

QUESTIONS AND QUESTIONS

FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF ALL WHO BELIEVE THE

RENUNCIATIONIST THEORY,

AS

DEFINED IN THE FOLLOWING PROPOSITION:

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

1. —It is written, that “Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to CONFIRM THE PROMISES MADE UNTO THE FATHERS.”—(Rom. 15:8.) It is further written, that “He is *the mediator of the new covenant*, that BY MEANS OF DEATH . . . they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance; for where a testament is, *there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.*” Confirmatory of these declarations, Jesus, at the last supper, in handing the wine to his disciples, said, “This is the new testament IN MY BLOOD.”—(Luke 22:20.) *Query:* Could the covenants of promise have been brought into force without the death of Jesus the testator?
2. —If not, how could Jesus, without dying, have obtained his portion of the covenant? seeing the promises (to Abraham) were “to thee and to THY SEED,” “which,” says Paul (Gal. 3:16), “IS CHRIST;” and the promise to David was, “I will establish the throne of *his kingdom for ever.*”—(2 Sam. 7:13.)
3. —Jesus being included in the covenants of promise, and the covenants being of no force without his death, did he not in this sense, in dying, die for himself, as well as for all others interested therein?
4. —Jesus tells us (Jno. 10:18) that he had received a commandment from the Father, to lay down his life, by submitting to be crucified. If Jesus had disobeyed this command, would he not have committed sin? If so, could he have been saved? How was it possible, then, that he could “enter eternal life alone?”
5. —And seeing his obedience unto death (Phil. 2:9) was a necessity to his own acceptance with the Father, did he not in this obedience, obey for himself as well as for the joint heirs (Rom. 8:17)? And seeing that obeying in this case was dying, did he not in dying, die for himself as well as for his brethren? (Other questions will bring it closer than this.)
6. —Jesus, in speaking of his death, says, “*For this cause* came I unto this hour” (Jno. 12:27); further, that “the Son of Man is come to give his life a ransom for many;” further, that this was the will of Him who had sent him, and whose will he had come to do. He was introduced

to Israel as “The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world” (Jno. 1:29) “by the sacrifice of himself” (Heb. 9:26); and Paul testifies that he was made a little lower than the angels, expressly *for the suffering of death*.—(Heb. 2:9.) Does it not appear on the evidence, that the very work he was sent into the world to do was *to die*? Could he have “earned eternal life” without doing the work the Father sent him to do? If not, could he “earn eternal life” without dying? If not, is it not a violation of the wisdom of God for anyone to speak of the possibility of his claiming eternal life before his death, and entering into the enjoyment of it alone? (If Adam in Eden had been appointed to die, could you have said his life was “free?” Who can make “free” from the appointment of God?)

7. —Peter testifies that “Christ hath suffered for us *in the flesh*.”—(1 Peter 3:18; 4:1.) What flesh was this? Was not this the flesh of his brethren?—(Eph. 5:30; Heb. 2:16.) If so, was it not mortal flesh? And if “mortal flesh,” was it not as much under destination to die as the mortal flesh of all men? If not, how can it be the flesh of the children?
8. —Is not our destination to die an inherited physical law in the flesh, resultant in the first instance, from the sin of Adam, and, therefore, called sin? If not, in what sense has death passed upon all men? But it is not a matter of argument. We see it every day with our eyes that a fixed tendency to dissolution is a quality of the flesh of Adam. Can a man partake of the flesh of Adam and not partake of this? Where is the testimony that he can? (An opinion is worth nothing.)
9. —Why was Jesus “put to death in the flesh” of Adam? Paul says it was that “THROUGH DEATH he might *destroy that having the power of death*.” If “that having the power of death” was not in his body, how could he “through death” destroy it? On the other hand, how could he be a body of the flesh of Adam without also having in himself that which was “the power of death” in it?
10. —You say that the body of Christ was not sinful flesh, but “a likeness” of it? In what did the *likeness* flesh consist if it was not of the same sort? It is testified that he was made in “the *likeness* of men.”—(Phil. 2:8.) Would you, therefore, say he was “not a man but a likeness of one?” If not—if you say he was a man, though Paul says he was made in the likeness, why not say he was sinful flesh though Paul says he was sent in the likeness of it?
11. —Paul says that God sending forth His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, “*condemned sin in the flesh*.” (Rom. 7:3), how could this have been done if there be no such thing as “sin in the flesh,” and if Christ was “not sinful flesh but a likeness of it?”
12. —Moses says that Adam begat a son “in his own *likeness*” (Gen. 5:3): does this mean that the son so begotten was, in any sense, of a dissimilar nature to his father?” If you say No, as you are bound to, why do you contend that a “likeness of sinful flesh” is dissimilar to sinful flesh itself?
13. —When Christ spoke of laying down his life, did he not refer to his voluntary (as regards men) submission to a violent death? If he meant that he was not mortal; and that away from a violent death, he would not have died, how are we to understand John’s exhortation to “lay down our lives for the brethren?”—(1 John 3:16.) Did John mean that in the ordinary course, those to whom he wrote would not die?
14. —Peter says “he bore our sins in his own body on the tree.”—(1 Peter 2:24; Is. 53:6.)

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

15. —If you say that our sins were laid on him in the same way as they were laid on the sacrificial animals in the Mosaic system of things (which was a mere ceremonial or artificial imputativeness,) how comes it that those sacrifices never could take away sins? (Heb. 10:2,) and where then is the substance of the shadow? The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animals was the type; the real putting of sin on the Lamb of God in the bestowal of a prepared sin-body wherein to die, is the substance.
16. —Paul says that they who commit transgressions are “worthy of death,” (Rom. 1:32), and that “the end of these things is death.”—(Rom. 6:21.) Is there any difference in point of fatality between sentence of death for these things, and the hereditary sentence of death upon Adam?
17. —As you will not say that death is more fatal than death, howsoever incurred, tell me how it is that you think that death on Adam’s account would have destroyed Christ, while believing that death because of our offences had no such effect?
18. —Even if we “sinned in Adam,” in the personal sense contended for on behalf of your theory, did Christ not bear the effect of that as well as all our other offences? If so, did he not come under Adamic condemnation? If not, is our sin in Adam untaken away, and in that case, how can we be saved?
19. —John testifies that Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2), and this reaches backward before Christ’s time, as well as forward; as is evident from Paul’s statement that Christ died “for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament.” On what ground is Adam to be excluded from the scope of this provision? Did not the coats of skin provided in Paradise (Gen. 3:21) convey an intimation that his sins could be covered? Is it not evident from this consideration that Adam’s condemnation, as well as ours, rested on Christ?
20. —David was a mortal man. Was not the flesh of Jesus the flesh of David? If so, was not the flesh of Jesus mortal likewise? If so, why? Was it not the effect of hereditary condemnation? If it was not mortal, how could it be the flesh of David which *was* mortal?
21. —Was not Jesus the son of David? If you believe this, which you cannot deny in the face of so much explicit testimony, are you not bound to admit that he was son of Adam. If David was son of Adam, and Christ was son of David, is not Christ the son of Adam also? Does not Luke carry his paternity back to Adam?—(Luke 3:31.) His sonship to Adam through Mary being unquestionable, does it not follow, that equally with us, he inherited mortality from him?
22. —Did Adam experience evil before disobedience? You are bound to answer No. What parallel then can there be between him in that state, and Jesus in the days of his flesh, experiencing weakness, grief, pain and death?

23. —If Jesus did not hereditarily participate in these effects of sin, how came they to be his portion in the days of his weakness, down even to the particular of eating his bread by the sweat of his brow?—(Mark 6:3.)
24. —If he had not patiently endured these things for the joy set before him, would he have been accepted? As you must say, ‘No,’ does it not follow that in this sense he suffered them for himself, while for us also?
25. —Were they not results of sin, and though he was personally righteous, did he not suffer them in himself for his own proof? and if he had working within him *one* result of sin, upon what principle will you deny the presence in him of its one great result—hereditary mortality in the flesh?
26. —If Jesus Christ, in the days of his flesh, was in the same position as Adam before disobedience, why did Christ experience evil and Adam not? How could he be in the same position in which Adam was before disobedience, seeing he was born of a woman who inherited the results of that disobedience, and that which is born of the flesh is flesh?
27. —Paul says, “God hath made Jesus to be sin.”—(2 Cor. 5:21). How is this to be understood, if death, the wages of sin, had no hold on him? Was he not made sin in being made of a woman, who was mortal because of sin, and could only impart her own sinful flesh to a son begotten of her?
28. —Paul says, (Heb. 9:28,) that Christ will appear the second time *without sin* unto salvation. This is equivalent to saying that the first time was not without sin. In what sense did he come the first time with sin if his flesh was not sinful flesh, and the law of sin had no hereditary claim?
29. —If you say it means a sin-offering, can you explain how it comes that a sin-offering is expressed by the word “sin,” if the sin-offering is in no sense sinful? and how do you in that case understand Paul’s statement (Rom. 6:10), that when he died, he died *unto sin* once? He did not die unto a sin-offering; but in making himself a sin-offering, he died unto sin. If the hereditary law of sin wrought in his members unto death, as in the members of his brethren, we can understand how in dying, he died unto sin; for as Paul says (verse 7), “he that is dead, is freed from sin,” sin having no more claim after that; but how can you understand it?
30. —Then, suppose we accept your paraphrase of it, and read for “sin,” “sin-offering,” in what did the sin-offering consist? Was it not his body, even as Paul says, that “we are sanctified through the offering of *the body* of Christ once?”—(Heb. 10:10.) And in what sense can his body be called sin, if it was clean from the hereditary effects of the sin-nature from which it was extracted?
31. —Paul says (Gal. 4:4), that Jesus in being born of woman, was “made under the law,” which law he tells us in 2 Cor. 3:7, was a “ministration of death.” Now, why was Jesus made under this death-ministrant law? If you answer according to Paul, you will say, to redeem them that were under it. Does it not follow from this, that in the divine process of redemption, the Redeemer had to be personally subject to the law to be redeemed from?
32. —How, on your theory of redemption, as applied to the Edenic law, can you make out this to have been necessary? If the life of a free, uncompromised man, standing outside the Edenic

law, could be accepted in substitution for that of offenders under that law, why could not the life of a free, uncompromised man, outside the Mosaic law, have sufficed, in the same manner, to redeem those who were under it?

33. —Does not your new-Adam theory, in fact, require that Jesus should have been born not under but outside of the law?
34. —Not only so, but consider how redemption from the Mosaic law was effected. You are aware that under this law, “he was made a curse,” though he never broke it. You are further aware that this being made a curse did not simply consist in dying, but that it laid personal hold on him through the mode in which he was killed. “He that hangeth on a tree is accursed of God.” Presuming you will not say that any of God’s ways are unnecessary, are you not bound to admit from these premisses, that before Jesus could deliver those who were under the curse of the law of Moses, it was necessary that he himself should come under that curse, though guiltless?
35. —If so, was it not equally necessary that he should come personally under the operation of the Adamic curse, in order to redeem those who were under it?
36. —As a matter of fact, did he not come under that curse in precisely the way we do, in being born of woman condemned?
37. —For what is the curse? Is it a sentence passed on us personally, or is it an inherited condition of our physical nature? The former you will not maintain, and the latter you are obliged to accept.
38. —Upon which comes the question, Was not Christ’s physical nature the same as ours? In saying “Yes,” which you are obliged to do if you speak according to the Word, you concede the whole question, and must renounce the Renunciationist theory.
39. —If you take refuge in the new-born quibble about life, I must ask you What is life in relation to us? Is it not organism in a vital state?
40. —Can you have human life without human organism? And is not the character of the life determined by the character of the organism? Thus, out of the same materials, does not dog organism generate dog life, horse organism horse life, and human organism human life? (assuming the distinction between life and organism merely out of accommodation to the theory).
41. —These things being undisputed, does it not follow that if the body of Jesus, was the Adamic organism, generated in the womb of Mary, in the ordinary gestatory period, possessed and manifested Adamic life? (employing that phrase merely out of accommodation to the new theory).
42. —How can a man’s flesh be condemned without the life generated in it being condemned also?
43. —And if the flesh of Christ was not condemned, how could the flesh of Christ be the flesh of David, Moses and Abraham, seeing that the flesh of these fathers was in that state of death-constitution through extraction from Adam?

44. —You seem to consider hereditary mortality in Adam more fatal than death incurred by individual delinquency. In other words, you call it “eternal death” apart from a Redeemer. If in this you are right, how comes it that the law of Moses would have given eternal life if the flesh had been equal to the keeping of it? Paul says it was “ordained to life.”—(Rom. 7:10.) Showing that this meant eternal life, Jesus, in answer to the question how eternal life was to be attained, said “What is written in the law? How readest thou? Keep the commandments. This do, and thou shalt *live*.” But Christ was the only man that ever kept the law without fault, and he was God-manifest in the flesh by the Spirit, for the purpose. All others were unable to keep it. Hence the law was “weak through the flesh.” If men had been able to keep it, obedience would have led to resurrection after Adamic death, as in the case of Christ. God does not hold us individually responsible for Adam’s offence. We inherit the effects, but could have been redeemed from them by obedience, if that had been possible. But how, according to your construction of Adamic death, could obedience have led to “eternal life?”
45. —Besides, if the Adamic penalty was eternal death, and the death of Christ was the suffering of that penalty in our stead, would not his resurrection, in that case, have been impossible?
47. —It is truly testified that Christ died “for us;” but it is evident that the phrase “for us,” means on account of us, and not instead of us. It is not only testified that he died for us, but that he died for our sins.”—(1 Cor. 15:3.) Does this mean instead of our sins? So while it is said that he was sacrificed for us (1 Cor. 5:7), it is also said he was sacrificed for sins.—(Heb. 10:12.) Should you understand he was sacrificed instead of our sins?
48. —It is testified (Luke 1:69), that God “hath raised up *for us* a horn of salvation.” Does this mean raised up instead of us?
49. —It is testified (Rom. 4:21), that Christ was raised again *for* our justification. Does this mean instead of our justification?
50. —It is testified (Rom. 8:34), “that Christ also maketh intercession *for us*.” Does this mean instead of us? (See also Heb. 9:24; 10:20.)
51. —So also with the statement, “Christ died *for them*.”—(2 Cor. 5:15.) If this means instead of them, how are we to understand the following statements: “I pray *for them*” (John 17:9); “He ever liveth, to make intercession *for them*” (Heb. 7:25); “Spirits sent forth to minister *for them*.”—(Heb. 1:14., &c.)
52. —But though the appearance of Jesus in the flesh, and all that he went through, was “for us,” surely you will not deny that in all he did *for us*, he was individually comprehended as the elder brother of the family. For instance, his birth was for us; “hath raised up *for us* an horn of salvation in the house of his servant, David;” but was his birth not for himself also? If he had not been born, where would have been the Messiah and the glory to be revealed? I could understand a Trinitarian saying that it was unnecessary for him to be born for himself; but one believing that Christ was Son of God from his mother’s womb, and that the Deity in him was the Father, is bound to recognise the fact that Christ was not only born for us, but born for himself as well.
53. —Again, Christ was obedient for us, as is manifest from the testimony, “*by one man’s* OBEDIENCE many shall be made righteous;” but was he not obedient for himself as well? If

he had been disobedient, would HE have been saved, “in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save him from death.”—(Heb. 5:7.)

54. —So he died *for us*; but did he not die for himself also? How otherwise could he have been made free from that sin which God laid upon him in sending him forth in the likeness of sinful flesh? Paul says that “he that is dead is freed from sin,” and that “in that Christ died, he *died unto sin once*,” being raised from the dead, death hath *no more* DOMINION *over him*.—(Rom. 6:7, 9, 10.) Is it not clear from this that the death of Christ was necessary to purify his own nature from the sin-power of death that was hereditarily in him in the days of his flesh?
5. —If to this you object, let me call your attention to Paul’s definition of the priesthood which Christ took not to himself, but received from the Father: “Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, for that he himself also is compassed with infirmities, and by reason hereof, he ought, as for the people, *so also for himself*, to offer for sins.”—(Heb. 5:2, 3.)
56. —Again, if Christ’s offering did not comprehend himself in the scope of it, how are we to understand the statement of Paul that he “needeth not DAILY, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, *first for his own sins and then for the people’s*, for THIS *he did once* when he offered up himself?”—(Heb. 7:27.)
57. —As Christ was the antitype of the high priest who “went alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered *for himself* and for the errors of the people” (Heb. 9:7), is it not required that his sacrifice should comprehend himself as well as his people in the effect of its operation?
58. —If you deny this most obvious conclusion, how do you explain the fact that the Messiah Prince in the future age, at the restored feast of the Passover, “shall prepare *for himself* and for all the people of the land a bullock for a sin offering?”—(Ezek. 45:22.) Do you deny that the sacrifices in the future age are memorial, like the breaking of bread of what has been, in the same way as the sacrifices under Moses are typical of what was to be? Presuming you are scripturally enough informed to give the right answer to this, let me ask how the Messiah’s offering for himself as well as for the people can be a memorial offering, if Christ in dying for us did not die for himself as well?
59. —To put it in a simpler form, in whatever sense our sins were laid on Christ, did they not, for the time being, become his; and, if so, did it not require his death that he might be purified from them, and, in this sense, in dying for us, did not he die for himself as well?
60. —It is testified that he rose again for our justification, but was it not for his own justification as well? If not, how do you understand Paul’s declaration, that in rising, he was “justified in the Spirit?”—(1 Tim. 3:16.)
61. —He ascended to heaven to appear in the presence of God for us (Heb. 9:27); but was not this also for his own exaltation and glory? If not, what mean the words of Peter and Paul, “that because of his obedience, God hath highly exalted him” “to His right hand.”—(Phil. 2:9; Acts 2:33; 5:31.)

62. —He is coming again for us (John 14:3; Heb. 9:28); but is he not coming for himself also, that he may see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied (Isa. 53:11), and be glorified and admired in all them that believe?—(2 Thess. 1:10.)
63. —It is all “for us,” but is he not included, as the first-born among the many brethren, whom, as captain, he leads to glory?—(Rom. 8:29; Heb. 2:9.)
64. —Your theory alleges that Christ in dying, paid the debts we owed on account of our sins. If this unscriptural representation of the case were true, would it not follow that forgiveness was ours as a matter of fact, as soon as he died? and if so, how comes it to pass that remission of sins is only attainable by believing and obeying the gospel?
65. —And in that case would not forgiveness be a right to be claimed? If another man pays my debt, can I not of right claim exemption from the demand of my creditor? And if divine forgiveness is of this order (viz: remission because of satisfaction obtained), how comes it that Paul says that “the remission of sins that are past” is “through the FORBEARANCE of God?”—(Rom. 3:25.) And how are we in that case to understand the class of declarations abounding in the apostolic epistles, of which the following are examples: “God hath shut up all in unbelief, that He might have MERCY upon all.”—(Rom. 11:32.) Again, “according to His MERCY He saved us.”—(Titus 3:4.) “The FAVOUR of God that *bringeth salvation*, hath appeared,” (Titus 3:11) “being *justified freely by His GRACE*, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.”—(Rom. 3:24.) “God was in Christ *reconciling the world unto HIMSELF*, not imputing their trespasses unto them.”—(2 Cor. 5:19.) Again, “having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ *TO HIMSELF, according to the good pleasure of His will*, wherein HE hath made us accepted in the beloved.”—(Eph. 1:5.) Do not these scriptural representations exclude the idea that we are saved, because Christ has “satisfied” God by “paying our debts?”
66. —Do you believe God is just and righteous? How then can you accept a theory which represents Him as requiring the death of one who under no law of His, could righteously be required to die?
67. —If Christ inherited Adamic mortality, was not his death in that case in harmony with the righteousness of God?
68. —Wherein lay the “help” laid upon Christ by God for us? Was it not in the power of obedience in conception imparted to him, for was it not his obedience that brought resurrection and life? If you say the “help” lay in “free life,” (a thing about which the Scriptures are silent,) are you not committed to the conclusion that our “help” vanished when that “free life” was destroyed in death?
69. —I could understand the possibility of “free life” being “help” if it was necessary for the deliverer to be exempt from death, but seeing the necessity lay just the other way, that is, that he should “taste of death,” is it not absurd, as well as unscriptural, to call his life “free?”
70. —Was not Jesus God manifest in the flesh? If you say that Adam was God manifest in the flesh as well (but surely no one would go to such a terrible depth of mere-manism), how comes it that the only place where Christ is called Adam, introduces Christ as *a contrast* to Adam, saying “the first man is of the earth, earthy, the second Adam is *Lord from heaven?*”

71. —If Jesus was God manifest in the flesh and Adam was not, is it not clear that you are precluded from drawing that parallel between them which your new theory assumes throughout?
72. —Does not the difference lie here, that in Adam man loses himself, and in Christ, *God* saves him, that salvation may be of grace and not of works, lest any man should boast?
73. —If Christ be a new Adam, merely succeeding where the other failed, was he not a mere man, and in that case is not Renunciationism mere-manism of the most definite character?
74. —Your theory compels you to teach that the flesh is not a sinful but a good thing. How do you reconcile with such a doctrine the continual disparagements of the flesh with which the Scriptures abound? Thus, “if ye walk after the flesh ye shall die” (Rom. 8:13); “he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption” (Gal. 6:8); “in my flesh dwelleth no good thing.”—(Rom. 7:18.)
- 74a. —Paul says the substance of the law or things foreshadowed in it are to be found in Christ.—(Col. 2:17; Rom. 2:20; Heb. 9:23; 10:1.) This being so, can your theory furnish the antitype to the High Priest offering for himself?—(Lev. 16:6.)
75. —Can your theory furnish the antitype to the scarlet which entered into the composition of the vail—that is to say, his flesh?—(Heb. 10:20.)
76. —Can your theory furnish the antitype to the uncleanness-imparting bodies of those beasts burnt without the camp? (Heb. 13:11).
77. —Can your theory furnish the antitype to the making atonement for the holy place (Lev. 16:16)?
78. —Can your theory furnish the antitype to the atonement made for the altar? (Lev. 16:18.)
79. —Can your theory furnish the antitype to the atonement made for the holy sanctuary? (Lev. 16:33.)
80. —Can your theory furnish the antitype to atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation wherein God dwelt? (Lev. 16:33.)
81. —If you attempt an answer, do not content yourself with “yes;” but show us wherein all these things which were typical of Christ, have their counterpart in a theory which teaches he had not the condemned nature on him, and therefore, needed not to offer for himself.
82. —Paul says that as it was necessary that these pattern-things in the Mosaic system should be purged with blood, so it was necessary that the things signified should be purged; but with a better sacrifice, that is the sacrifice of Christ—(Heb. 9:23). The Christ of your theory needed no “purging;” therefore does it not follow that he is not the Christ of Paul, who required purging from the law of sin and death, by his own sacrifice?
83. —Paul says of Christ, “it is of NECESSITY that this man have somewhat also to offer.”—(Heb. 8:3.) You say of your Christ, that he was under no necessity to offer himself; but might

have refused to die, and entered into eternal life alone. Is it not clear that your Christ is not Paul's Christ, with whom it was a necessity that he should offer up himself, for the purging of his own nature, first, from the uncleanness of death, that having by his own blood obtained eternal redemption (Heb. 9:12), he might be able afterwards to save to the uttermost, them that come unto God by him?—(Heb. 7:25.)

84. —Jesus said, he would be to the generation contemporary with him, “the sign of the son of Jonas,” in being “three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.”—(Matt. 12:40.) He also said, in reference to his death, “I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished” (Luke 12:50); and “the cup which my Father hath given me to drink, shall I not drink it?”—(John 18:11.) How agrees with these sayings, a theory which speaks of the possibility of death having been omitted from the work of Christ, and of his entering eternal life alone, the very gate to which lay through death?

85. —In fact, in view of all the facts, testimonies and arguments herein adduced, is it not evident that you have got hold of a mere plausible conceit of the fleshly mind, acceptable only to those who are more at home in calculations of pounds, shillings and pence, than in the apprehension of the lofty principles of the oracles of God?

Haste, haste, escape the snare, ere it be too late.—EDITOR.