

*The
Purifying
Of The
Heavenly*

THE
herald press
4011 BOLIVIA HOUSTON, TEXAS 77092

Table Of Contents

The Purifying Of The Heavenly (bro. Growcott)	1
Atonement — (bro. Growcott)	
<i>The Use And Meaning Of The Word</i>	13
Is It Andrewism, Or Truth? (bro. Growcott)	20
Did Christ Have To Offer For Himself First?	
(bro. Growcott)	30
In His Own Body (Dr. Thomas)	35
The Truth Concerning Christ's Offering For Himself	
First Made A Matter Of Fellowship In 1898	36
The Vital Issue (bro. Growcott)	38
Where Is The Substance? (bro. Roberts)	38
Metonymy (bro. Growcott)	38
The Diabolos In Christ (Dr. Thomas)	39
"Sin" And "Sin-Offering"	46
Brother Thomas' Work (bro. Roberts)	52
Jesus And Sin In The Flesh (bro. Roberts)	53
Christ's Self-Cleansing, Self-Perfecting Sacrifice	
(bro. Roberts)	53
For Himself That It Might Be For Us	
(bro. Growcott)	54
Eureka Excerpt (bro. Thomas)	65
The Sacrificial Blood (bro. Roberts)	70
The Burnt Offering (bro. Roberts)	
<i>The Removal Of The Sin-Nature By Sacrifice</i>	72
"My Sins Are Not Hid From Thee" (bro. Roberts)	73
The Los Angeles Ecclesia's TEN POINT STATEMENT	
In Defense Of The Truth Against Stricklerism	73
Andrewism And Stricklerism (bro. Growcott)	75
Nazarite's Guiltless "Sin" And Sacrificial Cleansing	
(bro. Growcott)	77
A Representative: One of Us: Needing Redemption	
(bro. Growcott)	78
Christ's Sacrifice: "For Us" — (bro. Growcott)	
<i>A Beautiful Essential, Inspiring Truth</i>	79
Christ And Sin — (bro. Growcott)	
<i>Was Christ "Made Sin" And Did He</i>	
<i>Require Sacrificial Purification?</i>	80
Redeeming The Race — (bro. Growcott)	
<i>God's Provision For The Total Abolition Of Sin And Death</i>	91

Must Christ Offer For Himself? — (bro. Growcott)	
<i>And Is This The Central Purpose Of His First Advent?</i>	104
Was Christ Ever "Alienated" From God? (bro. Growcott)	118
Aaron And Christ (bro. Thomas)	119
"By His Own Blood He Entered" (bro. Roberts)	127

Preface

"Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist"
(2 John 7).

The Sacrifice of Christ is a fundamental doctrine, an understanding of which is essential for salvation; a lack of which debars from association with the house of Yahweh. From the pen of Dr. Thomas in *Elpis Israel* and his other writings has come the clear exegesis of the things "concerning the Name of Jesus Christ" in these closing days of Gentile times. The beauty of this basic truth in the divine revelation set out in these works is stated in sharp contrast with the darkness created by centuries of the pale of the Apostasy.

With the preaching of the Truth throughout the world in subsequent years, departures from this solid foundation have been introduced. New ideas have been advanced, drawing away believers and generating divisions. New interpretations have been applied to brother Thomas' words, which in essence have undermined the basic plan of salvation. These new teachings only tend backward to the Apostasy's darkness. These have destroyed the simplicity of the means of redemption conceived by Yahweh in the beginning and brought to reality in the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ Jesus. Such have taken away the key to a correct knowledge required for man's ultimate liberation from sin and death. Essentially such false theories have set forth "another Christ," which is not another, but proclaim teachings which trouble the believers and pervert the gospel of Christ.

To counteract these "enticing words" brother Roberts strenuously sounded the clarion notes of the Truth, "this is the way, walk ye in it." His voice has been recorded in such works as the *Christadelphian Magazine* in his days, and other expositions which became necessary as these new departures were sounded forth. Other faithful brethren have written lucidly on this subject in defense of the Truth brought to light by brother Thomas.

Two extremes of teaching troubled the brotherhood in the days of brother Roberts, two divergent theories with which he had to contend. Both have been destructive of the revelation of Jesus Christ in the Word of God. They are encompassed in their terms "Stricklerism" and "Andrewism." These are extremes to the right and left of the Truth. We must avoid the subtle Andrew error (used to support the unscriptural non-Dr. Thomas teaching of non-Responsibility). We must as equally avoid the deadly Strickler error.

The following articles have been written by brother Growcott, or

compiled from the writings of brethren Thomas, Roberts and others. This pamphlet is a collation of these writings to reemphasize the need to clearly understand the Truth revealed in the Scriptures. His sources of information are shown which are readily available in many places, to verify the truth of his statements. We believe this material gives a clarion sound for a rising generation of Truth seekers who are searching the scriptures daily with understanding and sincere hearts to know the will of the Creator. They are designed for those who desire to refresh their minds on these vital matters, as a bulwark against the constant agitation of errors of brethren who have departed from the way of Truth, and which have assailed the foundations of our only means of eternal salvation.

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the diabolos, (sin nature)" (Heb. 2:14).

"Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there . . . the purpose of God was to condemn sin in the flesh; a thing that could not have been accomplished if there were no sin there."—*Elpis Israel*, page 127

These pages are sent forth with the earnest prayer that they will be studied in the light of the Word of God, with a sincere desire to understand this vital doctrine of truth for our eternal blessing.

brother E. Fred Higham

The Purifying Of The Heavenly

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

"It was necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these (animal sacrifices), but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." —Heb. 9:23

CHRIST NEEDED, WAS SAVED BY, AND CLEANSED BY, HIS OWN SACRIFICE

THIS is the heart of God's plan of salvation for man. The Ten Point Statement* issued by the Los Angeles ecclesia in 1940 to fence the Truth against Stricklerism, says —

"It was necessary that Jesus should offer for himself for the purging of his own nature, first, from the uncleanness of death, that having by his own blood obtained eternal redemption for himself, he might be able afterward to save to the uttermost those that come to God by him."

Is this true? It is a clear, simple, easily understood statement. We do not need answers as, "Yes, as interpreted by so-and-so." This has become a standard formula for evasion: "Yes, black is black, as interpreted by so-and-so that black is white." What is really being said is, "No, I do *not* accept that, *except* as specially re-interpreted and qualified according to my views."

Anyone with a clear perception of the Truth, as so ably and faithfully presented by brethren Thomas and Roberts, will wholeheartedly say, "Yes!" and will be *anxious* to do so, and to stand up on the side of Truth. Brethren Thomas and Roberts strongly emphasized this vital truth, appealing to Scripture. It is not only true: it is essential to the Truth.

The question is not whether Christ had "sinful flesh." We believe this is agreed (though sometimes we wonder, in the light of some compromising statements of the past used to bring surface "unity," and now being quoted with approval).

The question is not whether the sinful flesh of Christ required that he die, according to God's law on the race from the beginning. We believe this is agreed.

The question is not whether Christ was "liable" to a "violent death." We understand this to be intended to mean that he *deserved* being put to death. We are sure all are agreed he did *not*, and that he was the only one of mankind who did not. "The wages of sin is death," and all except Christ have sinned.

* Taken up immediately by Central as a promised basis for sound reunion, but later set aside.

What the question *IS*, is whether he was one of those who needed a bloodshedding sacrifice for salvation, and were *cleansed by it* in God's sight.

When we say "need," we mean: according to God's all-wise ordinance. We do not say this was the *only* way salvation could have been wrought. To say so would be presumptuous for our puny little minds. We *can*, however, confidently say — because God chose it — that it was the *best* way for the justification of His eternal principles, and for the accomplishment of His eternal purposes.

God ordained sacrificial blood-shedding for the cleansing of mankind from the defilement brought on the race through Adam.

This was to glorify God and humble man, and so to prepare the ground for God's infinite mercy and man's infinite blessing. This applied to *all* mankind. If it did not apply to Christ, then he was a *substitute* for man (as the Apostacy says), and not a *representative* of man (as brethren Thomas and Roberts so strongly insist).

The scriptures (and brethren Thomas and Roberts) clearly state that Christ, by his sacrificial life and death (they are inseparable) *first* obtained eternal salvation *for himself*, so that he might *then* offer it to those who humbly and self-renouncingly come to God by, and through, and *IN* him (see Los Angeles Statement above).

Among the passages to which brethren Thomas and Roberts appealed, time and time again, are —

"Every High Priest taken from among men . . . for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity. And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins" (Heb. 5:1-3).

"Such an High Priest became us . . . 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. 7:26-27).

"Into the second went the high priest alone once every year, **not without blood**, which he offered **for himself**, and for the errors of the people" (Heb. 9:7).

"**By his own blood** he (Jesus) entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption" — for himself, as the reflexive form of the verb requires (Heb. 9:12).

"It was necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these (animal sacrifices), but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices" (v. 23).

"God . . . brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that

great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting Covenant" (Heb. 13:20).

"The Prince shall prepare for himself and for all the people of the land a bullock for a sin offering" (Ezek. 45:22).

Brethren Thomas and Roberts strongly emphasized that Christ was the fulfilment of *all* the shadows of the Law of Moses: that *everything in the Tabernacle service* (each symbolizing Christ) had to be cleansed by sacrificial blood. Here are some statements by them (and many others could be produced: their writings abound with them) —

"The flesh (of Christ) had been purified by the sprinkling of its own blood." —*Catechesis*, page 12

"When was the Jesus-Altar purified and Jesus-Mercyseat sprinkled with sacrificial blood? After the veil of his flesh was rent . . . Jesus entered the true, through his own blood." —*Catechesis*, page 14

"The flesh made by the Spirit out of Mary's substance, and rightly claimed therefore as His flesh, is the Spirit's Anointed Altar, cleansed by the blood of that flesh when poured out unto death on the tree. The Spirit-Word made his soul thus an offering for sin, and BY IT sanctified the Altar-Body on the tree." —*Eureka II*, page 224

"Did Christ offer for his own sins?" Answer: "As antitype of the high priest, who 'offered first for his own sins and then for the people's,' there must have been a sense in which he did, even as Paul says, 'This he did once, when he offered up himself' (same verse)." —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 321

"The Son of God . . . had to offer for himself . . . Jesus had himself to be saved . . . 'By his own blood he entered the Holy Place, having (thus) obtained eternal redemption' ('for us' not in original) . . . It follows (from Heb. 7:27) that there must be a sense in which Jesus offered for himself, a sense apparent when it is recognized he was under Adamic condemnation." —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 404

"The whole system of the Law prefigured Christ . . . the whole had to be atoned for once a year . . . Jesus was the 'heavenly things' . . . they had to be purified by his sacrifice." —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 407

"Jesus was personally comprehended in his offering for sin . . . unfortunately perverted are those who suppose he was not himself included in the entire operation . . . He offered for himself, first, by reason of his participation in Adamic mortality." —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 554-5

"He offered 'first' for himself . . . He obtained eternal redemption **in and for himself**, as the verb implies . . . He was 'brought from the dead **through the blood of the Covenant.**" —*Christadelphian*, 1875, page 139

"It was for us that he came to be in the position of having first to **offer for himself.**" —*Christadelphian*, 1875, page 139

"It was 'necessary that . . . the heavenly things be purified with **better sacrifices**' . . . the heavenly things all center in Jesus . . . Jesus is the beginning of the purification. Deny the **necessity** in his case and you **displace him from his position** . . . and destroy the reason for his being a partaker of our common nature. In fact, you hide the wisdom of God, and substitute the confusion of the sectarian 'atonement' which in past ages has caused many to fall." —*Christadelphian*, 1877, page 376

"In what way was Christ involved in sin, that **his own shed blood was required for his exaltation to the divine nature?** By being born of a sin-stricken daughter of Adam." —*Christadelphian*, 1897, page 63

"Christ's own sacrifice was **operative on himself** first of all . . . Christ should first of all be **purified with better sacrifices than the Mosaic.**" —*Law of Moses*, chapter 10, page 90

"There must be a sense in which Christ (the antitypical everything) **must have been purged** by the antitypical blood of **his own sacrifice.**" —*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 170

"He must have been the subject of a personal cleansing in the process by which he opened the way of sanctification for his people." [Brother Roberts quotes Heb. 9:23; 8:3; 5:3; 9:12: "better sacrifices . . . so for himself . . . by his own blood, etc."] —*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 171

"He did these things **for himself** first . . . 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.**" —*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 173

"He 'obtained redemption', but **not till his own blood was shed.**" —*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 173

"Christ himself was included in the sacrificial work . . . '**For himself** that it might be for us.'" —*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 177

"We see Christ in the bullock, the furniture, the Veil, the High Priest . . . all the Mosaic patterns. . . **All were both atoning and atoned for.**" —*Law of Moses*, chapter 19, page 181

“Let me call your attention to the priesthood Christ received, ‘He ought, as for the people, so **for himself**, to offer for sins’ (Heb. 5:2-3). If Christ’s offering did not **comprehend himself**, how are we to understand Heb. 7:27? As Christ was the antitype of the high priest who ‘offered for himself’ (Heb. 9:7), is it not required that his sacrifice should **comprehend himself**? If you deny this, how do you explain Ezek. 45:22, ‘The Prince shall prepare **for himself** a sin offering’? Do you deny the future age sacrifices are memorial?” —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 466

“The Christ of your theory needed no ‘purging’. Does it not follow he is not the Christ of Paul, who required purging from the law of sin and death **by his own sacrifice**? . . . It was a necessity that he should offer up himself, **for the purging of his own nature**.” —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 468

“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, page 262*

Why are brethren Thomas and Roberts so strongly insistent that Christ needed and was purified by his own blood-shedding sacrifice?

Because that is the heart of the Divine Plan.

Because that is the vital link between him and us.

Because that makes the accomplishment of his sacrifice (“holy work”) a reality, and not just one more type or shadow.

Because his whole life’s “holy work” (sacrifice) was to destroy the diabolos in himself — to overcome it, to cleanse himself from it — so he could be a pure Ark of safety for all his brethren. And his voluntary, obedient, blood-shedding death on the cross was inseparable from his *life* of sacrifice. It was the *completion*, the climax, the victorious culmination of that lifelong “offering” or “holy work.”

Because sin had to be *actually* (not just typically) “condemned” — that is, judged, sentenced, and *put to death* — IN the body of Christ. And to be put to death there, it had to be there. Christ was not just *typifying* what had to be done to sin, he was *DOING* it: *fulfilling* all the types, once for all. There had been types and shadows for 4000 years. The time had come for the *reality to happen*: the Diabolos, Sin-in-the-flesh, to be destroyed.

His human flesh was unclean flesh, “Sin’s flesh,” “filthy garments.” This was the tremendous burden he carried, the tremendous battle he

* This last quotation is not by brother Roberts, but published and approved by him. All the previous quotations are directly by brethren Thomas and Roberts themselves.

fought every moment of his life. Let us not be squeamishly afraid to give the name SIN to the very *root* of sin: the Diabolos itself. The Scriptures do. Brethren Thomas and Roberts do. If we do not see this, we miss the whole point of Christ's sacrifice. We can juggle words like "metonymy" all we wish. They do not obliterate the *facts*: they are just a way of attempting to define them. This is not Andrewism: this is TRUTH.

* * *

We are told by some that we must not link transgressions and sin-in-the-flesh in the same "category," as two "aspects" of the same basic sin constitution. That is, we must not link "the Devil" (Diabolos) "and his works."

But the Scriptures do. *The Devil is inseparable from his works*, and the works from the Devil. This is the whole constitution of sin that Christ came to destroy: root (diabolos) and branch (transgressions). To artificially separate these parts of what is one whole in God's sight is to artificially (and fatally) separate Christ from his brethren, and his salvation from theirs, and leave them salvationless. Brother Thomas is very clear on this —

"The word 'sin' is used in two principal acceptations in the Scripture. It signifies, in the first place, **the transgression of the 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 . . .

"Inasmuch as this **evil** principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled 'sinful flesh,' that is, **flesh full of sin.**" — *Elpis Israel*, page 126

"SIN could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not **existed there** . . . the purpose of God was to condemn sin **in the flesh**, a thing that could not have been accomplished if there were no sin there." — *Elpis Israel*, p. 127

"Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of **sinful flesh** . . . This is a misfortune, not a crime." — *Elpis Israel*, page 129

"Men are sinners in a two-fold sense: first, by natural birth; and next, by transgression. In the former sense it is manifest they could not help themselves." — *Elpis Israel*, page 130

"Sin had to be condemned **IN** the nature that had transgressed . . . He took part of the same, that through death he might destroy the Diabolos, or elements of corruption in our nature inciting it to transgression, and therefore called 'Sin working death in us.'" — *Eureka I*, page 106

"Sin is a word in Paul's argument which stands for human nature." —*Eureka I*, page 247

"This perishing body is 'sin'. Sin, in its application to the body, stands for all its constituents and laws . . . the law of its nature is styled the 'law of Sin and Death.'" —*Eureka I*, p. 248

"What is that which hath the power of death? It is the 'exceedingly great sinner SIN' in the sense of the 'Law of Sin and Death' within ALL the posterity of Adam, **without exception**. This is Paul's **Diabolos**. —*Eureka I*, page 249

"He (Jesus) was **Sin's Flesh** crucified, slain, and buried: in which by the slaying, **Sin** had been condemned; and by the burial, put out of sight." —*Eureka II*, page 124

All these statements are meaningless, if we must carefully isolate transgression from Sin-in-the-flesh. And if Sin-in-the-flesh (the Diabolos) was the aspect of sin upon which the condemnation of Sin specifically fell (in the crucifixion), then clearly it is no minor or inconsequential aspect. Further, even more importantly, if we separate it from actual transgression, *then actual transgression did not get condemned at all* for there was no actual transgression in Christ to be condemned.

When God condemned Sin by condemning the Diabolos in the sinless Christ, He inseparably linked *all* aspects of sin together — or active sin was not condemned.

* * *

Brethren Thomas and Roberts taught that the laying of our sins upon Christ was not by mere type or symbol or imputation (like the animal sacrifices), but by an actual reality **IN HIS BODY**. That is, that our sins were "laid on him" *in his being born of our condemned Sin's-flesh race*: in his actual partaking of Sin's Flesh, the flesh in which the Diabolos, SIN, resided in every cell and fibre.

And that, having been so born into the condemned race, *he himself* — inseparably from all his brethren — required to come under God's appointed sacrificial cleansing for the race. This is the reality and unity that connects us with him, and makes it righteously possible for his cleansing to purify *us*. Brethren Thomas and Roberts say —

"The flesh was the 'filthy garments' with which the Spirit-Word was clothed: the '**iniquity of us all**' that was **laid upon him** (Isa. 53: 6.)" —*Eureka I*, page 108

"If the principle of corruption had not pervaded the flesh of Jesus . . . SIN could not have been condemned there, nor could he have borne **our sins** **IN** his own body." —*Eureka I*, page 203

"To be 'made sin' for others is to become flesh and blood."
—*Eureka I*, page 247

"The 'filthy garments' of flesh, styled his 'iniquity' (Zech. 3:4)." —*Eureka II*, page 19

"'Iniquities laid on him': this is a figurative description of what was literally done in God sending forth His Son, made of a woman (Adamic), made under the Law (Mosaic), to die under the combined curse . . . This was laid on Jesus in his **being made of our nature.**" —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 400

"The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animals was the type. The real 'putting of sin' on the Lamb of God, in the **bestowal of a prepared sin-body wherein to die**, is the substance." —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 462

* * *

Some quote a few statements by brother Roberts *purportedly* out of harmony with the vast bulk of his writings, as above illustrated. There are no contradictions. Objectors were always trying to get brother Roberts to say what would have happened, or what might have been required "*if*": IF certain facts about Christ were different; IF he had been entirely alone; IF he alone were to be saved.

This tack is not only unprofitable, but very mischievous and dangerous. Our wisdom is to take the *complete* Divine pattern of Truth as it is. To speculate on theoretical alternatives is presumption.

Christ cannot possibly be separated from his work for mankind. Immediately we separate him, even "for the sake of argument," we destroy the whole picture, and have nothing profitable to discuss. It is all or nothing: God's way in its completeness, the divine facts as they are — or no way at all.

Let us resolutely refuse to be drawn into the "what if" morass. Brother Roberts strenuously resisted this approach, but sometimes under pressure very guardedly yielded to it to help a confused questioner, or answer a pressing debater. Example:

"QUESTION: What would have been the consequences had Christ died a natural death?

"ANSWER: Had the will of God been so, his resurrection would have followed immediately, and our salvation equally secured. For the triumph lay here: that he rose after dying for sin. But a natural death would not have been the same trial of Christ's obedience . . . It does not appear that the mode of death would have made any difference to the result as regards us, except insofar as might have borne on the question of Christ's obedience." —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 322

Clearly it is all a matter of *Divine appointment*. IF God had appointed natural death for the cleansing of sin, it would have sufficed. The way He chose obviously served His purpose better. Note that brother Roberts correctly observes that in *such* a case, it would have sufficed for the salvation of ALL, not just Christ himself. But it is a profitless supposition. We are concerned with what God DID appoint as the way, not speculation about what He didn't.

But, some insist, *by himself*, apart from the race, *did* Christ need a purifying bloodshed sacrifice? It is utterly impossible to consider Christ "by himself, apart from the race." There is no such thing: we are playing with hypothetical nothings.

He was purposely created *of* the race and *IN* the race. His whole purpose of existence was to save the race, to represent the race, to BE the race, to incorporate the whole race into himself. He IS the whole human race, as far as God is concerned. And God's view is eternal reality, and the only *eternal* reality.

We just prattle when we speak of Christ "apart from the race." His very name tells us this: Christ Jesus, *Anointed Savior*. Anointed for what? Savior of whom? A man's name, scripturally, is himself: all he is and means. Can he be Christ Jesus *at all*, apart from the race he was specifically "anointed" to "save"?

But granted, just for a moment, as brother Roberts sometimes very reluctantly did under pressure, to try to make the point clear — granted that we consider Christ "apart from the race." Does he need a purifying *sacrifice* (bloodshedding)? Or could we say he just needed purifying from mortality (as by simple death)?

The purifying sacrifice was ordained by God from the Garden of Eden to lay a foundation of righteousness; to publicly repudiate and condemn sin; to erect this holy banner and standard, *so that God might show mercy to actual sinners*, without compromise of His holiness and righteousness.

Now, if we were considering Christ *alone* (though this is an impossible "if"), then there are no actual sinners to consider; no need to arrange that mercy may be shown; no need to publicly condemn sin and justify God's righteousness. Christ's own perfect obedience would have already sufficiently done that as far as HE was concerned (and there would be no one else to be concerned); and his sinlessness would have obviated any necessity for mercy.

So we see we are immediately in an entirely *different constitution* of things where a blood-shedding sacrifice would be *completely irrelevant*. This clearly demonstrates the unprofitability of "if"-ing.

Christ is an essential, inseparable part of the human race. He

immediately ceases to be Christ, or to have any meaning, as soon as we attempt to consider him separately. His very sinlessness that makes him Christ was God's work in him *for the sake of the race*. He is God's creation specifically *for the race*.

Because of sin, God ordained that the race should be purified by a perfect, obedient, freewill, blood-shedding sacrifice *from the race itself*: one who would in himself *embody* the race — a sacrifice to fulfil in reality *in himself* and *for himself* what was required of the race; and then to absorb the whole race into himself and into the victory over, and *purification from*, sin that he had wrought for himself.

His sacrifice was a baptism: "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" — a washing, a purification, a death, a burial — "Thus it becometh us to fulfil *all* righteousness" — *all* God's holy requirements, the Divine Purpose, the Divine Will.

As the race's heart, center, kernel, nucleus, embodiment, we cannot separate him from the purifying sacrifice that was for the race.

* * *

Christ did not "deserve" the punishment of death, nor any other punishment. This is cloudy orthodoxy. His sacrificial death was in no sense a "punishment" of anybody. It was a triumph, a victory, a voluntary testimony of obedience and love. By life and death (one unit) he perfectly repudiated and subdued the "mind of the flesh," "sin in the flesh," the "law of sin in the members," "the Diabolos" — held it absolutely powerless — and *voluntarily* joined with God in a final, once-for-all, public condemnation of it on the cross.

Nailing it to the cross was just the consummation of the sacrifice, essential to its completion: bringing the repudiation and overcoming to a final head and climax; terminating the lifelong battle in permanent, irreversible victory; destroying the Diabolos (in himself) once and for all.

God's appointed way to accomplish this was a sacrificial, blood-shedding death; a voluntarily-submitted-to death (which natural death would not be). And therefore such a death was the *only way* the result could be accomplished for *himself*, and *then* extended to all in him.

It was the only way because it was what God appointed. If God had been pleased to appoint another way, then *that way* would have been the only way.

* * *

We are disappointed to see, in other periodicals, the Berean fellowship grossly misrepresented, and — by inaccurate implication — associated with various anonymous "errors." We ask fairminded brethren

to judge the Berean fellowship by its own words, and not by unfair innuendo, and vague, evidenceless critical quotations about Bereans extracted from unsound critics of the past.

And we ask that we be judged separately, by ourselves. Articles that indiscriminately lump the Berean fellowship with other groups, and then proceed to knock down straw men (as far as Bereans are concerned) do not help the cause of Truth.

The Berean fellowship does not believe that Christ was "alienated" from God, or was a "child of wrath," or was "liable" to a "violent death." If he had been "liable" to it, he could not have offered himself *voluntarily* to fulfil God's requirement of the perfect sacrifice ("holy work"). To be the "holy work" that God required as a foundation of righteousness *within which* others can approach also, it had to be a *willing* submission to God's appointment, right through to the very end.

* * *

Baptism is not *only* for the remission of sins. That truly is vital and primary, and clears our *past*. But it is static. *By itself*, it would not help us. Baptism is to put us *into Christ*, and into all he stands for and embodies: to take our feet *out of* the way of death, and to set them *in motion* in the way of life.

This used to be spoken of as "passing *out of Adam* into Christ" (*Good Confession*, Question 10). But since the Andrew perversion of this expression, and the Andrew error built upon that perversion, sound brethren have avoided this expression because of what it now so widely connotes. It is one of the incendiary "red flags," like "violent death," "alienation," "constitutional sinner," etc., that wise and considerate brethren, seeking understanding and not inflammation, will either not use, or will be very, very careful how they use and define.

* * *

We have absolutely no sympathy for the Andrew "violent death" theory: that the sentence on Adam was "violent death," averted from the sinning Adam by animal sacrifice, and carried out on the sinless Christ. This is a repulsive theory. Actually, as regards Adam, the distinction between "violent death" (which he allegedly escaped) and "natural death" (which he admittedly suffered) is an artificial distinction. For Adam, who previously was not related to death at all, *no* death was "natural," and *any* death would have been "violent" death. The only distinction that might be made would be between a quick or slow "violent" death. But even that distinction is meaningless, for 930 years is lightning "quick," compared to the endless ages of life that lay before him if he were obedient.

We do not particularly like the term "violent death." It is not a

scriptural one (though admittedly it *may* be used to express a scriptural idea). It may have been a useful, and not misleading, expression at one time; but it is now inseparably connected in many minds with the false Andrew theory.

Rather than "violent death," as applied to the death of Christ, we much prefer the scriptural conceptions of (1) the condemning of Sin's Flesh by the voluntary nailing of this flesh to the cross, and (2) purification from *all* forms and aspects of "Sin" by God's appointed way of the sacrificial blood-shedding of a perfect, voluntary self-offering.

God ordained this for His glory. Christ in love submitted to it, for God's glory and man's salvation. He obediently accepted the position he found himself in as part of the condemned, sin-cursed, sin-defiled, purification-needing race. And he accepted and fulfilled God's required procedure for that cleansing, *as* the race.

* * *

We are told that Jesus himself personally was not "liable" to a "violent death," and that brother Roberts said so. *Absolutely true!* Utterly beyond any cavil. Jesus certainly was not "liable" to a "violent death." That was the penalty for actual transgression of God's Law, and he never transgressed.

But he — as embodying the race, and bearing the unclean, "filthy-garments," "Sin-in-the-flesh" mortality — required with all his brethren, by God's appointment, the cleansing of a perfect bloodshed sacrifice.

Everything related to this unclean mortal condition had, under the Law, to be cleansed by sacrificial blood: not only all the *obvious* uncleannesses, as sicknesses and diseases, but the *normal bodily functions*, and even *birth* itself.

This lesson of the uncleanness of the whole mortal constitution had to be hammered home over and over and over again, century after century, pointing forward in hope to the final redemption. Strange indeed is the suggestion that the one who took upon himself this burden, and who concentrated the sins of all the ages IN his own sin-stricken body, should not require the age-foreshadowed cleansing.

A sacrifice must be offered at his birth. Why? What did it mean? They were very poor. It was just two common little birds. But what tremendous import! He was one of us, and we are one with him. *What was the fulfilled REALITY of that typical, shadowy, forward-pointing offering that Mary made because HE was born of Adam's race?* He fulfilled on Calvary the offering made at his birth.

Indeed, the whole typical, sacrificial cleansing process *focused* specifically on him, *primarily and especially*.

He himself, for the whole race, must be cleansed in the God-appointed way. Not typically and symbolically; not in shadow and figure: but ACTUALLY, in the terrible, perfect life he lived and death he died, even to the moment he could at last triumphantly cry, "IT IS FINISHED!"

It was God's will to "make him perfect through suffering" (Heb. 2:10). Was not the cross the apex of that suffering? — of that perfecting?

THEN, after first having been made perfect, cleansed by dreadful, actual "baptism" (Lk. 12:50) for which his whole life was a preparation, he is NOW able to save them to the uttermost who come to God by, and IN, and as part of, him.

This is the true, scriptural, Christadelphian Christ of brethren Thomas and Roberts. All others are of orthodoxy of one shade or another.

* * *

We do not say that Christ's sacrifice was "for himself" as to motive. The entire weight of Scripture is on the side of the glorious fact that his motive was love for God and love for his brethren. The supreme joy of bringing good out of evil, on a universal and eternal scale; of pleasing God and blessing man by removing the barrier between God and man; and opening a way that God and man may be eternally reconciled and eternally at peace in perfect communion; and being forever privileged to observe and rejoice in the consummation of that glorious Divine Purpose — what selfish, personal motive could ever have a fraction of the power of this! Christ was far, far above self-centered motivation —

"It pleased the Lord to bruise him; He hath put him to grief . . . He shall see his seed . . . he shall see the travail of his soul and be satisfied."

Atonement

The Use And Meaning Of The Word

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

"And when the days of her purification are fulfilled . . . she shall bring . . . a sin offering: . . . the priest shall make an atonement for her, and she shall be cleansed." — Lev. 12:6-7

THE word "atonement" occurs 81 times in the Old Testament, and once in the New, in the AV. According to Webster, the English meaning of "atonement" is —

1. Reconciliation, restoration of friendly relations. (*This is the original meaning, now obsolete*).
2. A theological doctrine concerning the reconciliation of God and man.
3. Reparation, satisfaction. (*That is, the doing of something, or the paying of some penalty, to compensate for some wrong action.*)

It will be noted that originally "atonement" simply meant reconciliation, and was not a theological word, and did not in itself convey the idea of reparation, expiation, or some compensating action or payment.

This (original) meaning appears to be the AV meaning. From other uses of the word at the time the AV was translated (as Shakespeare), this appears to have been the meaning of the word then.

This somewhat clarifies the scriptural use. At least, it removes one aspect of misunderstanding and misinterpretation. That is, we can see we must clear the word of the idea of compensation or reparation, which is the basis of the orthodox theory of substitution. In fact, it appears to be the introduction of this theory that has corrupted the original common meaning of the word. We are aware how the Apostasy's false teachings have corrupted the meanings of many words, as baptism, hell, soul, kingdom, devil, Holy Spirit, death, etc.

But even "reconciliation" does not properly to us represent the Hebrew word that is translated "atonement"; for "reconciliation" as we commonly use it always implies a moral relation and personal estrangement. (But, upon thought — and accountants will be especially aware of this — we will realize that we *do* use "reconciliation" in strictly nonmoral, inanimate connections, as "reconciling" a bank statement, etc. Here the sense is simply to bring into factual or material conformity, without any moral implications.)

So much for the meanings of the English words, which are not important of themselves in searching scriptural meanings, but only insofar as they color — correctly or incorrectly — our understanding of the scriptural terms.

The Hebrew word that is always the original wherever "atonement" occurs in the AV, is *kaphar* (root meaning: to cover*) and *kap-*

* "Cover" is almost universally regarded as the root meaning of "kaphar," and this fits with its literal use in Gen. 7:14; but some (especially modern) lexicographers consider the root meaning to be "wash away" or "cleanse." This, if correct, would be even more fitting in its symbolic use. It will be noted in many of the examples given below that the idea of cleansing is the basic one, and that AV several times uses "cleanse" or "purge" in translation of "kaphar." Truly Christ is both a "cover" and a "cleansing" for his people. These are related concepts, but "cleanse" seems to be the deeper one. Christ's "covering" of his people is essential, and will always be a historic fact of their salvation, and in some sense always a present need and reality even in glorification, but his "cleansing" of them unto that glorification seems more fundamental.

poorim (plural: coverings). This is the same root as *kapporeth*, the "lid" or "cover" of the Ark, always in AV translated "mercy-seat" (RV/NRV margins: cover).

The first use of *kaphar* is Gen. 6:14, where it is translated "pitch," but in the sense of "cover with pitch" (Rotherham and NRV have "cover"). This is the only place where *kaphar* is used literally and neutrally as "cover." In all other places it is used of a figurative covering, and in relation to some uncleanness.

But *kaphar* is not restricted to moral relations, or to need for repentance and forgiveness and personal "reconciliation." It does not necessarily imply guilt or error. It is used for the figurative or ceremonial cleansing and purifying of inanimate objects, as concerning the original cleansing of the Altar when it was first constructed —

" . . . a bullock for a sin-offering for atonement (*kaphar*); and thou shalt *cleanse* the altar when thou makest (RV) atonement (*Kaphar*) for it" (Ex. 29:36).

In Lev. 14:34-53 is the cleansing of an infection-defiled house, and in this case there is no *direct* relation to any sin or guilt —

"He shall take to *cleanse* the house two birds . . ." (v. 49).

"He shall *cleanse* the house with the blood of the bird . . ." (v. 52).

"He shall let go the living bird . . . so shall he (RV) make atonement (*kaphar*) for the house, and it shall be clean" (v. 53).

Other instances of inanimate "atonements" are —

Ex. 30:10 (RV) — "Once in the year shall he make atonement (*kaphar*) for it (the Altar of Incense).

Lev. 16:16 — "He shall make an atonement (*kaphar*) for the Holy Place."

Lev. 16:18 — "He shall go out unto the Altar...and make atonement (*kaphar*) for it."

Lev. 16:33 — "He shall make an atonement (*kaphar*) for the Holy Sanctuary . . . for the Tabernacle . . . and for the Altar."

Num. 35:33 — "Blood defileth the land, and the land cannot be cleansed (*kaphar*) but by the blood of him that shed it."

Ezek. 43:20 — "Thou shalt take the blood . . . and put it on the four horns of it (the altar)...thus shalt thou *cleanse* and *purge* (*kaphar*) it."

Ezek. 43:26 — "Seven days shalt thou *purge* (*kaphar*) the Altar and *purify* it."

Ezek. 45:18 — "Thou shalt *cleanse* the Sanctuary . . . put the

"Mercy seat" was first used by Tyndale, literally translating Luther's "gnadenstuhl," from the Septuagint "hilasterion," place of conciliation. "Hilaskomai" is "be merciful" in Luke 28:13 and "make reconciliation" in Heb. 2:17. "Hilios" is "merciful" in Heb. 8:12.

blood upon the posts of the House . . . so shall ye reconcile
(*kaphar*) the House."

As applied to people, *kaphar* can imply reconciliation and involve the gaining of forgiveness. There are many examples of this in Lev. 4 and 5.

However, as applied to people, it can be merely a cleansing *without* any implication of personal guilt or need for forgiveness or reconciliation. This is most strikingly illustrated in the requirement of "atonement" for the uncleanness of childbirth in Lev. 12 —

"If a woman hath borne a manchild, she shall be *unclean* seven days" (v. 2).

"When the days of her *purification* are fulfilled, she shall bring . . . a *sin* offering . . . the priest . . . shall make an atonement (*kaphar*) for her, and she shall be *cleansed*" (vs. 6-7).

And the most notable and significant case of this is Mary —

"Hail, thou . . . highly favored, the Lord is with thee!"
(Luke 1:28).

"Thou hast found favor with God" (v. 30).

"The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (v. 35).

"And when the days of her *purification* according to the Law of Moses were accomplished . . . to offer a sacrifice"
(Luke 2:22-24).

Note from Lev. 12 (above) that this was a *sin* offering for "atonement," though clearly there was no guilt or alienation involved here.

Kaphar is almost always translated "atonement," but other renderings (beside those already mentioned) are —

Deut. 21:8 — "Be merciful (*kaphar*: RV, forgive) thy people . . . and the blood shall be forgiven (*kaphar*) them."

Deut. 32:43 — "God will be merciful unto (*kaphar*) His land."

Psa. 65:3 — "Our transgression, Thou shalt purge (*kaphar*) them away."

Psa. 78:38 — "He forgave (*kaphar*) their iniquity."

Psa. 79:9 — "O God . . . purge away (*kaphar*) our sins."

Prov. 16:6 — "By mercy and truth iniquity is purged (*kaphar*)."

Ezek. 16:63 — "When I (God) am pacified toward (*kaphar*: RV, have forgiven) thee."

Ezek. 45:17 — "To make reconciliation (*kaphar*) for the house of Israel."

Dan. 9:24 — "To make reconciliation (*kaphar*) for iniquity."

It will be seen from all the foregoing that the English word "atonement" as at present used is not a very good representation of the Hebrew *kaphar*, and carries connotations not in the original. Today, "atone" and "atonement" carry, to most people, the ideas of (1) moral culpability, and (2) expiation and a required compensation of some sort.

These are secondary and acquired meanings, even for the English word. They are not part of the original English meaning, which was simply "at-one-ment" — a bringing into unity.

And these ideas of guilt of, and payment for, sin are certainly not integral parts of the Hebrew word *kaphar* which, as seen, can apply to the cleansing of inanimate objects, or of "uncleannesses" of people which do not involve any personal guilt.

It would probably be simpler and less misleading to us, as well as more understandable, if we (to ourselves) in reading and study, substituted "cover" or "cleanse" wherever "atonement" occurs, being guided by the context as to whether it involved a moral reconciliation, or whether it was simply a physical (or ceremonial) cleansing.

Scriptural "atonement" (*kaphar*) is, truly, always related in some way to the physical condition arising from the general constitution of sin that has come upon the world through Adam. This is the unifying idea behind all its uses. But "atonement" (*kaphar*) being required does not necessarily imply personal guilt or estrangement — just a relationship to that sin-constitution.

The scriptural concept of "covering" and "cleansing" turns our minds profitably in the direction of what must occur *within us*, through and as a result of the required "atonement." The orthodox ideas attached to "atonement" — someone else being required to pay for our guilt, to suffer instead of us for our sins — tends to dull our conscience and turn our minds away from our own need for cleansing and purging.

It is the blood of Christ, the perfect sacrifice, that first "covers," then "cleanses" us — not ritually, but practically and gloriously. He did not die to "atone" for our sins in the orthodox sense. He lived, and died to become and provide a cleansing medium by which our sins are first mercifully "covered," and then progressively — and at last completely and perfectly — cleansed from us: "washed away."

"Atonement," then, as it occurs in the AV, does not mean an *external* payment or compensation or expiation: that is, something done outside of ourselves; something substitutionary. This is a corrupted, orthodox meaning. It means an *internal* covering, cleansing, purging, purifying, and putting in a right condition: something done not so much *for us* as *to us*. (Of course, it is all "for" us in the sense of "for our sakes," "on our behalf.")

The sacrifices of the Bible were not to *pay* for sins; nor were they a substitute to suffer and die in the place of the sinner, as orthodoxy teaches. True, *pagan* sacrifices doubtless were this, for they were a corruption and perversion of the true — the true, revealed Divine conception being far above the comprehension of the mind of the flesh.

The sacrifices of the Bible were a humble recognition that the only condition acceptable to God is purity and perfection; that sin is filth and uncleanness; and that sinful man can be reconciled to God only by being covered by, and washed in, the blood of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

The sacrifices had to be “without blemish,” a “perfect” life poured out unto death — a recognition that the flesh must be cut off; the body of sin must die: the ultimate submission and subjection and conformation of humanity to God in perfect unity of will.

Their required “*perfection*” is the key to their meaning: the strong perfection of Christ which can cover weak sinful man, if man will humbly and obediently accept the covering in the way appointed, and live in the way required to maintain possession of this covering.

The sacrifices were a manifestation of faith in the deliverance from sin that God had promised and would provide — the Seed of the Woman to crush the Serpent’s head.

* * *

The AV has introduced “*atonement*” only once into the New Testament, and there (Rom. 5:11) the RV has correctly changed it to “*reconciliation*,” consistent with the AV rendering of the same word (*katallagee*, *katalasso*) everywhere else.

In the New Testament we read much of reconciliation, redemption*, sanctification, purification, cleansing, etc. — all of which, in harmony with *kaphar*, turn our minds more to the state and condition of the recipient rather than to something done external to him and as a substitute for him, as the orthodox idea of “*atonement*” does.

Of Christ’s own need for, and participation in, the cleansing benefits of his sacrificial death, we therefore read —

“Necessary . . . patterns of things in the heavens . . . *purified* with these (animal sacrifices); but (that) the heavenly

* The conception of “*redemption*” (or “*ransom*”), however, must not be forced to the point of the actual payment of something to someone, but as the accomplishment (in some required way) of a deliverance. Thus “*Redeeming* (literally: buying up, buying out) the time” (Col. 4:5) clearly has no payee, or transfer of payment, but simply by a required course of wisdom and obedience delivering our time (life) from natural waste leading to death, to spiritual profitability leading to life. Likewise “*Bought with a price*” (1 Cor. 6:20) has no literal payee, but simply denotes our complete (joyful) bondage to righteousness (Rom. 6:18).

things themselves (be *purified*) with better sacrifices than these" (Heb. 9:23).

"By *his own blood* he entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal *redemption*" (Heb. 9:12).

And concerning that blood —

"Ye are *washed*, ye are sanctified" (1 Cor. 6:11).

"We have *redemption* through his blood, the *forgiveness* of sins" (Eph. 1:7).

"We have *redemption* through his blood, the *forgiveness* of sins" (Col. 1:14).

"If the blood of bulls and goats . . . *sanctifieth* to the *purifying* of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ *purge* your conscience" (Heb. 9:13-14).

"Almost all things are by the Law *purged* with blood" (Hebrews 9:22).

"That he (Jesus) might *sanctify* the people with his own blood" (Heb. 13:12).

"Ye were *redeemed* . . . with the precious blood of Christ" (1 Peter 1:19).

"The blood of Jesus Christ *cleanseth* us" (1 Jn. 1:7).

"*Washed* us from our sins in his own blood" (Rev. 1:5).

"Thou hast *redeemed* us to God by thy blood" (Rev. 5:9).

Cleansing and purifying and sanctifying (making holy) and redeeming from (rescuing from the service and bondage of) sin, is the picture presented throughout. It is a process which must, in one sense, be done for us and to us for we can "of our own selves do nothing," and

"It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure."

— but it is a process that demands our complete devotion and desire and utmost effort, for the immediately preceding verse commands —

"Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling"
(Phil. 2:12-13).

It is no contradiction, but beautiful harmony, that the washing is attributed, not only to the blood, but to the Word —

"That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water *by the Word*" (Eph. 5:26).

There must be a constant bathing, washing, total immersion in this divine Water of Life if the great work of "At-one-ment" — making all things one — is to have any meaning for us.

Is It Andrewism, Or Truth?

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

Brother ANDREW: "Is it not clear that the death of Christ was necessary to purify his own nature from the sin power, and that he as the first one had to undergo purification through his shed blood and resurrection?"

Brother ROBERTS: "CERTAINLY. I have never called that in question in the least."

THE Berean fellowship is charged with "Andrewism" because we point out the truths concerning the Sacrifice of Christ which brethren Thomas and Roberts taught. What is "Andrewism?" Where does the Truth end, and "Andrewism" begin? Wherein did brethren Andrew and Roberts agree on this subject, and wherein did they disagree? Some are quoting brother Andrew where he and brother Roberts agreed, and are calling it "Andrewism."

We do not deny there is such a thing as "Andrewism," and that it is an error, a dangerous, harmful, Truth-destructive error, a current, active error, like Stricklerism.

We would not for a moment want to belittle or undermine the necessary effort to warn brethren against it, and against the whole Resurrectional Responsibility error. We are glad some are still concerned about fellowship, and that they realize the necessity, and appreciate the value, of brother Roberts' strong fellowship stand in 1898 against this error. The last thing we want to do is to weaken hands that are striving for sound fellowship, and are resisting blandishments to return to the confused condition from which the sound 1898 action delivered them.

Andrewism had to do with Resurrectional Responsibility. The debate between brethren Andrew and Roberts was the "*Resurrectional Responsibility Debate*." The book brother Roberts wrote to defend the Truth against Andrewism was "*The Resurrection to Condemnation*." The matters of the relation of the Law of Sin and Death to baptism, and of Christ's offering for himself are side issues, because of a theory brother Andrew developed to support his theory that the unbaptized will not be raised to judgment.

The theory went like this: The sentence on Adam ("*Adamic Condemnation*") was eternal, *uninterruptible* death. Once the grave doors snapped shut, no one — *not even God* — could open them to bring out anyone who had died under Adamic Condemnation. Brother Andrew did not deny God's intrinsic *power* to do anything He chose.

But he argued that, within the fixed framework of the laws of life and death that God's wisdom and justice had set up regarding the human race, God Himself could not raise any not freed before death from Adamic Condemnation.

And he argued that in the present dispensation, it is baptism that frees a man from the inexorable Adamic Condemnation of uninterrupted death. That's why baptism and the Law of Sin and Death come into the debate.

* * *

Brother Roberts did not deny that baptism had a relation to the Law of Sin and Death. But he did deny that it had the relation that brother Andrew asserted. Brother Roberts recognized that baptism "*potentially and eventually*" frees from the Law of Sin and Death, and that there can be no freedom from that law without baptism (in the present dispensation). Summing up the debate, he says afterwards, in the preface —

"What is cancelled at baptism (and it is only cancelled *potentially* — for there is an 'if' all the way through) is the condemnation resting upon us as individual sinners, AND *the racial condemnation which we physically inherit*. I have never diverged from this view . . . 'Legal mortality' would be that which is constituted, ordered, or determined by law. In *this* sense, we pass (potentially) from death to life at baptism — which is a *very important sense certainly*, for without it there could be no hope of the *physical* deliverance that waits at the coming of Christ."

Brother Roberts agreed with brother Andrew to this point, but he goes on to say he did not agree with the arguments brother Andrew built on these truths. We note brother Roberts herein explains his previous use of the term "legal mortality." Brother Andrew used the term for *his conception* of release from the penalty of eternal death that he said baptism brings, making it possible for a man to be raised from the dead. Brother Roberts subsequently avoids this term because of brother Andrew's application of it to a false theory.

Brother Roberts taught that we are freed "potentially" at baptism from the Law of Sin and Death, and by this he explains that he meant that if the process begun at baptism is faithfully carried through to the end, then *at the resurrection and judgment* we shall be changed from mortal to immortal, and *thus and then* be actually freed from the Law of Sin and Death — as a final result of our baptism, and which could only come by baptism. In *this* sense, baptism frees us from that Law.

But to brother Andrew, the freedom from the Law of Sin and Death at baptism is a "legal" release from the Adamic sentence of eternal,

uninterruptible death, enabling resurrection to occur.

Brother Roberts taught that, *as a FINAL result of baptism, and dependent upon baptism*, we are “justified” from Adamic Condemnation (that is, our nature is cleansed) at the resurrection by change of body. But brother Andrew taught that, by baptism, we are “justified” from Adamic Condemnation immediately, making resurrection possible.

Brother Roberts taught that “justification from Adamic Condemnation” is, in its fulness, a *physical* change (though he recognized it had a present bearing as to relationship to life or death — “cancelled potentially at baptism”).

It is not Andrewism to say that baptism (potentially and eventually) frees us from Adamic Condemnation — if we are saying it with the meaning brother Roberts attached to it (though it’s wise to try to avoid any possibility of giving a wrong impression — especially when controversy has made some expressions potentially provocative).

We would urge a careful reading of the preface to the debate, where brother Roberts explains why he gave certain answers to some of brother Andrew’s questions — because he and the audience knew the false meanings brother Andrew attached to some of the words in the questions, and the wrong inferences brother Andrew drew from certain truths.

* * *

As to the matter of Christ needing, and being cleansed and saved by, his own sacrifice, brethren Andrew and Roberts were agreed. But brother Andrew, to support his theories, repeatedly pressed brother Roberts to say that Christ needed a cleansing sacrifice *apart* from the race. This brother Roberts steadfastly refused. Christ apart from the race is not Christ at all.

Because of this refusal, by quoting some questions and answers only, it can be made to look as if Brother Roberts resisted admitting that Christ needed a cleansing, bloodshedding sacrifice; but reading it all, we find brother Roberts several times said he *did*. The Resurrectional Responsibility Debate has been quoted to disprove the Berean position. Let us see what it really does say. Throughout the following, brother Andrew is always questioning brother Roberts, and begins each paragraph. “R:” means brother Roberts’ reply, and what follows this in each paragraph is by brother Roberts. (Remarks in **THIS** type are our comments). The numbers are question numbers in the published debate —

111. Is “sin in the flesh” the subject of justification through the blood of Christ? R: It will be ultimately. [**Brother Roberts disagreed as to the TIME, not the FACT**].

114. I said "acquittal from actual or imputed guilt." [Here is brother Andrew's theory of "imputed guilt" showing through. This is why brother Roberts had to be careful in answering].

284. Did Christ require to die *for himself*? R: In view of the work he came to do, YES. But if there had been himself only, No.

287. Was the shedding of his blood not necessary for himself apart from others? R: Since we cannot contemplate him *apart* from others, it is no use putting the question. He was one of the whole race.

288. You put it (that) if there had been no others, his death would have been unnecessary? R: That is putting an abstract question which it is not convenient to discuss.

290. But did he not fulfil the Aaronic type of offering for himself, and then for the sins of the people? R: NO DOUBT.

291. What was it in relation to himself for which he had to shed his blood? R: He stood there as bearing the sins of his whole brethren.

[Brother Roberts explains how Christ "bore the sins of his brethren" when he says: "The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animals was the type. The REAL "putting of sin" on the Lamb of God, in the bestowal of a prepared sin-body wherein to die, is the substance (*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 462). Again: "Iniquities laid on him...this was laid on Jesus in his being made of our nature" (*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 400). Therefore brother Roberts says: "He offered for himself, first, by reason of his participation in Adamic mortality" (*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 555).

That is: He came to save the race. He bore our sins in being made of Sin's Flesh. Being made of Sin's Flesh, he personally needed a cleansing sacrifice. Being, as one of the race, so cleansed, that cleansing covers all who become part of him.]

292. Did he have the sin-nature himself, as well as the sins of his brethren, which required the offering of himself as a sacrifice? R: He had no sin except the possession of a nature which leads to sin, but which in him did not lead to sin.

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

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

[Brother Roberts knew that brother Andrew was trying to get him to speak of Christ "apart from others", and that is why he appears to be evading a plain statement of truth. He explains this later (see 393

and 715-724). Some stop here, and quote it to “prove” brother Roberts did not believe Christ had to offer for himself. But he later repeatedly and emphatically says he DID, as we shall see].

392. Did not Christ enter into the most holy place, or immortality, on the basis of the shedding of his blood? Does this not mean that *he could not enter in without*? Does it not also mean that *the blood cleansed him individually from corruption which was an impediment to his obtaining eternal life*? R: I DO NOT DENY THAT.

393. Why did you say that Christ did not die for himself, apart from others? R: Because you were asking me to consider him in his individual capacity, *detached from the human race*, and I refuse to consider him in that capacity . . . What is the use of discussing a case that does not exist . . . His work is the saving of mankind, and you cannot discuss him apart from that.

[Note these two answers well. They explain much. Later answers are even clearer].

399. We both recognize Christ did not commit transgression, and that his blood was not required in regard to himself for anything of that kind. *Yet he did shed his blood for himself*. What was it then for which he shed his blood for himself? R: I have answered that several times, brother Andrew. He was a mortal man, inheriting death from Adam.

[Both agreed Christ shed his blood for himself, and could not otherwise attain to life. But brother Andrew contended it was to “atone” (in the orthodox sense) for the “imputed guilt” of Adam, while brother Roberts taught it was the necessary God-appointed cleansing from the physical defilement of the sin-nature that made him one with his brethren in need of a sacrifice].

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

401. Did he not require to shed his blood to cleanse himself from his own sin nature, and has not God made that the basis by which those in him may be justified from the sin of that nature, and have forgiveness of sins? R: I prefer the Scripture description of what was done by the death of Christ. The Scriptures never use the word *cleanse*, in *that* sense.

[Some use this to “prove” brother Roberts taught Christ wasn’t cleansed by his own sacrifice. This sets him against himself when he says: “Christ should first of all be PURIFIED with better sacrifices than the Mosaic” (*Law of Moses*, chapter 10, page 90, 1946 Edition). And again: “Christ must have been PURGED by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice” (*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 170). And many other places.

The "that sense" brother Roberts objected to was cleansing from "imputed guilt," as question 405 shows].

402. Never use the word "cleanse" in regard to physical sin? R: *Not in that connection.*

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

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

405. Then it was for *imputed guilt*?

[THIS was what brother Andrew was driving at; and THIS was what brother Roberts was denying. Here we can see why brother Roberts was so very cautious and seemingly evasive. Brother Andrew was trying to get brother Roberts to say that Christ by his bloodshed, and we at our baptism, are "cleansed" or "justified" from the "imputed guilt" of Adam. Brother Andrew's theory compelled him to believe that the "condemnation" that came on all men (including Christ), was "imputed guilt" This becomes clearer] —

414. Are they (Adam's posterity) not under condemnation for the offense of Adam before they do anything themselves, right or wrong? R: They are mortal because of Adam's sin.

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

416. Do you deny the statement, "By the offense of one, judgment came on all men to condemnation"? R: No, I do not deny it.

417. You do! R: No. I explain it.

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

[Here is where brother Roberts takes issue with brother Andrew's mechanical theory of "justifying" babies by the blood of Christ from the "imputed guilt" of Adam. We must observe where he agrees and where he takes issue. He agrees that the faithful are eventually justified from Adamic Condemnation by the blood of Christ, when they are made immortal] —

431. Does not that justification (of the faithful by the blood of Christ, 430) include justification from the Adamic condemnation they inherited? R: I have no issue with you as to the righteous.

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

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

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

458. Is not this statement made in reference to the Law? R: Yes.

459. Then what was the nature or effect of the purifying of the flesh which is spoken of here? R: Those who were purified were recognized as *legally clean*. It was a shadow cleanness — all types and shadows.

460. All types and shadows: but there was a *legal* cleanness? R: In the sense in question it was real — a really recognized *legal* cleanness.

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

[Brother Roberts never limits the benefits of baptism solely to forgiveness of personal sins. It is the only way to (eventually, if worthy) be cleansed from the sin nature through his blood. But he vehemently opposed the Andrew theory that baptism justified us from the imputed guilt of Adam's sin, and thereby made it possible for our death to be broken for resurrection to judgment. We must discern what he is opposing, and what he is agreeing with].

682. Is a man, when baptized, legally freed from Adamic condemnation? R: What do you mean by "legally freed"?

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

[Brother Roberts did not like the term "wrath of God" in this connection, but he did agree that Adamic condemnation is COMMENCED to be taken away at baptism. That is, that baptism is related to the (eventual) removal of Adamic condemnation].

685. Have you never taught that Adamic condemnation is legally taken away at baptism? R: I am not aware that I have.

686. Do you recognize this: "Legally a man is freed from Adamic condemnation at the time he obeys the Truth and receives the remission of sins, but actually its physical effects remain until this mortal (that is,

this Adamic condemned nature) is swallowed up in the life that Christ will bestow upon his brethren at his coming." —*Christadelphian*, 1878, page 225 R: I FULLY ENDORSE THAT.

690. Do you adhere to this statement that he is legally freed from Adamic condemnation? R: I understand God gives the obedient believer a clean slate.

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

692. Then there's a passing out of Adam in Christ at baptism? R: CERTAINLY.

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

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

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

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

706. In relation to himself, personally, *apart from his position as a sin-bearer for others*? R: You cannot take him apart from that position . . . There never would have been a Christ if there had not been a sin race to be redeemed. If he had been by himself, he would not have required to die at all — if he had been disconnected from our race . . . I mean, if he had been by himself — a new Adam — having no connection with the race of Adam first: not made out of it.

[Here brother Andrew is trying again to get brother Roberts to consider Christ apart from the race).

710. But if, as a descendant of Adam, he had been the only one to whom God granted the offer of salvation, would he not have had to die before he could obtain that salvation? R: I refuse the question in that form, because it is an impossible "if." He was not sent for himself, but for us.

711. Is it not clear that Christ, as a necessity, must offer up himself for the purging of his own sin nature? R: As a son of Adam, a son of Abraham, a son of David, YES.

712. First from the uncleanness of death, that having by his own blood obtained eternal life HIMSELF, he might be able to save others? R: CERTAINLY.

713. Then he died for himself apart from being a sin-bearer for others? R: I do not admit that: I cannot separate him from his work.

[Brother Andrew's peculiar theory required this separation: brother Roberts resisted it to the end].

715. How could Jesus have been made free from that sin which God laid upon him in his own nature — “made in the likeness of sinful flesh” — if he had not died FOR HIMSELF as well as for us? R: HE COULD NOT.

716. Then he offered for himself as well as for us? R: CERTAINLY.

717. Is it not clear then from this that the death of Christ was necessary to purify his own nature from the sin power? R: CERTAINLY.

718. That was hereditary in him in the days of his flesh? R: No doubt of it.

719. And he as the first one had to undergo purification through his shed blood and resurrection? R: CERTAINLY, I HAVE NEVER CALLED THAT IN QUESTION IN THE LEAST.

720. Did you not say Tuesday night that he did NOT need to shed his blood for himself? R: That is upon your impossible supposition that he stood apart from us, and was a new Adam altogether . . . You asked me to consider him apart from us.

723. Apart from us, but still a descendant of Adam? R: That is my point — that you CANNOT separate him from the work he came to do. There never would have been a Christ at all if he had not been for that work.

724. Then as a descendant of Adam, it WAS necessary for him to shed his blood in order to obtain eternal life? R: I have already answered that several times.

* * *

It will be noted from the above that on the relationship of baptism to Adamic Condemnation and the Law of Sin and death, brother Roberts fully agreed with brother Andrew that —

Racial condemnation is cancelled (potentially: Brother Roberts) at baptism (Preface).

In the sense of “legal mortality” (as brother Roberts defines), we pass from death to life at baptism (Preface).

"Sin in the flesh" is ultimately the subject of justification through the blood of Christ (111).

The righteous are eventually "justified" (that is, cleansed) from Adamic Condemnation by the blood of Christ (432).

Our nature does require cleansing. It will be cleansed at the resurrection. And it will be because of Christ's obedience unto death. [And it will be because we, through baptism have entered into him] (468).

The condemnation pertaining to a man as a result of his being descended from Adam COMMENCES to be taken away at baptism. [That is, he enters at baptism a relationship which will eventuate in its being taken away if he is faithful to the end] (683).

"Legally" a man is freed from Adamic condemnation at the time he obeys the Truth. [Brother Roberts wrote this in 1878, before the Andrew controversy. He endorsed it in the debate, but said later that in view of brother Andrew's "legal" theories and phraseology, he would not choose that expression again] (686).

At baptism, anything that stands against us in any way, whether from Adam or ourselves, is wiped out (691).

We pass out of Adam into Christ at baptism. [Another expression brother Roberts subsequently refrained from using, because of brother Andrew's misuse of it] (692).

A man, passing into Christ, loses his relationship to the whole death dispensation which Adam introduced. There is preliminary deliverance at baptism; actual at resurrection (693).

And on the matter of Christ needing and being saved by a sacrificial blood-shedding, brother Roberts agreed with brother Andrew that —

Christ fulfilled the Aaronic type of offering FOR HIMSELF, and then for the sins of the people (290).

Christ could not enter immortality without shedding his blood.

The shed blood cleansed him individually from corruption which was an impediment to his obtaining eternal life (392).

He shed his blood FOR HIMSELF, because he was mortal, inheriting death from Adam (399).

The antitype of MAKING AN ATONEMENT for the Holy Place in regard to Christ is the cleansing and redeeming him from Adamic nature utterly (704).

Christ, as a son of Adam, Abraham and David, must OFFER FOR HIMSELF for the PURGING of his own sin nature (711).

Having BY HIS OWN BLOOD obtained eternal life HIMSELF, he is able to save others (712).

Christ offered FOR HIMSELF, as well as for us (716).

He as the first one had to undergo PURIFICATION THROUGH HIS SHED BLOOD (719).

Brother Roberts said that it is ONLY on the "impossible supposition" that he was a "new Adam altogether" that we could say he did not need to shed his blood for himself (720).

* * *

It will readily be seen that by just quoting selected answers out of context, a very incorrect impression could be given of what brother Roberts said and believed. The answers which have been quoted to "prove" that, according to brother Roberts, Christ did not need a cleansing, bloodshedding are those where brother Andrew is trying to get him to consent to "imputed guilt" and/or Christ considered separate from his brethren.

When brother Roberts says (406), "Bloodshedding is never spoken of except *in connection with* actual sin," he is simply saying, as he says many times, that we cannot consider Christ as separate from the work for which he was specifically created and prepared. He is certainly not contradicting himself in connection with what he says so many times elsewhere about Christ needing a bloodshed sacrifice for the cleansing of his nature.

A debate is a time and pressure situation. There is no opportunity for full and balanced exposition. Brother Roberts had to constantly cope with brother Andrew's obsessive efforts to separate Christ from his mission, for the sake of his theory. A brother must be allowed to explain what he said and why he said it, and we must accept such an explanation, rather than set his words in one part of the debate against his words in other parts, and against his general teaching elsewhere.

Questions to ask those who do not seem clear on the
Sacrifice of Christ.

Did Christ Have To Offer For Himself First?

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

Did he have to offer for himself FIRST for HIS cleansing from the "Diabolos," "Sin's Flesh," "the Flesh of Sin," the "Exceeding great sinner Sin," "The Law of Sin and Death," the "Law in the members warring against the law of the

mind" — and THEN offer his own accomplished salvation to all who become part of him?

DENIAL of this is the very nub and essence of the Strickler error, as the Los Angeles ecclesia saw so clearly when it compiled the Ten Point Statement in 1940, particularly No. 5 of the Points of Truth to be upheld in fellowship —

"It was necessary that Jesus should offer FOR HIMSELF for the PURGING of his own nature, first, from the uncleanness of death, that having by his own blood obtained eternal redemption FOR HIMSELF, he might be able AFTERWARD to save to the uttermost those that come to God by him."

This is the real issue at stake. Let us keep bringing the consideration back to this. "Andrewism" is a side issue. What happens at baptism is a side issue. Let us get this central point of the Gospel of God clear *first*. Get this straight, and all the rest falls into place harmoniously.

Christ cleansed *himself* first, in the God-appointed way. His sacrifice cleanses and redeems US *only as we become* PART OF HIM. —See *Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 173

This is the emphatic teaching of brethren Thomas and Roberts over and over and over. This is the heart of the Sacrifice of Christ. This is the central issue that distinguishes the Truth from the Apostacy on this subject. This is the heart of the problem with those who cannot clearly see the scriptural picture of the Sacrifice of Christ.

Did he offer *as one of those needing the sacrifice*, as a REPRESENTATIVE; or did he offer merely on behalf of others, himself NOT needing it, that is, as a SUBSTITUTE? Brethren Thomas and Roberts are emphatic that the former is the truth, and the very *heart* of the truth concerning his sacrifice.

All animal sacrifices *typified* what needed to be done. He was not just another type. He actually DID in himself and for himself what needed to be done: overcome and destroy the Diabolos; offer the cleansing bloodshed sacrifice that God's wisdom had appointed for the cleansing of Sin's Flesh; and break out of the Law of Sin and Death that held all mankind, including himself, in bondage.

THEN he, and God through him, freely offered this victory and escape to all who completely deny *themselves*, and become part of him, enter INTO him, and to the fullest of their ability conform to his pattern and character. Where they fall short of his perfect victory, his blood continuously cleanses them through repentance and prayer and Divine loving forgiveness in mercy — IF they are giving their all and utmost to the service of God in thankful love.

Where do you stand on this vital, pivotal truth? The following are

the word-for-word, scriptural teachings of brethren Thomas and Roberts, cast into question form, with where to find them. Check every one carefully. Ponder each. Make sure you understand each. Take the time to look them up and check the context. Can you wholeheartedly answer YES to every one? Do those whom you fellowship understand and accept these truths? If not, you are losing, or have lost, the essential key to the knowledge of the Sacrifice of Christ — the vital Truth as so beautifully expounded by brethren Thomas and Roberts in their life-long, faithful labors.

(All from the *Christadelphian* are by brother Roberts himself, except the one by brother Thomas).

1. Did Christ offer “first for his own sins, and then for the people’s” (Heb. 7:26-27)?

2. Did Christ obtain eternal redemption and enter the Holy Place by his own blood (Heb. 9:12)?

3. Was it necessary for the heavenly things themselves (Christ) to be purified with better sacrifices — his own blood (Heb. 9:23)?

4. Did God bring Jesus from the dead through the blood of the Everlasting Covenant (Heb. 13:20)?

5. Will Christ in the Kingdom offer (memorial) sacrifices for himself (Ezek. 45:22)?

6. Was it necessary that Jesus should offer for himself for the purging of his own nature? —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 468

7. Was Christ’s sacrifice operative on himself first of all? —*Law of Moses*, chapter 10, page 90

8. Did Christ offer for himself first, and only “for us” as we may become part of him? —*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 173 (All *Law of Moses* quotes from 1946 edition).

9. Was Christ’s flesh purified by the sprinkling of its own blood? —*Catechesis*, page 12

10. Did Christ require purging from the Law of Sin and Death by his own sacrifice? —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 468

11. Was the Altar-Body on the tree sanctified by its shed blood? —*Eureka II*, page 224

12. Was Jesus the “heavenly things” purified by his sacrifice? —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 407

13. Was the Jesus-Altar purified by being sprinkled with sacrificial blood, and did Jesus enter the True through his own blood? —*Catechesis*, page 14

14. If one denies the need of Christ being purified by his own sacrifice, does this displace him from his position, destroy the reason for his being partaker of our common nature, and substitute the confusion

of the sectarian atonement? —*Christadelphian*, 1877, page 376

15. Was his sacrifice “for himself that it might be for us?” —*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 177

16. Is it true that God could not have condemned sin IN the flesh of Jesus if there were no sin there? —*Elpis Israel*, page 127

17. Is the *Diabolos* that Jesus destroyed the “exceeding great sinner SIN” in the sense of the Law of Sin and Death within ALL the posterity of Adam without exception? —*Eureka I*, page 249

18. Was the flesh of Christ the “filthy garments” with which the Spirit-Word was clothed — the “iniquity of us all” that was laid on him? —*Eureka I*, page 108

19. Does “Sin” in Paul’s argument stand for human nature with its affections and desires; and is to be “made sin” for others to become flesh and blood? —*Eureka I*, page 247

20. Were our iniquities “laid on him” by his being made of our nature? —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 400

21. Was the real “putting of sin” on the Lamb of God the bestowal of a prepared sin-body wherein to die? —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 462

22. Is the offering “for himself” by the Prince (Christ) in the Millennial Temple (Ezek. 45:22) a memorial of Christ’s offering for himself? —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 466

23. Is the word “sin” used in two principal acceptations in the Scripture: first, the transgression of the law, and second, the physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust? —*Elpis Israel*, page 126

24. Was it necessary that Christ should first of all be purified with better sacrifices than the Mosaic? —*Law of Moses*, chapter 10, page 91

25. Was the flesh of Christ cleansed by the blood of that flesh when poured out unto death on the tree? —*Eureka II*, page 224

26. Does an evil principle pervade every part of human flesh, so that the animal nature is styled in Scripture “sinful flesh,” that is, “flesh full of sin?” —*Elpis Israel*, page 127

27. Was Christ’s own shed blood required for his exaltation to the Divine nature? —*Christadelphian*, 1897, page 63

28. Did Christ take part of human nature that through death he might destroy the *diabolos*, or elements of corruption in our nature inciting it to transgression, and therefore called “SIN working death in us?” —*Eureka I*, page 106

29. Did Christ have to offer for himself? —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 405

30. Is *sin in the flesh* hereditary; and did it entail upon mankind as

the consequence of Adam's violation of the Eden law? —*Elpis Israel*, page 128

31. Was Christ's flesh "flesh of sin" in which "dwells no good thing?" —*Eureka I*, page 106

32. When God made Jesus "to be sin" (2 Cor. 5:21), does that mean He made him to be sinful flesh? —*Elpis Israel*, page 134

33. Did Christ offer for himself, first, by reason of his participation in Adamic mortality? —*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 555

34. Did the Spirit clothe Himself with weakness and corruption — in other words, "Sin's flesh's identity" — that He might destroy the *Diabolos*? —*Eureka I*, page 246

35. Is it true that the Devil was not destroyed *out* of Christ: he was destroyed *in him*. We have to get into Christ to get the benefit. In him *we* obtain the deliverance *accomplished IN HIM*? —*Christadelphian*, 1875, page 375

36. Is *Diabolos* a very fit and proper word to designate the Law of Sin and Death, or Sin's Flesh? —*Eureka I*, page 249

37. Did Christ "through the shedding of his blood enter into the spiritual state?" —*Christadelphian*, 1895, page 139

38. Is the Law of Sin and Death hereditary . . . and does the Law of Sin pervade every particle of the flesh? —*Elpis Israel*, page 137

39. Is it true that if Christ had not *first* obtained eternal redemption (Heb. 9:12), there would have been no hope for us, for we attain salvation only through what he has accomplished *in himself*, of which we become heirs by union with him? —*Christadelphian*, 1875, page 375

40. Was sinful flesh laid on Christ that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil, or *sin in the flesh*? —*Elpis Israel*, page 99

41. Was Jesus himself as the firstborn necessarily comprised in the sacrificial work he accomplished for his brethren? —*Christadelphian*, 1884, page 469

42. Is it true that these things (became sin for us, sin condemned in the flesh, our sins borne *in his body* on the tree) could not have been accomplished in a nature destitute of that physical principle styled "*Sin in the flesh*?" —brother Thomas, *Christadelphian*, 1873, page 361

43. Did Christ "offer for himself" . . . Did he obtain eternal redemption in and for himself, as the middle voice of the verb implies (Heb. 9:12) . . . Was he brought from the dead through the blood of the Everlasting Covenant? —*Christadelphian*, 1875, page 139

44. Was Christ purged by the blood of his own sacrifice? —*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 170

45. Is it true that "as a sufferer from the effects of sin, Jesus had

himself to be delivered from those effects: and as the mode of deliverance was by death on the cross, *that death was for himself FIRST?*" — *Christadelphian*, 1875, page 375

46. Is it true that condemnation has passed upon ALL men through Adam, and it cannot be annulled without sacrifice? *Christadelphian*, September cover, 1893

47. When it is testified that Christ was "made sin for us" (2 Cor. 5:21), can this only apply to his physical nature, which, drawn from the veins of Mary, was "made sin?" — *Christadelphian*, 1869, page 83

48. Was Jesus, though personally sinless, by constitution condemned, and had he therefore to offer *for himself* AND his brethren? — *Christadelphian*, 1873, page 405

* * *

The Scriptures and brethren Thomas and Roberts resoundingly answer YES! to all these questions, without reservation or evasion. Ask them of yourself: ask them of others. Test them by the Word and the sound teaching of the Pioneers.

Does it really matter? Are "Eureka and Elpis Israel back numbers"? Do we now just need a "few simple facts" (like the churches)? How sad that such questions should have to be asked! Christadelphians used to believe that this central foundation truth that distinguishes the Gospel of God on this subject from the Apostacy matters very, very much. What do YOU think?

In His Own Body

By brother John Thomas

Herald, 1860, page 12

WE do not deny the perfect sinlessness of Christ. We believe and teach that he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners" (Heb. 7:26), and that he was "in all points tried as we, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15). This was his *intellectual* and *moral* status.

Yet he was not perfect. This he says of himself, and therefore we may safely affirm it with him. He tells us that he was not perfected till the third day (Lk. 13:32), when he was perfected in recompense for his obedience unto death (Heb. 2:10; 5:9).

That which was imperfect was the *nature* with which the Logos, that came down from heaven to do the Father's will, clothed himself. That nature was flesh of the stock of Abraham, compared in Zech. 3:3 to "filthy garments," typical of the "infirmity with which he was compassed."

FOR this "infirmity" called "himself" — AND for all of the same infirmity associated with him by faith in the promises made with Abraham and David, and in him as the Mediator thereof — *he poured out his blood as a covering for sin.*

Upon this principle, "His own self bare our sins IN HIS OWN BODY to the tree" (I Peter 2:24). Sins borne *in a body* prove that body to be imperfect; and characterize it as "Sin's Flesh" (*sarx amartias*). Sin's Flesh is imperfect, and well adapted for the condemnation of sin therein.

Sin could not have been condemned *in the flesh* of angels; and therefore the Logos did not assume it: but clothed Himself with that of the seed of Abraham. Hence —

"The Deity sent His Own Son in the identity of SIN'S FLESH, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Romans 8:3).

This condemnation accomplished, the body slain was made alive again, and perfected, so that it now lives for the Aions of the Aions, as "the Lord the Spirit."

The Truth Concerning Christ's Offering For Himself First Made A Matter Of Fellowship In 1898

The following ecclesial news of May, 1898 is very much to the point. Brother Roberts, though traveling, was very much in charge of the magazine. Brother Walker says he did not publish controversial fellowship matter without brother Roberts' approval. This happened to be at the height of the Resurrectional Responsibility controversy, though not directly related. It is clear that neither brother Roberts nor brother Walker considered that the truth concerning Christ offering for himself was Andrewism. They totally opposed Andrewism: they totally approved this fellowship stand. The item is from Bournemouth, and is by brother G. S. Sherry, whom those familiar with the history of the events of these times will recognize as a prominent and sound brother: —

BOURNEMOUTH: "We have had trouble in our midst, which has resulted in division. Brother __ publicly proclaimed the doctrine that Jesus was not in a position requiring to offer himself as a sacrifice to secure his own redemption: that the sacrifice of Christ was required only to effect the salvation of actual transgressors. Jesus being no transgressor, for himself his sacrifice was not needed.

"This teaching **strikes at the root** of Scripture teaching of the condemnation of sin in the flesh, and also at the doctrinal basis upon which our ecclesia has been founded.

"It was necessary to meet this error in order to maintain the purity of the Truth. After private and collective effort, which proved fruitless, it was decided to re-affirm and define our doctrinal basis of faith upon this subject; and as to those who refuse to acknowledge and accept it, we feel duty bound from such to stand aside. The following propositions were submitted to every member of the ecclesia for acceptance —

"1. That the Scriptures teach: That Adam was created capable of dying, but free from the power of death; and when he disobeyed in Eden, he was condemned to death for that disobedience; and that He came under the power of death solely on account of this sin. That in consequence of this offense, all his descendants have been condemned to death, but without the moral guilt of his transgression attaching to them; and that those who are not actual transgressors die under the condemnation they inherit from their first parents.

"2. That the Scriptures teach: That Adam was created very good, and was then utterly devoid of that which the Scriptures style "sin in the flesh"; that from the time of his disobedience, and in consequence thereof, **he had sin in his flesh**; that sin in the flesh of his descendants, although not involving them in the moral guilt of Adam, has the power of death in them; that Jesus Christ, who was sinless as to character, by his sacrificial death and resurrection put away his sin nature (which was the only appointed means for the condemnation of sin in the flesh: that is, as a basis upon which it, the flesh, could be redeemed), and by which he destroyed the devil and death in relation to himself. That this destruction of sin and death by Jesus Christ has been made the basis of their future abolition in relation to all the righteous.

"3. That inasmuch as the forgoing scriptural 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 fellowshiping** all who believe that the descendants of Adam were not condemned to death on account of Adam's sin, or that **Jesus Christ's sacrificial death was not necessary to REDEEM HIMSELF** as well as others from that condemnation, until such time as they repudiate these anti-scriptural doctrines."

It was the same issue in 1923 with Stricklerism, but with brother Roberts gone action was not so sound. —G.V.G.

The Vital Issue

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

THE issue is not whether Christ “benefited” by his own sacrifice. That is obvious. He was obedient to the sacrificial death that God appointed, and as a consequence of his obedience he is now exalted and glorified. So it is obvious he “benefited” by his sacrifice. Even brother Strickler would readily have agreed to that.

The vital issue is: Did he **require** (by the appointment of God), a blood-shedding sacrifice for his own salvation **because** of his partaking of Adamic mortality, which is defiled (as a result of Adam’s sin and sentence) by the “Law of Sin in the members,” “the Diabolos,” “Sin in the Flesh,” etc.

And is **this** the essential link between him and us which makes **his** sacrifice effective for us as a representative of the whole race (and not a substitute)? And is it **this** which manifests and upholds God’s righteousness and holiness **IN** his death?

Was Sin — the Diabolos — condemned (judged, sentenced, put to death) **IN HIS FLESH** by the crucifixion of the Sin-Body on the tree? This is what brethren Thomas and Roberts teach, and teach as vital to a saving knowledge of the Sacrifice of Christ.

Where Is The Substance?

By brother Robert Roberts

“Four 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 imputativeness), how comes it that those sacrifices could never take away sins (Heb. 10:2)? And where then is the **SUBSTANCE** of the shadow?”—*Christadelphian*, 1873, page 462

Metonymy

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

“**METONYMY**” is not an alternate to reality. It does not mean mere shadow and type. It is simply the extension of one term to include a related aspect of the same entity. To say something is called something

"by metonymy" doesn't brush it away as a *fact*. The dictionary definition of "metonymy" is —

"The use of the name of one thing for that of another of which it is an attribute, or with which it is associated."

Sin, literally and primarily, is transgression of God's law. That is the root meaning, from which others flow. The term "sin" is *scripturally* extended by the process called "metonymy" (extending a name to include a related thing) to include the evil, corrupt, death-bringing principle in every cell and particle of human flesh — the *diabolos* — that causes all diseases and death and disharmony with God: and which normally (unless there is direct Divine interference, as in the unique case of Christ) will *inevitably* bring forth its fruits of actual transgression.

This evil principle in the flesh is both the *result* of sin, and the *cause* of sin, and therefore the Scriptures go to the root of the matter, and give the name "sin" to it (just as they call hate, "murder"; and lust, "adultery") — and they deal with all sin as an inseparable *totality*.

Actual transgression, and the evil principle that Paul calls "the Law of Sin in the members," (or "Sin in the flesh," or the *diabolos*) — are inseparable parts of the total sin constitution that Christ came to destroy and abolish. Therefore the Scriptures, which deal with roots and realities, and not mere superficial appearances, gives the same name to all: SIN.

"Metonymy" is not a magic word to change a Yes to a No, or a fact into not a fact. It is simply a description of a process, illustrated in this case by the Scriptures grouping together everything to do with sin under the name Sin.

When you see "metonymy," just remember "another name" — that's what it means — and in this case, a *scriptural*, God-given name.

To say it is "metonymy," doesn't change the *fact* that God (the Supreme and All-Wise Authority) gave the name "SIN" to the evil principle in all human flesh.

The Diabolos In Christ:

And Defeated And Destroyed In Him By The Sacrifice Of Sin's
Flesh Perfectly Overcome, And Crucified

By brother John Thomas

"In me — that is, in my flesh — dwelleth no good thing...I see a law in my members, warring against the law of my mind...the law of sin within my members." —Rom. 7:18, 23

He (Jesus) kept his body under, triumphing over its lusts.—*Eur* I:12

* * *

He (Zechariah) sees Joshua, the High Priest of the Restoration, angelized, and clothed in filthy garments. That is, he represents the Christ, in the capacity of Jehovah's Messenger, the "Angel of the Covenant," clothed with the "flesh of sin," in which, Paul tells us, "dwells no good thing" . . . While Zechariah was beholding, he saw the garments of Joshua the High Priest changed, and was instructed that the action represented the *putting away of iniquity* which the priest is supposed to bear. In this we see, by the light of the New Testament, *the change of nature*, or body, in relation to Christ, "whom," says Paul, "we know henceforth no more after the flesh." He was crucified "in the flesh," and then sin was "condemned in the flesh." —*Eureka* I:58

* * *

It (the body of Jesus) was not angel flesh or nature, but that common to the seed of Abraham, styled by Paul "*flesh of sin*," "in which," he says, "dwells no good thing" . . . His flesh was like our flesh in all its points — weak, emotional, and unclean . . . Sin, whose wages is death, had to be condemned *in* the nature that had transgressed . . . He took part of the same, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the *diabolos*, or elements of corruption in our nature inciting it to transgression, and therefore called "*Sin* working death in us." —*Eureka* I:106

* * *

Jesus is to be considered in two states . . . In the former state, the flesh was the "*filthy garments*" with which the SPIRIT-WORD was clothed (Zech. 3:2); the "*iniquity of us all*" that was laid upon him (Isa. 53:6). But as he now is, the filthy garments have been taken away, "*his iniquity has passed from him*," and he is clothed with change of raiment. —*Eureka* I:108

We note that, to bro. Thomas (and it is the Truth), the "iniquity of us all" that was laid upon him was the flesh of sin itself, the "filthy garments." This iniquity was laid on him — not merely "ritually" in shadow and type, but ACTUALLY in his being made ONE OF US, sharing our unclean, sin-in-the-flesh nature (with or without the hyphens, the TRUTH is the same). He was "made sin" that in himself he might destroy sin. This was his victory: rob him not of it.

* * *

Joshua, son of Josedec, a type of Jesus in the flesh, is first introduced as *clothed with filthy garments*, representative of the flesh with its propen-

sities and lusts. But when the type is changed to represent Jesus in Holy Spirit Nature, such as he acquired after resurrection, Joshua's raiment is represented as being changed. "Take away," says the Spirit, "the filthy garments from him." When this was done, then the Spirit addresses him and says, "I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment." —Eureka I:169

**"Filthy garments" and "iniquity" was the diabolos-Sin's
Flesh which he bore.**

* * *

Aaron wore the representations upon his person; Jesus bore them in himself. The gold represents the wisdom of a tried and precious faith; blue, a cleansing principle; purple, the element of the flesh; scarlet, the sin thereof; and fine twined linen, righteousness. These principles 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. —Eureka I:171

* * *

If the principle of corruption had not pervaded the flesh of Jesus, or if he were not flesh, he could not have been tried in all points as we; nor could sin have been condemned there; nor could he have "borne our sins IN his own body on the tree." —Eureka I:203

Here again, we note that the "principle of corruption" had to be in Christ's flesh in order for him to "bear our sins IN HIS OWN BODY." He did not bear them merely "ritually" — he bore them in being of the sin-cursed nature and in bearing sin-in-the-flesh. And he bore them AWAY in perfectly overcoming and defeating it, putting it to death, nailing it in condemnation to the cross.

* * *

The Spirit clothed Himself with *weakness and corruption* — in other words, "Sin's flesh's identity" — that He might destroy the "DIABOLOS." It is manifest from this the *Diabolos* must be of the same nature as that which the Spirit assumed; for the supposition that He assumed human nature to destroy a being of angelic nature, or of some other more powerful, is palpably absurd. The *Diabolos* is something, then, pertaining to flesh and blood, and the Spirit or Logos became flesh and blood to destroy it. —Eureka I:246

* * *

"SIN" is a word in Paul's argument (in Rom. 7) which stands for human nature, with its affections and desires. Hence, to "become sin," or for one to be "made sin" for others (2 Cor. 5:21) is to become flesh and blood. This is called "sin" or "Sin's Flesh," because it is what it is in

consequence of sin, or transgression. —Eureka I:247

* * *

This perishing body is “sin”; and left to perish because of “sin”. “Sin,” in its application to the body, stands for all its constituents and laws. The *power of death* is in its very constitution, so that the law of its nature is styled the “law of Sin and Death.” In the combination of the elements of the law, the power of death resides, so that “to destroy that having the power of death” is to *abolish this physical law of sin and death*, and instead thereof, to substitute the physical “law of the spirit of life,” by which the same body would be changed in its constitution, and live forever. —Eureka I:248

* * *

What is that which hath the power of death? It is the “exceedingly great sinner SIN,” in the sense of the “Law of Sin and Death” within all the posterity of Adam, *without exception*. This, then, is Paul’s *Diabolos*, which he says “has the power of death”; which “power” he also saith is “sin, the sting of death.”

But why doth Paul style Sin, *Diabolos*? The answer will be found in the definition of the word. *Diabolos* is derived from *diaballo* which is compounded of *dia*, a preposition which signifies “across, over”; and of *ballo*, “to throw, cast,” and intransitively, “to fall, tumble.” Hence *diaballo* is “to throw over or across”; and intransitively, “to pass over, to cross, to pass.” This being the signification of the parent verb, the noun *diabolos* is the name of that which “crosses, or causes to cross, or falls over.” DIABOLOS is therefore a very fit and proper word by which to designate the law of sin and death, or *Sin’s Flesh*. —Eureka I:249

* * *

Isaiah (6:5) saw the King of whom the Spirit afterwards said “Take away the filthy garments from him” — the filthy garments of flesh, styled his “iniquity” (Zech. 3:4). —Eureka II:19

* * *

As the Dead One, anointed with spices and bound with grave clothes, he (Jesus) was *Sin’s Flesh* crucified, slain and buried; in which by the slaying, sin had been condemned, and by the burial, put out of sight. —Eureka II:124

* * *

Jesus being set forth by the Deity a propitiatory for the remission of sins that are passed through faith in his blood (Rom. 3:25) exhibits him in relation to the believer as an Altar. The Word made flesh was at once the victim, the altar, and the priest. The Eternal Spirit-Word was the High Priestly Offerer of His Own Flesh, whose character was without spot — “holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners,” “who

knew no sin" — yet whose *nature was in all points like ours: Sin's Flesh* "in which dwells no good thing (Heb. 9:14, 7:26; 2 Cor. 5:21; Rom. 8:3; 7:18; Heb. 2:14-17).

The flesh made by the Spirit out of Mary's substance, and rightly claimed therefore (Psa. 16:8; Acts 2:31) as His flesh, is the Spirit's Anointed Altar, *cleansed by the blood of that flesh* when poured out unto death "on the tree." THIS FLESH WAS THE VICTIM OFFERED — THE SACRIFICE. Suspended on the tree by the voluntary offering of the Spirit-Word (Jn. 10:18), sin was condemned *in the flesh* when the soul-blood thereof was poured out unto death. The Spirit-Word made his soul thus an offering for sin (Isa. 53:10), and *BY IT sanctified the Altar-Body on the tree.* —Eureka II:224

* * *

Jesus was a man in the flesh common to all mankind, which is Sin's Flesh (Rom. 8:3) . . . If Jesus was not crucified in THE flesh common to us all, then "sin was" NOT "condemned *in the flesh*," as all the apostles taught. —Eureka II:624

* * *

Sin was condemned *IN the same flesh* that had transgressed in Paradise, so that *IN the crucified body* he bore the sins of his people upon the tree. —Eureka II:669

He bore his people's sins IN HIS BODY, not typically but actually in being of the same Sin's Flesh as they, and in the act of conquering and destroying it.

* * *

The subject of such a *nature*, however excellent a *character* he may be, or may have been, is materially defiled, or unclean. Therefore nothing born of a woman is clean, even though it have been begotten in her substance by the power of the Spirit (Job 14:4. Now, this is a principle of the knowledge revealed to us, and is of universal application. *It obtains in relation to Jesus himself.* Paul says (Gal. 4:4) the Son of the Deity sent forth "was made of a woman, made under the Law." *The body so made and born was therefore unclean materially and Mosaicly.* —Eureka III:586

* * *

The thigh and garment (of the Faithful and True One: Rev. 19:11-16) had been filthy; but their filthiness had been purged, or caused to pass away so thoroughly, that the garment was as raiment changed. The filthy garment was the Human Nature, which the Word of the Deity was clothed with in his flesh manifestation. —Eureka III:648

* * *

The flesh in or through which the Deity was manifested was — for

the brief space of 33 years, inferior to the angelic nature. It had been "purified" by the sprinkling of *its own blood* on the cross. —*Catechesis*, 12

* * *

When was the Jesus-Altar *purified*, the Jesus-Mercyseat *sprinkled with sacrificial blood*, and the Jesus-Holy of Holies *lustrated* (another word for "purified")? After the veil of his flesh was rent, and before he awoke at the early dawn of the third day. —*Catechesis*, page 14

* * *

Sinful flesh was laid upon him, "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil," or sin in the flesh (Heb. 2:14). —*Elpis Israel*, page 99

* * *

The word "sin" is used in two principal acceptations in the Scripture. It signifies in the first place "the *transgression* of law"; and in the next it represents that *physical* principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and 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." —*Elpis Israel*, page 126

* * *

"Sin" is a synonym for human nature. Hence the flesh is *invariably* regarded as *unclean* . . . This view of sin in the flesh is enlightening in the things concerning Jesus. The apostle says "God made him *to be sin* for us" . . . And this he explains by saying in another place that "He sent His Own Son *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, and for sin, condemned sin *in the flesh*." SIN COULD NOT HAVE BEEN CONDEMNED IN THE BODY OF JESUS-IF IT HAD NOT EXISTED THERE. —*Elpis Israel*, page 127

* * *

Sinful flesh being the hereditary nature of the Lord Jesus, he was a fit and proper sacrifice for sin. —*Elpis Israel*, page 128

Sin was condemned "ritually" and "ceremonially" IN Christ's flesh — not in the sense that it and its condemnation THERE were not realities — but that in being ACTUALLY condemned and destroyed there, it was condemned and (prospectively) destroyed in all his people, and for all time. Sin's condemnation in Christ's "flesh of sin" was not just another type or shadow: it was the climactic once-for-all REALITY which all the types and shadows represented, and without which they were meaningless.

As soon as we say there was no "sin" in Christ's flesh, and/or that the

sin in Christ's flesh did not need condemnation and cleansing away, we immediately make him a substitute instead of a representative, a shadow instead of a substance. The essence of the whole transaction is the REALITY of the sin there, and the REALITY of its destruction. Christ DID what all the sacrifices before him merely shadowed. He really and actually destroyed Sin — the Diabolos — and it had to BE THERE in order to be destroyed. It was not just a figure of speech, a type, a shadow, like all the preceding sacrifices.

This was his great victory. He did not just suffer. Lots of people suffer. He OVERCAME. He perfectly, flawlessly conquered, defeated, destroyed the Diabolos within himself: held it bound and powerless all his life, and nailed it in triumph to the cross. The death was the culmination and termination of the struggle and the victory; the perfecting of the essential life-long sacrifice and offering for all sin-stricken mankind, including himself. This is the very heart and power of the Truth of the Gospel of Salvation.

Many — mistakenly fearful of "defiling" and dishonoring Christ — make him just another shadow, destroy his struggle, and rob him of his victory, thrusting him back into the Mosaic rituals and ceremonies. They see a noble "sacrifice" in the shallow sense of the term, a heroic manifestation of selfless love, but they do not see the reality of the Diabolos — Sin-in-the-flesh — put to death within him.

Truly our sins were "laid on him" and he "bore them away." But HOW? Not in mere symbolic ritual, but in the reality of being part of the condemned race, of Sin's Flesh — contending lifelong with that same Diabolos within that slays his brethren. He was made ONE WITH US, in our sin-nature. He THUS "bore our sins IN HIS OWN BODY," that he might, for all (including himself) overcome sin, destroy it, bear it away — that we in turn may, in the deep wisdom and righteousness and loving mercy of God, be accounted ONE WITH HIM in his victory.

That which Christ actually ACCOMPLISHED in the perfection of the obedience of his life and death, is that which is SYMBOLIZED by animal sacrifices. He is the reality. That which is called "sacrifice" is simply the shadow representing that life and death — a shadow which has no meaning apart from the reality of what he accomplished.

The whole divine purpose of salvation from death — including Christ's own salvation as one of the condemned Adamic race — depended on someone doing just what he did . . . overcoming the diabolos and putting it to death: nailing it up in public condemnation

before all men to manifest and vindicate God's holiness and Sin's deadliness.

He did not just offer one more "sacrifice." Rather, he was IN HIMSELF everything that "sacrifice" means and teaches and (in shadow) "accomplishes," or, put more clearly, that which the sacrifices represented as being accomplished and needing to be accomplished.

All our conception and understanding of the meaning of "sacrifice" must be derived from WORKING BACKWARDS from his accomplished reality to the shadow. Apart from him and his work and his victory, sacrifice would have had no meaning or purpose, and would never have been instituted at all. —G.V.G.

"Sin" And "Sin-Offering"

Christadelphian, 1913-1915

THERE are four expressions scripturally applied to Christ that those who cannot accept the key truth concerning Christ's offering "first for himself" have difficulty with. We find these expressions treated very gingerly or laboriously explained away. They are: "sinful flesh," "sin in the flesh," "made sin," "our sins in his own body" (Rom. 8:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Pet. 2:24).

As brethren Thomas and Roberts so beautifully and satisfyingly explain, these passages reveal the very heart and meaning of Christ's sacrifice. To grasp their significance, as brethren Thomas and Roberts so robustly and soundly expound them, is the only way to get a clear understanding of that sacrifice, and to escape the orthodox confusion of "substitution" and "vicarious sacrifice."

We hope (perhaps next month) to point out brethren Thomas and Roberts' very forthright and robust expositions of these passages, as applied to Christ's purifying and redeeming offering for himself.

The following is on one of these passages. It appeared in the 1913-15 *Christadelphian Magazine*. It is clear and conclusive and very much to the point, on a vital first principle.

"HAMARTIA" and "PERI HAMARTIAS"

"God, sending His Own Son in the likeness of flesh of sin, and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3 RV and marg.).

"Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf; that

we might become the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. 5:21 RV).

Of all the lesser emendations made by the revisers of the N.T., none is more acceptable than that of Rom. 8:3. In this short passage are included the doctrines —

That sin is a constituent of the fleshly organization,*
That our Lord was constituted as to his physical nature in this likeness (compare 1 Cor. 15:49);
That he was sacrificed as a sin-offering; and
That since this sacrifice was of a Holy One who did no sin yet "died unto sin" (Rom. 6:10), sin became condemned in human nature, and so could be taken away from it — in the person of the risen Savior — with full satisfaction to the justice of God.

Some translators and expositors have not shown the same wisdom and knowledge as the revisers, but have allowed themselves to insert "sin-offering" in quite a number of passages *where the original does not warrant it*. Before we give examples, we will show upon what their action is based.

We are given to understand that "sin" and "sin-offering" are the same in the *Hebrew* of the O.T. These translators therefore assume that the same rule applies to the *Greek* of the N.T.: hence their errors.

The Greek for "sin" in these cases is *hamartia*. The translators of the Septuagint (LXX), faced with the need to render clearly in Greek what might be doubtful if translated literally, used the phrase *peri hamartias*, "concerning sin," to indicate "sin offering." Consequently, where they did not use this phrase, but rendered the Hebrew by *hamartia*, they made it clear that in such passages "sin" was meant.

One is sometimes directed to Hos. 4:8, as being a place where "sin" means "sin-offering," but RV, supported by LXX, makes it plain enough that the priests "fed on the *sin* of the people": they made sins a source of profit, like the Roman Church.

From its use in the LXX, *peri hamartias* became the current and proper expression in Greek, just as "sin-offering" is in English; whilst *hamartia* continued to be used for "sin." The revisers were therefore abundantly justified in their emendation in Rom. 8:3, and wherever else *peri hamartias* is found. Examples of this phrase in the LXX are found in Nm. 7:16 and Psa. 40:6; and in the Greek N.T. in Gal. 1:4 and Heb. 10:6, 8, 18, 26 — as well as Rm. 8:3.

The attempt, then, to force upon *hamartia* a meaning which it will

* Note this clear, forthright statement as applied to Christ's flesh: no fencing or equivocation.

not bear is to be condemned, and the consequent endeavor to foist unwarranted meanings on texts of scripture is to be resisted. Examples are (1) Heb. 9:28, "Apart from sin," wrongly rendered in Young's translation "Apart from a sin-offering," and (2) the second verse at the head of this article.

The force of the latter passage (2 Cor. 5:21) lies in the antithesis between sin and righteousness: that Jesus was, though sinless, constituted of our sinful nature in order that we, through him, might "become partakers of the divine nature." The erroneous rendering "made a sin-offering" (Diaglott, etc.) obscures the antithesis *and weakens the passage as a testimony to our Lord's nature.* —*Christadelphian*, Dec., 1913

* * *

The (above) Dec., 1913 article has aroused criticism from certain who hold the "clean-flesh" theory of the nature of the Lord Jesus. The article condemns their translation of *hamartia* in selected passages of the N.T. by "sin-offering." It states —

That thus to render the Greek word is to force on it a meaning it will not bear, and results in foisting an unwarrantable meaning on such texts as 2 Cor. 5:21 and Heb. 9:28;

That the correct Greek equivalent for "sin-offering" in the N.T. is *peri hamartias*;

That this phrase is derived from the Septuagint (LXX), which uses it as the Greek translation of the Hebrew word for "sin" when that word signifies, as it also does, "sin-offering."

The critic strenuously antagonizes these views, and invokes a number of "authorities" to his aid. Perhaps a brief rejoinder may not be out of place.

To begin with, some of these "authorities" deal with the meaning of the *Hebrew*, which is not in dispute, and has nothing to do with the matter. We will, therefore, not waste any space over these.

But others say that the Greek word *hamartia* alone, means not only "sin," but also "sin-offering." Parkhurst, Bullinger and Cremer amongst the theological lexicographers, Cruden and Stewart of the commentators, Robert Young and Benjamin Wilson from the translators, are all against us.

Well, we know enough of *commentators* to regard their views as of little or no weight. As to *lexicographers*, the lexicon which, perhaps alone, in English commands universal respect is "Liddell and Scott," and it *knows of no such meaning as "sin-offering" for hamartia.* Whilst as for *translators*, it should be enough to point out that the Revisers of the N.T., with all their ecclesiastical bias, with all the support of various transla-

tors, commentators and lexicographers, have not IN ONE SINGLE INSTANCE rendered *hamartia* "sin-offering." This is one of those "mountain facts" which are not to be removed by any amount of faith in translators and others with doctrinal axes to grind.

Another was appealed to about the meaning of *peri hamartias*. Far more satisfactory would it have been if my critic had asked his "undoubted Greek scholar" —

"Were the Revisers right or were they wrong in rendering this phrase 'offering (or sacrificed) for sin' in Rom. 8:3 and in Heb. 10:6, 8?"

For myself, I much prefer to trust the "undoubted Greek scholars" of the Revision Committee when they give us a translation *which tends to tell against their own theological views*. We may also here add that the "Handbook to N.T. Grammar," published by the Religious Tract Society, which cannot be accused of bias toward Christadelphian doctrine, says definitely, "*peri hamartias* . . . is sin-offering."

The greatest effort of criticism is directed against my statement that the LXX renders the Hebrew word by *hamartia* when it means "sin," and by *peri hamartias* when it means "sin-offering." The critic cites authorities and passages to prove *hamartia* is used for both, in precisely the same way as the Hebrew word. Let us see.

"Sin-offering" is represented some 55 times in the LXX. We are justified, therefore, in expecting — if *hamartia* alone is sufficient and adequate to translate the Hebrew word when it means "sin-offering" to find it frequently, if not almost invariably, so doing. The truth is, if the reading can be trusted (and it is not altogether beyond doubt), that *hamartias* is found (for sin-offering) only 5 times: twice in Lev. 4:21, 24; twice more in the next chapter with the genitive *hamartias* ["sin's" or "of sin"] as alternative reading; and once in Ex. 29:14 the genitive occurs unquestioned. More about these later.

In the meantime, to establish beyond cavil our own contention, we can point to OVER 40 instances, scattered through Lev., Num., 2 Chr., Ezra, Psa., Isa. and Ezek. of the use of *peri hamartias* to translate the Hebrew when "sin-offering" is meant. To vary the application of a sentence of my critic —

"We can see where the New Testament got the expression."

In point of fact, the very phrase itself is quoted by the apostle in Heb. 10:6, 8 from the LXX of Psa. 40:6.

But if the LXX uses the word "*hamartia*" *at all* for "sin-offering," does not that alone dispose of my contention? Not so. It most strongly *confirms* it by showing how the translators in their desire to be literal,

first essayed to make the word serve a double purpose*, despite the fact of it having *no such meaning as "sin-offering" amongst the Greeks themselves* (see *Liddell and Scott*), but quickly realized that to do so was to force their own Hebrew idiom on another language — an idiom which it could not tolerate.

Had the LXX translators been satisfied that *hamartia* alone was adequate to signify "sin-offering," they would not — we may be quite sure — have used it so *very rarely* (if, indeed, they used it at all), and then have dropped it altogether.

We have made allusion to the *genitive* form of the word, as though it conveyed a difference in meaning from the nominative *hamartia*, and so it does. In the passages referred to above (Lev. 4:21, 24 and Ex. 29:14), it marks as much difference as exists between "It is John" and "It is John's." So whereas in Lev. 4:24 the LXX reads when rendered literally into English, "It is sin," in the variant readings where the genitive occurs it means, "It is [something] in respect of sin" — truly a distinction with a mighty difference, and undeniable.

But even thus, the LXX translators deem to have recognized the weakness and imperfection, to say the least, of this rendering, for *after being used only three times it was abandoned for the unmistakable and idiomatic phrase "peri hamartias" and its slight variants.*

My critic quotes Cremer against us on Lev. 6:25. If he had looked up the passage for himself, he would have found that it gives *the very phrase for which we are contending.* And anyone who knows anything of Greek idiom will notice here the demonstration that *peri hamartias* is constituted a *definite technical phrase* to represent "sin-offering," since it is preceded by the article.

Our attention is also invited to Lev. 4:25, as an example of the use of *hamartia* alone for "sin-offering." And here again we find things other than as represented, for the phrase is *tou tes hamartias*, which means, "of the thing in respect of sin": once more, of course, "of the sin-offering." An abundance of examples of such a construction is found in the Scriptures. There is nothing in it to bolster up the notion that *hamartia* means "sin-offering," but much to the contrary.

Even were we snowed under with "authorities," the iron truth would remain as stated . . . "HAMARTIA" MEANS "SIN," and cannot be rendered "sin-offering" without doing it violence. The LXX recognized this

* But even then only in places where the real meaning could not possibly be mistaken, or where ambiguity did not matter. W.J.Y.

[And in the very few early cases where LXX appears to use "hamartia", for "sin-offering," is it not possible that they felt "sin" and not "sin-offering" was the meaning of the Hebrew in these places? See the comments at the beginning of the article about the meaning of Hosea 4:8].

truth, and therefore introduced and used in over forty places the phrase *peri hamartias* as the technical equivalent in Greek for the Hebrew word when it meant "sin-offering," in order to avoid all obscurity or ambiguity.

We may be certain also that the inspired writers of the New Testament would not be less clear in marking such an important difference in meaning.

And now these expositors and one-time fellow laborers want to turn back to obscurity and ambiguity, that by so doing they may gain some semblance of support for their views on the nature of the Lord Jesus in the days of his flesh. As we have already remarked, all such endeavors to foist unwarranted meanings on texts of Scripture are to be resisted. —*Christadelphian*, March, 1915.

SEVERAL things will be noted from the foregoing —

1. The Hebrew words for "sin" (ahshahm and chatahth) are also used for "sin-offering."

2. The Greek language does not have this peculiarity, and the LXX translators had to decide how to translate these words in their two meanings. They first ran into this problem in Ex. 29 and 30, and Lev. 4 and 5.

3. In two of the earliest places (Lev. 4:21, 24) they appear to have used the nominative hamartia (sin) for "sin-offering." In three more places (Ex. 29:14; Lev. 5:9, 12) they appear to have used the genitive hamartias (something in respect of sin). In all the other places (about 50), they appear to have settled on *peri hamartias* (concerning sin) wherever they decided the Hebrew word meant "sin-offering."

4. This expression (*peri hamartias*) occurs for "sin-offering" often in Lev. 4 and 5, and later.

5. In places they attached the article "the" to this expression, making it the name of something ("the thing concerning sin"), and giving it a definite technical meaning.

6. It is quite possible that in the very few places in question (4 maximum) that LXX employed the nominative (sin), they believed the meaning to be "sin" and not "sin-offering."

7. "Hamartia" in the N.T. (as in 2 Cor. 5:21 does NOT mean "sin offering," and should not be so rendered to suit a theory. It means "sin": Christ was "made sin.")

8. Those who published the *Christadelphian Magazine* in 1913-15 recognized and believed this truth, and considered it important in the defense of the Truth.

9. Some who had formerly been in fellowship were strenuously arguing for "sin offering" in such passages as 2 Cor. 5:21 and Heb. 9:28 in order to support the Clean Flesh theory. This error, in its various

forms and degrees, is not new: it is one of the oldest and most dangerous.

If brethren and sisters are not prepared to put away their toys, and make the effort to look into these things as their life's interest, and take them seriously, and defend them, the Truth will soon be lost. Don't leave it all lazily to your leaders, like the religious world does. Christadelphians used to be deeply and individually interested in these truths so vital to their salvation. They used to be, in truth, the "People of the Book." As the current generation of leaders notes with apparent amazement, the brethren and sisters of 100 years ago wouldn't dream of going on a vacation without taking Eureka with them. They didn't go to play, but to be spiritually refreshed. Is it too much to hope that there are still many such today? —G.V.G.

Brother Thomas' Work

By brother Robert Roberts

IF God had not raised up in this century such a man as Dr. Thomas, our generation would have been stumbling on in the inherited fogs which have entirely hidden the teaching of the Bible from view, while glorifying the Bible itself in a certain sentimental way.

It does not appear that the understanding of the Bible has been attained in any other channel. There is a deal of writing about the Bible, and a deal of smattering in connection with separate and scattered points involved in Bible things.

But where, outside of his work in our day, is to be found that complete mastery of the whole Scriptures, from *Genesis to Revelation*, which renders the work of God through Israel from the beginning a consistent, connected and progressive thing: which not only does not require the help of human philosophy, but which cannot endure the admixture of it, without being spoiled?

We know not its like in any current system or movement, or in the hands of any teacher or institution of modern life anywhere. If others know of it, we'd be delighted to be introduced — with the liberty, however, of thorough independent inspection. We know enough of shams and echoes and abortions to make us very chary. —November, 1891

These inescapable truths are very galling to modern Athenians who call themselves brethren, and who wish to denigrate the sound labors and laborers of the past so they can theorize and speculate. The

modern suggestion that brother Thomas did not expound Genesis 1 and the book of Revelation correctly reveals an ignorance of the saving Truth he brought to light. —G.V.G.

Jesus And Sin In The Flesh

By brother Robert Roberts

THE article in the *Christadelphian* for March, 1869 continues to represent our convictions on the subject of which it treats, namely, the *relation of Jesus* to the condemnation which we all inherit from Adam.

On some details, however, of that general subject, we should if we were writing it again express ourselves more explicitly, in view of the searching controversy which has arisen on the subject of sin in the flesh. We should guard ourselves against forms of expression which seem to favor the false ideas that have come to be advocated.

In asserting, for instance, that there was no change in the nature of Adam in the crisis of his condemnation, we should add that though his nature continued of the order expressed in the phrase "living soul," *a change occurred in the CONDITION of that nature through the implantation of death*, as recognized in the article in question (p. 83, col.2, line 15) in the statement that death ran in the blood of Mary.

And on the subject of *sin in the flesh*, while retaining the declarations on page 83, as regards the operation of our moral powers, we should add that *the effect of the curse was as defiling to Adam's nature as it was to the ground* which thenceforth brought forth briars and thorns. And that therefore, after transgression, there was a *bias in the wrong direction which he had not to contend with before transgression*.

Our mind has not changed on the general subject, but some of its details have been more clearly forced on our recognition by the movements and arguments of heresy. —*Christadelphian*, October, 1877

Christ's Self-Cleansing, Self-Perfecting Sacrifice

By brother Robert Roberts

We must become part of him to benefit from his own redemption

The "Simple Facts," According To Bro. Roberts

WE have only to receive the simple facts testified in the case to reach the

end of all difficulty. 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, dishonor 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. 2:10) — but *he was not perfect till he was through it*. He was saved from death (Heb. 5:7) — but *not until he died*. He obtained redemption (Heb. 9:12) — but **NOT UNTIL HIS OWN BLOOD WAS SHED**.

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. He is, as it were, a new center of healthy life, in which *we must become incorporate* before we can be saved. —*Law of Moses*, ch. 18, page 172-3.

This is indeed the “simple facts” of the glorious Truth that brother Thomas providentially resurrected. Christ actually *did in himself* what was required for the destruction of the diabolos, and the cleansing from sin of the defiled and condemned human nature. He offered the divinely required, perfect, life-and-death sacrifice foreshadowed in Eden, and he **THEREBY “obtained eternal redemption” and was “made perfect.” We share that accomplishment **ONLY** by becoming *part of him* and being covered by him — absorbed into him. This is The Truth. The only alternative to it is the old orthodox substitutionism — in one or other of its many ancient or modern guises. Let us faithfully preserve this precious heritage of Truth. — G.V.G.**

For Himself That It Might Be For Us

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

THIS is from the August 1913 *Christadelphian*. It begins with a long quotation from brother Roberts.

THE statement of Paul (Heb. 7:27) is that Christ did “once” in his death what the high priests under the Law did daily, namely, offered

"first for his own sins, and then for the people's." But there is all the difference between the two cases that there always is between shadow and substance. Christ's "own sins" were not like the sins of the priests: they were not sins of his own committing. He was without sin, so far as his own actions were concerned.

Yet as the bearer of the sins of his people — whether "in Adam" or otherwise — he stood in the position of having these as "his own," from the effects of which he had himself first to be delivered. Consequently, HE OFFERED FIRST FOR HIMSELF. He was the first delivered. He is "Christ the first fruits." He obtained eternal redemption in and for himself, as the middle voice of the Greek verb *euramenos* (Heb. 9:12) implies. The "for us" is not in the original: RV omits it. He was —

"Brought again from the dead through the blood of the Everlasting Covenant" (Heb. 13:20).

But this offering for himself was also the offering for his people. The two aspects of the double typical offering were combined in one act. He had not twice to offer for himself —

"By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14).

Yet, though combined, the two relations of the act are visibly separate. Christ was the first saved from death (Heb. 5:9) —

"Afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming" (I Corinthians 15:23).

In this way the Mosaic type has its counterpart.

There is no inconsistency whatever between these facts and the constant declaration that Christ "died for us." ALL that Christ was and did was "for us." It was "for us" he was born; "for us" he bore sin; "for us" he came under the curse of the Law; "for us" he died. And the fact that personally he was without sin where all were transgressors, gives all the more point to the declaration.

It is "for us" that he came to be in the position of *having first to offer FOR HIMSELF*. The "for us" does not deny that what he submitted to "for us" was our own position —

"He was MADE SIN for us who knew no sin" (2 Cor. 5:21)
— and does not sin require an offering?

The matter might be simplified by supposing the case were leprosy instead of sin; and the cure to be passing through fire instead of death. But that the fire should only possess the power of cure where the disease existed without the virus of the disease; and that in all other cases the effect of the fire should be to destroy. Let the leprosy be death in the constitution, brought about by sin; and the virus, actual sin itself.

By this illustration, all mankind are under the power of leprosy,

which cannot be cured by the fire, owing to the presence of the combustible virus, which will catch fire and destroy the patient. If only one could be found free from the virus, he could go through the fire and save the rest: but he cannot be found.

God interposes, and produces such an one among them, one in whom the *leprosy exists without the virus*, that the rest may be cured by joining hands with him after he has gone through the fire. He goes through the fire "for them," but is it not obvious that he goes through it *for himself* in the first instance? For if he is not delivered from the leprosy first, how will his going through the fire avail them?

It is "for himself that it might be for them." He is NOW "separate from them," but he *was not so in the first instance*. —brother Roberts, 1875, page 139

* * *

The foregoing was written by brother Roberts in answer to a correspondent in the *Christadelphian* for 1875, page 139. At that time there had been much controversy concerning the Sacrifice of Christ, and some had introduced old errors that in effect denied that Jesus Christ came in the flesh. The doctrine became known some 40 years ago by the term *Renunciationism*, because the promulgators printed and published a document "*renouncing*" their previous views in favor of their supposed new discovery. This new discovery was really only a bit of old "philosophy and vain deceit, which speedily gave the lie to Christ himself. Thus one asked a —

QUESTION: *What is meant by Adam's posterity?*

And he supplied the —

ANSWER: *Every human being who has been born of two human parents.*

Therefore, in the writer's judgment, Jesus was not of Adam's posterity. Yet Jesus himself is at pains to emphasize the fact that he is "the Son of Man." Here are some more examples of this false philosophy —

"Jesus not having Adam for his father, he was not involved in Adam's transgression."

"Jesus Christ was not a son of Adam, but a second Adam made in the nature of the first Adam."

And so the "philosophy" of 40 years ago gave Jesus a "free life," "unforfeited," and affirmed he was UNDER NO NEED OF SACRIFICIAL REDEMPTION HIMSELF. Thus there was proposed the —

QUESTION: *Was the sacrifice of Christ an offering for himself?*

And there was given the —

ANSWER: *No.*

This same ERROR is cropping up again in various parts of the

world, and in *The Shield* (Sidney) for June a determined attempt is made to re-introduce it. It is actually and strenuously denied that Heb. 7:27 applies to Jesus at all! And this three times over by three brethren in this one issue. A. J. Webb says (page 101) —

"We make the assertion that there is not a passage of Scripture in the whole Bible that says that Jesus offered up sacrifice first for his own sins and then for the people's."

R. Irving says (page 104) —

"It does not say that 'Jesus' offered up sacrifice 'first for his own sins and then for the sins of the people.'"

J. Bell says (page 105) —

"No apostle ever said any such thing."

Now this is a DIRECT DENIAL OF SCRIPTURE, and, as such, is to be resisted. How brother Roberts viewed the passage is seen from the above extract. And that that view is the *only* right and scriptural one should be apparent to honest and impartial discernment. Look again at Heb. 7:27 —

"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."

Who "offered up himself"? Jesus. Who did this once? Jesus. What is "this" that he did once? — "Offered up sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the people's."

But did not the Levitical high priests so? Yes, "daily" in the type. But Jesus is he "who needeth NOT *daily* as those high priests" so to do, "for this he did *once*" in antitype.

Look again: the "who" with which v. 27 opens relates to the same person as the "who" of the preceding v. 26 —

"who is holy, harmless, undefiled."

And this in turn relates to the "he" of the preceding v. 25 —

"He is able to save to the uttermost . . . he ever liveth."

And this again relates to "this man" of v. 24: "This man . . . continueth ever."

And this of course is none other than "Jesus" of v. 22. Who can deny it? And if you attempt to deny it, you *destroy the correspondence between type and antitype*, and present us with an antitypical high priest who himself needed no redemption. This did the Renunciacionists of 40 years ago. And the utterances we now complain of are only too sadly in harmony with some of those of so long ago. Thus R. Irving says (*Shield, June, page 104*) that the Aaronic high priest —

"had first to cleanse himself from sin. This he did. Then he was a perfect representative of that spotless Lamb of God who needed

NOT to first cleanse himself by sacrifice from sins which he had committed, for he knew no sin."*

He does not perceive that in that "not" he has *destroyed the correspondence* between type and antitype, and *denied the Scripture*. And that, in the insertion of the words "which he had committed" he has very wrongly introduced an ambiguity with the effect of beclouding the issue.

We have never heard of a Christadelphian who contemplated "sins which he (Jesus) had committed," and therefore such an idea should not be introduced. But that *Christ needed to be cleansed from "sins" by sacrifice is here testified in the Word of God*. The flesh is "this corruptible," and from this Christ was delivered "through death" (Heb. 2:14; 5:7-9; 7:27-28; 9:12-26; 13:20). It is NOT correct to say —

"It was for us he died. It is always 'for us,' 'on our account':
never for himself."

Of course it was "for us," as we all most thankfully believe. But if that "never for himself" be logically adhered to, then Christ is not the "first-fruits," the "first-born," but a being superior to human nature, and needing no redemption. The *truth* is, as above defined, that the sacrifice of Christ, WAS "for himself" that it might be "for us." —Editor, *Christadelphian Magazine*, August, 1913, page 339.

* * *

The "*Christadelphian Magazine*" of April, 1902, page 148 contains the following —

Question: Does Heb. 7:27 teach that Jesus offered for his own sins?

Answer: Yes: it says so plainly. But you must remember that the reference is to the antitypical fulfillment of the high-priestly offerings under the Law, which was —

"A shadow of good things to come, and not the very image itself" (Heb. 10:1).

Jesus was in character sinless, and he "bare the sin of many" only in the sense of BEARING THEIR NATURE in obedience to death, even the death of the cross. He —

"carried up our sins IN HIS OWN BODY to the tree, that we being dead to sin should live unto righteousness" (1 Peter 2:24).

This is an inspired definition and comment.

* * *

And this occurs in the *Christadelphian*, Dec., 1910, pages 538, 547 —

* This is practically word-for-word for what we have heard just recently.

All the priests under the Law were sinners in the sense of being transgressors of the Law. Christ was not so. Yet —

“*THIShe did once... offer... first for his own sins*” (Hebrews 7:27).

What is *meant* is explained in a later part of the same wonderful expository epistle (13:20) —

“The God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus . . . *through the blood of the Everlasting Covenant.*”

God required the Lord Jesus to lay down his life in sacrifice, and through that “one offering” he was *himself* redeemed from death as the “firstfruits” . . .

That Christ had to offer for himself is testified in Heb. 2:27. The reason why is revealed: that he might *himself be saved* by his own blood (Heb. 13:20; 5:7). Though in character sinless, he inherited the sin-nature from his mother, and therefore *needed redemption from death*. Christendom has altogether lost sight of this truth.

* * *

The *Christadelphian*, October, 1907, page 459, reprints these statements by brother Roberts, originally appearing in the *Christadelphian* of September, 1896, page 339, concerning the same errors in Australia about which a later editor writes in 1913, as quoted above —

God’s method for the return of sinful man to favor 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. 8:3).

“Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the devil” (Heb. 2:14).

“Who his own self bare our sins IN HIS OWN BODY to the tree” (1 Pet. 2:24).

“Our old man is crucified with him, that the BODY OF SIN might be destroyed” (Rom. 6:6).

“He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:15).

“Be of good cheer, I have OVERCOME THE WORLD” (John 16:33).

“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation thru faith in his blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past thru the forbearance of God: to declare, I say, at this time, His righteousness, that He might be just, and the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus” (Rom. 3:25-26).

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 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. 5:7-9).

“By his own blood he entered once into the Holy Place, HAVING OBTAINED ETERNAL REDEMPTION” (Hebrews 9:12).

“The God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus . . . THROUGH THE BLOOD OF THE EVERLASTING COVENANT” (Heb. 13:20).

As the antitypical 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 honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest” (Heb. 5:3).

“Wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer” (Heb. 8:3).

“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” (Hebrews 7:27).

“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. 9:23).

(End of quotes from old *Christadelphian Magazines*.)

It is notable that even brother Carter — who was quite vague* on the

* In a “battle of quotations” (which he deprecates), he brings forward some irrelevant quotations from brethren Thomas and Roberts, and brushes aside relevant ones.

subject of the Sacrifice of Christ in all his Australian statements, reducing the Adamic defilement to merely that of conscience (C. C. Addendum), and ridiculing brother Thomas' (*Elpis Israel*, page 126-127) sound definition of the two-fold use of "Sin" in the Scriptures (Unity, page 32, 62, 63), and accusing the Bereans of "Andrewism" for agreeing with brethren Thomas and Roberts — it is notable that at an earlier time he was quite clear in his book "*Hebrews*" that Christ had to offer for his own cleansing from the defilement of the sin-nature. He says in Hebrews 9:12 (page 95) —

"It has many times been pointed out (*Blood of Christ*, page 9; *Law of Moses*, pages 91 and 172) that the italicized words "for us" in the AV are an unwarranted addition. They are omitted by RV. If any words are added, they should be "FOR HIMSELF" — but the fact that *he obtained* eternal redemption involves this.

"And here it may be remarked that *he needed redemption*: otherwise how could it be said that he "obtained" it? And it was *by his own blood that he obtained it*. He was himself a sharer in the effects of his own sacrifice, because he was a member of a race that is mortal because of sin."

Again on Hebrews 9:12 (pages 102-104) —

"The 'heavenly things' is a phrase denoting Christ and those who are redeemed by him . . . It is important to observe that these 'heavenly things' *stood in need of cleansing*, and undoubtedly Christ is part of the heavenly things."

Then he approvingly quotes brother Roberts (*Law of Moses*, page 92)

"There must therefore be a sense in which Christ (the antitypical Aaron, altar, mercyseat, 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*...

"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 sacrifice"? . . .

"All (the Mosaic patterns) were both atoning and atoned for. There is no counterpart to this if Christ is kept out of his own sacrifice. He CANNOT be so kept out, if place is given to all the testimony — an express part of which is that, as the sum-total of things signified by these patterns, *he was 'purified with' a better sacrifice than bulls and goats* — his own sacrifice.

"If he was 'purified,' there was something to be purified from: what was it? Look at his hereditary taint, as the son of Adam, through whom death entered the world by sin, and there is no difficulty."

(End quotes from brother Carter's "Hebrews").

* * *

It is not a matter of "atonement," in the orthodox sense of the term. That just befogs the issue. It is CLEANSING, PURIFICATION, as brother Roberts points out. "Atonement" is a misleading, confusing, ecclesiastical word. It has acquired unscriptural connotations from which it is impossible to separate it in the average mind. It is not a scriptural term. It occurs only once (erroneously) in the AV of the New Testament, and not at all in the RV. In the O.T. it is used in our versions incorrectly and confusingly for redemption, purifying, cleansing and covering. It is far better to stick to these scriptural terms and ideas. This will clear the Sacrifice of Christ of much confusion and contention.

"Atonement" expresses the orthodox idea of the Sacrifice of Christ: paying a penalty, Christ receiving the punishment due to sinners, so sinners can go free.

* * *

These quotations are not endorsements of subsequent editors who followed brother Roberts. They are simply given as evidence that on this vital point they held fast to the original sound and scriptural Christadelphian foundation, as indeed any must do if they wish to use the Christadelphian name legitimately. Those who have a new doctrine should adopt a new name, in all fairness and honesty.

There are really no *new* crotchets, no *new* errors. That Christ did not offer for himself is listed as an error that had already troubled the Brotherhood over 100 years ago (*Christadelphian*, Dec., 1873, page 542). Sound brethren have been fighting it ever since.

In the wisdom of God, error is necessary, and has a useful purpose. It throws the Truth into sharper focus, and it gets brethren thinking and studying the sound writings of the pioneers. Otherwise the tendency in these easy and treacherous days is to go to sleep to the tune of the TV and the Disneyland.

It is a very dangerous sign when anyone says: "Let us not consider what brethren Thomas and Roberts say: let us forget them and just stick right to the Scriptures." It has a very noble and high-sounding ring, but it usually means: "I have a 'new' theory to propound that is different from the sound and established Christadelphian beliefs."

Christadelphians have understood and believed and taught the Truth for over 100 years, and have repeatedly repudiated all the errors.

It is therefore foolishness at this late date to ignore the soundness and stability of the past, and keep starting over to see if we can find the Truth.

To say Christ did not offer for himself is to deny the very heart of all Christadelphian belief from the beginning. This is the fundamental difference between substitutionary orthodoxy and scriptural truth. We believe brethren Thomas and Roberts and the brethren of the past were right, and those wrong who deny Christ's need of purification and redemption through sacrifice. The Sacrifice of Christ is the very core of the Truth. And his one-ness with the condemned, sin-cursed race is the nucleus on which the Truth of salvation is built.

Those who say Christ did not offer for himself repudiate the scriptural Christadelphian Christ of brethren Thomas and Roberts and of the whole Body for over 100 years: the Christ who (as these brethren so beautifully open up and manifest) —

"Was brought from death by the blood of the Everlasting Covenant" (Heb. 13:20).

"By his own blood obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12).

Was the central reality of all the "heavenly things" that were "purified by better sacrifices than those of Moses' Law" (Heb. 9:23).

As the antitypical High Priest, "offered first for his own sins and then for the people's" (Heb. 7:27).

As the great Prince-Priest in the Age to Come offers a memorial "sin offering for himself and for all the people." —Ezek. 45:22

Destroyed the Diabolos in his death by nailing the sin-body to the tree (Heb. 2:14).

Battled the "law of SIN IN HIS MEMBERS," and perfectly overcame and subdued it; and was forever cleansed from it by his perfect, life-long life-and-death sacrifice culminating in the final obedience of Calvary — the final, once-for-all fulfillment and REALITY of all the typical sacrifices: the true "sacrifice" (holy work) which God required for the redemption of ANY mortal son of Adam.

He did not just go through one more typical, shadowy, powerless ritual, as those say who claim he did not offer for himself. They must come out of the shadows and perceive the glorious *reality* of what he did. He alone achieved immortality thru a *real* SACRIFICE: even his *WHOLE life and death* laid on the divine altar —

"Sacrifice (ritual) Thou wouldst not, but a BODY Thou hast prepared me" (Heb. 10:5).

He accomplished in himself and FOR himself what God demanded for human salvation: a perfect sacrifice of self – absolute and entire; and

the death that completed and crowned it cannot be separated from the life of perfection that gave it its God-pleasing, purifying power. It was by this REAL life-sacrifice that HE was saved, and all who, in God's mercy, are allowed to get INTO him.

In his death Christ manifested and vindicated God's holiness, because the Body of Sin was publicly repudiated and crucified. If you say that the diabolos-law-of-sin-in-the-members of every descendant of Adam is not scripturally "sin", then you have no "body of sin" to be repudiated and crucified, no manifestation of God's holiness and righteousness in Christ's death: no "sins IN his own body" to be borne to the tree. You have just one more powerless type, shadow, ceremony, pattern, ritual, foreshadowing: *no final, once-for-all REALITY.*

Those who say that Christ's glorious, total life-and-death offering to God was not for his own purifying and perfecting repudiate all the teachings of brethren Thomas and Roberts on the subject, and go back to the dark, orthodox, substitutionary, vicarious Christ who was just one more empty, powerless type like the endless stream of animals before him, just ritually and imputedly (but not *really*) "being MADE SIN."

If Christ was not *actually* "made sin," if he did not "bear our sins IN HIS OWN BODY," then sin was not put to death on the cross. It was just one more shadow of what *needed* to be done, but not the glorious, triumphant, actual DOING of it.

Some apparently can only see cold, dead, legal ritual in this glorious life-sacrifice, missing all the mortal conflict and the terrible reality of the enemy.

God is not interested in ritual as such, but in reality. Ritual never *accomplishes* anything. Ritual, yes, for those who by a ceremony unite themselves, or express their union, with the reality (but even then there must be the *reality* in the personal life for the ritual to be acceptable to God).

But in the case of Christ — who was the *fulfillment* of all preceding foreshadowing ritual and of all succeeding memorial ritual, and who concentrated in himself the once-for-all *accomplishment* of all that has ever been or ever will be ritualized — there must be more than ritual.

There must be the living substance to which the ritual points: there must be the ACTUALITY. And that actuality was the overcoming and putting to death of Sin's Flesh, the Diabolos: the perfect, lifelong, victorious sacrifice by which he "obtained redemption," was "made perfect," was the "heavenly things purified," was "brought again from the dead."

We miss all the power and beauty of the Psalms* if we cannot see in them his lifelong battle with the Diabolos — his “sin” that constantly assailed him, but to which he never for a moment gave way. When we realize that anything short of perfection is sin, and any tendency or temptation to render less than perfection is enticement to sin, then we begin to understand his conflict and his victory.

For directing our minds to these glorious and saving truths, we have to humbly thank the God-given discernment of brethren Thomas and Roberts. Let us never lose them and slip back into dark orthodoxy. The easy and natural reaction is —

Does it really matter? Is it important? It will cause contention. It may divide us. We are all one big happy family. ‘Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.’ Why agitate the Body?”

The majority have always followed this pleasant and downward path. We see disturbing trends of it today, as “required” beliefs get more and more rudimentary, and shallowness is glorified as progress and “simplicity.” The “contentions” of the past, which kept the Truth pure and the Body healthily awake, are being deprecated as “contentiousness,” and pabulum is prescribed in place of strong meat: “If you can’t stomach Eureka, read “Beside the Brook.”

Shallowness and “simplicity” and harmony-through-apaty might be fine, if there were no errorists to eat at the foundations. But there always are. So the Truth must be contended for, and kept sharp and clear. The “Let us have peace” approach is at best precarious in its rootless instability. God demands, and simple wisdom mandates, depth and foundations. This should be our life’s only real interest. We haven’t time for anything else. It’s so easy for the Truth to slip away. There’s safety only in rock-deep foundations.

An Excerpt From

Eureka

Volume 1, pages 245-249

By brother John Thomas

But while we repudiate the clergyman’s devil as a mere phantasma of disordered brains, we by no means deny the existence of what is styled *diabolos* in the scriptures. Our proposition at this point is, that *the*

* As brother Roberts beautifully expounds in many places: “Slain Lamb,” “Blood of Christ,” etc.

Devil of the clergy is not the Diabolos of scripture. This is easy to be seen by taking their representation of the devil as the definition of the word, and trying to expound the scriptures in which devil is mentioned thereby. Take, for instance, Heb. 2:14, where it is written, "Therefore for as much as the children (given of the Deity to the Son for brethren) partook of flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner shared in the same, that through the death (he accomplished) he might destroy that *having the power of death, that is, THE DIABOLOS.*" Now, Paul elsewhere informs us that "Jesus was crucified through weakness" (2 Cor. 13:4); and the clergy teach that their *diabolos*, or devil, is second only to their Trinity in power — almost, if not quite, omnipotent; at all events, powerful enough to hold in eternal captivity and torture the vast majority of the human beings God has made. He either holds them with God's consent or against it; if he hold them with it, God and the Devil are made copartners; and God is made by their traditions to have created an enormous multitude of men, women, and children for no other destiny than eternal torments; which gives the lie to the scriptures, which teach that "God is love:" if the Devil hold "the damned" against God's consent, then the Devil is more powerful than God! But, the clergy are unwilling to accept the consequences of their own theories. They would not like to admit the copartnership, nor the superior strength of their Devil; though upon their premises one or the other is unavoidable. They will admit, however, that their father and patron, the Devil, is vastly powerful. This is admission enough to illustrate the incompatibility of their traditions with scripture. Thus, *How comes it that the Spirit laid hold upon death-stricken and corruptible flesh and blood, which is so weak and frail, called "the Seed of Abraham," that through its death he might destroy so mighty and powerful a Devil?* Would it not have been more accordant with the requirements of the case for him to have combated with him unencumbered with flesh, or in the spirit-nature of angels? Became weak and dead to destroy the mighty and the living; when the Creator of the Devil could with a word annihilate him! But there is as little reason as scripture in "the depths of Satan" as the clergy teach; and therefore it would be mere waste of time and space to occupy ourselves any further with their speculations and traditions upon this subject.

The Spirit clothed himself with weakness and corruption — in other words, "Sin's flesh's identity" — that he might destroy the *Diabolos*. It is manifest from this the *diabolos* must be of the same nature as that which the Spirit assumed; for the supposition that he assumed human nature to destroy a being of angelic nature, or of some other more powerful, is palpably absurd. The *Diabolos* is something, then,

pertaining to flesh and blood; and the Spirit or Logos became flesh and blood to destroy it.

Now, whatever flesh-and-blood thing it may be, Paul says that "it hath *the power* of death" — that is, it is the power which causes mankind to die. If, then, we can ascertain from Paul what is the power or cause of death, we discover what the thing is he terms the Diabolos; for he tells us that the Diabolos has the power of death.

Well, then, referring to Hos. 13:14, where the Spirit saith, "I will ransom them from *the power* of the grave," Paul exclaims, in view of this deliverance as the result of a price paid, "O Death, where is thy *sting*? O Hades, (sheol, or grave,) where is thy victory?" The power of a venomous serpent to produce death lies in its "*sting*;" therefore Paul uses "*sting*" as equivalent to "*power*;" hence his inquiry is, "O Death, where is thy power?" This question he answers by saying, "The sting (or power) of death is SIN, and the strength of sin is the law." That the power of death is sin, he illustrates in his argument contained in his letter to the saints in Rome. In Rom. 5:12, he says, "*Death by sin*." He does not say, "By the Devil sin entered into the world;" if he had, this would have given "the Devil" existence before Sin: but he says, "By one man, or Adam, sin entered into the world." This agrees with Moses, who tells us that there was a time after the creation was finished when there was nothing in the world but what was "very good" — "and Elohim saw *all* that He (the Spirit) had made, and behold, it was very good" — Gen. 1:31. Man is, therefore, older than Sin, and, consequently, older than the Diabolos. Man introduced it into the world; and not an immortal devil, nor God. Neither God, then, nor such a devil, was the author of sin; but the authorship was constituted of the sophistry of the serpent believed and experimented by the Man, male and female.

Man, then, having introduced Sin, "death entered into the world by Sin; and so death passed upon all men . . . to condemnation; for by one man's disobedience the many were constituted sinners; and the wages of sin is death to those who obey it" — Rom. 5:12, 18, 19; 6:23, 16. But though constituted sinners in Adam, if no law had been given after his transgression, his posterity would not have known when they did right or wrong; for Paul says, "I had not known sin, but by the law." The law is, therefore, "the strength of Sin." Sin reigns by "the holy, just, and good law," through the weakness of the flesh" — Rom. 7:7, 12; 8:3. Where there is no law there is no sin; for "sin is the transgression of law:" so that "without the law sin is dead" — ch. 7:8; 1 John 3:4. This shows how inherently bad flesh is in its thoughts and actions, that a good thing should stir it up to wickedness. Its lusts and affections are impatient of

control. Paul therefore said, "in me, that is, in my flesh, dwells no good thing." When this, which is utterly destitute of any good thing, is placed under a good law, scope is afforded it to display itself in all its natural deformity; and to prove that "the law of its nature" is not the law of God, but "the law of sin and death." Thus, the introduction of a good law, demanding obedience of that which has nothing good in it, is the occasion of sin abounding in the world (ch. 5:20), and thereby evinces its enormity, and shows that "*SIN is an exceedingly great sinner*" — *kath, hyperbolon amartolos* — ch. 7:13. In this expression Paul personifies Sin; and says that it deceived him, slew him, and worked death in him.

"SIN" is a word in Paul's argument, which stands for "human nature," with its affections and desires. Hence, to become sin, or for one to be "*made sin*" for others, (2 Cor. 5:21), is to become flesh and blood. This is called "*sin,*" or "*Sin's flesh,*" because it is *what it is* in consequence of sin, or transgression. When the dust of the ground was formed into a body of life, or living soul, or as Paul terms it, a *psychical or natural body*, it was a very good *animal* creation. It was not a pneumatic, or spirit-body, indeed, for it would then have been immortal and incorruptible, and could neither have sinned nor have become subject to death; but for an animal or natural body, it was "very good," and capable of an existence free from evil, as long as its probationary *aion*, or period might continue. If that period had been fixed for a thousand years, and man had continued obedient to law all that time, his flesh and blood nature would have experienced no evil; and at the end of that long day, he might have been permitted to eat of the Tree of the Lives, by which eating he could have been changed in the twinkling of an eye into a spirit-body, which is incorruptible, glorious, and powerful; and he would have been living at this day. But man transgressed. He listened to *the sophistry of flesh, reasoning under the inspiration of its own instincts*. He gave heed to this, "the thinking of the flesh," or carnal mind, which "is enmity against God, is not subject to his law, neither indeed can be." The desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and the pride of life, which pertain essentially to all living human, or ground, souls, were stirred up by what he saw and heard; and "he was drawn away of his lust, and enticed." His lust having conceived, it brought forth sin in intention; and this being perfected in action, caused death to ensue — James 1:13. Every man, says the apostle, is tempted in this way. It is not God, nor the clerical devil that tempts man, but "his own lust," excited by what from without addresses itself to his five senses, which always respond approvingly to what is agreeable to them.

Seeing that man had become a transgressor of the divine law, there was no need of a miracle for the infliction of death. All that was

necessary was to prevent him from eating of the Tree of Lives, and to leave his flesh and blood nature to the operation of the law peculiar to it. It was not a nature formed for interminable existence. It was "very good" so long as in healthy being, but immortality and incorruptibility were no part of its goodness. These are attributes of a higher and different kind of body. The animal, or natural body, may be transformed into a deathless and incorruptible body, but without that transformation, it must of necessity perish.

This perishing body is "sin," and left to perish because of "sin." *Sin*, in its application to the body, stands for all its constituents and laws. The power of death is in its very constitution, so that the law of its nature is styled "the law of Sin and Death." In the combination of the elements of the law, the power of death resides, so that "to destroy that having the power of death," is to abolish this physical law of sin and death, and instead thereof, to substitute the physical "law of the spirit of life," by which the same body would be changed in its constitution, and live forever.

By this time, I apprehend, the intelligent reader will be able to answer scripturally the question, "What is that which has the power of death?" And he will, doubtless, agree, that it is "the exceedingly great sinner SIN," in the sense of "the Law of Sin and Death" within all the posterity of Adam, without exception. This, then, is Paul's *Diabolos*, which he says "has the power of death;" which "power" he also saith is "sin, the sting of death."

But why doth Paul style Sin *diabolos*? The answer to this question will be found in the definition of the word. *Diabolos* is derived from *diaballo*, which is compounded of *dia*, a preposition, which in composition signifies *across, over*, and answers to the Latin *trans*; and of *ballo* to *throw cast*; and intransitively, *to fall, tumble*. Hence, *diaballo*, is *to throw over or across*; and intransitively, like the Latin *trajicere*, to *pass over, to cross, to pass*. This being the signification of the parent verb, the noun *diabolos* is the name of *that which crosses, or causes to cross over, or falls over*. DIABOLOS is therefore a very fit and proper word by which to designate the law of sin and death, or Sin's flesh. The Eternal Spirit drew a line before Adam, and said, Thou shalt not cross, or pass over that line upon pain of evil and death. That line was the Eden law; on the east of that line was the answer of a good conscience, friendship with God, and life without end; but on the west, fear, shame, misery, and death. To obey, was to maintain the position in which he was originally placed; to disobey, to *cross over the line* forbidden. But "he was drawn away, and enticed by his own lusts." The narrative of Moses proves

this. The man was enticed of his own lust to cross over the line, or to disobey the law; so that his own lust is the *Diabolos*. Thus, etymology and doctrine agreeing, our definition must be correct.

(End of quote from *Eureka*.)

The Sacrificial Blood

Jesus Purged And Redeemed By The Blood Of His Own Sacrifice

Law of Moses, Chapter 18, pages 170-177

By brother Robert Roberts

THE sacrificial blood was applied to everything — Aaron and his sons included (see Lev. 8:14-24). An atonement had to be made by the shedding and sprinkling of blood for and upon them all (Lev. 16:33). As Paul remarks —

“Almost all things by the Law are purged with blood”
(Heb. 9:22).

Now all these things were declared to be “patterns of the things in the heavens,” which it is admitted on all hands converge on, and have their *substance* in, Christ. There must, therefore, be a sense in which Christ, the antitypical Aaron, the antitypical Altar, the antitypical Mercyseat — 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*.

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 better sacrifice?*

There is first the express declaration that it was so (Heb. 9:23) —

“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.*”

“*By his own blood* he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption*” (Heb. 9:12).

There was next the *necessity* that it should be so. The word

* “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. — R.R.

"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.

The forgiveness of personal offenses is the *prominent* feature of the apostolic proclamation, because personal offenses are the *greater barrier*. Nevertheless, 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. 3:26).

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 . . .

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, dishonor and sorrow, poverty and hatred, and all other evils that have resulted from the advent of sin upon 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. 2:10).

— but he was not perfect until he was through it. He was "saved from death" (v. 7), but not until he died. He "obtained redemption" (Heb. 9:12), *but not until his own blood was shed*.

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 by taking part in his death, and putting on his Name and sharing his life afterwards.

He is, as it were, a new center of healthy life, in which we must become incorporate before we can be saved.

The antitype of the cleansing of the holy things WITH BLOOD is manifest when we look at Christ as he now is, and contrast him with what he was . . .

Some consider him immaculate in all senses, and *in no need to offer for himself*, but it is not "according to knowledge." It is not consistent with the Divine objects in God — ". . . sending forth His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh."

Christ himself was included in the sacrificial work which 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?

The Burnt Offering

The Removal Of The Sin-Nature By Sacrifice

By brother Robert Roberts

A "fundamental testimony of the Gospel"

THAT burnt offering should be required in the absence of particular offense 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 acknowledgement 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 (Lev. 16:16).

The type involved in complete burning is self-manifest: it is consumption of sin-nature. This is the great promise, prophecy and requirement of every form of the Truth: the destruction of the *body of sin* (Rom. 6:6).

It was destroyed in Christ's crucifixion — the "one great offering." We ceremonially share it in our baptism: "crucified with Christ," "baptized into his death." We morally participate in it in putting the old man to death in "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts." And the hope before us is the prospect of becoming subject to such a physical change as will consume mortal nature, and change it into the glorious nature of the Spirit.

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 SACRIFICE, and thereby deny the fundamental testimony of the Gospel that he is "the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world. —Law of Moses, chapter 25, page, 237.

“My Sins Are Not Hid From Thee”

By brother Robert Roberts

IN the Psalms the sufferings of Christ are vividly manifest, as well as “the glory that should follow.” Those sufferings are not to be confined to the closing scene of his tribulation . . . We must consider how he felt and what he thought in relation to his whole surroundings. The opportunity of doing this is abundantly afforded in the Psalms, and more particularly in Psalm 69, to which Paul refers —

“Christ pleased not himself, but as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached Thee fell on me” (Romans 15:2).

Turning to that Psalm, we are presented with the inner and personal experience of Christ in a form not accessible in the Gospel narratives. V.5 —

“O Lord, Thou knowest my foolishness, and my sins are not hid from Thee”

The application of this to Christ is only intelligible on the principle that he partook of the common nature of our uncleanness — flesh of Adamic stock — in which, as Paul says, there “dwelleth no good thing” (Rom. 7:18); a nature the burdensome of which arises from its native tendencies to foolishness and sin.

This burden is felt in proportion as higher things are appreciated. Christ knew as no man can know, the gloriousness, spotlessness, and spontaneous holiness of the Spirit nature . . . True, Christ sustained the burden; he carried the load without stumbling . . . Still, the burden was there, and his consciousness of it finds expression in the words under consideration. —The Christadelphian, 1874:171

The Los Angeles Ecclesia's Ten Point Statement

In Defense Of The Truth Against Stricklerism

Published by the Los Angeles ecclesia in 1940 as the Truth in contrast to Clean Flesh Stricklerism. It was taken up by Central and brother Carter (under the heading of “A Time to Heal”), as a sound basis of reunion as regards the Sacrifice of Christ. It was — after an emotionally-built-up momentum had assured “success” of the “conference” — mysteriously abandoned at the last minute at the Jersey City Conference over the strenuous objections of the Berean brethren drawn there by its promise. If it had been faithfully maintained

as the (as promised) world-wide basis of reunion, the present difficulties on two continents could not exist.

The four currently most significant points are emphasized in bold type.

FOUR ERRORS TO BE REJECTED

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

SIX STATEMENTS OF TRUTH TO BE RECEIVED

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

Andrewism And Stricklerism

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

In the Truth's history, from the apostles' days, errors in the direction of Stricklerism (that Christ did not offer for himself, and that there is no such thing as the "law of sin in the members") have been far more prevalent, dangerous and appealing, than errors in the direction of Andrewism. This is where the immaculate, substitutionary, trinitarian Christ came from. Andrewism was but a sad little error that few ever fell for it (though it supported the much more serious error on Resurrectional Responsibility). But Stricklerism is a dangerous heresy with a 2000-year history, that attacks the very vitals of the Truth. Where it conquers, the Truth is gone.

But truly we must carefully avoid slipping into either error in our zeal to combat the other. We tend to easily get carried away with the excitement of the battle, and to go too far in one direction or the other. Extremism is rarely Truth. Truly, extremism *upward* is greater and greater Truth, and we can never go too far in *that* direction. But Andrewism and Stricklerism are extremes to the right and left of Truth. We must avoid the deadly Strickler error that —

Christ did not need a purifying sacrifice for his own redemption.

There is no such actual, physical thing as "Sin in the flesh, the diabolos, the law of SIN in the members, SIN'S flesh, SIN that dwelleth in me," etc.; that these are just abstract figures of speech applying only to actual sinners — not to a universal characteristic of the flesh of all the race.

The flesh is not "defiled" except by actual transgression.

All that baptism has any connection with is our actual sins; not our physical bondage to sin.

We must, on the other hand, avoid the rather subtle Andrew error that Our physical diabolos *as such* "alienates" us from God, and makes us "children of wrath," and in some mysterious, ritual way we are "justified" from it at baptism.

Some, in the commendable zeal of combatting Stricklerism, have gone too far and have taken on various shades of this view, weakening their case against Stricklerism in an effort to dramatize that case, exposing themselves to counterattack. Some retain a lingering flavor of Andrewism, though not necessarily with the theory it was created to be a stepping-stone unto: the doctrine that none can come out of the grave for judgment who are not thus "justified" from the sin nature.

Brother Roberts always tried to pull the picture back into practical reality from brother Andrew's technical legalisms, and to emphasize that our diabolos like our mortality to which it is inseparably related, is strictly of itself a *physical* condition. It is an uncleanness, not a guilt. It does not require forgiveness, but cleansing. It motivates God's pity, not His wrath.

Christ had it in common with all the race, but it did not "alienate" him from God, or make him a "child of wrath" for the 30 years prior to his baptism. That is, in any reasonable, scriptural meaning of "alienate" and "wrath" — of course it is possible, by "black=white" definitions, to make anything say anything. Brother Roberts strenuously fought the application of these terms to Christ as the foundation of brother Andrew's theories of Resurrectional Responsibility. What *does* "alienate" us from God and make us "children of wrath" is *service* to the diabolos sin-motions that pervade our flesh. And this *everyone* is guilty of, and worthy of a cutting-off death — a *putting* to death — for, *except Christ*.

Brother Roberts insisted that "justification" (cleansing) from the diabolos sin-nature is not a legal fiction that occurs at baptism to *all*, but an actual change of nature that occurs at last-day acceptance only to the *righteous*. But he did recognize that this could only come through baptism, and that baptism is effective only through the Sacrifice of Christ. In *this* way we achieve physical cleansing by baptism.

What baptism does for us, as far as our sin-in-the-flesh diabolos is concerned, is this: Baptism is our official* transfer from the service of the diabolos sin-nature to the service of God (Rom. 6). It is *in this sense* a release from the bondage of the diabolos (which bondage, unescaped from, inevitably means eternal death *at the last*). If we continue faithful and acceptable to the end — through the cleansing power of Christ's shed blood — then our baptism will prove to have been the beginning of a course that at last brings us to complete freedom from the diabolos both morally and physically.

It is all real and practical, not ritual and mysterious: real and practical like Christ's own self-cleansing sacrifice was. His sacrifice did not *ritually* cleanse him: it was a divinely-required process that *actually*, physically cleansed him.

Errors, though harmful and distressing, do serve the useful pur-

* We use the term "official" in this sense: Certainly, by the time we reach the point of baptism we have for some time rejected the service of the diabolos; but baptism is the "official" God-appointed gateway and specific dividing-line from the service of Sin to the service of God. Until we in obedience and submission pass through that gateway, we are — in God's sight — not "brought nigh," whatever our intentions or moral state may be.

pose of bringing out the beauty of the Truth more sharply; and (hopefully) of stirring up interest in and appreciation of the deeper aspects of the Truth. We see the Truth, and its beauty, and its importance, *and the importance of keeping it clear, and defending it*, much more clearly in contrast with the error.

Nazarite's Guiltless "Sin" And Sacrificial Cleansing

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

A Point to Ponder

IT is recorded in the legislation concerning the Nazarite that —

"If any man die very suddenly by him, and he hath defiled the head of his consecration; then he shall shave his head in the day of his cleansing, on the seventh day he shall shave it. And on the 8th day he shall bring two turtles or two young pigeons to the priest . . . and the priest shall offer the one for a SIN OFFERING, and the other for a burnt offering, and make an atonement (*kaphar*: cleansing) for him, for that he SINNED by the dead . . . and he shall bring a lamb for a TRESPASS offering" (Numbers 6:9-12).

That is, if during a Nazarite's period of vow, someone happens to suddenly die in his presence and thus cause him to be defiled, he must offer "sin" and "trespass" offerings, and his innocent defilement is spoken of as his having "sinned by the dead."

The pre-eminent antitype of the Nazarite is Christ, and every sacrifice of the Law is a type of his sacrifice, and has no meaning apart from that sacrifice. Do you get the picture? You will, and will rejoice in its beauty and fittingness, if you understand the Truth that sound Christadelphians have always believed and insisted on, that *Christ, though personally sinless, was redeemed and cleansed by his own sacrifice, in the God-appointed way, from the defilement of his physical relationship to the Sin-and-Death constitution — and that THIS was the essential link between him and us that makes his death a testimony to God's righteousness, and effectual for our salvation.*

A Representative: One Of Us: Needing Redemption

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

A vital truth—faithfully defended for over 100 years.

CHRIST, as the one representative man — the embodiment of the entire race — was required, not just to die, but to openly, publicly, voluntarily *put to death* the Body of Sin, in order to declare — *as the race and for the race (himself included)* — his repudiation of, even unto death, the sin-principle, the diabolos, the “law of sin in the members” which infects every particle of the Body of Sin; and thus to demonstrate and vindicate the holiness and majesty and justice of God. And no one of the condemned race — *himself included* — could enter into the divine life until that divinely-required declaration *by the race* (concentered in him) had been made. This was the cleansing sacrifice *for the race* that God required.

Therefore that cut-off, blood-shedding death was essential for his own ascent to eternal glory. Any theory that he did not need, like all his brethren, that Eden-propheesied, diabolos-destroying, foundation-of-perfection-laying sacrifice immediately cuts him off from the race, and makes him a substitute.

He is then no longer the Head of the Body, the Representative, the Example, the Firstfruits, the Forerunner, the Captain (Heb. 2:10, *archegos*: the one who is first in anything). Brother Roberts stressed this over and over in combatting Renunciationalism, which was the Truth’s first major experience with the age-old antichrist error.

As brethren Thomas and Roberts repeatedly emphasized (and later writers who followed them), if Sin was not actually IN Christ’s flesh, and was not *actually* physically put to death in his crucifixion, then that crucifixion did *not* manifest the justice and righteousness of God, but the reverse: injustice and unrighteousness. If he himself was unrelated to the sacrificial redemption, then Sin was not *actually and really* put to death, and he never achieved the destruction of the diabolos: the purpose for which he was created.

It is the old orthodox theory of making God say to the world —

“Look, I am doing to Christ what he has absolutely no relationship to, but what SHOULD happen to you.”

That is, pure Substitutionism: vicarious sacrifice. Whereas the Truth, as so beautifully brought out constantly in the teachings of brethren Thomas and Roberts, has God saying —

“Look, this is how the Sin-Body MUST be repudiated and put to

death, as a repudiation of the SERVICE of the Law of Sin in the members, which is unto death; and a statement of allegiance to Me and My service, which is unto Life Eternal. My Beloved Son has done this to the uttermost in perfect obedience even unto death, and therefore has achieved Life. Enter into him and his victory, and I will in mercy accept you as part of him, IF you will strive to the limit of your ability to do what he has done; overcome and put to death the Law of Sin in your members."

Here is reasonableness and beauty: the Sin-Body overcome and put to death in public, obedient, loving vindication of Gods holiness and justice. And in return, supreme glory and life achieved for ever more by a God-strengthened Christ, offered freely through him to all sin-stricken men and women who will in humility and love accept this glorious Way and its gracious and God-honoring terms.

Surely the saddest of all are those who say, in their sleepy bewilderment, "Is it a first principle?" *Is the heart-truth at the root of the Sacrifice of Christ a first principle!* Is it still important that a truth zealously and faithfully defended for over 100 years, continue to be preserved as part of the Faith? What a tragic question! If this truth, faithfully defended *in fellowship* by sound brethren against Turney, Cornish, Strickler, Bell, is not a first principle — *what IS?* How loud and clear the 1940 trumpet! How can a knowledge of the Truth have slipped so far so fast?

Christ's Sacrifice: "For Us"

A Beautiful, Essential, Inspiring Truth

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

OF course it was "for us": purely, and spiritually, and lovingly. That was its glory and beauty and power. He was not concerned for himself. He was the perfection of selflessness. His joy was the Father's glory, and the saving of others. If it had not been purely "for us," then it would not have been acceptable to God, for it would have been marred with selfishness.

And if we have — as we *must* have — the beautiful mind or spirit of Christ (without which we are "none of his": Rom. 8:9), then all *we* do will be for others. That is the whole power and meaning of his glorious example. There is no blacker, uglier sin than selfishness, self-seeking, self-advantage. People have no beauty or attraction of character if they do not utterly forget themselves, and devote their lives in love to the service and welfare of others.

Truly there are times and circumstances (and it comes at last to us all) in which outward opportunity and ability to do so may be very limited. But there is still always prayer, and the thoughts of the heart. God knows our inmost thoughts, whether they are selfish or selfless, self-enwrapped or all-embracing, though externally we may be totally immobilized and helpless.

There must be no thought of self: "Except a man deny *himself*..." Moses was not only willing but desirous to be blotted out for his people's sake (Ex. 32:32). So was Paul (Rom. 9:3).

But still, inevitably, we benefit from our goodness: for so immutable divine love and wisdom decrees. *This* is life and joy: all else is death. It is only by serving others that we purify ourselves from the deadly selfishness and self-centeredness of the flesh — the *diabolos* — and put it to death.

And so it was with Christ. He *purified* himself by a life-long, perfect sacrifice of holiness and obedience, even unto death, and thus won his own eternal perfection and salvation *for us*, that he might be the loving and joyful Captain of our salvation; that he might "bring many sons to glory"; that he might "see his seed, the travail of his soul (the labor of his life), and be satisfied."

Christ And Sin

Was Christ "Made Sin," And Did He Require Sacrificial Purification?

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

"The word 'sin' is used in two principle acceptations in the Scripture. It signifies in the first place 'the transgression of law'; and in the next it represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust . . . Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled 'sinful flesh,' that is, 'flesh full of sin' . . . Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature." —Elpis Israel, pages 126-127*

Illustrating brethren Thomas' and Roberts' robust and uncompromising use and exposition of terms scripturally applied to Christ that moderns, for "unity," shy away from or try to water down and explain away. These excerpts could be multiplied many-fold, and the quotation of a fuller context would make them even more powerful. (We suggest they all be looked up and studied). But surely these given here are

* Synonym: "One of two or more words having the same meaning."

sufficient to show without possibility of contradiction their consistent teaching: sound Christadelphian teaching from the beginning. A few by later writers are given to show that, in the early days at least, the same sound teaching was preserved and insisted on. It is deeply saddening that the present outlook is very different.

All quotations from the Christadelphian through 1898 are by brother Roberts personally, except where they are specifically attributed to brother Thomas.

“Made Sin”—2 Cor. 5:21

“To be ‘made sin’ for others (2 Cor. 5:21) is to become flesh and blood.”—*Eureka* I:247

“Christ was ‘made sin’ in being born into a sin-constitution of things.”—*Christadelphian*, 1898:390

“Was Christ ‘made sin’? Brother Roberts’ answer: ‘Yes.’”—*Resurrectional Responsibility Debate*, No. 93

“‘Sin’ is a synonym for human nature . . . God made him to be sin for us . . . Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there.”—*Elpis Israel*, page 127

“Christ ‘made sin,’ though sinless, is the doctrine of God.”—brother Thomas, *Christadelphian*, 1873: 362

“It is testified that he was ‘made sin for us’ (2 Cor. 5:21). As he was not of sinful character, this could only apply to his physical nature, drawn from the veins of Mary.”—*Christadelphian*, 1869:83

“God sent forth Jesus in the nature of the condemned, that sin might be condemned in him. Hence, he was ‘made sin’” (2 Cor. 5:21). —*Christadelphian*, 1873:402

“This perishing body is ‘sin’ . . . ‘Sin,’ in its application to the body, stands for all its constituents and laws.”—*Eureka* I:248

“Was he not made sin *in being made of a woman* who was mortal because of sin, and could only impart her own sinful flesh to a son begotten of her?”—*Christadelphian*, 1873:463

“He (Jesus) 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.”—*Christadelphian*, 1898:343

Later Writers

“God hath made him to be sin (2 Cor. 5:21) . . . Partaking thus of the flesh, he was ‘this corruptible,’ though in character sinless, and so *needed cleansing and redemption* as much as his brethren . . . *Hamartia* means ‘sin,’ and not ‘sin-offering.’ We speak from a careful comparison of all the passages in the N. T. and LXX. In all the 170 or more occur-

rences in the N. T. it is *never* rendered 'sin-offering.'"—brother Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1922:222

"What we Christadelphians call 'pernicious teaching' in this matter is the teaching taught by brother Bell . . . The 'poor and illiterate' who have brother Bell's sympathy, can rest quite content with the text of 2 Cor. 5:21 as it stands in AV and RV. It is such as brother Bell who makes things hard for them by altering the English translation of this passage without any justification whatever, in order to support their theory . . . 2 Cor. 5:21 *cannot* be rendered 'made to be a sin-offering' without doing violence to the meaning of the word *hamartia* and forcing on it a meaning it will not bear."—brother Young, *Christadelphian*, 1922:310

And the following by brother Carter, at a time when he was trying to persuade the Bereans to join Central. Brother Carter is answering a "Fraternal Visitor" (Suffolk Street) article that taught that "Christ was not 'made sin' until he hung upon the cross." Brother Carter says—
"The Truth is only maintained by faithful contention, and however much we dislike contention, earnest men do not hesitate to contend for the Faith . . . It has been sound Christadelphian teaching from the days of Dr. Thomas that *Jesus was 'made sin' by being born a member of the human family* . . . Jesus by birth was 'made sin' . . . If he was not *related to sin*, either in NATURE or character, then a grave injustice was done when he was allowed to suffer on the cross, and there was no declaration of God's righteousness . . . The publishing of such teaching reveals again the absence of that unity between the two sections without which *union is not possible*."—*Christadelphian*, 1940:40

We also call attention again to the 1913 and 1915 articles from the Christadelphian reprinted in the Jan. 1979 Berean, pages 28-31: very clear, positive and conclusive on this passage. Sound brethren of the past never dreamed of trying to inaccurately and unjustifiably render this "sin-offering."

"Sin the Flesh"—Rom. 8:3

"'Sin in the flesh' will ultimately be the subject of justification through the blood of Christ."—brother Roberts' answer in *Resurrectional Responsibility Debate*, No. 111

"Question: 'What do you mean by "sin in the flesh"?' Answer: David by the Spirit says (Psa. 51:5), 'I was shapen *in iniquity*, and *in sin* did my mother conceive me' . . . '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. 7:17), adding, 'I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing.' Now, what is this element called 'unclean-ness,' 'sin,' 'iniquity,' etc? . . . There is a principle, element or pecu-

- liarity in our constitution which leads to the decay of the strongest and healthiest. Its implantation came by sin, for death came by sin; and the infliction of death and the implantation of this peculiarity are synonymous things. Because the invisible, constitutional, physical inworking of death in us came by sin, that inworking is termed 'sin.' It is a principle of weakness and uncleanness and corruption. For this reason, it is morally operative; for whatever affects the physical affects the moral. If no counterforce were brought into play, its presence would subject us to the uncontrolled dominion of disobedience, thru the constitutional weakness and impulse to sin... The body of the Lord Jesus was this same unclean nature in the hand of the Father."—*Christadelphian*, 1874:88
- "That through death he might destroy *him* that had the power of death, that is, the devil," or "*sin in the flesh.*"—*Elpis Israel*, page 99
- "'Become sin for us,' 'sin condemned in the flesh,' 'our sins borne in his body upon the tree'—these things could not have been accomplished in a nature destitute of that *physical principle* styled '*Sin in the flesh.*'"—brother Thomas, *Christadelphian*, 1873:361
- "Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there."—*Elpis Israel*, page 128
- "Sin had to be condemned in the nature that had transgressed. For this cause, he was made a little lower than the angels, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the *diabolos*, or *elements of corruption in our nature* inciting it to transgression, and therefore called '*Sin working death in us.*'"—*Eureka* I:106
- "Christ's death was a representative condemnation of sin in the flesh . . . 'Sin in the flesh' is that peculiarity in its physical constitution that inclines it to self-gratification, regardless of the law of God . . . At our baptism we symbolically identify ourselves not only with death but with all that has been *actually accomplished* in Christ in his death, burial and resurrection. But the results are not real, except as to God's favor, therefore it is as unreasonable to speak of our being actually justified from 'sin in the flesh' as it would be to claim we are actually clothed with the new body which Christ attained at the resurrection."—*Christadelphian*, 1895:24
- "What is that which has the power of death? . . . the 'exceedingly great sinner SIN' in the sense of the 'Law of Sin and Death' *within ALL* the posterity of Adam *without exception*. THIS, then, is Paul's *Diabolos*."—*Eureka* I:249
- "Sin in the flesh is hereditary; and entailed upon mankind as the consequence of Adam's violation of the Eden law."—*Elpis Israel*, page 128

“Paul had to say, ‘Sin dwelleth in me . . . I see a law in my members warring against the law of my mind’ . . . Sin, as disobedience, arose in Adam and Eve’s 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 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*, 1898:343

“That *physical principle* or quality of the flesh styled ‘indwelling sin.’” —*Elpis Israel*, page 137

“What is meant by ‘devil’ in Heb. 2:14 and 1 John 3:8? Answer: *Sin in the flesh*.” —*Good Confession*, page 120

“The devil is the scriptural personification of *Sin in the flesh*.” —*Declaration*, prop. 23

“Him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil (or *sin in the flesh*).” —*Instructor*, question 55

“*Sin in the flesh* is the devil destroyed by Jesus in his death.” —*Christendom Astray*, Lecture 7, page 162

“The Law of Sin pervades every particle of the flesh.” —*Elpis Israel*, :137

“Sin-in-the-flesh is only the root principle that leads to the various forms of diabolism. All these forms are in harmony with the root . . . Judas was a devil, through the action of sin-in-the-flesh. He hanged himself. That form of sin-in-the-flesh was gone, but sin-in-the-flesh survived in the world. The devil that imprisoned the Smyranean brethren was a form of sin-in-the-flesh. That form passed away, but sin-in-the-flesh continues in the world. When the devil is bound for 1000 years, it is that form of sin-in-the-flesh which exists in the organized governments of the world that is bound; but sin-in-the-flesh remains an ingredient in human nature during all the 1000 years, until flesh and blood ceases to exist on earth.” —*Christadelphian*, 1898:201

Note that brother Roberts uses “*sin-in-the-flesh*” WITH HYPHENS 8 times in this short answer. A later leader was gratefully lauded because he “got rid of (brother Roberts’) *hyphens* for us” —presumably a major accomplishment, for it permitted the union of divergent views on the Sacrifice of Christ. Brother Roberts does not always use the *hyphens*, but he usually uses the expression in a *hyphenated* sense (that is, as a unit). So does brother Thomas, as will be noted.

Later Writers

“Sin is a term of double import in the Scriptures. It has a physical as well

as a moral application.”—brother Boulton, “*Hebrews*,” page 181
“The apostle Paul is very precise in his references to sin as a *physical principle* inherent in human flesh: ‘body of sin,’ ‘Sin wrought in me,’ ‘Sin revived,’ ‘Sin beguiled me,’ ‘Sin working death in me,’ ‘sin that dwelleth in me,’ ‘Law of sin in my members.’ 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.”—brother Boulton, “*Hebrews*,” page 182

Moderns seeking compromise have been very squeamish about facing up to the reality of sin-in-the-flesh. They miss completely the fundamental point that, as brother Thomas says, God could not have ACTUALLY (but only ritually) condemned sin in the flesh of Jesus if it had not BEEN there. Their arguments lead logically to the orthodox substitution theory that it was merely someone else’s sins that were “ritually imputed” to Christ, just as in the case of the animals: that is, that Christ was just another shadow or type or symbol.

“Sinful Flesh”—“Sin’s Flesh”—“Flesh of Sin”—Rom. 8:3

“Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and ‘that which is born of the flesh is flesh.’ This is a misfortune, not a crime.”—*Elpis Israel*, page 129

“How could Jesus have been made free from that *sin* which God laid upon him *in his own nature*, ‘made in the likeness of sinful flesh,’ if he had not died *for himself* as well as for us? Brother Roberts’ answer: He could not.”—*Resurrectional Responsibility Debate*, no. 715

“‘Sin’ is a word in Paul’s argument which stands for ‘human nature.’” —*Eureka* I:247

“‘Sinful flesh’ is a generic description of human flesh in its total qualities.”—*Christadelphian*, 1895:24

“Sinful flesh was laid upon him.”—*Elpis Israel*, page 99

“*Diabolos* is a very fit and proper word to designate the law of sin and death, or Sin’s flesh.”—*Eureka* I:249

“Sinful flesh being the hereditary nature of the Lord Jesus, he was a fit and proper sacrifice for sin.”—*Elpis Israel*, page 128

“Jesus was the sin-nature, or sinful flesh of Adam, that *sin* being THUS laid upon him, he might die for it.”—*Christadelphian*, 1873:407

“Joshua (in Zech. 3:3-4) clothed in filthy garments represents the Christ . . . clothed with the ‘flesh of sin,’ in which, Paul tells us, ‘dwells no good thing.’”—*Eureka* I:58

“Jesus was not less ‘sin’s flesh’ than we.”—*Christadelphian*, 1873:363

“He sent His Own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh’ . . . Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there.”—*Elpis Israel*, page 128

"It (the body of Jesus) was . . . that . . . styled by Paul 'flesh of sin' in which, he says, 'dwells no good thing.'"—*Eureka* I:106

"His nature was in all points like ours: 'sin's flesh' in which dwells no good thing . . . his flesh . . . cleansed by the blood of that flesh when poured out unto death."—*Eureka* II:224

"Flesh and blood . . . This is called 'sin' or 'Sin's flesh' because it is what it is in consequence of sin, or transgression."—*Eureka* I:247

"As the Dead One . . . he was Sin's Flesh crucified, slain and buried; in which by the slaying sin had been condemned; and by the burial, put out of sight."—*Eureka* II:124

"His nature was flesh and blood, which Paul styles 'sinful flesh,' or *flesh full of sin*, a physical quality or principle which makes the flesh mortal; and called 'sin' because this property of the flesh became its law as the consequence of transgression."—brother Thomas, *Christadelphian*, 1873:501

"Jesus was a man in the flesh common to all mankind, which is Sin's flesh."—*Eureka* II:624

"This perishing body is 'sin.'"—*Eureka* I:248

"I was shapen *in iniquity*, and *in sin* did my mother conceive me' (Psa. 51:5). This is nothing more than affirming that he was born of sinful flesh."—*Elpis Israel*, page 128

"In what sense did Christ come in sinful flesh? . . . Rom. 7, immediately preceding, supplies the sense of the words 'flesh of sin' used in Rom. 8:3. Gal. 5, and all N. T. allusions to the subject, teach that the flesh of human nature is a *sinful thing*."—*Slain Lamb*, page 19

In the context, brother Roberts strongly defends the translation "sinful flesh" against the more literal (but, as to English meaning, less accurate) "flesh of sin." RV retains "sinful flesh," like AV, though recognizing in the margin that the literal Greek is "flesh of sin."

The Diabolos

"What is that which has the power of death? . . . It is the 'exceeding great sinner Sin,' in the sense of the 'Law of Sin and Death' within all the posterity of Adam, *without exception*. THIS is Paul's *diabolos*."—*Eureka* I:249

"What is meant by 'devil' (*diabolos*) in Heb. 2:14 and 1 John 3:8? Answer: It means *sin in the flesh*."—*Good Confession*, question 120

"That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil (*diabolos*), or SIN IN THE FLESH."—*Elpis Israel*, page 99

"The release began *with himself*. He destroyed that hold which the devil had obtained *in himself* through extraction from Adam . . . The devil was not destroyed *out of* Christ. He was destroyed *IN* him. We have

to get into Christ to get the benefit. In him we obtain the deliverance accomplished IN HIM."—*Christadelphian*, 1875:375

"The devil (*diabolos*) is the scriptural personification of *sin in the flesh*."—*Declaration*, prop. 23

"He also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the *diabolos*, or elements of corruption in our nature inciting it to transgression, and therefore called 'Sin working death in us.'"—*Eureka* I:106

"Him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil (or *sin in the flesh*)."—*Instructor*, question 55

"He that committeth sin is of the *diabolos*, for the *diabolos* sinneth from the beginning.' All this is perfectly intelligible when understood of Sin's flesh."—*Eureka* I:249

"Sin in the flesh is the devil destroyed by Jesus in his death."—*Christendom Astray*, Lecture 7, page 172

"*Diabolos* is a very fit and proper word to designate Sin's flesh."—*Eureka* I:249

Later Writers

"The Devil is a scriptural personification of *Sin in the flesh*, in its several phases of manifestation . . . ' This old Christadelphian definition (*Declaration*) is palpably true, and does not need revising. And no exception to its application can be made to Heb. 2:14. Dr. Thomas wrote upon the subject with a grasp and lucidity that were almost apostolic—

"*Sinful flesh was laid upon him that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, or sin in the flesh* (Heb. 2:14)."—*Elpis Israel*, page 99

Yes, the 'Devil' that had the power of death is 'Sin,' and Christ has destroyed him *IN himself individually*, and will yet destroy him from the earth."—brother Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1913:541

"Our Sins in His Own Body"—1 Pet. 2:24

"Our Iniquity Laid on Him"—Isa. 53:6

"Iniquities laid on Him' . . . This is a figurative description of what was literally done in God sending forth His Son made of a woman . . . This was 'laid on' Jesus *in his being made of our nature*."—*Christadelphian*, 1873:400

"The flesh was the 'filthy garments' with which the Spirit-Word was clothed (Zech. 3:3) the '*iniquity of us all*' laid on him; the 'soul made an offering for sin' (Isa. 53)."—*Eureka* I:108

"Our sins laid on him' . . . The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animals was the type; the *real* putting of *sin* on the Lamb of God in

the bestowal of a prepared *sin-body* wherein to die, is the substance."—*Christadelphian*, 1873:462

"The filthy garments of flesh, styled his 'iniquity.'"—*Eureka* II:19

"If our sins were laid on him in the same way as on the animals (ceremonial imputativeness), where is the *substance* of the shadow?"—*Christadelphian*, 1873:462

"If the principle of corruption had not pervaded the flesh of Jesus . . . sin could not have been condemned there, nor could he have borne our sins '*IN his own body*.'"—*Eureka* I:203

"Jesus, with the sin of the world thus defined, rankling *IN his flesh*, where it was to be condemned to death when suspended on the cross (Rom. 8:3), came to John as the 'Ram of Consecration,' that his *inwards* and his *body* might be washed."—brother Thomas, *Christadelphian*, 1873:501

Later Writers

"He kept himself from his '*iniquity*' (Psalm 18:23). He possessed perfect knowledge of any thought or impulse arising from the flesh contrary to the purpose of his Father, thus leading him to view his temptations as '*iniquities*' more numerous than the hairs of his head (Ps. 40:12). While the '*iniquity*' that took hold of him was *in his flesh*, in which '*dwelleth no good*,' the *character* he manifested was perfect."—brother Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921:499

"He could say 'There was no soundness in his flesh' (Ps. 38:7) because he himself said the flesh profiteth nothing (John 6:73). This testimony is amplified by the Spirit in the apostle Paul thus, 'In me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing.' Jesus also could 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."—brother Sulley, *Christadelphian*, 1921:500

"First For His Own Sins"—Heb. 7:27

"He offered first for himself: he was the first delivered. He is 'Christ the *Firstfruits*.' He obtained eternal redemption *IN and FOR himself*."—*Christadelphian*, 1875:139

"Christ's sacrifice was operative on himself first of all."—*Law of Moses*, chapter 11, page 90

"There is no doubt Jesus fulfilled the Aaronic type of offering for himself."—brother Roberts, *Debate* 290.

"As the anti-typical High Priest, it was necessary he should offer for himself."—*Christadelphian*, 1896:341

"He did these things ('was made perfect,' 'was saved from death,' 'obtained redemption') for *himself first* . . . for us *only* as we become

- part of him.”—*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 173
- “Then he offered for himself as well as for us? Brother Roberts’ answer: Certainly.”—*Debate* 716
- “As a sufferer from the effects of sin, he had himself to be delivered from those effects; and as the mode of deliverance was by death on the cross, that death was *for himself first*.”—*Christadelphian*, 1875:375
- “From Paul’s statement (Heb. 7:27) 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*, 1873:405
- “The sacrificial work . . . *for himself*, that it might be for us.”—*Law of Moses*, chapter 18, page 177
- “He offered for himself first, by reason of his participation in Adamic mortality.”—*Christadelphian*, 1873:555
- “It was ‘for us’ that he came to be in the position of having first to *offer for himself*... ‘He was *made sin* for us who knew no sin,’ and does not sin require an offering?”—*Christadelphian*, 1875:139
- “If Christ’s offering did not comprehend himself, how are we to understand the statement of Paul in Heb. 7:27?”—*Christadelphian*, 1873:466
- “Though personally sinless, he was by constitution condemned, and had therefore to offer for *himself* and his brethren.”—*Christadelphian*, 1873:405

Later Writers

- “Heb. 7:27 says plainly that Jesus offered for his own sins.”—brother Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1902:148
- “This he did once . . . offer . . . first for his own sins’ (Heb. 7:27) . . . God required the Lord Jesus to lay down his life in sacrifice, and through that ‘one offering’ he was *himself* redeemed from dead as the ‘firstfruits.’”—brother Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1910:538
- “That Christ had to offer for himself is testified in Heb. 7:27. The reason is revealed: that he might *himself be saved by his own blood* (Heb. 13:20; 5:7).”—brother Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1910:547
- “Who ‘offered up himself’? *Jesus*. Who did this ‘once’? *Jesus*. What is ‘this’ that he did once? ‘*Offered up sacrifice, first for his own sins, then...*’”—brother Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1913:339
- “His sacrifice was ‘first for himself, and then for the people’ (Heb. 7:27) . . . To say that it was not for himself is to contradict the Word of God, and to take a step at least toward the doctrine of the Antichrist . . . The salvation was by ‘the blood of thy covenant’ (Zech. 9:11), by which both *the ‘King’ himself* and his ‘prisoners of hope’ are ‘brought again from the dead.’ 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."—brother Walker, *Christadelphian*, 1921:313

See also Berean, February, 1979, pages 61-64.

* * *

We quote brethren Thomas and Roberts profusely and unashamedly because the Christadelphian Body has had this elementary first principle matter firmly settled in its mind for over 100 years, based on the providential labors of these two brethren. The Body has always believed that these brethren soundly expounded the Truth concerning it. We need no ever-learning, never-learning, long-since-repudiated "new" theories.

Let us be very thankful that these things were fought out by sound brethren over 100 years ago, and sound brethren ever since have always accepted them. We feel very strongly that the brethren and sisters should be made clearly aware that the "new" theory that Christ was merely another type and ritual, and did not have to offer for himself, is a direct contradiction to brethren Thomas and Roberts, and was denounced by them as a fatal error.

Ask those who teach differently from this: "Do you think and claim you are teaching in harmony with brethren Thomas and Roberts, and what has been considered sound doctrine from the beginning? Or do you recognize and acknowledge that you are teaching things that have been denounced by brethren Thomas and Roberts and sound Christadelphians for 100 years?"

Bring the issue clearly into the open. Were brethren Thomas and Roberts right or wrong? Is it a question of *interpreting* them, or is it an issue of *repudiating* them? Do they profess to agree with them, or do they confess they disagree with them? This must be clarified first. Those who disagree with brethren Thomas and Roberts are often very coy about revealing this openly. They very much prefer to make a big show of "going right back to Scripture," brushing aside brethren Thomas and Roberts without openly repudiating them. They want to ignore 130 years of Christadelphian belief and teaching, and pretend to start out fresh, as if Christadelphian history did not exist at all, and the subject had never before been considered.

Brethren Thomas and Roberts were not inspired, nor do we quote them as such. But for over 100 years sound Christadelphians, after exhaustive scriptural investigation, have decided that brethren Thomas and Roberts were right on the Sacrifice of Christ, and that they providentially delivered us from the substitutionary orthodoxy of Renunciationism and Bell-Stricklerism.

Redeeming The Race

God's Provision For The Total Abolition Of Sin And Death.

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

"Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

If some feel that this subject is being overdone, they may be right. And if they are, we ask that they bear with us, for we are deeply concerned. It is a vital, interesting, beautiful subject, and — far more than we had realized (it seems beyond belief) — it is in great danger of being completely lost in a large part of Christadelphia. We feel a terrible urgency to keep the clear Truth, as expounded by brethren Thomas and Roberts, very prominent — in the hope of persuading a few to hold it fast. Some of the following may seem repetitious. Please bear with this too. It is hard to put eternal spiritual things into human words. And different ways of expressing the same thing will often appeal, or be more clear, to different readers.

TO understand the "Sacrifice" of Christ, we must *start* with the ACTUAL WORK — the task, the accomplishment — that Christ did, and which God from the very beginning determined to require to be done by and for the race to redeem the race. *This* is the REALITY of the case. From it, we must *work BACK* to develop our understanding of the types and shadows that point to it.

Because they come first in time, the natural tendency is to work *from* the shadows and types (or what we *think* the shadows and types mean) forward *to* the reality, and to define the reality in terms of the types. We say that Christ "needed a sacrifice." Christ did not need *A* sacrifice, in the common sense of the term: he needed *THE* Sacrifice. More clearly, he needed that *God-ordained REALITY* of which "sacrifice" as we know it is merely the shadow and type.

"Sacrifices" — though antedating Christ's work in time—are just foreshadowings of that work, and have no meaning or purpose apart from it. "Sacrifice" is not an entity in itself — a specific something — so that we can say: Christ needed a "sacrifice." That is getting the cart before the horse.

And the picture is further confused and compounded by the fact that man has totally corrupted and debased and given new and false meanings and connotations to the conception of "sacrifice," as: punishment, appeasement, vicarious transfer of penalty, purchase of divine favor, etc., etc., etc. We must be very careful not to be unconsciously

influenced in our thinking by the accretions and new meanings that "sacrifice" has picked up erroneously, and now cling closely to the term.

"Sacrifice"

The *actual accomplishment* which God required of some one member of the race, and which Christ voluntarily undertook to do for the race, is the root and meaning of the *ritual and shadow* that we call "sacrifice." As an *English* word, "sacrifice" has various meanings that may or may not be relevant. Its literal, root meaning is simply "holy work" (Latin: *sacra*, holy, sacred; and *facio*, to make or do).

Its current, common meaning is "the giving up or forgoing of something for the sake of something better." Certainly this principle is *involved* in scriptural sacrifice. It is the basic principle of choosing the truly beneficial good, and eschewing the pleasant (or seemingly pleasant) evil. But this is certainly not the whole picture of scriptural "sacrifice," or even the heart and core of the picture.

In the Scriptures (and *here* is where we must really get our definitions), there are two conceptions in the terms used to describe what comes under the heading of what we commonly call "sacrifice." They are: 1) to *slay*, and 2) to *offer*.

A glance at Young's, pages 829-30, will reveal that, in the overwhelming number of cases, the words in the original (both O.T. and N.T.) translated "sacrifice" mean "a slaughter": *zebach* in the Hebrew, and *thurion* in the Greek. Let us bear this in mind: it is fundamental. Scriptural "sacrifice" is a *putting to death*.

And a study of pages 710-11 of Young's will illustrate the other aspect: *offering up to God*, causing to ascend, bringing near to God. (All under "offer," etc.).

We could say that Christ's *life* was an *offering*, and his *death* was a *sacrifice*. And that would be true. But actually they are a one-and-indivisible *sacrificial offering*. His whole life was a putting to death: his death was the supreme offering.

Ritual "sacrifice" from the beginning was an obedient act of manifestation of faith in God's promised provision of the "Seed of the Woman" to "take away the Sin of the world." It was faith in Christ and his work.

As such, it involved *complete self-repudiation* — an abjuration of self, and confession of total inability to save self.

As such, it involved a *complete repudiation of Sin*; a total declaration of war against Sin; an abject confession of powerless bondage to Sin ("O wretched man that I am!"); a declaration of allegiance to God and His holiness.

As such, it involved *total thankfulness to God* for His promised provision and deliverance from the Sin-condition into which the first man had plunged the race.

We see these aspects, and others, more specifically delineated and distinguished in the various different kinds and forms of sacrifice under the Law of Moses.

Sacrifice has to do with Sin. Its background and framework is in relation to Sin. It arose from the problem created by Sin. It takes into consideration the punishment of Sin. It recognizes that Sin must inevitably bring Death. But it is not a punishment for Sin, or even a *symbol* of a punishment for Sin. It is the very OPPOSITE of that: it is a *conquering of Sin*, a victory over Sin, a deliverance from Sin.

Sacrifice is not a symbol of "punishment" or "paying a penalty," although it does involve the conception and confession that "The wages of Sin is Death." And it does involve the recognition that Sin as a totality —*concentered in the Sin-Nature* — must be publicly condemned and put to death IN the body of one who is totally free from personal transgression.

We tend to make a mistake when we say that Christ "offered a sacrifice." We are coming at it from the wrong direction. We should say that Christ DID A WORK that became the basis of, and gave meaning to, the shadow and type that is popularly called "sacrifice."

In The Beginning

God created man "very good" — free from Sin, free from Death. Man disobeyed God, and this brought Sin and Death upon the race. While Adam was created "very good," Paul very powerfully states that in *his* flesh (one of the best of men) was "NO GOOD THING," (Rom. 7:18). And this "no good" condition of his flesh he repeatedly calls "Sin." With Adam's sin and sentence, Sin infected the whole race, diseased the whole race, defiled the whole race, brought the whole race under "condemnation" to Death. *This condemnation was on the whole race.*

After Adam sinned, God inaugurated a plan to cleanse the race from Sin, and redeem it from Death. This plan was that, *of the race itself*, there had to be one man to voluntarily give himself to remove from the race that condemnation of Death, and its cause, Sin. He must be ONE OF THE RACE — subject to all the evils and disabilities and defilements brought on the race by Adam's disobedience, *and with them equally in need of deliverance from those evils, disabilities and defilements.* These were the typical "filthy garments" of the typical High Priest Joshua (Zech. 3:4), who was typically cleansed and re-arrayed in the purity of glorious Sin-freed immortal nature.

This Representative Man must overcome and destroy Sin, and abolish Death. He must thus achieve salvation from these two evils *for himself*, in full harmony with God's law and justice and holiness.

He must do it by a *life of perfect obedience voluntarily completed and terminated by a blood-shedding death* that publicly condemned Sin (in ALL its aspects), justified God's law, exalted God's holiness, and manifested God's justice. The obedient life was to defeat and conquer and subdue Sin *in himself*. The obedient death that completed that obedient life was to condemn and destroy Sin *in himself*.

God Required An Actual Destroying Of Sin

God required — not a symbol, not a shadow — but a REALITY: a real overcoming and conquering of Sin, a real condemning and destroying of Sin. And that is what Jesus accomplished *for himself*. His *obedient death* was just as real and necessary a part of his earning his salvation as was his *obedient life*. And what he did in his death was no more a mere shadow or ritual than what he did in his life.

The blood-shedding, specifically cut-off death (rather than a "natural" death) was required by God for Sin's public condemnation, and God's public justification and glorification: a public repudiation of Sin, a public confession that God's sentence on Sin — the whole Sin-constitution through Adam — was *just*.

The putting to death of Christ was to manifest God's *justice*. How did it do so, if Christ never sinned? How can it possibly manifest God's justice to put a perfectly *righteous* man to death? Why — if Sin must be publicly condemned and God publicly justified for His condemnation of Sin to death — why, of all people, pick the only one man who *never* sinned to do it to? THEREIN IS THE CLUE. Christ had no sins. Therefore *his* death made the issue crystal clear that it was the Body of Sin, Sin's Flesh, the "Law of Sin in the members," that was being condemned and put to death. And it *had* to be done *in this way* before any one of the race — *Christ included* — could be cleansed from the Sin Constitution, the Law of Sin and Death in the members. This was God's requirement for cleansing the race from Sin, in harmony with His holiness.

All orthodoxy, and some others, say his "sacrifice" was simply a type, a shadow, a symbol. They say God is simply saying to man — "This is what by justice should happen to you. It shouldn't happen to this man; he has no connection with it, but I am just doing it to him to illustrate what should be done to you."

It is hard to see either logic or justice in this. They say *this* is how sin was "condemned" — and God's justice was "manifested": by just

arbitrarily putting to death the one person who had never sinned, just as a sample of what should happen to sinners. This would be a strange way of portraying God's justice: to pick as the *example* of what should be done to sin the *one man* who had nothing to do with sin.

If we do not see *Christ's relation to Sin's Flesh*, and God's plan for cleansing the whole race from Sin's Flesh — the "motions of Sin in the members" — we shall never make any real sense out of Christ's blood-shedding death, or see HOW it *destroys Sin and manifests God's justice*.

Human Flesh Is Scripturally "Sin"

Happily, brethren Thomas and Roberts have pointed out from Scripture a rational, God-honoring, God's-justice-manifesting, *actual* Sin destroying (not just in shadow) explanation. There is in all human flesh — as a result of the sin and sentence of Adam — an evil, destructive, defiling principle that the Scriptures call "Sin-in-the-flesh," "The Law of Sin in the members," "Sin that dwelleth in me," "Sin working Death in me," etc. It is Paul, in Rom. 7, who goes into this most fully; but what the Spirit says all throughout the Scriptures about the "flesh" and the "natural mind" and the "heart of man" repeatedly testifies to this Sin-defiled condition of *all* human flesh that caused Paul the righteous to cry (Rom. 7:24) —

"Who shall deliver me from the body of this Death?"

(marg: *this Body of Death*).

As brethren Thomas and Roberts point out, the Sin-caused and Sin-causing principle that is in every cell of human flesh is called "Sin" by the Scriptures. Certainly this is "metonymy." "Metonymy" is simply a title for this "figure of speech" by which the name of something is extended to its related aspects.

"Sin" — literally and narrowly and primarily — is an act of disobedience against God's law. *By* "metonymy," and very reasonably, God extends the name "Sin" to that principle of evil in all human flesh that *came by* Sin and *causes* Sin — and that inevitably makes all men sinners (except in the one special case where God stepped in for the sake of the race, and made special arrangements).

But let us not get hung up here on the word "metonymy," and continue thereafter to just go in circles on this spot. Having established by "metonymy" that God has extended the name "Sin" to include this evil, sinful principle in all human flesh, let us go on from there. WHY did He do so? And *what bearing does the fact have on salvation?* We find that the fact He did so is a very important step in the developing picture. Paul, continuing his exposition from chapter 7, says —

"To be *fleshly*-minded is death . . . the *fleshly* mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither

indeed CAN be, so that they that are in the *flesh* CANNOT please God" (Rom. 8:6-8).

This is certainly enough to identify the flesh as "Sin," and to justify the name the Scriptures give it. What better definition of Sin is there than "enmity against God: not subject to God, nor CAN be"? That is the flesh: *all* mortal flesh: Sin's Flesh. That is why it had to be crucified. That is why the crucifixion of Christ was a declaration of God's justice and holiness and righteousness. That is why Christ, who successfully fought Sin's Flesh all his life, voluntarily crucified it — in life and in death: wholly: completely.

Look up "flesh" in Strong's — especially throughout Romans, but also all through the New Testament. If the "works of the flesh" are what Paul tells the Galatians they are (5:19), and if the "flesh lusteth AGAINST the Spirit" (Gal. 5:17), then what else, is the flesh but SIN?

Our Oneness With Christ: A Common Sin-Nature

As brethren Thomas and Roberts so repeatedly point out, this evil principle in the flesh — scripturally called "Sin" — is the essential unifying factor between Christ and us: the fact that makes it possible for *our* sins to be done away in *his* blood-shedding. It is our common, mutual problem *with* him. He solved it: escaped it: cleansed himself from its defilement in God's holy appointed way. (Is not something in us that is "enmity to God" and leads to all the corrupt things Paul calls the "works of the flesh," a *defilement*? If we are godly-minded — and Christ was pre-eminently so — then anything that pulls us constantly in the very opposite direction will be seen vividly as the *worst possible defilement*. What is a little filth on the outside, compared to this vile leprosy on the inside? This is the terrible struggle of the Psalms.)

As a race, we ARE *Sin*. Everything we do *naturally* is Sin. Sin is the very fiber of our being: "Conceived in Sin, and shapen in Iniquity" (Psa. 51:5). If this was true of Christ (and brethren Thomas and Roberts correctly apply it to him), then how much more of us! It is from this that we need redemption, cleansing, deliverance. Let us realize this to the full. It is far deeper and more pervasive than we realize. This is why the whole world is in such a terrible condition. This is what we have to fight. This is what we MUST overcome. A full realization of what we *are* is the key to the achievement of what we *may become*. Facing facts is always the essential beginning to any solution. Let us face this reality concerning Christ and ourselves.

He, by total devotion to God, lifted himself out of this universal Sin-Constitution: cleansed himself from it in the "sacrificial" way and method that God had appointed from the beginning. *Now* he is no

longer Sin, or Sin-tainted, in any respect. He is "free from Sin . . . without Sin . . . Sin hath no more dominion over him."

And he now offers, by God's merciful arrangement, to reach down and lift us out — if we will give total devotion to him. That was the very purpose of his creation and existence and glorious work.

Paul said, "In me, that is, IN MY FLESH, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18). And Jesus could say exactly the same*. That is why he crucified it, and tells us we must do the same. And the fact that he could say this with Paul is what makes him one with us in our problem. It is what makes his putting the flesh to death a manifestation of God's justice, in which he himself totally concurred. In fact, in that death, Jesus is saying exactly what Paul said: publicly, humbly, God-honoringly —

"In my flesh dwelleth no good thing. This is what Sin's Flesh deserves. I have never yielded to it for a moment. I have always crucified it within me. And now, in obedience to the Father, and in full agreement with Him, I am putting it to death IN ME once and for all: *destroying the diabolos*. That is the kernel and essence and climax of my work of perfecting MYSELF so that I may save YOU."

Christ Totally Defeated And Destroyed Sin In Himself

The work Christ did — the essential, race-redeeming work that was pre-ordained and fore-shadowed from the beginning — was the overcoming and destroying and publicly repudiating and condemning and putting to death of Sin IN himself, and, necessarily, FOR himself — not as a personal, selfish motive, but as a *practical, necessary operation* to achieve the *race's* redemption.

As a moral and physical *actuality*, Christ could conquer and destroy Sin only IN HIMSELF. That was the arena of his total and perfect victory over Sin, by which he laid the eternal foundation for his *further* work. He will *complete* the battle against Sin by: 1) absorbing into his own perfect, Sin-free self all who accept this deliverance that God has provided and *do* what God requires them to do to receive it; and 2) physically destroying all who do not accept him and enter into him. In this way, the whole race will eventually be purged and saved (as a race, though not all individuals of it).

Christ — in the God-appointed way, and with the indispensable God-provided help and guidance and strengthening — had to: 1) Cleanse himself from Sin, and 2) Destroy Sin in himself — by his total, inseparable life-AND-death work. That is the root and basis and meaning of what we call "sacrifice." It was his *only* way to his *own* personal

* "Why callest thou *me* good? *None* is good, save One, that is, God" (Luke 18:19).

salvation. He was “made perfect by suffering” (Heb. 2:10), and THIS was the “suffering” required. He was “redeemed by his own blood” (Heb. 9:12).

His great work was not a mere shadow, not a mere form, not a mere symbol illustrating what *should* be done to *someone else*. It was an actual, essential accomplishment: the self-cleansing from, and destruction of, Sin. He didn’t just *typify* this — he DID it. He didn’t “pay the penalty” for anyone. He did the *actual job of destroying Sin* that God’s holiness required to be done for the race to be saved. He did it *in* and *for* himself. There was no other way or place he *could* do it.

As to motive, he did it — not for himself — but in love and obedience to his Father, and for the sake of the glorious “Seed” whose eternal redemption and joy was, and will ever be, his eternal “satisfaction” (Isa. 53:10-11).

The total life-and-death work of Sin-destroying that was laid upon him as THE Representative Man of the race, was essential for his own cleansing and salvation, as part of the race. In fact, it WAS his cleansing — that was its whole essence and actuality. He, as THE Representative Man, the embodiment and new nucleus of the race, must first himself be transformed from a defiled, condemned condition to a totally purified and perfected condition.

And his culminating blood-shedding death on the cross was an inseparable Divinely-required part of that work of racial salvation. He was not just *ritually* “cleansed” by “sacrifice.” It was not just an arbitrary form that God required him to go through as an act of obedience, or to symbolize something. It was an actual personal process of conquering and self-cleansing: a being “made perfect by suffering.”

Could *he* have attained to immortality without that blood-shedding death? NO. Because he must share the common racial salvation, or it has no benefit for us. God had several threads of purpose in that death and its form. In God’s wisdom that particular death was essential to lay a sound basis for the salvation of the race. And Christ was, and IS, the Race. He is all mankind. None can live eternally except *within* him and *as part of* him.

Did Christ Need A “Sacrifice”?

But did Christ “need a sacrifice”? Perhaps we can see it more clearly this way: Christ, as one of the race, and as the embodiment of the race, needed what the whole race needed — the *reality* that is simply shadowed by the ritual of “sacrifice.” He did not need a “sacrifice” *as such*, in the shadowy, typical sense of the term: and nor do we. We need, as he with us needed, the flesh-cleansing, sin-condemning, grave-

opening perfect-life-and-shed-blood-death REALITY that God's holiness and wisdom demanded from some one man for the salvation of any of the race.

Starting *within* the condemned, defiled, Sin-and-Death-cursed race, he — with God's strengthening — *earned* his way out of it. That work was his "sacrifice."

Ritual can never save anyone. It is true that ritual may be required by God (as baptism in this dispensation, and circumcision and sacrifice in the Mosaic), as an act of humility and obedience to *connect* us with the reality, and to bring us its benefits. And when God requires a ritual, then salvation is impossible without that ritual. But a ritual must have a fulfilling reality; and shadow must have a fulfilling substance. Christ's *actual Sin-destroying accomplishment* — his overcoming, his self-perfecting — is the reality and substance of which baptism and breaking of bread, sacrifice and circumcision, are the representative rituals.

It was not for himself that he redeemed himself. He was specifically created to redeem the race, and he joyfully accepted the great work for which he was born:

"God will provide Himself a Lamb . . . a Lamb to take away the sin of the world."

Someone had to righteously *win his way out of the Sin-Constitution*, in the way God appointed, with whom God could deal as the race. There was no one already in the race — nor naturally ever would or could be — that could do it. So God in love especially created one within the race, and specially strengthened him so that he could do what had to be done: one who from beginning to end always kept God in the foreground and himself in the background, claimed nothing for himself, and always attributed everything he accomplished to God Who did it through him — at his own voluntary acceptance and submission.

* * *

Now, are *we* cleansed from the "Body of Sin" by Christ's sacrifice? Yes! But not in the artificial, legalistic, ritualistic way of brother Andrew's technical "justification from eternal death so as to come out of the grave" theory. We are cleansed (eventually, as the final result) from the Body of Sin by the blood of Christ, if we have been faithful to the end. And we cannot possibly be cleansed from the Body of Sin without the shed blood of Christ. This was brother Roberts' point (see *Debate*, Question 468, etc.).

We are not "justified from Sin's Flesh at baptism (as brother Andrew claimed, and built his theory on), except in the *prospective* sense that brother Roberts explained. At baptism we are . . . 1) washed and cleansed from *our own transgressions* (literally, they are forgiven, blotted

out of record against us); and 2) we are lifted out of the path of certain death in which Adam put us, and are set on the path that will lead us at last (if we are faithful) to total cleansing and deliverance from Sin's Flesh, from the Constitution of Sin, from the Sin-nature and its Sin-impulse — to which, as natural creatures, we are in hopeless, death-ending bondage.

Does His Sacrifice Cleanse Us From Sin's Flesh?

What is the "barrier" between us and God that is removed at baptism?: our *nature* (legalistically), or our *transgressions*? Certainly our transgressions. At baptism all our past personal sins are "washed away" — forgiven: we stand morally perfect before God. We can approach God as justified and cleansed men, washed in Christ's shed blood. Our nature is unchanged, though our Adamic destiny is reversed.

We are confronted by those who differ with us with many quotations from brethren Thomas and Roberts that Christ died for our personal sins: our actual transgressions. This has never been questioned. It is beside the real point. This emphasis on certain agreed truths diverts attention from the real issue on which there is a difference.

Clearly, as far as we ourselves are concerned, our own personal transgressions are the real problem in God's sight. It was from *them* that Christ came to redeem us. But not *only* from them. They are but the Fruit of the evil. We must go to the Root. What is the Root of Sin — of *our* sins? What assures that there will always be Sin, as long as that Root remains?

And how did Christ get at that Root? How did his God-appointed life-and-death extirpate that Root? repudiate it? condemn it? destroy it? deliver him from it? cleanse him from it? make him for us a cleansed Ark of Safety and Life?

We are charged with being obsessed (like brother Andrew) with the technicalities of the Sin Nature, and being insufficiently mindful of the vital, major part *our own sins* play in the matter. This charge is not true, but it *does define a real danger we must avoid*. The issue truly isn't technicalities and legalities, but realities. It was an actual reality for Christ, and actual work, and actual life of self-purification. And it must be an actual reality for us. We must first define the basic doctrine correctly, but admittedly our *main* work and concern must be the *reality of coping with Sin's flesh ourselves*: our own sins. With us, as with Christ, nothing is actually accomplished by the magic wand of ritual: there must be a real doing, a real labor, a real victory and overcoming of the "motions of Sin in our members."

But to solve the problem, to remove Sin *as a totality*, Christ had to go to the Root, in himself and for himself — the whole race embodied in

One Man who in himself solved the problem and destroyed the Enemy of the race.

If we cannot see this picture, then we just have two disjointed, unconnected things: 1) our sins, and 2) Christ's sacrifice. And we have to invent a shadowy link in the name of "ritual" which just boils down to Substitution. In that case, he was not actually treating Sin as it ought to be treated, and *had* to be treated to solve the problem. If he had no Sin in his flesh to overcome and destroy, he was not destroying Sin, but just once more *typifying* how it *ought* to be destroyed.

* * *

Christ was always one with God. There was never any barrier separating them morally, though he was of Sin-defiled flesh. But still the defiled nature *is* (was) a barrier in one sense, both for him and us. He could not be one with God in perfect and eternal totality and substance, *as he now is*, until that barrier was removed: not a moral barrier, but a physical one: not a "guilt," but a misfortune, a disability, an inherited disease of the flesh that must be cleansed in God's required way.

Andrewism And Stricklerism: The Latter More Dangerous

Some who oppose brother Andrew's theories have gone to the other extreme. No one can unbiassedly read the *Law of Moses* without perceiving that brother Roberts largely had his eye on the Renunciationist/Strickler-type "Christ didn't offer for himself" errors. The whole spirit, tenor and essence of his many and extensive expoundings of the Sacrifice of Christ are to the effect that he must accomplish the work *for and in himself first* — work out his *own* physical purification by perfect life-and-death obedience as God required, and *then* open it up for the benefit of others.

This is the essential link that the current advocates of Stricklerism are missing. This is the *reality* of his work that makes it more than just a ritual and shadow.

Even though Andrewism was at the time a very current issue (*Law of Moses* appeared serially 1894-1898), still it was the opposite error (also then current: brother Harry Fry was withdrawn from for Stricklerism in 1898) that brother Roberts could see was the principal one that the Truth needed defending against.

There seems to be an incomprehensible squeamishness about robustly accepting this clear pivotal Truth: the vital link that takes the Sacrifice of Christ out of the powerless, shadowy realm of just one more type and figure, and gives it substance as an actual and essential accomplishment: a terrible, wonderful, personal self-sacrificial purging and cleansing: "made perfect by suffering."

How dreadful, how beautiful, how glorious a victorious self-purification it was! What a deadly Enemy within! What a perfect, personal victory over the dread Sin-Power of the Flesh that held all his brethren in hopeless bondage! What marvelous meaning we see thereafter in the symbol and type and ritual of "sacrifice"!

What do they have but dead types and shadows who cannot see this reality? It seems to be feared that the acceptance of this great Truth will give the whole case away to Andrewism. Far from it! The fear is groundless. All sound brethren have held this Truth for over 100 years with no taint of Andrewism.

Rather it would greatly *strengthen* the case for the Truth; for it would supply the missing link that makes the Strickler concept of Christ's Sacrifice another dead shadow, instead of a living reality, an actual accomplishment, a real destruction of Sin at its root.

Let Us Stick To The Main, Basic Issue

Much is being written and quoted from brethren Thomas and Roberts which is beside the point, and with which all who are sound will agree. The main, key issue is —

Did Christ offer for himself first, and was he cleansed and redeemed from "Sin-in-the-flesh," "the Law of Sin in his members," by his own perfect life and blood-shedding death?

— as brethren Thomas and Roberts teach over and over as the essential link that binds him to us, makes his death on the cross a declaration of God's holiness and justice (as it is declared to be), and makes his personal perfecting and cleansing efficacious for us as a true Representative (*one in need of the same thing*), and not as a mere ritual Substitution, just illustrating something not applying to himself. Let us stick to this main issue, and not be side-tracked into side-issues.

Once we frankly and robustly take our stand with brethren Thomas and Roberts, and say clearly:

"Yes! Christ offered for himself. His sacrifice was necessary for his own cleansing and salvation from Sin, the whole Sin Constitution. He "obtained eternal redemption and entered the Holy Place by his own blood" (Heb. 9:12). He was "brought from the dead through the blood of the Everlasting Covenant" (Heb. 13:20). He actually in himself destroyed Sin by his perfect sacrifice."

— *then* the picture is clear, and controversy ceases. Until we snap this vital link shut, we leave his sacrifice an isolated enigma, a shadow, unrelated to reality and accomplishment: a type, a symbol, nothing more: a yawning chasm between *his* work and *our* need. Brethren Thomas and Roberts say (in many forms of words, and this is one) —

“Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there . . . The purpose of God was to condemn Sin in the flesh, a thing that could not have been accomplished if there were no Sin there.” —*Elpis Israel*, page 128

“To be ‘made Sin’ for others is to become flesh and blood.”
—*Eureka* 1:247

Brethren Thomas and Roberts saw so clearly, and stated so unequivocally, that Christ’s “destruction of the devil” in his death had to be a *reality*, and not just a shadow. It is not logical or reasonable that after 4000 years of preparatory, foreshadowing rituals, God would be satisfied with settling the great conflict with Sin — the Diabolos — with just one more ritual of what *should* be. He required the *fulfillment*.

* * *

“He bore *our sins* in his own body on the tree” (1 Peter 2:24). Of course he did! Peter specifically says so. Of course it was our sins: our personal transgressions. That is one side of the arch. But it was “*IN his own body*” — that’s the other side of the arch. And the vital keystone that links them and makes them one is the Sin Nature, Sin-in-the-Flesh, the Law of Sin in the members. It *all*, as a unit, needed taking away: our sins and the evil defilement from which they spring; the Fruit, AND the evil Root from which the Fruit springs, and from which it would endlessly continue to spring until the *Root itself* be stamped out in victory.

Brother Andrew got the Root aspect out of proportion. Brother Roberts fought this — especially in view of the inferences concerning resurrection brother Andrew drew. Andrewism is a mixture of Truth and Error, often in the same sentence. We have no desire to go into its ramifications. As a totality, we repudiate it.

But some, in very rightly denying its errors, are going too far and are denying the heart of the Truth that brethren Thomas and Roberts brought to light.

Separating Christ From His Brethren

Those currently teaching the Strickler theory make the same mistake as brother Andrew. They separate Christ from his brethren. They say —

“We need a blood-shed sacrifice for *our* salvation: *Christ* only needed a simple death.”

They are hung up on “sacrificial” ritual. They completely miss what he actually *did*. Any theory that has two different salvations — one for Christ and one for his brethren — *must* be wrong. We all — the whole race — need the same thing. And what we need is not just a ritual that points, but an *accomplishment* — a real, actual victory over the Sin

Nature that we can (in God's mercy) enter into and share.

God deals with the race as a race, but on an individual basis. That sounds like a contradiction, but it is not. God is saving the race, as the race, IN and through Christ. But not the whole race: just those members of the race who individually take advantage of God's provision of salvation for the race.

"IN Adam all die": that is the natural — our natural destiny in Adam. "IN Christ shall all be made alive": that is the spiritual — our spiritual destiny in Christ, if we *enter into* Christ, and *stay* in Christ:

"Abide IN me . . . if a man abide not in me, he is cast forth . . . and burned." (John 15:4-6)

Naturally, in Adam, we die *with* Adam. Spiritually, in Christ, we live *with* Christ. One man *took himself down*, and us with him. The second man *took himself up*, and us with him, IF we enter him, and stay in him.

Christ redeemed and saved *himself*, and — at first, *only* himself. Then, having "obtained eternal redemption," the salvation he won for himself was, in God's mercy and as planned from the beginning, extended to all who make themselves part of him.

Must Christ Offer For Himself?

And Is This The Central Purpose Of His First Advent?

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

THIS article by brother Roberts appeared in the October, 1873 *Christadelphian*, under the heading: "Questions and Questions for Those Who Believe the Renunciationist Theory." One of the key tenets of that theory was that *Christ did not need to offer for himself*; that he was not *cleansed and redeemed by his own sacrifice*.

It will be noted how brother Roberts hammers this point over and over as the key issue.

We have been asked to reprint this article so that the Brotherhood may have it for reference in contending with current error, and because an extract from it (part of #44) has actually been published to "prove" the very error that brother Roberts is so specifically and statedly and obviously contending *against*. When it is read throughout, with its strong, constant, repeated denunciation of the error that Christ did not offer for his own cleansing (saying that such a "Christ" is not Paul's Christ), it is incomprehensible that anyone should quote, in support of Stricklerism, this particular writing of brother Roberts.

It will be noted that in many places brother Roberts refers to the necessity of Christ's *sacrificial* death for his own cleansing (expressing this thought fully), while in other places he speaks of the necessity of his *death* for that purpose, without specifically each time mentioning the sacrificial aspect. The alternating association throughout of the two ways of expressing it is conclusive evidence that the latter ("death") is an abbreviated form of the fuller expression "sacrificial death." This is rather a minor point, because the necessity of the sacrificial aspect for himself is so very frequently and specifically stressed; but when perceived, this point does add even fuller force to the places where it is not so fully spelled out — both in this writing of brother Roberts, and also in others. He repeats the full definition often enough to show what he means in *all* cases.

For quick referral, we have put the points most relevant to the present controversy in bold type (though other points will also be seen to have a bearing).

Much of this article is admittedly beside the present matter of controversy. But much of it is very, very much to the point. All of it, to the present point or not, is good exercise for the mind. And it is currently relevant in that the Renunciationist error is similar to the current and very active "Nazarene" error — another drift back to orthodox substitutionism, by some once enlightened. We suggest the whole article be read, but **if you just want its application to the current problem, read the bold face.** One may not agree with brother Roberts that Christ needed to offer for himself, and was cleansed and redeemed and attained to salvation by and through his own perfect life-and-death sacrifice, and that this is vital truth. But no honest reader can deny that *this is what he DID believe, and diligently taught, and so did brother Thomas.*

* * *

THE ARTICLE BY BROTHER ROBERTS ("Questions and Questions," Oct., 1873, pages 460-468): —

1. It is written that "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the Truth of God, to *confirm the Promises made to the fathers*" (Rom. 15:8). It is further written that "He is *the Mediator of the New Covenant*, that **BY MEANS OF DEATH** . . . they which are called might receive the Promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also *of necessity be the death of the testator*" (Heb. 9:15-16). Confirmatory of these declarations, Jesus at the last supper, in handing the wine to his disciples, said, "This is the New Testament *in my blood*" (Lk. 22:20). Query: Could the Covenants of Promise have been brought into force without the death of Jesus the testator?

2. If not, how could Jesus, without dying, have obtained *his* portion

of the Covenant? — seeing the Promises (to Abraham) were “to thee and to thy Seed,” “which (says Paul — Gal. 3:16) IS CHRIST,” and seeing that the Promise to David was, “I will establish the throne of his Kingdom forever” (2 Sam. 7:13).

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

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

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

6. Jesus, in speaking of his death, says, “For this cause came I unto this hour” (Jn. 12:27); further, that “The Son of man is come to give his life a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28). Further, that this was the will of Him Who had sent him, and Whose will he had come to do (Jn. 6:38). He was introduced to Israel as “The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world” (Jn. 1:29) “by the sacrifice of himself” (Heb. 9:26). And Paul testifies that he was made a little lower than the angels *expressly for the suffering of death* (Heb. 2:9). Does it not appear on the evidence that the very work he was sent into the world to do was *to die*? Could he have “earned eternal life” without doing the work the Father sent him to do? If not, could he “earn eternal life” without dying? If not, is it not a violation of the wisdom of God for anyone to speak of the possibility of his claiming eternal life before his death, and entering into the enjoyment of it alone? (If Adam in Eden had been appointed to die, could you have said his life was “free”? Who can make “free” from the appointment of God?)

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

8. Is not our destination to die an inherited physical law in the flesh, resultant in the first instance from the sin of Adam, **and therefore called SIN**? If not, in what sense has death passed upon all men” (Rom. 5:12)? But it is not a matter of argument. We see it every day with our

eyes that a fixed tendency to dissolution is a quality of the flesh of Adam. Can a man partake of the flesh of Adam, and not partake of this? Where is the testimony that he can?

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

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

11. Paul says that God, sending forth His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, "condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3). How could this have been done IF THERE BE NO SUCH THING AS "SIN IN THE FLESH," and if Christ was not SINFUL FLESH, but a likeness of it?

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

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

14. Peter says "he bore our sins IN HIS OWN BODY on the tree" (1 Pet. 2:24; Isa. 53:6). Does this mean the very acts of disobedience themselves, or their effects? As the former is inadmissible, it must be the latter. If he bore their effects in his body, was not his body mortal, which is the effect of sin?

15. If you say that our sins were laid on him in the same way as they were laid on the sacrificial animals in the Mosaic system of things (which was a mere CEREMONIAL OR ARTIFICIAL IMPUTATIVENESS), how comes it that those sacrifices could never take

* That is, the *diabolos* (Heb. 2:14).

away sins (Heb. 10:2)? **And where then is the SUBSTANCE OF THE SHADOW?** The ceremonial imposition of sins upon the animal was the type. **The REAL putting of sin on the Lamb of God IN THE BESTOWAL OF A PREPARED SIN-BODY wherein to die, is the substance.**

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

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

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

19. John testifies that Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 Jn. 2:2). And that this reaches backward before Christ’s time, as well as forward, is evident from Paul’s statement that Christ died “for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament” (Heb. 9:15). On what ground is Adam to be excluded from the scope of this provision? Did not the coats of skin provided in Paradise (Gen. 3:21) convey an intimation that his sins could be covered? Is it not evident from this consideration that Adam’s condemnation, as well as ours, rested on Christ?

20. David was a mortal man. Was not the flesh of Jesus the flesh of David? If so, was not the flesh of Jesus mortal likewise? If so, *why*? Was it not the effect of hereditary condemnation? If it was not mortal, how could it be the flesh of David which *was* mortal?

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

22. Did Adam experience evil before disobedience? You are bound to answer No. What parallel then can there be between him in that state,

and Jesus in the days of his flesh, experiencing weakness, grief, pain and death?

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

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

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

26. If Jesus Christ, in the days of his flesh, was in the same position as Adam before disobedience, why did Christ experience evil and Adam not. How could he be in the same position in which Adam was before disobedience, seeing he was born of a woman who inherited the results of that disobedience, and “that which is born of the flesh is flesh” (Jn. 3:6)?

27. Paul says, “God hath made Jesus to be sin” (2 Cor. 5:21). How is this to be understood, if death, the wages of sin, had no hold on him? Was he not made sin **IN BEING MADE OF A WOMAN** who was mortal because of sin, and could only impart her own **SINFUL FLESH** to a son begotten of her?

28. Paul says (Heb. 11:28) that Christ will appear the second time **WITHOUT SIN** unto salvation. This is equivalent to saying the first time was not without sin. In what sense did he come the first time **WITH SIN**, if his flesh was not sinful flesh, and the law of sin had no hereditary claim?

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

30. Then, suppose we accept your paraphrase of it and, for “sin,” read “sin offering,” in what did the sin-offering consist? Was it not his body, even as Paul says, that “We are sanctified through the offering of

the body of Christ once" (Heb. 10:10)? And in what sense can his body be called SIN, if it was clean from the hereditary effects of the sin-nature from which it was extracted?

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

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

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

34. Not only so, but consider how redemption from the Mosaic Law was effected. You are aware that under this law "he was made a curse," though he never broke it. You are further aware that this being made a curse did not simply consist in dying, but that it laid *personal* hold on him, through the *mode* in which he was killed: "He that hangeth on a tree is accursed of God" (Deut. 21:23; Gal. 3:13). Presuming you will not say any of God's ways are unnecessary, are you not bound to admit from these premises that before Jesus could deliver those who were under the curse of the Law of Moses, it was necessary that *he himself* should come under that curse, though guiltless?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

44. You seem to consider hereditary mortality in Adam more fatal than death incurred by individual delinquency. In other words, you call it "eternal death" apart from a Redeemer. If in this you are right, how comes it that the Law of Moses would have given eternal life if the flesh had been equal to the keeping of it? Paul says it was "ordained to life" (Rom. 7:10). Showing that this meant eternal life, Jesus, in answer to the question how eternal life was to be attained, said, "What is written in the Law? How readest thou? Keep the commandments. *This do*, and thou shalt *live*." (Lk. 10:26-28). But Christ was the only man that ever kept the Law without fault, and he was God-manifest in the flesh by the Spirit, for the purpose. All others were unable to keep it. Hence the Law was "*weak through the flesh*" (Rom. 8:3). If men had been able to keep it, obedience would have led to resurrection after Adamic death, as in the case of Christ. God does not hold us individually responsible for Adam's offense. We inherit the *effects*, but could have been redeemed from them by obedience, if that had been possible. But how, according to your construction of Adamic death, could obedience have led to "eternal life"?

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

(There is no question 46 in the original.)

47. It is truly testified that Christ died "for us"; but it is evident that the phrase "for us" means "on account of us," and not "instead of us." It is not only testified that he died for us, but that he died "for our sins"

(1 Cor. 15:3). Does this mean “instead of our sins”? So while it is said that he was “sacrificed for us” (1 Cor. 5:7), it is also said he was sacrificed “for sins” (Heb. 10:12). Would you understand he was sacrificed *instead* of our sins?

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

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

50. It is testified (Rom. 8:34) that “Christ also maketh intercession *for us*.” Does this mean instead of us? (See also Heb. 11:24; 10:20).

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

52. But though the appearance of Jesus in the flesh, and all that he went through, was “for us,” surely you will not deny that in **ALL** he did *for us*, **HE WAS INDIVIDUALLY COMPREHENDED as the Elder Brother of the family**. For instance, his birth was for us: “having raised up *for us* an horn of salvation in the house of His servant David” (Lk. 1:69). But was his birth not for himself also? If he had not been born, where would have been the Messiah and the glory to be revealed? I could understand a Trinitarian saying that it was unnecessary for him to be born for himself. But one believing that Christ was Son of God from his mother’s womb, and that the Deity in him was the Father, is bound to recognize the fact that Christ was not only born for us, but born for himself as well.

53. Again, Christ was obedient for us, as is manifest from the testimony, “By *one man’s obedience* many shall be made righteous” (Rom. 5:19). But was he not obedient for himself as well? If he had been disobedient, would he have been saved “in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save him from death” (Heb. 5:7)?

54. So he *died* “for us.” But did he not **DIE FOR HIMSELF** also? How otherwise could he have been made free from that sin which God laid upon him **IN SENDING HIM FORTH IN THE LIKENESS OF SINFUL FLESH**? Paul says that “He that is dead is freed from sin . . . in that Christ died, he *died unto sin once* . . . being raised from the dead, death hath *no more dominion over him*” (Rom. 6:7-10). Is it not clear from this that the death of Christ was necessary to **PURIFY HIS OWN NATURE** from the sin-power of death that was hereditary in him in the days of his flesh?

55. If to this you object, let me call your attention to Paul’s definition

of the priesthood which Christ took not to himself, but received from the Father: "Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, for that he himself is also compassed with infirmities, and by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also **FOR HIMSELF, to offer for sins**" (Heb. 5: 2-3).

56. Again, if Christ's OFFERING did not COMPREHEND HIMSELF in the scope of it, how are we to understand the statement of Paul that he "needed not DAILY, as *those* high priests, to offer up sacrifice, **FIRST FOR HIS OWN SINS** and then for the people's, for **THIS** he did once, when he offered up himself" (Heb. 7:27)?

57. As Christ was the antitype of the High Priest who "went alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people" (Heb. 11:7), is it not required that his sacrifice should COMPREHEND HIMSELF as well as his people in the effect of its operation?

58. If you deny this **MOST OBVIOUS CONCLUSION**, how do you explain the fact that the Messiah-Prince in the Future Age, at the restored feast of the Passover, "shall prepare **FOR HIMSELF** and for all the people of the land a bullock for a **SIN OFFERING**" (Ezek. 45:22). Do you deny that the sacrifices in the Future Age are memorial — like the breaking of bread — of what has been; in the same way as the sacrifices under Moses are typical of what was to be? Presuming you are scripturally enough informed to give the right answer to this, let me ask how the Messiah's OFFERING FOR HIMSELF as well as for the people can be a memorial offering, if Christ in dying for us did not die **FOR HIMSELF** as well?

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

60. It is testified that he rose again for our justification (Rom. 4:25), but was it not for his own justification as well? If not, how do you understand Paul's declaration that, in rising, he was "*justified* in the Spirit" (1 Tim. 3:16)?

61. He ascended to heaven to "appear in the presence of God *for us*" (Heb. 9:24). But was not this also for his own exaltation and glory? If not, what mean the words of Peter and Paul that "because of his obedience, God hath highly exalted him" "to His right hand" (Phil. 2:9; Acts 2:33; 5:31).

62. He is coming again *for us* (Jn. 14:3; Heb. 11:28). But is he not coming for himself also, that he may "see of the travail of his soul and

be satisfied" (Isa. 53:11)? — and be "glorified and admired in all them that believe" (2 Thess. 1:10)?

63. It is all "for us," but **IS HE NOT INCLUDED, as the Firstborn among the many brethren whom, as Captain, he leads to glory** (Rom. 8:29; Heb. 2:10)?

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

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

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

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

68. Wherein lay the "help" laid upon Christ by God for us (Psa. 89:19)? Was it not in the power of obedience in conception imparted to him; for was it not his obedience that brought resurrection and life? If you say the "help" lay in "free" life (a thing about which the Scriptures are silent), are you not committed to the conclusion that our "help" vanished when that "free" life was destroyed in death?

69. I could understand the possibility of "free life" being "help" if it was necessary for the deliverer to be exempt from death. But seeing that necessity lay just the other way, that is, that he should "taste of

death," is it not absurd, as well as unscriptural, to call his life "free"?

70. Was not Jesus "God manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. 3:16)? If you say Adam was God manifest in the flesh as well (but surely no one would go to such a terrible depth of mere-manism), how comes it that the only place where Christ is called Adam, introduces Christ as a *contrast* to Adam, saying, "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second Adam is *Lord from heaven*"?

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

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

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

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

74a. Paul says the substance of the Law, or things foreshadowed in it, are to be found in Christ (Col. 2:17; Rom. 2:20; Heb. 9:23; 10:1). This being so, **can your theory furnish the antitype to the High Priest OFFERING FOR HIMSELF (Lev. 16:6)?**

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

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

77. **Can your theory furnish the antitype to the MAKING ATONEMENT for the Holy Place (Lev. 16:16)?**

78. **Can your theory furnish the antitype for the ATONEMENT made for the Altar (v. 18)?**

79. **Can your theory furnish the antitype to the ATONEMENT made for the Holy Sanctuary (Lev. 16:33)?**

80. **Can your theory furnish the antitype to ATONEMENT for the Tabernacle of the congregation, wherein God dwelt (Lev. 16:33)?**

81. If you attempt an answer, do not content yourself with "Yes"; but show us wherein all these things which were typical of Christ have their counterpart in a theory which teaches he had not the

condemned nature on him, and therefore **needed not to offer FOR HIMSELF.**

82. Paul says that as it was necessary that these pattern-things in the Mosaic system should be purged with blood, so it was necessary that the **THINGS SIGNIFIED** should be purged, but with a better sacrifice, that is, the sacrifice of Christ (Heb. 11:23). The Christ of YOUR theory **NEEDED NO "PURGING."** Therefore does it not follow that **HE IS NOT THE CHRIST OF PAUL**, who required purging from the law of sin and death **BY HIS OWN SACRIFICE?**

83. Paul says of Christ: "It is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer" (Heb. 8:3). YOU say of YOUR CHRIST that he was under **NO NECESSITY to offer for himself**; but might have refused to die, and entered into life alone. Is it not clear that YOUR Christ is **NOT Paul's Christ**, with whom it was a necessity that he should offer up himself **FOR THE PURGING OF HIS OWN NATURE, FIRST**, from the uncleanness of death, that having by his own blood obtained eternal redemption (Heb. 9:12), he might be able afterwards to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by him (Heb. 7:25)?

84. Jesus said he would be to the generation contemporary with him, "the sign of the prophet Jonas" in being "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. 12:39-40). He also said in reference to his death, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" (Lk. 12:50). And, "The cup which my Father hath given me to drink, shall I not drink it?" (Jn. 18:11). How agrees with these sayings, a theory which speaks of the possibility of death having been omitted from the work of Christ, and of his entering eternal life alone — the very gate to which lay through death?

85. (*This was a personal admonition, and was left off the printed pamphlet*).

— End of 1873 article by brother Roberts.

* * *

The more we are forced by controversy to ponder and analyze this question, and to consider the extensive writings of brethren Thomas and Roberts upon it, the more we are forced to the conclusion that Christ's necessity to cleanse himself by "sacrifice" from the constitution Law of Sin and Death in his members is the whole heart and hub of the Divine Plan of redemption: the great watershed between Truth and Error.

His whole mission, his whole life-and-death process, his whole work, was a self-cleansing, a "sacrifice," **THE SACRIFICE.** And this work of Christ upon and within himself is the whole *meaning* of sacrifice: of the whole sacrificial system, from the Lamb slain in Eden to

the very last memorial offering at the Millennium's end, before God becomes All in All.

All the typical, ritual, foreshadowing and memorial sacrifices converge in and upon this one great central world event: the perfect self-purification of Christ from the bondage and corruption of the dread Law of Sin and Death brought upon the whole race by Adam.

Christ must be the purified Ark and Altar, Priest and Tabernacle, the Great Forerunner, the Perfect Example of the Divinely-appointed Way of Life, the "Captain" (Heb. 2:10, *Archegos*: "one who leads, who does a thing first"). What eternal significance in that triumphant cry—*"It is finished! . . . Be of good cheer: I have OVERCOME THE WORLD!"*

That Christ himself was involved, together with all his brethren and sisters, in the cleansing and redemption from Sin has been the central keystone of sound Christadelphian belief and teaching from the beginning. It has *always* been taught that he — starting from their common condition, as one of them, under the same defilement and condemnation — cleansed himself by total, perfect life-sacrifice, so as to carry *them* WITH HIM from uncleanness to perfection. It is a tragedy that this essential truth is being lost in the drift back to Substitutionism.

It is remarkable how early in his studies it was that brother Thomas perceived that the Psalms, as a whole, are — in essence — the inspired, Divine portrayal of Christ's great, lifelong struggle against, and victory over, SIN: Sin-in-the-flesh, the Great Enemy of mankind, the Devil, the Diabolos — upon which struggle and victory the whole destiny of the world depended.

We urge all to deeply study the sound writings of our pioneers on this subject, in their faithful expounding of Scripture. It is the heart of the Truth. It is a beautiful, reasonable picture: so wholly satisfying and convincing when perceived. Misunderstanding of it has been the single most fruitful source of apostasy and departure ever since apostolic days.

Study! Study! Study! We have no time to waste on tinker-toys. We are not in a child's game. We are called out by God to an eternal and universal destiny. We are, each one, chosen out of millions. Let us be worthy of the call: grow up to spiritual, mature things: put away passing rubbish. Error is spreading. And this beautiful, saving Truth is being lost, because the masses are shallow, and are leaving doctrine to their leaders, and sound fellowship principles are decried.

* * *

In looking up Answers to Bible Questions, we just ran across this by brother Roberts —

"The Sacrifice of Christ could not be for us without being

for himself inclusively. What was accomplished was accomplished in himself alone. We come on to the foundation he laid. It does not appear how the Sacrifice of Christ for us COULD BE SCRIPTURALLY UNDERSTOOD without this being perceived. Away from this, the heathen notion of substitution is the only idea that remains.”—*Christadelphian*, April, 1888, Inside Cover

* * *

FIX this firmly in the forefront of your consciousness: Christ’s **WHOLE WORK** was to actually **ACCOMPLISH** (not just symbolize) a **REAL, PERFECT, SACRIFICIAL SELF-CLEANSING** — *a total, unflawed defeat and destruction of the Diabolos.*

Christ’s great required work was, by total devotion and total sacrifice, to overcome and subdue the *Diabolos* within himself, and to crucify it. So also is this *our* great required work. Truly we must devote our time and efforts to the service of the Truth and of others, but it is even far more important to God that we purify and perfect our own character, disposition, heart, reactions, thoughts and desires.

Read 1 Cor. 13 over and over and over. It is not just vague poetry. It is a practical recipe — the **ONLY** practical recipe — for **LIFE**. It is an absolute necessity. It is our first and overwhelming priority in life. The mighty power of Divine love **MUST** totally crush and subdue and obliterate the evil and ugliness and corruption of the natural flesh within us. The promise is **ONLY** “*to him that overcometh.*” It is not enough that we control and restrain desire. We must totally redirect and transform it — from self to sacrifice.

To suppose that Christ could enter eternal oneness with God without total sacrifice is absurd. No one can. But, mercifully, the absolute perfection and completion of sacrifice even unto the death of the cross is not required of us as it was of him: but we must, in love, get as close as we can to it. In our weakness he covers us, **IF** we give our utmost according to what we have and are. And for that, thank God without ceasing.

Was Christ Ever “Alienated” From God?

By brother Gilbert V. Growcott

NEVER! Of course, it is possible to personally give such an artificial definition to “alienate” as to use it of Christ, and still *mean* the Truth. Some have, unfortunately, apparently for its “shock” value, done this

(to their own and others' confusion), in their zeal to combat the other extreme. Such a course is highly unwise, and can only be counter-productive to the calm presentation and acceptance of the Truth.

To suggest that Christ was "alienated" from God by reason of the fact that he bore Sin's Flesh, is to go too far in the opposite direction from Stricklerism. Certainly Sin's Flesh — which it was Christ's mission to overcome and cleanse *in himself*, to totally cleanse *himself* from the ingrained defilement of the *diabolos* by a perfect life of obedience and a sacrificial death — certainly this affliction of Sin's Flesh was a *physical barrier* that stood in the way of the perfect eternal oneness of Christ with God that now exists.

But "alienation" is a most improper and inappropriate word to use of the relationship between God and Christ in the days of his flesh, either before or after his baptism (or, as some say, his circumcision).

And beside being inappropriate in itself, it has become even more so because, due to the Andrew error and controversy, it has become one of the inflamed and emotional watchwords for the Andrew error. In the *Resurrectional Responsibility Debate* of 1894, brother Andrew asked, and brother Roberts answered —

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

125. *Is it not applicable to any who are unable to do right or wrong?* Ans: NO. It is a MORAL relation.

In the "*Christadelphian*," Sept., 1894, p. 351, a correspondent is defending the Truth against the Andrew error, and happens to mention, in quotation marks, that error's (alleged) "alienation of Christ." At this point, brother Roberts could not forbear inserting in parenthesis the strong editorial disclaimer: "*God pardon the expression appearing in the "Christadelphian" — EDITOR*". And in the *Law of Moses* —

"Christ was never alienated from God." — *Law of Moses*, end of chapt. 26, p. 250

Aaron And Christ

By brother John Thomas

"*Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.*" — Matt. 3:15

YAHWEH (that is, "I Shall Be" Ex. 3:15) said to Moses (Ex. 25:40) —

"See that thou make what thou wast caused to see, after their pattern (*tabneeth*) showed thee in the mount."

Which things, Paul says, are only (Heb. 8:5) —

"The image (*hupodeigmati*) and shadow (*skia*) of heavenly things."

— as God said to Moses. And else where Paul says that (Rom. 2:20) —
"The Jews have the model (*morphosin*) of the Knowledge and of the Truth, in the Law."

From which, and other passages that can be adduced, it is evident that the following proposition is true, that —

The Mosaic system of righteousness is symbolical of the righteousness of God in Jesus Christ.

Definition: by "Mosaic system of righteousness" is meant —

All that was necessary to "sanctify to the purifying of the FLESH," but which could not free the conscience from SIN.

To impart this carnal purification to the worshiper, a High Priest and his household (distinct from the other classes of the Jewish nation), legally inaugurated and sanctified, were necessary: also a Tabernacle, sacrifices, washings, etc.

Definition: by the "righteousness of God" is meant —

*A justification from all past sins, devised and enjoined by God: a purification of the heart, or conscience, without the necessity of obeying the Law of Moses (which since the destruction of Jerusalem cannot be kept), but attested by that Law and the Prophets: a justification through Jesus Christ's faith (*diapisteos Iesou Xristou* — Gal. 2:16).*

That is, through belief of what he and his apostles preached concerning the Kingdom of God and his Name (Ac. 8:12). In other words: *through belief of the Gospel to all who shall put on Christ* (Gal. 3:27).

The "righteousness of God" is the "Gospel of the Kingdom"; sometimes called the "Gospel of Christ," and often simply "the Gospel," which Paul says is:

"The power of God for salvation of every one that believeth: to the Jew first, and then to the Greek (Gentile)" — Rom. 1:16.

Nothing can save Jew or Gentile but "the Power of God." The power for that special purpose is the Gospel only; so that *saving power* and the *Gospel* are but different phrases for the same thing.

Look into these things *narrowly* —

"Jesus became the Author of eternal salvation to *all them that OBEY him*" (Heb. 5:9).

"If ye love me (said Jesus), *keep my COMMANDMENTS*" (John 14:15).

"If a man love me, he *will* keep my words" (John 14:23).

“Ye are my friends, if ye DO *whatsoever* I command you”
(John 15:14).

“He that rejecteth me, and keepeth not my words... the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day”
(John 12:48).

“LOVE is the *fulfilling of the law*” (Rom. 13:10).

Hence “love” and “obedience” in scriptural language are but two words for the same idea or thing. So that God, in Jesus Christ’s words, admit of no “love” or *professions* of devotions and attachment, that are unaccompanied with a *childlike obedience to “whatsoever” He commands*.

Where obedience is not, there love does not exist. And where there is no scriptural love, there is no obedience in word or deed. And where these are absent, the spirit of love, which is “the spirit of Christ,” is wanting (1 Cor. 13:4-7) —

“Love suffers long, and is kind; it envieth not; it boasts not itself (not full of wordy professions); is not puffed up; doth not behave itself unseemly; seeketh not its own; is not easily provoked; thinketh no evil;

Rejoiceth not in iniquity, *but rejoiceth in THE TRUTH*; beareth all things, *believeth all things; hopeth all things; endureth all things.*”

To persons in whom such a disposition has been created, the precepts of Jesus are:

“He who believeth the Gospel (of the Kingdom), and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth it not shall be condemned”
(Mark 16:16).

Here, the “Gospel” is that proposed for *faith*; and baptism the thing prescribed for *obedience*, that the believer may show or prove whether that faith hath worked in him a true and genuine love to its Author. Baptism is only for *such* believers; for baptism is “the obedience of faith,” so that where belief of “The Truth” does not exist, there can be no true obedience.

When Jesus came to John, he demanded to be *buried in water*, that he might come out of it an immersed man. With a view to this, he said —

“Thus it is proper for us to *fulfil ALL righteousness*” (Matt. 3:15).

And the apostle adds:

“When he was baptized, he went up straightway *out of the water*” (v. 16).

— clearly evincing that he must have first gone *down* into it.

And now mark this well . . . *after* he had done this, God acknowledged him as His Son, and declared Himself well pleased with him.

(verse 17). Jesus had been God's most excellent Son for 30 years, but He withheld His acknowledgement of him till he signalized his filial obedience in *being baptized*.

Jesus was a Jew under the Law of Moses. When, therefore, he spake of the "all righteousness" to be "fulfilled," he spake of the necessity of *doing what was SIGNIFIED* by the prophetic and symbolic institutions of the Mosaic Law.

Jesus, being the Anointed Seed long promised by God, was, therefore, the High Priest who was to arise after the similitude, likeness, or order of Melchizedek (Psa. 110), and to "sit as a priest upon his throne, and to bear the glory" (Zech. 6). This being so, he would have, at some future time, to occupy the place formerly occupied by Aaron.

And as the Aaronic inauguration was *representative* of the Melchizedek, Jesus had to be consecrated after the same example or type, that in so doing he might anti-typically fulfil the representation of the Law.

Aaron was forbidden to enter the Most Holy Place of the Tabernacle without being adorned and glorified with garments of splendor and holiness, and therefore styled "holy garments." Nor was he permitted to enter even when habited with these, *unless he had been previously baptized*, upon pain of death. The Law said (Lev. 16:4) —

"He shall wash his flesh in water, and so put them on."

He was not permitted to officiate as High Priest in his ordinary attire. He must "put off" and "put on" the holy linen robe. And had he put this on without bathing his flesh in water, and proceeded to officiate, this unbaptized High Priest of Israel would have been struck dead.

When legally invested and arrayed, the Aaronic High Priests were "Holiness to Yahweh" (Ex. 39:30), and the representatives of the Holy and Just One in his character and priestly office. The symbolism relative to the High Priest was the "righteousness" to be fulfilled by Jesus before he could enter upon his functions by "the power of an endless life" as High Priest, first over the Household of God, and afterwards over the Twelve Tribes of Israel.

John the Baptizer, a "greater prophet" than Moses (Luke 7:28) but not so great as Jesus, preached and administered —

"The baptism of repentance for the remission of sins"
(Mark 1:4).

Jesus came to him to be baptized of this baptism; for, as Moses baptized Aaron and his sons, so the greatest of all the prophets was appointed to baptize Jesus and his brethren.

But some may object that Jesus had no sins to be remitted, and had

no need of "repentance," and was therefore not a fit subject for such a baptism. It is admitted without reserve that he had no sins of his own, having never transgressed the law. Nevertheless, as the *Sin-bearer of the Abrahamic Covenant* (through whom it was confirmed [Rom. 15:8]), Yahweh made the iniquity of all "the children of the Covenant" to meet upon him, that by his bruise they might be healed (Isa. 53:5-6). He was not the Sin-bearer of every son of Adam that ever lived, but —

Of the true believers from Abel to the Day of Pentecost; and
Of the obedient believers of the Truth, constituting the Household, separated by "the obedience of faith," from Pentecost in the year of the crucifixion to his future appearing in Jerusalem; and

Of the living Twelve Tribes when their transgressions shall be blotted out as a thick cloud, at their ingrafting into their own Olive Tree; and

Of that family of nations of which Abraham is the constituted father, when they are made righteous.

— so that the sins of the whole of *that* world which shall dwell upon the earth in the post-millennial eternal ages, and which will all of it have been separated from Adam's race by "*the obedience of faith*," will have met upon him, and been borne away into everlasting oblivion. *This* is the "world" so beloved of God that —

"He gave His only begotten Son . . . that through him it might be saved" (John 3:16).

But to return. Jesus, with the sin of the world thus defined, ranking *in his flesh* (where it was to be condemned to death when suspended on the cross [Rom. 8:3]), came to John as the "Ram of Consecration," that his inwards and his body might be washed according to the Law (Exodus 29).

But these representations of the Law and the Prophets could not have found their antitype in Jesus if in the days of his flesh he had possessed a holier or purer *nature* than those for whom he was bruised in the heel. His *character* was spotless. But, as being the Seed of the Woman of whom no clean flesh can be born (Job 15:4), and the Seed of Abraham, which is not immaculate, be it virgin or Nazarite, his *nature* was flesh and blood (Heb. 2:14), which Paul styles "SINFUL FLESH," or *flesh full of sin*, a physical quality or principle which makes the flesh mortal, and called "sin" because this property of flesh became its law as the consequence of transgression —

"God made Jesus sin for us, who knew no sin; that *we* might be made the *righteousness* of God IN him" (2 Cor. 5:21).

In *this* view of the matter, the Sin-bearer of the world indicated, was a

fit and proper subject of John's baptism of repentance for remission of sins. The holy and undefiled disposition of Mary's son was *granted to him for repentance*, in fulfilling the symbolical righteousness of the Law when he descended into the Jordan to enter into the antitypical robe of righteousness, with which he must of necessity be invested before he could enter into the Most Holy as High Priest after the order of Melchizedek.

In being baptized, he proclaimed the development of a *character distinguished by perfect faith and obedience*. This character was his holy raiment, and was without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. This was the "fine linen, clean and white" with which he arrayed himself —

"The righteousness of the (king of) saints" (Rev. 19:8).

It was the antitype, in part, of Aaron's holy garments. And he had to put it on in the same way that Aaron did —

"By washing his flesh in water, and so putting it on."

He was baptized of John into a *holiness of his own*, which publicly **BEGAN** with *obedience* in the Jordan, and **ENDED** with *obedience in death* on the cross (Phil. 2:9-11) —

"He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every name; that every tongue should confess he is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

Had Jesus yielded to John (supposing the thing to have been possible), he would have stood before his nation as the High Priest of Israel, claiming to officiate in the Most Holy Place, without baptism — a spectacle it had never seen before, nor ever will while the world stands.

But the symbolic righteousness of the Mosaic Law not only required the High Priest to put on the holy vestments by having his body baptized, but it also commanded his household to be baptized into theirs:

"This is the thing Yahweh commanded to be done: and Moses brought Aaron and his sons, and washed them with water. And he put on Aaron the coat . . . and he put coats upon his sons, and girded them with girdles, and put turbans upon them, as Yahweh commanded" (Lev. 8:5-13; 16:4).

Here, as I have said, Moses performed the part of John the Baptizer to Aaron and his sons, who were to be rulers and priests in Israel. Aaron and his family were their nation's priestly household; and it was the office of the High Priest to make atonement, or reconciliation — first for himself, *then for his household*, and lastly for all the congregation of Israel.

But admission into the Holy and most Holy Places was only

permitted to the baptized: they must bathe their flesh in water, and so put on their holy garments. Hence, all Israel's priests were immersed persons. And so also all that shall be their Priests and Kings in the Age to Come, and have power over the Gentiles, must be immersed likewise.

Jesus, the Melchizedek High Priest of Israel, has a household as well as Aaron had. A proof of this is found in the words of Paul. Writing to certain Hebrews who had *believed* the Gospel of the Kingdom and the Name of Jesus, and had *obeyed* it in having their "bodies washed with pure water," he says (Heb. 3:6, 14) —

"Christ is a Son over his own House, *whose House are we*, if we hold fast the confidence and rejoicing of THE HOPE firm unto the end."

Now Jesus, speaking for himself *and others*, said —

"THUS it becomes US to fulfil all righteousness."

It is, therefore, necessary for all "his House" to do as he did, but with this modification of the significancy of the deed: *he* was baptized as the initiative of his *own* holiness, sacrificial and priestly. *They* must be baptized into *his* holiness, and into *a development of their own* conformable to his; and — with this induction for a beginning — thenceforth "continue patiently in well doing," that they may be holy as he was holy in the days of this flesh, as it is written —

"BE YE HOLY BECAUSE I AM HOLY."

Jesus and his Household are the future Kings and Priests prepared of God to rule Israel and the nations for Him. The Law and the Prophets, which attest the righteousness of God, require them all to put on that righteousness by bathing. Jesus commands the same thing, and says:

"Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, *till all be fulfilled*" (Matt. 5:18).

Therefore he said to his apostles (Matt. 28:19-20) —

"Go and preach the Gospel to every creature, and teach them (who receive your proclamation) to observe whatsoever I command you."

By virtue of this saying, the apostles become the depositaries of his commands, so that, in the words of Jesus (Luke 10:16) —

"He that heareth them, heareth him; and he that despiseth them, despiseth him; and he that despiseth him despiseth Him that sent him."

Now, Peter, who was one of these plenipotentiaries of Christ, commanded Cornelius, who was —

"A devout man, and one that feared God with all his house;

and gave much alms to the people (Israel), and prayed to God
always" (Acts 10:2).

— Peter, I say, commanded this company of pious Gentiles, who believed the word Jesus began to preach in Galilee, *to be baptized in the Name of the Lord* (Acts 10:48). The apostolic style of address was —

"Children of the stock of Abraham, AND whosoever among you *feareth God*, TO YOU is the word of this salvation sent" (Acts 13:26).

A man's supposed piety did not exempt him from the necessity of believing and obeying the Gospel of the Kingdom, or, as Paul styles it, "the word of this salvation." Peter went to Caesarea to tell pious, Godfearing men "*words whereby they should be SAVED*" (Acts 11:14). However pious they may be who are ignorant of these saving words, they are "alienated from the life of God *through ignorance*" (Eph. 4:18).

Piety in general has so little to do with an understanding of the "word of the Kingdom," and the *obedience* it enjoins, that it has passed into a proverb that: "*Ignorance is the mother of devotion.*"

In a certain sense, this is true. The most ignorant are, for the most part, the most pious, and the most intolerant of the Truth and its obedience. This is Pharisaism, whether it flourish in the first or in the 19th century; and in reference to which Jesus has said (Matt. 5:20) —

"Except your righteousness shall exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of heaven."

Shall it be said that it was necessary for the Melchizedek High Priest, who was innocent of transgression, and who for 30 years had enjoyed the favor of God and man (Luke 2:52), to be immersed in a baptism of "repentance for remission of sins"; but that it was not necessary for the pious who would compose his Household, who are sinners by nature and practice?

Nay, if it were indispensable for Jesus to be buried in water, that he might begin an (official) career of *holiness to Yahweh* in coming up out of it, it is infinitely more so that all should tread in his steps of perfect faith and *obedience* who would be invested with —

"Robes washed white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. 7:14) — having their —

"Loins girt about with the girdle of Truth, and having on the breastplate of Righteousness, and their feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of Peace, and on their head the helmet of Salvation" (Eph. 6:14-17).

An immersed High Priest requires an immersed Household. There is one law for both, as there was "One Baptism" for Jesus and his apostles; on whom — as on all others of the Household — the necessity

is imperative to fulfil all the righteousness foreshadowed in Aaron and his sons. There is no discharge for this necessity for Jew or Gentile —

“For THUS it behoveth US to fulfil ALL righteousness.” — Herald, March, 1855

“By His Own Blood He Entered”

By brother Robert Roberts

THE following was drawn up by brother Roberts while in Australia to confute the error he found being taught there that: Christ did not offer for himself; did not require a cleansing sacrifice; was not “made sin” in being born of a human mother under the present defiled, sin-nature constitution of the race; did not possess (and struggle to perfect and glorious success against) the “law of sin in the members” that afflicts all of Adam’s race; and did not ACTUALLY (but only “ritually”) condemn and destroy the sin-principle IN his own flesh, to the honor and justification of God by the crucifixion of the Sin-Body.

It was the same old error that has troubled (and tested the faithfulness of) the Body from the beginning. Brother Roberts in introducing this article describes it as “The Roman Catholic view in a modified form (which) revolts at the very idea of Jesus having been in any way related to sin. This is a zealous antipathy not inspired by knowledge.”

1. That death entered the world of mankind by Adam’s disobedience.

“By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin” (Rom. 5:12).

“In (by or through) Adam, all die” (1 Cor. 15:22).

“Through the offense of one, many are dead” (Rom. 5:15).

2. That death came by decree, extraneous 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. 1:27; 1:31).

“Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife . . . unto dust shall thou return” (Gen. 3:17-19).

3. Since that time, death has been a bodily law.

“The body is dead because of sin” (Rom. 8:10).

“The law of SIN in my members...the body of this death” (Rom. 7:23-24).

“This mortal . . . we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened” (1 Cor. 15:23; 2 Cor. 5:4).

"Having *the sentence of death in ourselves* that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God Who raiseth the dead" (2 Cor. 1:9).

4. **The human body is therefore a BODY OF DEATH requiring redemption.**

"Waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our body*" (Rom. 8:23).

"He shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body" (Phil. 3:21).

"Who shall deliver me from the **BODY OF THIS DEATH?**" (Rom. 7:24).

"This mortal (body) must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15:53).

5. **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. 7:18).

"**SIN dwelleth in me**" (Rom. 7:20).

"The **LAW OF SIN** which is in my members" (Rom. 7:23).

"Every good and perfect gift is *from above*, and cometh down from the Father of Lights" (John 1:17).

"Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts" (Matt. 15:19).

"He that soweth *to the flesh* shall **OF THE FLESH** reap *corruption*" (Gal. 6:8).

"Put off the old man which is *corrupt* according to the *deceitful lusts*" (Eph. 4:22).

6. **That God's method for the return of sinful man to favor 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. 8:3).

"Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14).

"Who his own self bare our sins *IN his own body* to the tree" (1 Pet. 2:24).

"Our old man is *crucified* with him, that the **BODY OF SIN** might be destroyed" (Rom. 6:6).

"He was tempted in ALL points *like as we are*, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15).

"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, *to declare His righteousness*, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time His righteousness, *that He might be just*, and the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:25-26).

7. 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. 8:32).

"Him being delivered by *the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God*, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts 2:23)

"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 4:27).

"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 10:18).

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

"You that were sometime alienated in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh *through death*" (Col. 1:21).

"When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God *by the death of His Son*" (Rom. 5:10).

"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*" (Isa. 53:5).

"*I lay down my life for my sheep*" (John 10:15).

"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. 10:20).

9. 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. 5:9).

"In whom we have redemption *through his blood*, even the forgiveness of sins" (Col. 1:14).

"Without *shedding of blood* there is no remission" (Heb. 9:22).

"This is the New Covenant in my blood, *shed for the remission of sins*" (Matt. 26:28).

"The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29).

"Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins *in his own blood*" (Rev. 1:5).

"Having washed their robes and made them white *in the blood of the Lamb*" (Rev. 7:14).

10. 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. 5:7-9).

"Joint heirs with Christ" (Rom 8:17).

"*BY HIS OWN BLOOD* he entered once into the Holy Place, *having OBTAINED eternal redemption*" (Heb. 9:12).

"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*" (Heb. 13:20).

11. 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 honor 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 . . .*" (Heb. 5:3).

"Wherefore it is of necessity that *this man* have *somewhat also to offer*" (Heb. 8:3).

"Through the Eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot unto God" (Heb. 9:14).

"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. 7:27).

"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. 9:23). — brother Roberts, *Christadelphian*, Sept. 1896

* * *

WE believe this is essential scriptural Truth. But whether any accept this teaching or not, NO ONE can honestly deny one fact: that THIS is what the Christadelphian Body has believed and taught in the past, and has taken a firm fellowship stand on. Others may today sincerely believe differently from these original Christadelphian doctrines. But if they do, in honesty and for clarity they should not claim the Christadelphian name, but should adopt a new name and sail openly under their own flag. Some accept some parts of these truths, and some accept other parts. But whoever just has a "ritual," shadowy picture, and does not have the basic comprehension that Christ ACTUALLY and IN REALITY "worked out his OWN salvation" by his life-and-death, self-purifying, self-perfecting sacrifice, and AFTERWARDS incorporates his brethren into his OWN personal victory and salvation—then they do not have the true, saving Christ at all, but a mere orthodox, substitutionary "christ". — G.V.G.