

Christ our Passover

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER

OR

TRUE CHRISTADELPHIAN TEACHING
CONCERNING
THE ONE GREAT OFFERING

AS OPPOSED TO THE "CLEAN FLESH", "FREE LIFE", AND
"SUBSTITUTION" HERESIES NOW RIFE IN AUSTRALASIA,
UNITED STATES, AND CANADA.

COMPILED FROM
RECOGNISED CHRISTADELPHIAN WRITINGS

BY
FRANK G. JANNAWAY
AUTHOR OF "SATAN'S BIOGRAPHY", ETC.



REPRINTED BY
CHRISTADELPHIAN OLD PATHS PUBLISHING
468 CAVENDISH ROAD, COORPAROO, AUSTRALIA. 4151

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER

EXPLANATORY NOTE

NOT long since, in the course of earnest disputation with a well known *examining brother*, concerning latter day apostasy and prevailing wrong views on the Sacrifice of Christ, he exclaimed—"But you expect too much; where do you find examining brethren troubling candidates on that subject, as they once did?" The question set us thinking, for, we realized what he implied was only too true. Think of the biggest ecclesia in the world being apparently content with an applicant for fellowship if he "confess that Jesus is come in the flesh" (see *Christadelphian*, Oct., 1923, final "Cover Note").

What may appear tautological is intentional.

May the God of peace, that brought again from the dead, our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant—may He bless this compilation as a means to the strengthening of the hand of such as have not lost their first love.

THE COMPILER.

THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST has ever been a burning question in the brotherhood, and a cause of divisions, notwithstanding that each of the contending parties has professed a whole-hearted acceptance of Scripture teaching, and to be able to state its belief in Scripture language.

It is manifest, however, that there must be something wrong somewhere, or there would be unity where there is now dissension and disruption. Individuals, and ecclesias, may be perfectly sound in their affirmative Statement of Faith, and yet really unsound. How can that be? By holding views which nullify other truths or First Principles. An object lesson has been furnished in these latter days by an ecclesia which claims to be "the centre of Christadelphian activities." Judging by its "Statement of Faith" it is absolutely sound on questions of Military Service, Constabulary, Voting, and Oath-taking; but, when the touchstone is applied, it is found that beneath the surface of gold, there abound reservations, supported on contemptible pleas: "Special circumstances"; "If compelled to vote"; "There are oaths and oaths."

Of what use, then, a "Basis of Faith"?

Of very little use to an unfaithful ecclesia, except as camouflage deceiving the hearts of the simple. The leaders of such faithless ecclesias resent questions, and hush up all enquiry, under the plea of peace.

Bro. Roberts, and others, foresaw the possibility of even a heretic being able to "submit" to a positive Basis of Faith, while at the same time refusing to "accept" it (see *Birmingham Frictions*, p. 46): hence he formulated a list of negative "doctrines, to be rejected" by those seeking the ecclesias' fellowship: not that such form an infallible rule for dealing with every possible form of heresy; but they do form a *Basis* whereon to meet those who "arise speaking perverse things".

"The Birmingham (Amended) Basis", we have discovered, is "*loyally submitted to*" by "Christadelphians" of most diverse minds—men utterly at variance with the explanations of those who compiled the said Basis.

In the following pages we deal with a fundamental doctrine—Christ as our Passover—concerning which there are heresies afloat, different in some details, but which, whether at home, in Australasia, The United States or Canada, really set forth "another Jesus".

As to Australasia, its chief exponent and advocate candidly admits denial of the Jesus believed in by Dr. Thomas, Bro. Roberts, and other old-time Christadelphians. He has no hesitation in charging such with "discreditable blasphemy". He, and his followers, utterly reject the Christadelphian First Principle that our first parents' nature became "defiled" as the result of transgression, and, that, thenceforth, the flesh has been inherently "unclean", and "condemned" by God.

In the United States, the enemies are not so candid: for they profess to belong to the old school of Christadelphians, and to follow Dr. Thomas and Bro. Roberts in their understanding of the Scriptures; whereas, they are really and truly "enemies".* Not

* This is the deliberate verdict of Bro. H. SULLEY, of Nottingham, than whom no one is so well qualified to form a correct judgment, he being personally familiar with the said Australian and American advocates—see *Christadelphian*, 1921 and 1922, in which Bro. H. SULLEY combats, and demolishes, the "Clean flesh" and "Substitution" theories. (See p. 57.)

insincerely we admit, but that does not alter the fact. The very title of the leading American pamphlet on the subject, *Out of Darkness into Light*, stultifies its author's subsequent endeavours to show "by quotations from their own writings" that Dr. Thomas, and Bro. Robert Roberts, were in harmony with his theory; for, if it were not those two Christadelphians he had in mind, when he penned the words found on pages 69-70, to whom was he referring? His words there are: "It is what your leaders have taught you; you have allowed those leaders to do your thinking. With emphasis we repeat, that, when Christ offered himself on the cross, he did not do so as a high priest, but as a lamb without blemish; and that when he commenced to make offerings, he was in Heaven and not on earth."

Readers of *Elpis Israel*, the *Law of Moses*, and other Christadelphian works, know, beyond all doubt, that Dr. Thomas and Bro. Robert Roberts are the "leaders" held up to scorn as being in "darkness", and whose followers are exhorted to come into the "light": hence the title chosen, *Out of Darkness into Light*.

The latest contention of its author, that the denounced leaders—Dr. Thomas and Bro. Roberts, really held and taught the American theory concerning the sacrifice of Christ, was clearly an afterthought, but too late to be of any service to him in his propaganda, as we shall show.

Clauses in the *Birmingham (Amended) Basis of Faith* read as follows:—

IV. That the first man was Adam, whom God created out of the dust of the ground as a living soul, or natural body of life, "very good" in kind and condition, and placed him under a law through which the continuance of life was contingent on obedience (Gen. ii. 7; xviii. 27; Job iv. 19; xxxiii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 46, 49; Gen. ii. 17).

V. That Adam broke this law, and was adjudged unworthy of immortality, and sentenced to return to the ground from whence he was taken—a sentence which defiled and became a physical law of his being, and was transmitted to all his posterity (Gen. iii. 15–19, 22, 23; 2 Cor. i. 9; Rom. vii. 24; 2 Cor. v. 2–4; Rom. vii. 18–23; Gal. v. 16, 17; Rom. vi. 12; vii. 21; John iii. 6; Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22; Psalm li. 5; Job xiv. 4).

VI. That God in His kindness, conceived a plan of restoration which, without setting aside His just and necessary law of sin and death, should ultimately rescue the race from destruction, and people the earth with sinless immortals (Rev. xxi. 4; John iii. 16; 2 Tim. i. 10; 1 John ii. 25; 2 Tim. i. 1; Titus i. 2; Rom. iii. 26; John i. 29).

VII. That He inaugurated this plan by making promises to Adam, Abraham, and David, and afterwards elaborated it in greater detail through the prophets (Gen. iii. 15; xxi. 18; Psalm lxxxix. 34–37; xxxiii. 5; Hosea xiii. 14; Isaiah xxv. 7–9; li. 8; Jer. xxxiii. 5).

VIII. That these promises had reference to Jesus Christ, who was raised up in the condemned line of Abraham and David, and who, though wearing their condemned nature, was to obtain a title to resurrection by perfect obedience, and, by dying, abrogate the law of condemnation for himself, and all who should believe and obey him (1 Cor. xv. 45; Heb. ii. 14–16; Rom. i. 3; Heb. v. 8, 9; i. 9; Rom. v. 19–21; Gal. iv. 4, 5; Rom. viii. 3, 4; Heb. ii. 15; ix. 26; Gal. i. 4; Heb. vii. 27; v. 3–7; ii. 17; Rom. vi. 10; vi. 9; Acts xiii. 34–37; Rev. i. 18; John v. 21, 22, 26, 27; xiv. 3; Rev. ii. 7; iii. 21; Matt. xxv. 21; Heb. v. 9; Mark xvi. 16; Acts xiii. 38, 39; Rom. iii. 22; Psalm ii. 6–9; Dan. vii. 13, 14; Rev. xi. 15; Jer. xxxiii. 5; Zech. xv. 9; Ephes. i. 9, 10).

IX. That it was this mission that necessitated the miraculous begetting of Christ of a human mother,

enabling him to bear our condemnation, and, at the same time to be a sinless bearer thereof, and, therefore, one who could rise after suffering the death required by the righteousness of God (Matt. i. 18–25; Luke i. 26–35; Gal. iv. 4; Isaiah vii. 14; Rom. i. 3, 4; viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4; 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. ii. 17; iv. 15).

X. That being so begotten of God, and inhabited and used by God through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, Jesus was Immanuel, God with us, God manifest in the flesh—yet, was, during his natural life, of like nature with mortal man, being made of a woman, of the house and lineage of David, and therefore a sufferer, in the days of his flesh, from all the effects that came by Adam's transgression, including the death that passed upon all men, which he shared by partaking of their physical nature (Matt. i. 23; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. ii. 14; Gal. iv. 4; Heb. ii. 17).

XI. That the message he delivered from God to his kinsmen the Jews, was a call to repentance from every evil work, the assertion of his divine sonship and Jewish kingship; and the proclamation of the glad tidings that God would restore their kingdom through him, and accomplish all things written in the prophets (Mark i. 15; Matt. iv. 17; v. 20–48; John x. 36; ix. 35; xi. 27; xix. 21; i. 49; Matt. xvii. 11–42; John x. 24, 25; Matt. xix. 28; xxi. 42, 43; xxiii. 38, 39; xxv. 14 to the end; Luke iv. 43; xiii. 27–30; xix. 11–27; xxii. 28–30; Matt. v. 17; Luke xxiv. 44).

XII. That for delivering this message, he was put to death by the Jews and Romans, who were, however, but instruments in the hands of God, for the doing of that which He had determined before to be done—viz: the condemnation of sin in the flesh, through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all, as a propitiation to declare the righteousness of God as a basis for the remission of sins. All who approach God, through this crucified, but risen, representative of Adam's disobedient race, are forgiven. Therefore, by a figure, his

blood cleanseth from sin (Luke xix. 47 ; xx. 1-26, 48 ; John xi. 45-53 ; Acts x. 38, 39 ; xiii. 26-29 ; iv. 27, 28 ; Rom. viii. 3 ; Heb. x. 10 ; Rom. iii. 25 ; Acts xiii. 38 ; 1 John i. 7 ; John xiv. 6 ; Acts iv. 12 ; 1 Pet. iii. 18 ; ii. 24 ; Heb. ix. 14 ; vii. 27 ; ix. 26-29 ; Gal. i. 4 ; Rom. iii. 25 ; xv. 8 ; Gal. iii. 21, 27 ; ii. 21 ; iv. 4, 5 ; Heb. ix. 15 ; Luke xxii. 20 ; xxiv. 26, 46, 47 ; Matt. xxvi. 28).

Among the "doctrines to be rejected", the *Birmingham (Amended) Basis of Faith*, includes :

No. 4. That Christ was born with a "free life".

No. 5. That Christ's nature was immaculate.

No. 27. That there is no sin in the flesh.

This Basis is being undermined, not only in Australasia, America, and Canada, but, also at home, by those in fellowship with the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) and allied ecclesias, who excuse the alliance on the plea that the indicted brethren do "accept the said Basis of Faith". Yes, apparently because they have not the courage to stand alone, or to oppose the boasted, and boastful, "1300". As already stated, some of the new-theorists (A. D. Strickler and H. G. Ladson), have written works with a view to show that neither Dr. Thomas, or Bro. Roberts, really taught that Jesus Christ was personally involved in the one great offering for sin ; and, that, except for sins committed by his brethren, the death on the cross, the crucifixion of flesh, was not required—eternal life was his. The fact is, that this new contention has been combatted by Dr. Thomas, Bro. Roberts, and other faithful Christadelphians, from time immemorial—long before any living Christadelphian was born.

We will now produce the evidence, without any comments whatever. The latter are not needed, the language used by all witnesses is so plain, so clear, and so emphatic. And, too, let it be noted, they all "speak

the same things", being "all of one mind" on the doctrines in question.

The conclusion of the matter, as bearing upon the question of fellowship, we shall deal with at the end of the evidence.

1. "The word *sin* is used in two principal acceptations in the Scriptures. It signifies in the first place, *the transgression of law* ; and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature, which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh '*which has the power of death*' ; and it is called *sin*, because the development or fixation, of this *evil* in the flesh, was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled '*sinful flesh*', that is, *flesh full of sin* ; so that *sin*, in the sacred style, came to stand for the substance called *man*. In human flesh '*dwells no good thing*' (Rom. vii. 18, 17), and all the evil a man does is the result of this principle dwelling in him."

Elpis Israel, p. 113.

2. "Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature. Hence, the flesh is invariably regarded as *unclean*. It is therefore written, 'How can he be clean that is born of a woman ?' (Job xxv. 4). 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ? Not one' (Job xiv. 4). 'What is man that he should be clean ? And he that is born of a woman that he should be righteous ?' (Job xv. 14, 16)."

Elpis Israel, p. 114.

3. "Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there. His body was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for ; for he was born of a woman, and 'not one' can 'bring a clean' body out of a defiled body ; for 'that', says Jesus himself, 'which is born of the flesh is flesh' (John iii. 6)."

Elpis Israel, p. 114.

4. "This view of sin in the flesh is enlightening in the things concerning Jesus. The Apostle says, 'God made him sin for us, who knew no sin' (2 Cor. v. 21); and this he explains in another place by saying, that, 'He sent His own Son *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, and for sin, condemned sin *in the flesh*' (Rom. viii. 3) in the offering of his body once (Heb. x. 10, 12, 14). Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus, if it had not existed there. His body was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for; for he was born of a woman, and 'not one' can bring a clean body out of a defiled body; for 'that,' says Jesus himself, 'which is born of the flesh is flesh' (John iii. 6)."

Elpis Israel, p. 114.

5. "According to this physical law, the seed of the woman was born into the world. The nature of Mary was as unclean as that of other women; and therefore could give birth only to 'a body', like her own, though especially '*prepared of God*' (Heb. x. 10, 12, 14). Had Mary's nature been immaculate, as her idolatrous worshippers contend, an immaculate body would have been born of her; which, therefore, would not have answered the purpose of God; which was to condemn sin in the flesh; a thing that could not have been accomplished, if there were no sin there."

Elpis Israel, p. 115.

6. "Sinful flesh being the hereditary nature of the Lord Jesus, he was a fit and proper sacrifice for sin; especially as he was himself 'innocent of the great transgression', having been obedient in all things. Appearing in the nature of the seed of Abraham (Heb. ii. 16-18), he was subject to all the emotions by which we are troubled; so that he was enabled to sympathize with our infirmities (Heb. iv. 15), being made *in all things* like unto his brethren."

Elpis Israel, p. 115.

7. "Sin in the flesh is hereditary; and entailed upon mankind as the consequence of Adam's violation of the Eden law. The '*original sin*' was such as I have shown in previous pages. Adam and Eve committed it; and their posterity are suffering the consequences of it. The Tribe of Levi paid tithes to Melchisedec many years before Levi was born. The Apostle says 'Levi, who received tithes, paid tithes in Abraham'. Upon the same federal principle, all mankind ate of the forbidden fruit, being in the loins of Adam when he transgressed. This is the only way men can by any possibility be guilty of the original sin. Because they sinned in Adam, therefore they return to dust from which Adam came, says the Apostle, '*in whom all sinned*'."

Elpis Israel, p. 115.

8. "Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and that which is born of the flesh is flesh, or sin. This is a misfortune, not a crime. They did not will to be born sinners. They have no choice in the case; for, it is written, 'the creature', that is, the animal man '*was made subject to the evil*, not willingly, but according to *the arranging in hope*' (Rom. viii. 20) . . . Hence, the Apostle says, 'by Adam's disobedience the many were *made sinners*' (Rom. v. 19); that is, they were endowed with a nature like his, which had become unclean, as the result of his disobedience."

Elpis Israel, p. 116.

9. "But men are not only made, or constituted, sinners by the disobedience of Adam, but they become sinners even as he, by *actual transgression* . . . Thus men are sinners, in a two-fold sense. They are 'condemned already' to the dust as natural born sinners; and secondarily, condemned to a resurrection to judgment for rejecting the Gospel of the Kingdom of God; by which they became obnoxious to '*the SECOND*'

DEATH'. Thus men are sinners in a two-fold sense ; firstly by natural birth ; and next by transgression."

Elpis Israel, p. 117.

10. "The Apostle says, 'As through one offence (sentence was pronounced) upon all men unto condemnation ; so also through one righteousness (sentence was pronounced) upon all men (that is Jews and Gentiles) into a *pardon of life*. For as through the disobedience of the one man the *many* were *constituted sinners* ; so also through the obedience of the one the many were *constituted righteous* (Rom. v. 18, 19). The two Adams are *two federal chiefs* ; the first being figurative of the second in these relations (Rom. v. 14). All sinners are *in* the first Adam ; and all the righteous, *in* the second, only on a different principle. Sinners were in the loins of the former when he transgressed ; but not in the loins of the latter, when he was obedient unto death ; therefore, the flesh profiteth nothing'."

Elpis Israel, p. 118.

11. "Jesus Christ in being made a sacrifice for sin by the pouring out of his blood upon the cross, was set forth as a *blood-sprinkled mercy seat*, to all believers of the Gospel of the Kingdom, who have faith in this remission of sins through the shedding of his blood."

Elpis Israel, p. 119.

12. "If he (the believer) turn his thoughts back into his own heart, and note the impulses which work there, he will perceive a something that, if he were to yield to it, would impel him to the violation of the divine law. These impulses are styled '*the motions of sin*' (Rom. vii. 5) . . . The remote cause of the '*motions*' is that physical principle, or quality, of the flesh, styled indwelling sin, which returns the mortal body to the dust ; and that which excites the latent

disposition is the law of God forbidding to do thus and so ; for 'I had not known sin ; but by the law'."

Elpis Israel, p. 123.

13. "The purifying principle, so largely represented in the sanctuary, we find abundantly realized in the '*substance*', which is '*of Christ*.' Both as a physical and a spiritual power, it flowed, to cleanse and to save the suffering and the sinner'."

Patterns of Things in the Heavens, p. 15.

14. "These principles (represented by the material of the Ephod) were embodied in Jesus, as '*holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners*', as to character ; yet the likeness of sin's flesh, in whom sin was condemned when crucified, as to nature ; and the purifier unto righteousness of those who become the righteousness of the Deity in and through him."

Patterns of Things in the Heavens, p. 22.

15. "The Altar, we are informed, was the first thing sanctified by the pouring out of the blood : that reconciliation might be made upon it. The testimonies concerning the sufferings of Christ, reveal the mystery hidden within these sacrificial services."

Patterns of Things in the Heavens, p. 45.

16. "Jesus being set forth by the Deity a propitiation, for the remission of sins that are passed, through faith in his blood (Rom. iii. 25), exhibits him in relation to the believer of the Truth as an Altar—the real *Ail-Elohai-Yisrael* and *Yahweh-Nissi*. The Word made flesh was at once the victim, the Altar, and the Priest. The Spirit-word made his soul an offering for sin (Isaiah liii. 10) ; and thus sanctified the Altar-Body on the tree ; and all that touch it are holy ; and without touching it none are holy."

Patterns of Things in the Heavens, p. 62.

17. "The occasion of the curse was the transgression of the divine law by the 'very good' nature formed in and of the dust of the ground. 'Cursed is the ground *for thy sake*; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it *all the days of thy life*; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth *to thee*; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; *in* the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread *till thou return unto the ground*; for out of it was thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return'. So long, then, as the sin-nature continues to inhabit the earth, there must be sorrow, toil, and death; for the sentence pronounced upon the sinning nature, declares the continuance of the curse to be in all the days of its life."

Eureka, iii. 705.

18. "To abolish the curse, then, is equivalent to the abolition of the nature cursed with sorrow, toil, disease, and death. This abolition is the consummation of all things, by which is introduced an entirely new creation; the basis of which is a nature that neither has nor can transgress—that is the divine nature. *All that comes out of the ground is cursed, and unclean*; so that even the body of Jesus, and the bodies of the approved saints, in resurrection require to be justified, rectified, purged, or perfected, by all-absorbing spirit: which makes every atom of their substance instinct with incorruption and life; in other words, transformed it into spirit."

Eureka, iii. 705.

19. "The flesh in or through which the Deity was manifested, was for the brief space of thirty-three years, inferior to the angelic nature, which is spirit. It had been *purified* by the sprinkling of *its own blood* upon the cross."

Catechesis, p. 12.

20. "It was necessary that one not born of the will of man, or of the lust of the flesh, should become a sin offering—that one 'who knew no sin should be made sin' for believers of the Gospel, that he might 'bear their sins *in his own body* to the tree; that by putting him on 'they might be made the righteousness of God in him' (Heb. ix. 22; x. 4-14)."

Revealed Mystery, pp. 7, 9.

21. "It is testified that he was 'made sin for us' (2 Cor. v. 21). As he was not of sinful character, this could only apply to his physical nature, which drawn from the veins of Mary, was 'made sin.' Again, in Rom. viii. 3, we are informed that 'what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God (hath done) in sending forth His son in *the likeness of sinful flesh*, and for (on account of) sin, *condemned sin in the flesh*'."

Christadelphian, 1869, p. 83.

22. "If Jesus came in the flesh, he was under condemnation, for the nature he inherited was a condemned one. The sentence of death ran in the blood which he inherited from Adam through Mary. He was, therefore, 'in the days of his flesh', as much under its power as those he came to save. This conclusion follows from the testimony that he was a man; it would stand secure upon that foundation alone, but it is also expressly affirmed in divers parts of the Word. It is testified that he was 'made sin for us' (2 Cor. v. 21)."

Christadelphian, 1869, p. 83.

23. "We call attention to the fact that John lays emphasis on this doctrine, that Christ had come in the flesh. He makes it a test: he says if a man confess not that Jesus is come in the flesh, the same is not of God (1 John iv. 1-3), and he forbids the faithful to receive

any who bring not this doctrine with them. We shall see a good reason for this stringency. We shall find that the fact of Christ having come in the flesh, involves a principle that lies at the bottom of the scheme of truth, of which the manifestation of Christ is but an expression ; and that to surrender it, or be a party to its surrender, is to be guilty of opening a leak which tends to the admission of the polluted flood which has for centuries submerged the world in death."

Christadelphian, 1869, p. 83.

24. "The mere impulse to sin is not sin. Sin consists in giving way to impulse in thought or deed. The prophets were men of like passions with ourselves (James v. 10, 17). Jesus was tempted in all points like as we are (Heb. iv. 15). There could be no victory if there were no impulse inclining in a forbidden direction."

Christadelphian, 1870, p. 23.

25. "God's plan was to condemn sin in its own nature after the type of the serpent in the wilderness. The bitten Israelites were asked to look at the biter impaled, as the condition of being healed. Jesus said this had to be fulfilled in him. Human nature as the sinner was the biter, and in him, it was lifted up in condemnation on the cross (Rom. viii. 3 ; John iii. 14)."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 318.

26. "The body offered on Calvary being the nature that transgressed and was condemned in Eden, was offered under a condemnation that affected both itself and those for whom the sacrifice was made (Heb. vii. 27)."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 321.

27. "Adam prior to his fall was neither mortal nor immortal."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 316.

28. "Had Jesus not been put to death violently would he have lived for ever ? No."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 324.

29. "Those who hold Paul's doctrine ought not to worship with a body that does not. This is holding with the hare and running with the hounds—a position of extraordinary difficulty. Does not such an one love the hounds better than the hare ? When the hounds come upon the hare, where will he be ? No ; if I agree with you in doctrine, I will forsake the assembling of myself with a body that opposes your doctrine, although it might require me to separate from the nearest and dearest. No good is effected by compromising the principles of the truth ; and to deny that Jesus came in sinful flesh, is to destroy the sacrifice of Christ."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 324.

30. "Jesus by being of the seed of Abraham, became sin for us ; that sin was condemned *in* the flesh, our sins were borne *in* his body *on* the tree ; these things could not have been accomplished in a nature destitute of that *physical* principle, styled 'sin in the flesh'."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 361.

31. "Was the flesh of Jesus from his birth by Mary pure, holy, spotless, undefiled ? No."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 364.

32. "God sent Christ forth in the nature of the condemned, that sin might be condemned in him. Hence he was *made sin* (2 Cor. v. 21), and when he died, he *died unto sin* (Rom. vi. 10), and when he comes again he comes *without sin* (Heb. ix. 28). Regarding sin in a figure, as the captor of the human race, the death of Christ is in the same figure, a ransom ; but it is a ransom in harmony with the revealed principles of action

in the case, viz., the death of a sinless wearer of the condemned nature ; and not a ransom in the ordinary literal sense ; for this ransom was only made effective for the deliverance of the captives by that resurrection to life again which his sinlessness allowed."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 402.

33. "The Spirit so to speak, arrays itself with the nature of Adam which is the nature condemned. The Son of God is thus no substitute, but the very bearer of the condemnation. Though personally sinless, he was by constitution condemned, and had therefore to offer for himself and his brethren."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 405.

34. "Paul's statement (Heb. vii. 27) is that Jesus did *once* what the typical high-priest did *daily*. What was that ? 'Offered first for his own sins and then for the people's'. It follows that there must be a sense in which Jesus offered for himself also, a sense which is apparent when it is recognized that he was under Adamic condemnation, inhering in his flesh."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 405.

35. "There is the declaration of Paul that God sent forth His Son in the flesh and blood of the children to *condemn sin in the flesh* (Rom. viii. 4). Next, the corresponding statement that he took on him the seed of Abraham that 'THROUGH DEATH he might *destroy* that having the power of death' (Heb. ii. 17, 14). Next, the statement of Peter that he bore our sins *in his own body* on the tree (1 Pet. ii. 24). Next, Paul : He hath *made him to be sin* for us who knew no sin (2 Cor. v. 21)."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 405.

36. "Christ was 'the seed of Abraham', the flesh of David, the sin-nature of the condemned Adam, for

the condemnation of sin in the flesh. The condemnation rested on him, which was the uncleanness, and this antitypical uncleanness of the 'one great offering' could only be cleansed after the example of the type—by death and burning : the burning being the change effected by the Spirit on the risen body of the Lord after his death for sin. The new theory contains no parallel to this uncleanness of the typical 'bodies of those beasts burnt without the camp'."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 407.

37. "The red heifer was without spot and had never been put under yoke, pointing to the sinlessness of Christ, and of the fact that he was brought into the world for the service of God alone ; but what counterpart had the uncleanness (Lev. xv.) ? The answer is found in the fact that he was 'the seed of Abraham', the flesh of David—the sin nature of the condemned Adam, for the condemnation of sin in the flesh. The condemnation rested on him, which was the uncleanness, and this anti-typical uncleanness of the 'one great offering' could only be cleansed after the example of the type."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 407.

38. "Jesus was the substance of the 'heavenly things' (Heb. ix. 22). He was 'the heavenly things' in compendium ; and the testimony of the law, argued out by Paul, is that before his sacrifice, they were unclean, and had to be purified by his sacrifice. The exact meaning of this is not obscure when it is recognized that Jesus was the sin-nature, or sinful flesh of Adam, inheriting with it the condemnation clinging to it ; that sin being thus laid on him he might die for it. He bore in himself the uncleanness of the sanctuary, the altar, the high priest, his own house, and of the whole congregation ; for he was born under their curse, being born in their nature, and could therefore bear it."

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 408.

39. " Jesus tells us (John x. 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 is it possible, then, that he could enter eternal life alone? "

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 461.

40. " If our sins were laid on Christ 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 could never take away sins (Heb. x. 2)? And where then is the substance of the shadow? "

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 462.

41. " The figure used by the Apostle when he enjoins to ' crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts ' is drawn from the fact that it was none other than the flesh containing these affections and lusts that was literally crucified when Jesus was put to death. "

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 489.

42. " The taking away of sin is specially associated with the blood-shedding, death, or offering of Christ because that is the one element of the process of sin-taking-away, which implies all the rest. The shedding of blood was typical of more than death: it was typical of a violent manner of death: for in natural death the blood is not shed . . . Death had a double hold upon those for whom Christ was to die . . . their being from one who was condemned to death because of sin and their own numerous offences . . . Christ came under both curses, and discharged them both by the shedding of his blood. He came under the first in being born of the same condemned stock . . . He came under the second in the act of crucifixion. "

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 553.

43. " The mistake lies in supposing that because it was ' for us ', he was not personally subjected to the burden laid upon him . . . He offered for himself first, by reason of his participation in Adamic mortality; and second, because his hanging on a tree brought on him the curse of the Law, from which he could only be delivered by death. The resurrection that followed was the Father's interference on behalf of His holy One, whose very condemnation by the Law was the result of his submission to what the Father required—his death on the cross. "

Christadelphian, 1873, p. 555.

44. " Attention has been called to the fact, that in the ' *Good Confession* ', the common translation is put into the mouth of the person under examination: Question 142—' And yet he died? *Yes, but not for himself* '. If it is contended that this was meant at the time it was written, to convey the Renunciationist idea, that Jesus was exempt from Adamic condemnation, the context will show any reader how unfounded such a suggestion is. "

Christadelphian, 1874, p. 84.

45. " Job speaking of ' man that is born of woman ' says; ' who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? ' and David, by the Spirit, says, in Psalm li. 5: ' Behold I was shapen *in iniquity*, and *in sin* did my mother conceive me. ' Furthermore, the annual atonement under the Law (Lev. xvi.) was appointed even ' for the holy place ', because of the *uncleanness* of the children of Israel, besides their ' transgressions in all their sins ' (verse 16). ' Sin in the flesh ', which is *Paul's phrase*, refers to the same thing. It is what Paul also calls, ' *Sin that dwelleth in me* ' (Rom. vii. 17), adding ' I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing '. Now what is this element called ' uncleanness ', ' sin ', ' iniquity ', etc. ? "

Christadelphian, 1874, p. 88.

46. "It is a principle of uncleanness and corruption and weakness . . . Our experience answers to Paul's and leads us to sympathize exactly with his exclamation, 'Oh wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?' The body of the Lord Jesus was this same unclean nature in the hand of the Father, that deliverance might be effected by God on His own principles and to His own glory . . . God accepts no compromise. He provided a prisoner furnished with the key of obedience who could open the door for all who should name themselves after him."

Christadelphian, 1874, p. 89.

47. "There was in Adam, after he sinned, as there is in all his descendants hereditarily from him, a physical principle, which reigns in the whole man, causes pain and sorrow, and finally brings him to the dust of death."

Christadelphian, 1874, p. 158.

48. "If you admit his body (Jesus) was *the same* as ours, you are bound to admit the body of Jesus was dead, because ours is (Rom. viii. 10); it was vile, because ours is (Phil. iii. 21); it was mortal, because ours is (1 Cor. xv. 53); it was unclean, because all born of women are (Job xiv. 4; Psalm li. 5); it had the sentence of death in itself, because Paul's had (2 Cor. i. 9), the reason of all which was, that it was produced exactly as ours, in being made and born of a sinful woman."

Christadelphian, 1874, p. 237.

49. "The Spirit was the Saviour: God in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. The words that Christ spoke concerning this mystery of love and wisdom were the food to be eaten (John vi. 63). As the mystery related to the manifestation of God *in the flesh*, the words related to the flesh—and, therefore, were in parable spoken of as the flesh; but the flesh in itself

was profitless, except as an ingredient in the Spirit's work of salvation. To be an efficacious ingredient in this work, it required to be and was 'the same' flesh. God's plan required the sinful flesh to be offered in the person of a sinless wearer of it, whom He could only produce by the manipulation of Himself therein. In this way He sent forth His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and on account of sin, condemned sin in the flesh."

Christadelphian, 1874, p. 237.

50. "Mortality (among men) is the result of sin, and He (Christ) was mortal, requiring to be saved from death (Heb. v. 7), and bringing life by his obedience (Rom. v.). Into this state of things, he was introduced, as we are introduced, in being born of a sinful woman. This is the sense of the phrase '*a constitutional sinner*'. Only perversity would suppress the word '*constitutional*', and allege that the Christadelphians teach Christ to have been sinner."

Christadelphian, 1874, p. 281.

51. "The 'death (of Jesus) as a sacrifice' was the death of a righteous, God-begotten, God-sent, God-upheld Bearer of the condemnation of others—a condemnation put upon him first by birth, and secondly by the mode of his death; a death which having been submitted to in obedience, was speedily terminated in resurrection through intervention of the Father's love, who was 'well-pleased'."

Christadelphian, 1874, p. 527.

52. "Christ bore our sins 'in his own body' (1 Pet. ii. 24) all our sins—not one class of sins only, and therefore if we 'sinned in Adam', he bore that sin too. Your contention that Christ was 'free' while he bore those sins is a contradiction in terms. Sin can only be borne in its effect, and how can a man be 'free' from those effects while bearing them?"

Christadelphian, 1875, p. 42.

53. "The Truth shows us in Christ (of the seed of David according to the flesh) a fellow-sufferer with us, from the evils that have come by Adam's disobedience, and therefore from the constitutional sentence of death. In his death, therefore, we are not invited to contemplate a punishment inflicted upon him instead of upon others, but a suffering of a divine sentence which he was qualified to submit to without infraction of divine justice, by being made one of those upon whom death had passed, and on whose account he was made subject to death, in being 'made of a woman, made under the Law' (Gal. iv. 4)."

Christadelphian, 1877, p. 369.

54. "They think with our poor Renunciationist friends, that they honour Christ in speaking of him as 'untainted with the Adamic curse'—not perceiving that thereby they unfit him for the very work he came to do in getting rid of that curse himself, and for all who should afterwards come into him and partake of his victory."

Christadelphian, 1877, p. 370.

55. "What does the Bible teach? It teaches that since Adam transgressed in the garden of Eden, a man, the seed of woman partaking man's *sinful* nature, if found obedient and sinless all his life, should restore and rectify the relation between God and man, and repair the breach of Eden by dying on behalf of man, not instead of man; and such a man was found in Jesus, who being a son of David, and the seed of Abraham, had to condemn sin in his own flesh on the cross, and had to redeem for himself on account of his own flesh, and afterwards to redeem his people from their sins (see Heb. v. 1, 3; and Lev. ix. 7)."

Christadelphian, 1882, p. 29.

56. "It is a fine principle of the Truth that Jesus, at his first appearing among men, was of the identical

flesh of all men—the flesh derived from the condemned transgressor in Eden. His mission required that it should be so, both that he should conquer morally by obedience (which he could not have done in 'pure flesh', as Renunciationism teaches), and that he might nullify its hereditary condemnation by offering it up in sacrifice on Calvary as required."

Christadelphian, 1894, p. 232.

57. "Though Jesus was personally righteous, he stood as the representative of chosen sinners in two senses—first, as to the possession of the sin-nature transmitted from Eden, a nature weak in itself and condemned because of sin, and which it was the Father's purpose to put to death in Christ, as the foundation of mercy; and secondly, as to the relation of his work to forgiveness of the sins of his people."

Christadelphian, 1895, p. 23.

58. "God sent forth His Son in the likeness (or strictly, the identicalness) of human flesh, that He might in 'the body of that flesh through death', condemn sin in the eyes of all the world—sin in the abstract, sin as the wont and rule of human nature, except in the specially prepared man in whom the sinful tendencies of the flesh were all held in check by the superior enlightening power with which he was clothed."

Christadelphian, 1895, p. 24.

59. "If we ask why it was that the Holiest of all could not be entered without a perfect sacrifice, the same answer ('God willed it', see *Elpis Israel*, p. 149) must be given. If we then ask whether God would have required a declaration of His righteousness if Christ had been the only one to enter life, we ask a presumptuous question. If God's purpose had been different His will might have been different. As it was

He required Jesus to submit to a sacrificial death, consequently a violent death was necessary for his own redemption."

Christadelphian, 1895, p. 261.

60. "Christ required redemption from Adamic nature equally with his brethren, and the mode of redemption which God had ordained was a perfect obedience culminating in a sacrificial death."

Christadelphian, 1895, p. 262.

61. "Though Jesus was not a sinner, he was made subject to a sinful state of things in being born of a mother who was mortal because of sin. He was born into that state that he might heal it in death and resurrection. 'When he died he died unto sin once' (Rom. vi. 10)."

Christadelphian, 1898, p. 342.

62. "(a) In the sacrifice of Christ was atonement made for Adam's transgression? Yes: but not for that alone. Adam will be forgiven, and so will all his children who submit to Christ. (b) What sin made the death of Christ a necessity? All sin. (c) In what way was Christ involved in sin? By being born of a sin-stricken daughter of Adam, who, inheriting the condemnation of death with her father's nature, could only impart that nature to her son, 'who was made in all things like his brethren' (Acts ii. 17)."

Christadelphian, 1897, p. 63.

63. "Adam was in the 'very good' state before he sinned. He was not in the state his descendants are in. They are heirs of death: he was not. They have the sentence of death 'in themselves' (2 Cor. i. 9): he had not. Paul had to say, 'sin dwelleth in me': 'I see a law in my members warring against the law of my mind' (Rom. vii. 17, 23): Adam could not have said this."

Christadelphian, 1898, p. 343.

64. "Sin, as disobedience, arose in their case from a wrong opinion concerning a matter of lawful desire, and not from what Paul calls 'sin in the flesh'. It became sin in the flesh when it brought forth that sentence of death that made them mortal, and all their children with them: that is, this sentence, passed because of sin, affected their bodily state and implanted in their flesh a law of dissolution that became the law of their being. As a law of physical weakness and death, it necessarily became a source of moral weakness. That which originated in sin, became a cause of sin in their posterity, and therefore accurately described by Paul as 'sin in the flesh'."

Christadelphian, 1898, p. 343.

65. "It may shock you to think that such a condition attached to the Lord Jesus in the days of his flesh. But there is no cause where a full enlightenment prevails. He partook of our very nature that in him it might be redeemed and perfected. He did no sin, but he was physically 'made sin for us who knew no sin'. He was sent forth in the likeness of sinful flesh that sin might be condemned in him: that through death he might destroy that having the power of death. It is so testified (2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. viii. 3; Heb. ii. 14), and we have nothing to do but believe the testimony, even if we could not see through it."

Christadelphian, 1898, p. 343.

66. "Christ was 'made sin' in being born into a sin-constitution of things—a state in which evil prevails because of sin, for the cure of that evil, and the removal of that sin in being treated as a sinner when he was not a sinner."

Christadelphian, 1898, p. 390.

67. "The combination of condemned human nature with personal sinlessness was effected through divine

power begetting a son from Mary's substance. A 'Lamb of God' was thus produced guileless from his paternity, and yet inheriting the human sin-nature of his mother."

Christendom Astray, chap. vi.

68. "It is not possible that 'the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin' (Heb. x. 4), for the reason that appears in view of all these facts. The Law would admit of no substitute, but exacted the very nature obnoxious to its penalty. Christ, then, 'being found in fashion as a man', and yet being sinless, was a perfect sacrifice; because being the representative of human nature, he could meet all the claims of God's law upon that nature, and yet triumph over its operation by a resurrection to immortal life."

Christendom Astray, chap. vi.

69. "And now was about to be accomplished the next and most difficult of all, so far as Christ's submission was concerned: the public and official condemnation of sin in his crucifixion, which his nature qualified him to be the subject of, but not without all the suffering of the most sensitive of Adam's race. His physical flesh and blood, as he was before his death, was identical with that which had prevailed upon earth from Adam downwards, characterized by the same weakness and mortality, arising from the same hereditary cause—the sentence of death upon Adam. The nailing of his body to the cross, was therefore a representative ritual, in which the rejection of the first Adam nature was signified, and the righteousness of God declared. We morally identify ourselves with the transaction when we receive it in faith as God's appointed mode of reconciliation. Paul expressed it thus: 'our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin' (Rom. vi. 6)."

Nazareth Revisited, chap. li.

70. "In this condemnation of sin in the flesh, the sinning nature had to be representatively nailed up to death in the eyes of all the world, in one who, without sin himself, was a partaker of the nature that had come under death by its power (Rom. viii. 3; Heb. ii. 14). . . . Had he possessed any other than the very nature of condemned man, he would not have been a suitable sacrifice for man. And his blood would have been like the blood of the animals shed under the Mosaic system of things, 'which could not take away sin' (Heb. x. 4). Hence the importance of receiving the fact that he 'came in the flesh' (1 John iv. 3; 2 John 7)."

Nazareth Revisited, chap. xxxv.

71. "God's plan in Christ has given us a scheme by which human salvation is achieved without the violation of any of His laws, which are necessary to the maintenance of His supremacy in the Universe. Christ meets all the necessities of the case. The first necessity was that the law, both Edenic and Mosaic, should be upheld. The law required the death of the transgressing nature, vile, human nature."

Christendom Astray, chap. vi.

72. "God dealt with him representatively. There is a great difference between a *representative* and a *substitute*. A representative is not disconnected from those represented. On the contrary, those represented go through with him all that he goes through. But in the case of a substitute, it is otherwise. He does his part *instead of* those for whom he is a substitute, and they are dissociated from the transaction."

Christendom Astray, chap. vi.

73. "In his own person, as a representative man, he extinguished the power of sin by surrendering to its full consequences, and then escaping by resurrection, through the power of his own holiness, to live for

evermore. This is New Testamentally described as 'God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned *sin in the flesh*' (Rom. viii. 3). Sin in the flesh, then, is the devil destroyed by Jesus in his death."

Christendom Astray, chap. vii.

74. "The first covenant was 'not dedicated without blood.' The Mosaic patterns were all purified thus. Blood proclaimed the infliction of death. It was an infliction of death on animals, and therefore not efficacious for final results, yet, as a shadow, it commanded assent to the principle. Blood, as the symbol of death, typically purged the death defilement. Death is always treated in the Mosaic system as a defiling thing. To touch a dead body, or a grave, or a bone, was to contract defilement."

Law of Moses, p. 83.

75. "Paul, commenting on those things, says that, 'almost all things are by the Law purged with blood.' The reason he gives is that no covenant is of force while the testator liveth. Blood poured out is the symbol of death, and the sprinkling with this blood on altar, booth, and people, was an intimation that no covenant of everlasting force, could be made without the death of the men to whom it was offered. If it be asked why, the answer is, that death was due."

Law of Moses, p. 83.

76. "The whole congregation, as they stood there before Moses, were in the antitypically defiled state. They had not only touched death through descent from the condemned of Eden; but they were in contact with its defiling power in their own bodies. There was therefore nothing but that which was just and seemly in the shedding of blood being made accessory to the establishment of a covenant of peace between God and them."

Law of Moses, p. 84.

77. "Paul notes that without the shedding of blood there is no remission—that is, there is no putting aside of sin with a view to friendship, without the fullest recognition of its nature and its unreserved repudiation. This is the reasonable requirement of the wisdom of God in type and antitype."

Law of Moses, p. 84.

78. "The type is before us; the antitype is in Christ. He is the altar, the book of the law, and the other things that come after. The sprinkling of the typical blood on both by Moses prefigured the operation of divine love and wisdom in Christ's own sacrifice. It was a sacrifice operating on himself first of all: for he is the beginning of the new creation, the firstfruits of the new harvest, the foundation of the new temple."

Law of Moses, p. 84.

79. "As such, it was needful that he should himself be the subject of the process and the first reaper of the results. Hence the testimony that 'the God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, *through the blood of the everlasting covenant* (Heb. xiii. 33), and that by his own blood, entering into the holy place, he obtained (*middle, or self-subjective state of the verb*), eternal redemption ('for us' is interpolated) (Heb. ix. 12). The Father saved him from death for his obedience unto death (Heb. v. 7-9; Phil. ii. 8, 9; Rom. v. 19)'. "

Law of Moses, p. 84.

80. "The common view which disconnects Christ from the operation of his own sacrifice would have required that Moses should have left the altar and the book of the law unsprinkled. These were parts of what Paul terms 'the patterns of things in the heavens', concerning which he remarks that it was necessary that they should be purified with the sacrifices ordained.

The application of this to Christ, as the antitype, he makes instantly; 'but (it was necessary that) *the heavenly things themselves* (should be purified) with better sacrifices than these' (Heb. ix. 33)."

Law of Moses, p. 84.

81. "The phrase 'the heavenly things' is an expression covering all the high, holy, and exalted things of which the Mosaic pattern was but a foreshadowing. They are all comprehended in Christ, who is the nucleus from which all will be developed, the foundation on which all will be built. The statement is therefore a declaration that it was necessary that Christ should first of all be purified with better sacrifices than the Mosaic: 'Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered once into the holy place' (Heb. ix. 12, 23, 24)."

Law of Moses, p. 84.

82. "The veil of the flesh divides the two states (the holy and most holy). The veil had to be torn asunder that we might enter the one to the other. This was done in Christ. It could not be done in any other; for while any man could have been crucified, any man could not under the law of sin and death have risen to glory, honour and immortality. Any one could have died; but *mere death was not passing through the veil.*"

Law of Moses, p. 113.

83. "As we contemplate the babe of Bethlehem, born after nine months' gestation, built out of his mother's blood, and nourished by his mother's milk, we cannot resist the conclusion forced on us by the words of Paul, that 'he partook of the same flesh and blood' as those he came to redeem, and that he was made in all points like unto his brethren (Heb. ii. 14-17)."

Law of Moses, p. 115.

84. "Though a sinless man was needed for this work of wisdom and mercy, yet he had to be a man clothed in the very nature that is the historical sinner, and that has come under death by sin; for the very aim of the whole institution was that this nature should be redeemed in him."

Law of Moses, p. 115.

85. "He (Christ) was palpably and before our eyes thus made subject to the sin-constitution of things that had prevailed on the earth 'through one man's offence,' which enables us to understand the otherwise unintelligible statement of Paul that when he (Christ) died, 'he died unto sin once' (Rom. vi. 10). *A sinless man made subject to the consequences of sin.*"

Law of Moses, p. 115.

86. "Rome has created difficulty by her doctrine of immaculate conception, in which she has latterly included Mary herself. This doctrine has gone through the world by tradition, and breaks out here and there in unsuspected places. Renunciationism has troubled us with it in a special shape, and well-meaning minds perpetuate the trouble by their superficial partiality for a view that seems more honouring to Christ than the Truth."

Law of Moses, p. 116.

87. "God required that there should be an actual assertion of the violated principles of His supremacy in the death of the men under sin. Animals were not sinners: their death was no meeting of the case. It was a mere prophecy in figure of what was coming. God purposed the death of one representing all who should be with that one; who should die for them, and by whose stripes they should be healed, and with whose blood by a figure they should be washed: not, however, on the principle of substitution, for God's

righteousness is not violated in the death of Christ, but declared."

Law of Moses, p. 139.

88. "God's righteousness would be violated in a man dying who ought not to die. The provided representative became related to death by derivation from a mother who was a descendant of a man by whom death entered into the world. He could, therefore, stand for all who come unto God by him. They are reckoned as dying in him—which would be unnecessary if he died instead of them. And his death does not release them from death at once, as it would do if his death had been a substitutionary death."

Law of Moses, p. 139.

89. "Man is an unclean and corruptible organization, physically considered, living or dead: and his thoughts and actions are of the same complexion. We see him in his true nature when we compare him as he is, even at his best, with what he is promised to be—the pure, incorruptible, spiritual, everliving, and glorious nature of the Lord Jesus and the angels."

Law of Moses, p. 142.

90. "The 'soil' differs in different men, and yet they are all men. Christ was a man, yet his mental soil differed from all men's. He had the impulses common to all men, but conjoined with these, a power of control possessed by no man. And this was the result of the antitypical washing to which, in him, the Seed of David was subjected in harmony with the Mosaic figure."

Law of Moses, p. 155.

91. "The holy oil was also sprinkled upon the 'Tabernacle and all that was therein', and upon 'the altar and all his vessels', and upon 'the Laver and his foot' (Lev. viii. 10, 11). The proximate and Mosaic

purpose of this was 'to sanctify them'. The antitypical significance was the same as the anointing of Aaron; for all the elements of the Tabernacle and its furniture represented some phase or other of the work of God in Christ, as we have seen, and therefore all had to be anointed with the typical oil to fill in the 'pattern'."

Law of Moses, p. 157.

92. "The sacrificial blood was applied to everything as well—Aaron and his sons included (see Lev. viii. 14, 15, 23, 24). An atonement had to be made by the shedding and the sprinkling of blood for and upon them all (Lev. xvi. 33). As Paul remarks, 'almost all things by the law are purged with blood' (Heb. ix. 22). Now all these things were declared to be 'patterns of things in the heavens', which it is admitted on all hands converge upon and have their substance in Christ. There must, therefore, be a sense in which Christ (the antitypical Aaron, the antitypical altar, the antitypical mercy seat, the antitypical everything) must not only have been sanctified by the action of the antitypical oil of the Holy Spirit, but purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice."

Law of Moses, p. 157.

93. "From the statement of Lev. xvi. 16, that the atonement for the holy place, altar, etc., was to be made 'because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and, because of transgressions in all their sins', it is argued that the holy things would have had no uncleanness in themselves apart from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. This must be granted, but it must also be recognized that because the children of Israel were sinful and polluted, the holy things were reckoned as having contracted defilement in having been fabricated by them and through remaining in their midst."

Law of Moses, p. 157.

94. "The 'holy things' were ceremonially unclean because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and had to be cleansed by the holy oil and the sacrificial blood before they were acceptable in the Mosaic service."

Law of Moses, p. 158.

95. "Great difficulty is experienced by various classes of thinkers in receiving this view. Needless so it should seem. There is first the express declaration that the matter stands so: 'it was, therefore, necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices), but the HEAVENLY THINGS THEMSELVES *with better sacrifices* than these' (Heb. x. 23). 'It was of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer' (Heb. viii. 3). 'By reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins' (Heb. v. 3). 'By his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption' (*for us*, is an addition inconsistent with the middle voice of the verb employed, which imports a thing done by one to one's own self) (Heb. ix. 12)."

Law of Moses, p. 158.

96. "The holy things, we know, in brief, are Christ. He must, therefore, have been the subject of a personal cleansing in the process by which he opened the way of sanctification for his people. If the typical holy things contracted defilement from connection with a sinful congregation, were not the antitypical (Christ) holy things in a similar state through derivation on his mother's side from a sinful race? If not, how came they to need purging with his own bitter sacrifice? (Heb. ix. 23)."

Law of Moses, p. 158.

97. "There was next the necessity that it should be so. The word 'necessity', it will be perceived, occurs

frequently in the course of Paul's argument. The necessity arises from the position in which men stood as regards the law of sin and death, and the position in which the Lord stood as their redeemer from this position. The position of men was that they were under condemnation to die because of sin, and that not their own sin, in the first instance, but ancestral sin at the beginning."

Law of Moses, p. 158.

98. "The statement that he did these things 'for us' has blinded many to the fact that he did them 'for himself' first—without which, he could not have done them for us, for it was by doing them for himself that he did them for us. He did them for us only as we may become part of him, in merging our individualities in him by taking part in his death, and putting on his name and sharing his life afterwards."

Law of Moses, p. 159.

99. "The antitype of the cleansing of the holy things with blood is manifest when we look at Christ as he is now, and contrast him with what he was. He was a mortal man: he is now immortal. He was a sorrowful man: he is now 'full of joy with the Father's countenance.' He was an Adamic body of death, corruptible and unclean: he is now a spiritual body, incorruptible, pure and holy. What lies between the one state and the other? His own death and resurrection. Therefore, by these, he has been purified, and *no one else* has been so purified as yet."

Law of Moses, p. 159.

100. "Men are mortal because of sin, quite independently of their own transgressions. Their redemption from this position is a work of mercy and forgiveness, yet a work to be effected in harmony with the righteousness of God, that He might be just while justifying those believing in the Redeemer. It is so

declared (Rom. iii. 26). It was not to be done by setting aside the law of sin and death, but by righteously nullifying it in One, who should obtain this redemption in his own right, and who should be authorized to offer to other men a partnership in his right, subject to required conditions (of their conformity to which, he should be appointed sole judge)."

Law of Moses, pp. 158, 159.

101. "We see Jesus born of a woman, and therefore a partaker of the identical nature condemned to death in Eden. We see him a member of imperfect human society, subject to toil and weakness, dishonour and sorrow, poverty and hatred, and all the other evils that have resulted from the advent of sin upon the earth. We see him *down in the evil* which he was sent to cure: not outside of it, not untouched by it, but in it, to put it away. 'He was made perfect through suffering' (Heb. ii. 10), but he was not perfect till he was through it. He was saved from death (Heb. v. 7) but not until he died. He obtained redemption (Heb. ix. 12) but not until his own blood was shed."

Law of Moses, p. 159.

102. "'Condemn sin in the flesh' (Rom. viii. 3). That he (Christ) was sent 'in the likeness of sinful flesh' for the accomplishment of the work shows that it was a work to be done in him. Some try to get away from this conclusion (and this is the popular habit) by seizing on the word '*likeness*' and contending that this means not the same, but only like. This contention is precluded by the use of the same term to his manhood: 'he was made in *the likeness* of MEN'. He was really a man in being in the likeness of men: and he was really sinful flesh in being in 'the likeness of sinful flesh'."

Law of Moses, p. 160.

103. "If there was one injunction of the Law more strenuous than another, it was that contact with death

in any form, however remote or indirect, was defiling. Even to touch a bone made a man unclean: or to be touched by a man unclean from such a cause had the same effect. We have the perfect antitype in the Lord born of a death-bound woman, and therefore made subject to death: it was 'that he, by the grace of God, might taste death for every man'; but he was the first to taste it, in the process of redemption from it . . . In him were combined the antitypical 'holy things' requiring atonement, 'because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgression, in all their sins'."

Law of Moses, p. 160.

104. "The statement remains in its undiminished force that 'God sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for (or because of) sin, condemned sin in the flesh'! It is, in fact, a complete and coherent statement of what was accomplished in the death of Christ, and a perfect explanation of the reason why he first came in the flesh, and of the reason why John the Apostle insisted so strenuously on the maintenance of the doctrine that he had so come in the flesh."

Law of Moses, p. 161.

105. "Possessing sinful flesh was no sin in him, who kept it under perfect control, and 'did always those things that pleased the Father'. At the same time, being the sinful flesh derived from the condemned transgressors of Eden, it admitted of sin being publicly condemned in him, without any collision with the claims of his personal righteousness, which were to be met by an immediate and glorious resurrection."

Law of Moses, p. 161.

106. "There is no difference between the shedding of the blood of Christ, and the condemnation of sin in the flesh. For this blood-shedding was what is otherwise expressed as 'the pouring out of his soul unto

death. And what is death but the condemnation of sin? Christ did no sin, but he inherited the condemnation of sin in deriving his nature from a daughter of Adam, the condemned: and he was considered as having the sins of his people laid upon him, in so far as the sins of his people were to be forgiven for the sake of what should be done in him."

Law of Moses, p. 161.

107. "The crucifixion was a divine declaration, and enforcement of what is due to sin, and as it was God's righteous appointment that this should be due to sin, the infliction of it was a declaration of God's righteousness."

Law of Moses, p. 162.

108. "If we limit our view to the 'individual man Christ Jesus', and look at him in the light of what is due to individual character as between man and man according to the 'justice' of common parlance, we may have a difficulty in seeing how the righteousness of God was declared in the scourging and death of a righteous man. But this is not looking at the subject in the light in which it is prophetically and apostolically exhibited."

Law of Moses, p. 162.

109. "God's work was to establish salvation by forgiveness, but forgiveness on conditions, and these conditions involved the declaration of the Father's righteousness in the public condemnation of sin in its own flesh in the person of a guileless possessor of that flesh. Paul declares it was so, and controversy really ends with his words."

Law of Moses, p. 163.

110. "Jesus did not come into the world as an individual, but as a representative, though an

individual. In this sense, he came 'not for himself', but for others, though he was included in the coming."

Law of Moses, p. 163.

111. "Christ himself was included in the sacrificial work he did 'for us'. 'For himself that it might be for us', for how otherwise could we have obtained redemption if it had not first come into his possession, for us to become joint heirs of?"

Law of Moses, p. 163.

112. "The necessity for Christ coming personally into the operation first, comes out very clearly—perhaps more clearly than anywhere—in the study of Paul's statement concerning Israel: 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law.' The method of this work is before us without any fog. First, Paul says he was *made unto the Law* to redeem them that were under the Law (Gal. iv. 4). He was *himself born under the Law*, that he might work the work that was to be done for others in that position."

Law of Moses, p. 163.

113. "In bearing the curse of the Law away, it had to act on (Christ) himself. This will be seen if we ask how he took the curse of the Law away; he did it by bearing it. 'Being made a curse for us'. How? Instead of us? No, by himself coming under it. This is Paul's teaching. As it is written, cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree."

Law of Moses, p. 164.

114. "It might seem in Moses that the clause about cursedness of hanging on a tree merely means human infamy: but we must suspend our impressions in the presence of the Spirit of God in Paul. Mere human infamy is not the curse that Christ redeemed us from, but the curse of God, as evident from his statement in the immediate context: 'As many as are of the works

of the Law are *under the curse*, for it is written, *cursed is everyone* that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to do them' (Gal. iii. 10)."

Law of Moses, p. 164.

115. "Christ was cursed by the Law in the mode of his death. He could not be cursed in any other way, for he was not a transgressor of the Law. But in this way he was cursed. And it is probable that this clause was inserted in the Law for this very purpose—that Christ might innocently die under the curse of the Law, and so take it away: for the Law can do nothing more than kill."

Law of Moses, p. 164.

116. "Christ partook of this nature (derived from Adam) to deliver it from death as Paul teaches in Heb. ii. 14, and other places: 'Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, it became him likewise to take part of the same, that *through death* he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil' (*diabolos*)."

Law of Moses, p. 165.

117. "Understanding by the devil (*diabolos*), the hereditary death-power that has reigned among men by Adam through sin, we may understand how Christ, who took part of this death-inheriting nature, destroyed the power by dying and rising. We then understand how 'he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself'. We may also understand how 'our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed' (Rom. vi. 6)."

Law of Moses, p. 165.

118. "All which enables us to understand why the typical holy things were purified with sacrificial blood,

and why the high priest, in his typical and official capacity had to be touched with blood as well as anointed with the holy oil before entering upon his work."

Law of Moses, p. 165.

119. "When we say, as some in their reverence for Christ prefer to say, that the death of Christ was not for himself but only for us, they destroy all these typical analogies, and in truth, if their view could prevail, they would make it impossible that it could be for us at all: for it only operates 'for us', when we unite ourselves with him in whom, as the firstborn, it had its first effects."

Law of Moses, p. 165.

120. "If he (Christ) was 'purified', there was a something to be purified from. What was it? Look at his hereditary death-taint, as the son of Adam, through whom death entered the world by sin, and there is no difficulty. Look at the curse of God brought on him in hanging on a tree (Gal. iii. 13; Deut. xxi. 22, 23). We must not get away from the testimony. As the antitypical bullock without the camp, Jesus was a *sin-offering*—an offering to be burnt, consumed—to be which he had to be the very nature cursed by sin, that the body of sin might be destroyed' (Rom. vi. 6)."

Law of Moses, p. 167.

121. "There is no counterpart to this (Lev. xvi. 33) if Christ is kept out of his own sacrifice, as some thoughts would do. He cannot so be kept out if place is given to all the testimony—an express part of which is that as the sum total of the things signified by these patterns, he was 'purified with a better sacrifice than 'bulls and goats'—viz. his own sacrifice' (Heb. ix. 23, 12)."

Law of Moses, p. 167.

122. "Paul thus (in Heb. xii. 11-13) identifies Jesus in crucifixion with the bullock burnt without the camp, whose blood was sprinkled on the furniture in the sanctuary, then on Aaron, and afterwards on his sons, and on all the people. Under Apostolic guidance, we see Christ both in the bullock, in the furniture, in the veil, in the high priest, and, in brief, in all these *Mosaic* 'patterns', which he says were a 'shadow of things to come' (Heb. viii. 5; ix. 23; x. 1; iii. 5). All were both *aton*ing and *atoned* for (Lev. xvi. 33)."

Law of Moses, p. 167.

123. "The pouring out of the blood (Lev. xvii. 11) was the pouring out of the life, and therefore an acknowledgment on the part of the offerer that he was worthy to die. It was a typical declaration of that righteousness of God which was proclaimed in Christ in the one great offering as the basis of forgiveness (Rom. iii. 25, 26)."

Law of Moses, p. 200.

124. "Paul says (Heb. x. 4): 'The blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin', but 'it was a figure for the time then present' of the 'one offering' that could and did, even 'the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all'."

Law of Moses, p. 205.

125. "Angel or beast, or un-Adamic man could not 'die for us', because the dying was not to be a punishing the innocent in the room of the guilty, but an establishing of the divine supremacy in righteousness as the basis of favour in forgiveness in the case of all such as see and believe and submit."

Law of Moses, p. 206.

126. "That burnt-offering should be required in the absence of particular offence (Gen. viii. 20; xxii. 2) shows that our unclean state as the death-doomed

children of Adam itself unfits us for approach to the Deity apart from the recognition and acknowledgment of which the burnt-offering was the form required and supplied. It was 'because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel', as well as because of their transgressions in 'all their sins', that atonement was required for even the tabernacle of the congregation" (Lev. xvi. 16).

Law of Moses, p. 218.

127. "The type involved in complete burning is self-manifest: it is *consumption of sin-nature*. This is the great promise and prophecy and requirement of every form of the Truth: the destruction of the body of sin (Rom. vi. 6). It was destroyed in Christ's crucifixion—the 'one great offering': we ceremonially share it in our baptism: 'crucified with Christ', 'baptized unto his death'."

Law of Moses, p. 218, 219.

128. "It was a beautiful requirement of the wisdom of God in the beginning of things that He should require an act of worship that typified the repudiation of sinful nature as the basis of divine fellowship and acceptability. Those who deny Christ's participation thereof deny its removal by his sacrifice, and therefore deny the fundamental testimony of the Gospel, that he is 'the Lamb of God, taking away the sin of the world'. They think they honour him by saying his flesh-nature was a clean nature. In reality, they deny his qualification for the work he was sent to do. They mistake holiness of character for holiness of nature, and by a wrong use of truth, destroy it."

Law of Moses, p. 219.

129. "By this means of paternity, Christ escaped the hereditary moral and mental bias of the race, and received such a divine intellectual impress as made him strong, in spirit or mind, and of quick understanding

in the fear of the Lord. He was therefore enabled to overcome all the promptings and desires of his unclean nature derived from his mother, and maintained his moral perfection without blemish and undefiled."

Law of Moses, p. 228.

130. "Christ required no justification morally, and the only other justification which the Scriptures teach he did require was justification by Spirit from the condemnation of mortality resting upon his flesh-nature, and this could not be effected until he had made reconciliation for iniquity in death and resurrection."

Law of Moses, p. 228.

131. "He (Christ) required no justification or cleansing pertaining to the conscience as we do: he needed only a cleansing or justification by Spirit of his physical nature—sin's flesh—which he bore. This cleansing took place, as we see in the type, at the end of thirty-three days, or years. Luke tells us that at his baptism, he 'began to be about thirty years of age'."

Law of Moses, p. 228.

132. "It is argued by some that Christ was justified at his baptism from the condemnation ruling upon his flesh-nature before he could go on probation, but the type emphatically teaches that he was not justified or cleansed from his physical uncleanness until the end of his life, or after the thirty-third day."

Law of Moses, p. 228.

133. "The healthy, though mortally healthy, are recognized as 'all under sin', to use Paul's expression (Rom. iii. 9), because the descendants of the sinner of Eden, and the individual transgressors of the divine law, and are therefore held at arm's length, as we might say, unless they humble themselves and confess and approach in the way appointed, and then they are

received for blessing and ultimate healing. Their mere mortality is no bar when the divine conditions of reconciliation are complied with."

Law of Moses, p. 232.

134. "This (law of leprosy as a type) is only a difficulty with those who do not realize the position occupied by Jesus while yet a mortal man. He was the *Sin-Bearer* in every way in which such an expression can be understood—an expression which excludes by its very form all suggestion of his having been himself a sinner: a sinner could not be a sin-bearer in the sense of a taker-away of sin, for this requires spotlessness—sinlessness—that resurrection might come after death had put the sin away."

Law of Moses, p. 236.

135. "Turning from the confusion inseparable from a false view of the nature of man, and a false view of the divine dealing with sin, we find a key in the teaching of the Apostles . . . that the death of Christ was the representative condemnation of sin in the flesh (Rom. viii. 3), for the declaration of the righteousness of God (Rom. iii. 25), in the person of a righteous man possessing the very nature of the race condemned in Eden, with which condemnation repentant sinners might identify themselves (Rom. vi. 4-6)."

Law of Moses, p. 236.

136. "There is no conceivable principle in their (orthodox) system, upon which the death of a righteous man in the place of a wicked man, could be imagined an acceptable offering to a righteous God; neither any principle upon which the resurrection of said righteous man should be necessary to complete the redemption effected by his death."

Law of Moses, p. 235.

137. "The sin-offering represented and ritually prophesied that aspect of the death of Christ by which

he atoned for sin. Christ himself did no wrong, and was never alienated from God, but always did that which pleased Him, both prior to and after his baptism. Thus was foreshadowed in this beautiful type, the cleansing of the human nature of Christ by his own death, and of our cleansing on account of the same, by the favour of God through faith."

Law of Moses, p. 230.

138. "At the same time, it (the Sin Bearer) is an expression that involves this other idea, that there was something for him to be cleansed from. Three facts tell us what: he possessed our mortal nature, which is an heir of death because of sin: he came under the personal curse of the Law in the mode of his death (Gal. iii. 13). God had laid on him the iniquities of us all in the sense that He was going to deal with him as a representative of all, that He might forgive us all for his sake, 'that He might be just and the justifier' at the same time (Rom. iii. 26)."

Law of Moses, p. 237.

139. "That the second bird (in leprosy cleansing) should be dipped in the blood of the first bird is, therefore, in harmony with what has since been revealed concerning Christ as the antitypical sacrifice. He was cleansed by his own death from the stain of death to which he was subject in common with us, as the descendant of the first sinner, and as the appointed sufferer from it that he might take it away."

Law of Moses, p. 237.

140. "The whole process (cleansing from defilement by contact with death, Num. xix), was for cleansing, and yet it defiled those who took part in it. The priest was to be 'unclean until the even' (verse 7), and was to 'wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water'.

His assistant was affected in the same way (verse 8). And so was the 'clean' man who should gather up the ashes and store them up in a clean place as a purification for sin (verse 10). There is a significance in all these details that ought to be fatal to the loose ideas entertained in some Gentile quarters as to the death of Christ, to the effect that it was not necessary and not required, except as a mere act of martyrdom or crowning act of a life of obedience."

Law of Moses, pp. 240, 241.

141. "Some who admire Christ are horror-struck at the idea of his having been a partaker of the Adamic condemned nature—a nature defiled by death because of sin. Their horror is due wholly to too great a confinement of view. They fix their attention on the idea of 'defilement', without remembering that the defilement was undertaken expressly with a view to removal."

Law of Moses, p. 243.

142. "Now these things (offerings for defilement through death) were shadows, of which we see the perfect object projecting them when we see Christ as a partaker of condemned human nature for its emancipation and purification on the principles and with the object already fully indicated. Away from this, all is confusion."

Law of Moses, p. 246.

143. "Christ then was 'man', and being man needed salvation from death just as other men do, though he was sinless. Hence his sacrifice, agreeably to the type of the High Priest under the Law, was first for himself, and then for the people. 'This he did once, when he offered up himself' (Heb. vii. 27). Thus he was saved from death (Heb. v. 7), and 'though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by

the things which he suffered' (Heb. v. 8). Thus God 'brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant' (Heb. xiii. 20). Thus, 'by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption' (Heb. ix. 12)."

C. C. Walker, in *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 313.

144. "It will be observed that the omitted words here 'for us' (in Heb. ix. 12) are in italics in the A.V., the reason being that they do not appear in the original. They are omitted from the R.V. for that reason. It is perfectly true, thank God, that the eternal redemption is 'for us' contingent on its being first of all for the High Priest himself, 'Christ the first fruits'; but Paul is here dealing with Christ the 'High Priest' (Heb. ix. 11), and he obtained 'eternal redemption' for himself that it might be for us. To say that it was 'for us' and 'not for himself' is to contradict the word of God, and to take a step at least towards that doctrine of the Anti-christ that denies that Christ has come in the flesh. This is a form of error that has persisted from the days of the Apostles until now."

C. C. Walker, in *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 313.

145. "These things have been faithfully upheld as principles of the Truth from the beginning, and contradictory teaching has not been tolerated, and should not be now. Yet there is such current. We noticed last month, among pamphlets received, one on *Sacrifice* which reproduced the errors that were introduced by Edward Turney fifty years ago, and which were met by the demonstration of the Truth in the pamphlet *The Slain Lamb*, to which attention is now again directed."

C. C. Walker, in *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 313.

146. "Hebrews ix. 11, 12. Here was the Antitype (Christ). The high priests of old entered into the Most Holy once every year, thereby obtaining a temporary covering for sins on behalf of themselves and also of the people. Christ, through his own blood, entered in once for all and obtained eternal redemption. In what way, and to what extent, can it be said that there was in this an antitype of the high priest who offered 'first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people'?"

Epistle to the Hebrews,* p. 166.

147. "The construction of the passage (Heb. ix. 11, 12) involves that he participated in the benefit of the sacrifice. Moreover, the Scriptures frequently testify to the same fact. In prophecy it was foretold of him that he should be just and saved (Zech. ix. 9, margin). An apostle declared of him that he slew the enmity in himself (Ephes. ii. 16, A.V. margin); whilst in the epistle before us it is testified that he prayed to be saved out of death, and was heard for his godly fear, and that he was brought again from the dead by the blood of the everlasting covenant."

Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 167.

148. "As a possessor of sinful flesh, he (Christ) needed to be redeemed therefrom, and so 'he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself'. There is no need to stumble at such a fact; indeed, it is only when the Truth involved herein is rightly understood that the true value of Jesus' obedience to his Father can be fully appreciated. An impeccable man, or one who was entirely free from sin, as Adam was before the Fall, could not present such an example to members of a sin-stricken race."

Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 167.

* By W. H. Boulton; published by Maran-atha Press, London.

149. "In the offering of himself Jesus put away sin. In orthodox circles this is supposed to mean that in some way, which cannot be defined, the accumulated sins of mankind were placed upon Jesus by imputation, and that consequently they were taken away by his death, a death which he suffered as a substitute for others. Any further meaning is ignored. And yet a little reflection should show that such a limited interpretation fails to meet the facts of the case."

Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 180.

150. "If all that was required to 'put away sins' was that the sins of mankind should be 'imputed' to the sacrifice, why should the blood of bulls and goats not have availed? Could not sins have been 'imputed' to them? As a matter of fact, so far as the imputation of sins was possible, they were so imputed to the sacrifice by the ceremonies connected with it. If, therefore, that were the principle involved, there would be no difference in this respect between the sacrifice of the old and new covenants. Consequently this cannot be the meaning of the statement before us."

Epistle to the Hebrews, pp. 180-181.

151. "The Law was only a shadow of good things to come, not the very image of them. If the association between Jesus and sin were precisely the same as that between Mosaic sacrifices and sin, then shadow and substance would be alike on one of their most important points, and that would be absurd. No shadow can ever equal the substance; the substance is real, the shadow is intangible. The statement that 'he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself' evidently implies that in some way sin was associated with Jesus."

Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 181.

152. "Sin is a term of double import in the Scriptures; it has a physical as well as a moral application.

When Adam and Eve were first created, sin had no association with them in any way. They were very good. When, however, by the sophistry of the serpent, they were led to disobey God's command, a principle was established in them which, later, is defined as the law of sin and death. Their nature became defiled, and on the principle that none can bring a clean thing out of an unclean, all descended from them became partakers of their defiled or sin-stricken nature."

Epistle to the Hebrews, pp. 181-182.

153. "The Apostle Paul is very precise in his references to sin as a physical principle inherent in human flesh. He speaks of 'the body of sin' (Rom. vi. 6), and says in relation to it, 'Sin, finding occasion, wrought in me, through the commandment, all manner of coveting'. 'Sin revived'. 'Sin, finding occasion, through the commandment beguiled me'. 'Sin, that it might be shown to be sin, by working death in me . . . that sin might become exceeding sinful'. 'So now it is no more I that do it but sin which dwelleth in me. The law of sin which is in my members' (Rom. vii). Sin as spoken of in these verses must necessarily be considered as something different from actual transgression. It is 'sin' within that leads to sin in action."

Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 182.

154. "As a member of the race, partaking of sin's flesh, Jesus was in a position to receive in himself the sentence pronounced against sin, in harmony with the righteousness of God, which, indeed, was declared thereby (Rom. iii. 25). In his death 'he died unto sin once' (Rom. vi. 10), and 'what the Law could not do; in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh' (Rom. viii. 3)."

Epistle to the Hebrews, pp. 183-184.

155. " 'Christ . . . through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption' (Heb. ix. 12). How much this passage is misunderstood is evidenced by the addition in the Authorised Version of the words '*for us*'. These words are not merely unnecessary, they are opposed to the construction of the passage, which implies that he obtained it for himself; even as the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement, which form the basis of the reasoning of the ninth chapter, imply."

Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 189.

156. "Therefore all his (Adam's) descendants are subject to death, and to the same conditions which supervened when he sinned . . . This is their misfortune, not their crime. The descendants of Adam also suffer all the consequences by his transgression which are transmissible through their physical relationship to him. Much more so than the son of a leper who becomes leprous, or the son of a syphilitic who is syphilitic. By nature they inherit the natural impulses of the flesh set in motion by Adam's disobedience. This would have been an unmitigated evil had not a covering for sin and 'a way' to the tree of life been provided."

H. Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 394.

157. "Now since the Son of Mary 'partook of the same flesh as the children', since 'he was tempted in all points as they' (Heb. ii. 14; iv. 15), there should be no difficulty in understanding in what way he kept himself from 'his iniquity' (Psalm xl. 23). He knew what was in man (John ii. 24, 25), therefore he must at all times have possessed perfect knowledge of any thought or impulse arising from the flesh contrary to the purpose of his Father, thus, leading him to view the temptations as 'iniquities' more numerous than the hairs of his head (Psalm xl. 12). While the

'iniquity' that took hold of him was *in his flesh*, in which dwelleth no good thing (Rom. vii. 18; Matt. xix. 17) the *character* which he manifested was *perfect* and pleasing to his Father, hence we read in Psalm xviii., 'He delivered me, because He delighted in me' (verse 19)."

H. Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 499.

158. "Oh God, Thou knowest my foolishness, and my sins are not hid from Thee" (Psalm lxix. 5). The possibility of such an expression and such an aspiration ascending from the Son of God seems unthinkable unless we look at him in the Garden of Gethsemane, and consider him in that agony of mind when he shrank from crucifixion and death. The impulse to escape from that terrible ordeal, and the mental conflict arising therefrom was in his flesh (Ephes. ii. 15), yet in the midst of it all he said:—'Oh, my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless, *not as I will, but as Thou wilt*'."

H. Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 499.

159. "He (Jesus) could say:—'*There was no soundness in his flesh*' (Psalm lxix. 7) because he himself said *the flesh profiteth nothing* (John vi. 63). This testimony is amplified by the Spirit in the Apostle Paul thus:—'*In me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing*'. Jesus could also say:—'There is no rest in my bones because of my sin' when realizing fully, as he did, that there could be no freedom from temptation so long as he was of flesh and blood nature, and for this reason: until crucifixion, when the life-blood exuded from his wounds, there *could be no release* from those impulses which are aroused by temptation, and which were intensely offensive to him, causing him to say to Peter, 'Get thee behind me Satan (*adversary*); thou art an offence unto me, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men' (Matt. xvi. 13)."

H. Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 500.

160. "The physical is the basis of the mental, so of Jesus it is written:—'Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on, or to, the tree' (1 Pet. ii. 24). Seeing that Jesus could not have borne our personal sins in his own body; seeing that he did not commit sin in the sense of personal transgression, the only admissible inference is that sin was crucified in the *person* of Jesus. This conclusion is supported by the illustration which Jesus himself furnished of his own relationship to sin, saying:—'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up' (John iii. 14)."

H. Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 501.

161. "John iii. 14; Heb. ii. 14; Cor. xv. 56; James i. 14 . . . These testimonies conclusively show that physically, Jesus was related to sin just as are all the children of Adam, yet without question, Jesus did no sin, for he was 'holy, guileless, undefiled, separate from sinners' (see Heb. vii. 26). But like the High Priests under the Mosaic economy he *offered for his own sins*. Thus we read: 'Who needeth not *daily*, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people: for *this* he did *once* for all, *when he offered up himself*' (Heb. vii. 27)."

H. Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 502.

162. "After transgression Adam was a body of sin. This 'old man' Jesus and his brethren inherit from him. Physically, Jesus was one with his brethren in this respect—an extension of Adam's being—'made of a woman' (Gal. iv. 4). Therefore our '*old man* crucified with him that *the body of sin might be destroyed*', is that flesh and blood nature whose impulses led Adam to transgress God's laws. A dual result was accomplished in the death of Jesus, viz., deliverance from the power of sin (Heb. ii. 14) and the abolition of the Law (Gal. iii. 13)."

H. Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 535.

163. "Friend Bell, whose capable and useful co-operation when I visited Australia is a very pleasant recollection, has now become an enemy because of his identification with the Free Life theory of Renunciationism, and the Substitution theory of brother Strickler, whose time-past friendly co-operation is also a pleasant memory. Both propagandas are alike in essence. They are the inception of that which is totally opposed to the definition of the destruction of the body of sin in the Sacrifice of Christ. Brethren who adopt their theories will be led astray."

H. Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921, p. 199.

164. "What we Christadelphians call 'pernicious teaching' in this matter is the teaching taught by brother Bell and those who agree with him, and which opposes that taught by Dr. Thomas and held by us ever since as to the human nature of Jesus. Bro. Bell has no need to *ask* what the latter is: he exhibits it himself from Dr. Thomas, and tries to refute it. And bro. Bell will grant that from our point of view his own teaching is 'pernicious'."

W. J. Young, *Christadelphian*, 1922, p. 310.

165. "As I have said before, I prefer my own method of dealing with heresy, and so far as the teaching of Dr. Thomas and the belief of those who agree with Dr. Thomas is concerned brother Bell will grant that his teaching is 'heresy'."

W. J. Young, *Christadelphian*, 1922, p. 311.

166. "At least we know where we are. We stand in this matter exactly where Dr. Thomas stood, and hold fast the same form of sound words to this day."

W. J. Young, *Christadelphian*, 1922, p. 312.

167. "THIS CORRUPTIBLE.—This is Paul's description of the bodily estate of the righteous resurrected,

who in 'the time of the dead' stand up for judgment and change into the divine nature. Of these Christ is 'the first-fruits' (1 Cor. xv. 53, 20). He was once in 'this corruptible' flesh and blood estate, from which he needed physical cleansing just as much as his imperfect brethren. For God 'hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin', that we might be made the righteousness of God in him (2 Cor. v. 21). We set forth the Apostolic phrase, 'this corruptible', as sufficient answer to brother Bell's 'railing accusation' against ourselves and brother Young in the *Shield* (for February) and in his support of the 'clean flesh' heresy."

C. C. Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1922, p. 221.

168. "It is satisfactory (negatively) to see him (J. Bell) deliberately disown Dr. Thomas' teaching in *Elpis Israel*. Thus quoting Dr. Thomas, he says, 'The flesh is invariably regarded as unclean'. And he immediately adds, 'Yes, by Dr. Thomas, but not by God in the Bible.' Now Christadelphians know where brother Bell stands."

C. C. Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1922, p. 222.

169. "Partaking thus of the flesh, he (Christ) was 'this corruptible', though in character sinless, and so needed cleansing and redemption as much as his brethren. And as concerning the woman, we read of 'the days of her purification according to the Law of Moses' (Luke ii. 22). If the flesh be 'clean' why should a woman having a man-child be 'unclean seven days'? (Lev. xii. 2). And why should the child be circumcised the eighth day, and the mother then continue unclean another thirty-three days, 'until the days of her purifying be fulfilled'? What is circumcision but the drastic repudiation of this so-called 'clean flesh'?"

C. C. Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1922, p. 222.

170. "Does God in the Bible regard 'this corruptible' as 'clean' in His sight? Far from it. Eliphaz and Bildad spoke the truth concerning this, however wrongly they judged Job. 'What is man that he should be clean? And he which is born of woman that he should be righteous? Behold He putteth no trust in His saints, yea, the heavens are not clean in His sight. How much more abominable and filthy is man, which drinketh iniquity like water' (Job. xv. 14-16). 'How can man be justified with God? Or, can he be clean which is born of a woman?' (Job xxv. 4). So also Job himself: 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one' (Job xiv. 4). Christ was 'born of a woman'—'made of a woman, made under the Law' (Gal. iv. 4)."

C. C. Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1922, p. 222.

171. "Christ's nature was identical with our own; he partook of all the infirmities inherited by all the sons of Adam, even though he was without a personal transgression, and that he developed a perfect character while possessing a defiled and unclean physical nature. The mind of the flesh existed in Christ and had to be controlled by him, as it does in all his brethren; but, as they are able to and do partially control and repress that mind by assimilating and acting according to the mind of the Spirit, so he perfectly controlled and repressed the mind of the flesh and acted and thought according to the mind of the Spirit. The mind of Christ as referred to in Scripture is the mind of the Spirit by which he acted, thought, and spoke. 'I came not to do mine own will (mind of the flesh) but the will of my Father' (mind of the Spirit)."

Newark Report, Sept. 9, 1923.

(W. Biggar, R. A. Brittle, G. F. Aue, E. Gamble).

172. "In the sacrifice which Christ made for sin, he was himself included. His sacrifice for himself was

on account of his having the misfortune, not the guilt, of possessing the sinful nature common to all men, which nature is in Scripture sometimes styled 'sin' in a constitutional sense. This sin nature was condemned by God as being fit only for destruction, and from this nature it was necessary that Christ be redeemed. By his sacrifice Christ therefore 'entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption.' The sacrifice of Christ was 'the condemnation of sin in the flesh, through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all, as a propitiation to declare the righteousness of God as a basis for the remission of sins.'

Newark Report, Sept. 9, 1923.

(W. Biggar, R. A. Brittle, G. F. Aue, E. Gamble).

173. "By being made in all points like unto his brethren, Christ bore by inheritance our sin nature, that he might destroy, first in himself, 'him that had the power of death, that is the devil', and by his sacrifice bore away the sins of his people in that God forgives their sins in his name and for his sake."

Newark Report, Sept. 9, 1923.

(W. Biggar, R. A. Brittle, G. F. Aue, E. Gamble).

174. "The subject is a great and important one, and our only safety lies in the acceptance of Scripture teaching in its entirety. In this Brethren Thomas and Roberts have shown great fidelity to the testimony. They have given a place in their expositions to all parts of it, and the writer will not yield for one moment to anyone who declares that one part of their teaching is neutralized by another."

Sin and Sacrifice, p. 91 (Wm. Smallwood).

175. "We need not be surprised that some, whose knowledge is but superficial, are inconsistent and wavering. Even in Apostolic times there was a disposition, on the part of some, to be 'carried about with

every wind of doctrine', which evoked from the Apostle words of warning. In his day, as in ours, there were men of 'cunning craftiness lying in wait to deceive', and some who 'were ever learning and never able to come to a knowledge of the Truth'. Notwithstanding the warning of the Apostles, there were some ever ready to give heed to seducers, who 'with good words and fair speeches' drew away disciples after them, 'deceiving and being deceived'. In the closing years of the beloved disciple John there were many anti-Christ.

Sin and Sacrifice, p. 91 (Wm. Smallwood).

176. "It was a principle of action with Brethren Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts 'to give the Truth the benefit of all doubts and to accept such co-operation only as uncompromising loyalty to it may allow'. Some brethren of our day appear to act on the opposite principle of giving the benefit of all doubts to the erring creature, a course which must be offensive to God, for the Bible represents Him as being jealous and very sensitive of the least encroachment upon the sacredness of His Truth, as witnessed in the case of Nadab and Abihu, Uzzah and many others. The divine order is 'first pure, then peaceable', but some Christadelphians want 'peace' without 'purity'—union regardless of unity."

B. J. Dowling and Wm. Smallwood.

DIFFICULTIES

177. Scripture teaching on the subject dealt with in the foregoing pages, is so clear and so simple, that there would be no difficulties were it not for the introduction of questions, which, when answered with an "I KNOW", betray a wisdom not in accordance with what is written, but really a being "wise above what is written".

A STOCK QUESTION

178. As an illustration—let us cite a stock question with those whose theories are dealt with in the pages herewith ; it is :—

“ Suppose Christ had been alone, and had not had to die for the sins of others, would he have needed to die the death on the cross for himself ? ”

179. Brother Roberts rightly termed such a question presumptuous (see paragraph 59). A Bible-enlightened man would never presume to ask such a question : it supposes a Scriptural impossibility. To imagine Christ being “ alone ”, is to imagine that all the promises of God in Christ were but words—words—words. Put the question, in harmony with what is written, thus :—Seeing that Christ was not alone, but came into the world as one of “ many brethren ” to be redeemed, did he need to die the death on the cross ? The answer is emphatically, YES ; for he himself would not have been redeemed had he not so died. The evidence is overwhelming, as we have seen.

180. The present editor of the *Christadelphian* has truly written :—“ We cannot legitimately contemplate Christ ‘ apart from his work as the Sacrificial Redeemer of the race ’ . . . ‘ Apart ’ from this, he is no Christ at all, and, no other provision, was made by the Father by which His ‘ Holy One ’ should live for ever than that which has been revealed. It is presumption, and folly, to speculate concerning anything else ” ; and “ we have no right to indulge in hypothetical speculations as to what ‘ might have been ’ with regard to Christ and mankind. When we do so, we get lost, and introduce confusion into the divine plans ” (*Christadelphian*, 1910, p. 539).

Sound words those.

STOCK ARGUMENTS

181. A strong point with those who oppose the First Principle, of Jesus needing an offering for himself, is based on Matt. xxii. 35 and Luke x. 25. Upon those two texts they put the question : Did not the Lord tell the *lawyer* that all *he* had to do to obtain eternal life was to keep the Law of Moses ; any ‘ sacrifice for sin ’ in such a case being unnecessary ?

The reply to such a question is a decided NO, for the Lord said nothing of the kind. A careful reading of the records, and a noting of the following facts, will make such apparent.

182. The question was put by a *lawyer*, in order to tempt the Lord—Matt. xxii. 35 ; Luke x. 25 ; xi. 46, 52.

183. Our Lord’s reply was clearly personal to the *lawyer* in question, as to what *he* should do to obtain eternal life (Luke x. 25).

184. No one for a moment contends that this *lawyer* was like the Lord himself—one who “ did no sin ”.

185. Each of the “ Clean Flesh ” and “ Substitution ” theorists, dealt with in the foregoing pages, admits, that, without the shedding of the blood on the Cross there is no remission of sins.

186. It follows therefore, that, even if the *lawyer* had been able henceforth to have kept the Law of Moses, eternal life would not have been his until Christ had died the death on the Cross.

187. Further, be it noted, the gist of the conversation, between the *lawyer* and Christ, had to do, not with the Law of Moses, but, to the two *Great* commandments—Love to God, and love to man.

188. The deductions of our theorists, that eternal life would follow, as a natural sequence, to the keeper of the Law, apart from the One Great Offering, is as unreasonable and unscriptural as to use John xi. 26 to prove that a mere belief in Christ will mean the believer will "never die"—sacrifice or no sacrifice.

189. Another stock argument is also put in the form of a question. Seeing the Law of Moses *was ordained* to Eternal Life, and that Jesus kept the Law, is it not evident he was *entitled* to Eternal Life apart from the death on the Cross?

190. The question is based on an adulterated Bible text—namely Romans vii. 10, which in the *Common Version* reads

"The commandment which *was ordained* to life, I found to be unto death."

The italicized words have no foundation; they are not in the original Greek.

191. As a matter of fact the Law was given for a very different purpose—

"It was added because of transgressions till the seed should come" (Gal. iii. 19).

"The Law was our schoolmaster unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith" (Gal. iii. 24).

"The ministration of death" (2 Cor. iii. 17).

"That every mouth may be stopped; and all the world may become guilty before God" (Rom. ii. 19).

"That no flesh shall glory in his presence" (1 Cor. ii. 29).

192. Brother Roberts beautifully puts it thus:—The Law of Moses was given for the restraint and regulation of the body; to stop the mouth of boasting; to cut away all chances of self-justification; and to bring

in all the world guilty before God" (*Christadelphian*, 1875, p. 305).

193. Dr. Thomas well, and Scripturally, states the case thus:—"It (the Law), was an unbearable yoke of bondage; and a law *which no man borne of the will of the flesh* had been able to keep without sin. If, then, a man sought to obtain a right to an everlasting possession of the land by obedience to it, he had undertaken an impossibility; *for the Law*, on account of human weakness *could give no one a right to live for ever*" (*Elpis Israel*, p. 221).

194. Further on, in the same chapter, the Doctor says:—"He (Paul), says explicitly, 'By the Law shall no flesh be justified. A circumcised person is therefore bound to keep that which he cannot possibly keep; and which, if he did keep, could not benefit him, because justification to life is by faith in the promises, and not by conformity to the Mosaic Law'" (*Elpis Israel*, p. 221).

195. No doubt the words "was ordained", in Rom. vii. 10, have caused many to stumble, and unwisely attempt to deal with hypothetical questions (the deliverer of the Lecture on the *Slain Lamb* being no exception). The text in question did apparently teach that eternal life was possible by a mere keeping of the Law, but we agree with the present editor of the *Christadelphian*.

196. Brother C. C. Walker describes the paragraph found in the old edition of *Slain Lamb* (p. 9) as, "a passing hypothetical speculation, uttered in the heat of a controversial lecture", which "will not stand investigation for a moment"; "It was not a feature of brother Roberts' serious teaching" (*Christadelphian*, 1910, p. 538).

What that serious teaching was, is made abundantly clear in the foregoing pages.

197. Shortly before his death, Bro. Roberts paid a visit to Australia and while in Melbourne met one George Cornish, a professing Christadelphian, whose views were akin to those combatted in the foregoing pages. In his *Diary of a Voyage to Australia*, published by himself, he says, on pp. 67-69 :—

“We cannot better demonstrate the serious nature of this departure from Gospel truth than by the exhibition of the following :—

ON THE NATURE OF MAN AND THE DEATH OF CHRIST

198. *That death entered the world of mankind by Adam's disobedience.*

“By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin” (Rom. v. 12). “In (by, or through) Adam all die” (1 Cor. xv. 22). “Through the offence of one many are dead” (Rom. v. 15).

199. *That death came by decree extraneously to the nature bestowed upon Adam in Eden, and was not inherent in him before sentence.*

“God made man in his own image . . . a living soul (a body of life) . . . very good” (Gen. i. 27 ; ii. 7 ; i. 31), “Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife . . . unto dust shalt thou return” (Gen. iii. 17, 19).

200. *Since that time, death has been a bodily law.*

“The body is dead because of sin” (Rom. viii. 10). “The law of sin in my members . . . the body of this death” (Rom. vii. 23, 24). “This mortal . . . we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened” (1 Cor. xv. 53 ; 2 Cor. v. 4). “Having the

sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raiseth the dead” (2 Cor. i. 9).

201. *The human body is therefore a body of death requiring redemption.*

“Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body” (Rom. viii. 23). “He shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body” (Phil. iii. 21). “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?” (Rom. vi. 24). “This mortal (body) must put on immortality” (1 Cor. xv. 53).

202. *That the flesh resulting from the condemnation of human nature to death because of sin, has no good in itself, but requires to be illuminated from the outside.*

“In me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing” (Rom. vii. 18). “Sin dwelleth in me” (Rom. vii. 20). “The law of sin which is in my members” (Rom. vii. 23). “Every good and perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights” (James i. 16). “Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts” (Matt. xv. 19). “He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption” (Gal. vi. 8). “Put off the old man which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts” (Eph. iv. 22).

203. *That God's method for the return of sinful man to favour required and appointed the putting to death of man's condemned and evil nature in a representative man of spotless character, whom He should provide, to declare and uphold the righteousness of God, as the first condition of restoration, that He might be just while justifying the unjust, who should believingly approach through him in humility, confession, and reformation.*

“God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh” (Rom. viii. 3). “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and

blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. ii. 14). "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body to the tree" (1 Peter ii. 24). "Our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed" (Rom. vi. 6). "He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. iv. 15). "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world" (John xvi. 33). "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God, I say, at this time, His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 26).

204. *That the death of Christ was by God's own appointment, and not by human accident, though brought about by human instrumentality.*

"He that spared not His own Son, but delivered him up for us all" (Rom. viii. 32). "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts ii. 23). "Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done" (Acts iv. 27). "No man taketh it—my life—from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father" (John x. 18).

205. *That the death of Christ was not a mere martyrdom, but an element in the process of reconciliation.*

"You that sometimes were alienated in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death" (Col. i. 21). "When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His

Son" (Rom. v. 10). "He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquity; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed" (Isaiah liii. 5). "I lay down my life for my sheep" (John x. 15). "Having therefore boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh, let us draw near" (Heb. x. 20).

206. *That the shedding of his blood was essential for our salvation.*

"Being justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him" (Rom. v. 9). "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins" (Col. i. 14). "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb. ix. 22). "This is the new covenant in my blood, shed for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28). "The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (John i. 29). "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood" (Rev. i. 5). "Have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. vii. 14).

207. *That Christ was himself saved in the Redemption he wrought out for us.*

"In the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared. Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered. And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him" (Heb. v. 7-9). "Joint heirs with Christ" (Rom. viii. 17). "By his own blood he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. ix. 12). "Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great shepherd of the

sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect", etc. (Heb. xiii. 20).

208. *That as the anti-typical High Priest, it was necessary that he should offer for himself as well as for those whom he represented.*

"And by reason hereof, he ought as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins. And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he that said unto him", etc. (Heb. v. 3). "Wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer" (Heb. viii. 3). "Through the Eternal Spirit, he offered himself without spot unto God" (Heb. ix. 14). "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the people's; for this *he did once* when he offered up himself" (Heb. vii. 27). "It was, therefore, necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens (that is the symbols employed under the Law) should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices), but *the heavenly things themselves* (that is, Christ who is the substance prefigured in the Law), with better sacrifices than these" (that is, the sacrifice of Christ) (Heb. ix. 23).

FIRST PRINCIPLES AND FELLOWSHIP

209. Seeing that Scripture teaching concerning the Human Nature and the Death of Christ is a First Principle of the Truth, what must be the attitude of those who recognize such to be a First Principle to those holding contrary or nullifying views or who do not accept the said doctrine as a First Principle?

In answer thereto we cannot do better than reproduce the following from the pen of one who we are convinced has no living equal in expounding the Word of God in relation to doctrine and practice. In the *Christadel-*

phian for 1885, pp. 388, 389, we have the following under the heading of:—

THE NATURE AND CONDITIONS OF FELLOWSHIP IN THE TRUTH

210. "The first condition of association is the belief of the Truth, apart from the perception and reception of which, there is no basis of fellowship.

211. "The Truth forming the basis is made up of a number of items or elements, that are each essential to its integrity as a whole.

212. "That it is a matter of duty to require the recognition of these at the hands of those claiming association with us in the Truth.

213. "That we are not at liberty to receive anyone who denies or refuses to believe any of them, because the receiving of such would open the way for the currency of their principles among us, with the tendency of leavening the whole community. The elements of the Truth are so mutually related that the displacement of one undermines the foundation of the whole.

214. "A man himself believing the Truth, but willing to wink at its denial among those in fellowship in any of its essential elements, becomes by his willingness an offender against the law of God, which requires the faithful manifestation of the whole. Faithful servants of Christ cannot unite with such, on the ground that though he hold the Truth himself, such a man is responsible for the error of those whom he would admit, and therefore becomes the channel of a similar responsibility to those who may endorse him in fellowship:— 'He that biddeth him God-speed is partaker of his evil deeds'.

215. "It is the duty of the friends of the Truth to uphold it as a basis of union among themselves by refusing to receive either those who deny any part of it, or those who would receive those so denying."

HALF A CENTURY AGO IN LONDON

216. In the Intelligence columns of the *Christadelphian* for 1876, p. 334, is found the report of controversy in North London, the only ecclesia which then existed in the Metropolis, and of which the Compiler had the honour to belong. The report reads:—

"On Sunday, the 21st of May, after months of patient and careful investigation, and after the fullest opportunity offered to those who differ, to maintain their position, we resolved to discontinue fellowshipping such as believe that the descendants of Adam were not condemned to death on account of his sin, or that Jesus Christ's death was not necessary to redeem himself as well as others from that condemnation."

217. The last of the three resolutions which were passed at the final meeting, reads:—

"That insamuch as the foregoing truths substantially form part of our doctrinal Basis of Fellowship, and are essential to 'the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ', we hereby resolve from this time to discontinue fellowshipping all who believe that the descendants of Adam were not condemned to death, on account of his sin, or that Jesus Christ's death was not necessary to redeem himself as well as others from that condemnation."

