy of brother Andrew's intended "ecclesial proposition," together with a letter in reference thereto, which evidently caused the letter of July 11th, 1892, to be written. My copying book contains copy of a letter, dated July 13th, 1892, to brother Roberts, from which I extract the following sentences:—"Your two notes to hand. I am pleased at your remarks re the 'responsibility resolution.' We will do our best to induce brother J. J. to withdraw it as you suggest." Thus it is clear that brother Roberts was fully cognizant of the resolution of which brother J. J. A. had given notice, to amend the Islington basis, and that the "getting rid" of this was brother Roberts's "anxiety."—FRANK G. JANNAWAY.

Then I was not treated with the candour to which I was entitled. I should never have asked brother Roberts to come to London to discuss my ecclesial proposition, much less have offered to pay any expenses. I regret having to advert to these minor matters; it is entirely due to brother Roberts having unnecessarily introduced them into his pamphlet.—J. J. A.

According to the opposite view there is at baptism only a taking away of the wrath of God for the evil deeds committed, and then there is to be a course of well-doing in order to nullify the sin nature which has been inherited. That involves this unscriptural position, that probationary well-doing can counteract or nullify the sin nature. It cannot do anything of the kind. Probationary well-doing is to obtain eternal life, and to avoid condemnation in the future. It cannot take away condemnation in reference to the past; to say that it does is to say in effect that good deeds can nullify bad ones; this the Scriptures do not teach, apart from blood-shedding. There must be blood-shedding in order that condemnation arising from sin may be taken away.

The question is also important because it affects many passages of Scripture relating to judgment. The belief I am opposing leads to a perverted view of many of them, and hence it is that we have passages quoted from the epistles and applied to those outside, such as "whoremongers and adulterers, God will judge," as if God purposes to bring to the judgment seat of Christ any of that class outside Christ. This passage, together with several others quoted by brother Roberts, applies solely to those in Christ.

The principles which determine this question are, 1st: That the death arising out of Adam's offence is, in the absence of justification, without end; and 2nd: That resurrection is through Christ on the basis of justification from sin. Man brought death through disobedience; man brought resurrection through obedience, including blood-shedding. Therefore, resurrection is on the basis of that which was effected by Him. Inasmuch as Christ was at birth in the same position as His brethren, and as He was raised from the dead through the redemptive work He effected, so are they, and thus resurrection does not comprise those who do not come within the scope of that redemptive work.

The third principle is that the judgment seat is for the purpose of making known whether those who have been candidates for eternal life are deserving of that life or of a judicial death. In regard to those outside Christ there is no such thing as determining whether they are worthy of either the one or the other, and therefore there is no fitness in bringing them before a tribunal specially so provided. To bring them to that tribunal is to transform the judge, in relation to them, into a mere executioner, and that is not the object of the judgment seat. They can give no account at that judgment, and there is no necessity for them to be asked a word, or to utter a word. If they are brought there, their very presence will be evidence as to what they are about to undergo, whereas in regard to the members of Christ's household it will not be known what is their individual

destiny until they have rendered their account, and Christ, as the judge, has pronounced the verdict in relation to that account. Therefore I say, as brother Roberts said ten years ago, that it is "inappropriate" and out of harmony with God's arrangements that there should appear before a tribunal established for such a purpose, men who have no relationship whatever to its judicial process, and no relationship to the eternal life which will be bestowed upon some. (Brother Roberts:—30 years ago. It was intended to be rewritten, but it was not rewritten, only revised, and I was too fatigued with other literary occupation to do it very thoroughly). It is very much altered from previous editions.

In dealing with the question of immortal resurrection, this principle of the judgment seat constituted the very foundation argument, namely, that because it was a tribunal to decide upon one of two destinies, therefore the resurrection to that judgment seat must be mortal. That same principle is applicable to this question, and it excludes from such a position those who have not been brought into a relationship which admits of the bestowal of eternal life. There is no judicial process required for them. Whatever responsibility towards God they may have incurred by reason of what they have done or failed to do during their lifetime is limited to this life. Brother Roberts has quoted a number of instances of judgments in the past. I fully recognise them, but when were they bestowed? There was no judicial ceremony before their infliction, no account-giving, and no judgment seat—God simply poured out His judgments upon them as wicked beings, and that is what He has designed for all who are outside Christ.

What is the origin of the teaching I am combatting? It originates in the moral sentiments, which constitute part of the thinking of the flesh, and which are blind until instructed by the intellectual faculties. Hence it is that those who believe with brother Roberts exhibit such a great amount of moral indignation in support of their contention. But the same moral indignation has been exhibited in time past as the foundation of other and more egregious errors. When life only in Christ was proclaimed, some years ago, it aroused the same kind of moral indignation. From whom? From believers in eternal torments, who also said it was a most demoralising thing to affirm that men who had committed all manner of enormities—

drunkenness, theft and even murder—should absolutely perish without being brought before a judgment seat, supposed to be provided for the whole human race. This, we were told, was most demoralising. Is that any evidence or argument that God has so designed it? Neither is such reasoning evidence upon this occasion. Life only in Christ and resurrection only through Christ stand upon precisely the same basis. Life only in Christ is through His redemptive work, and resurrection only through Christ is likewise through His redemptive work. Life only in Christ is bestowed on the basis of that redemptive work, and resurrection is also put into operation on the same basis. Christ was a forerunner in regard to both. A forerunner of all who have been justified from sin, in being raised from the dead; and a forerunner of the faithful portion in being the recipient of immortality. To those who never partake of justification from sin He can clearly be no forerunner, because they are left in Adam; they are never transferred into Christ. Those who come into Him enter upon a probation as He did. He was brought from the dead on the basis of His redemptive work, and so will they, all of them; the one class to receive immortality, and the other to receive condemnation. Those who are outside that redemptive work cannot come forth. They are in Adam. Christ has never "bought" them. They never come within the scope of His blood, and therefore He is not their Lord to judge them. The power given to Him over all flesh is a power to be exercised when He comes to take possession of His inheritance; power over all flesh then living on the inheritance; and He will exercise it by pouring out judgments on the wicked in this life, not by resurrection from the dead. All who died in Adam have come under the operation of a law which God decreed in the first instance; and there they are left. Whereas probationers come forth, and He asks them how they have acted since they became His. They are servants, and the fact that servants knew, and are brought before the judgment seat in order to give an account, is no evidence that those who are not servants will also be brought before that judgment seat to give any account. The mere use of the word "know" taken from its context, is no evidence in regard to those outside Christ. We must confine passages of scripture to those to whom they are related, otherwise we shall fearfully mangle them.

THE BLOOD OF THE COVENANT,

ITS EFFICACY IN BAPTISM, RESURRECTION, AND IMMORTALIZATION

By J. J. ANDREW (author of *Jesus Christ, and Him Crucified*, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, *Reply to Baxter*, &c)

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1 The Blood of the Everlasting Covenant	1	14 The Covenant of Circumcision	11	97 We shall not all Sleep	37
2 Edemic Law	2	15 The Covenant of Shadows	13	98 The Judgment Seat Summons	38
3 Edemic Temptation	3	16 Shadow Offering	14	2) The Second Death	49
4 Edemic Disobedience	4	17 The Curse of the Law	20	30 Immortalization	42
5 Edemic Nakedness	4	18 Jews and the Abrahamic Covenant	21	31 Recapitulation	43
6 Edemic Judgment	5	19 The Justification of Jesus	22	32 Objections	44
7 Edemic Mercy	5	20 The Condemnation of Sin	25		
8 Edemic Clothing	6	21 The Resurrection of Christ	27	A Historical raising of the Dead	
9 Edemic Sacrifice	7	22 Justification by Christ's Blood	28	B Rejection of Christ	
10 Edemic Justification	8	23 The Law of the Spirit of Life	30	C Rejection of Apostolic Preaching	
11 Edemic Allegory	9	24 Out of Adam into Christ	33	D The Justice of God	
12 Abel to Abraham	10	25 Walking in the Light	34	L The Power of God	
13 The Justification of Abraham	11	26 The Lord of Dead and Living	36	F Dr Thomas's Teaching	
				33 The Unity of the Truth	58

Published by the Author, 26, Douglas Road, Canonbury, London, N.

Price, 5d. Post Free, 6d.

THE RESURRECTION TO CONDEMNATION,

WHO WILL COME FORTH TO IT?

BEING A REPLY TO THE ABOVE BY THE EDITOR OF THE *CHRISTADELPHIAN*.

CONTENTS

<p>PREFACE</p> <p>CHAPTER 1—Introductory</p> <p>2—Change of Front</p> <p>3—Literary Peculiarities</p> <p>4—Figures of Speech</p> <p>5—A Ponderous Effort</p> <p>6—New Doctrines</p> <p>7—The Doctrine Assailed</p> <p>8—The Theory Advocated</p> <p>9—The Ground of Responsibility</p> <p>10—The New Argument</p> <p>11—Back to Eden</p> <p>12—Types and Shadows</p> <p>13—Alleged Temporary Licencies</p> <p>14—The Import of Circumcision</p> <p>15—Inconsistencies</p>	<p>CHAPTER 16—Divine Claims and Human Recognitions</p> <p>17—The Jews and the Resurrection</p> <p>18—The Law and Eternal Life</p> <p>19—Baptism and the Death of Christ</p> <p>20—The Memorial Supper</p> <p>21—The Law of the Spirit of Life</p> <p>22—The 'No condemnation of Romanism'</p> <p>23—The Temporary Victory of Death</p> <p>24—A Set Time for Actual Freedom</p> <p>25—The Blood of the Everlasting Covenant</p> <p>26—The Reason of Resurrection to Punishment</p>	<p>CHAPTER 27—'In Christ shall all be Made Alive'</p> <p>28—"Gather my Saints"</p> <p>29—The World Asleep</p> <p>30—The Second Death</p> <p>31—The Points Summarised</p> <p>32—OBJECTIONS—</p> <p>The Historic Cases of Resurrection</p> <p>Rejoinders</p> <p>Light as the Rule of Responsibility</p> <p>He that believeth not God's Commands to all Men</p> <p>Justice</p> <p>33—The Extent of Resurrectional Responsibility</p> <p>34—The Teaching of Dr Thomas</p>
---	---	---

Published at the Office of the *Christadelphian*, 139, Moor Street, Birmingham

Price, 6d. Post Free, 7d.