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The purpose of this booklet is to demonstrate that the Unamended Christadelphians have pursued a consistent course concerning the teachings on, The Nature of Man and The Nature and Sacrifice of Christ which commenced with Bro. John Thomas as found in *Elpis Israel* (1848); was continued by Bro. Robert Roberts in *The Law of Moses* (1898); and by Bro. Thomas Williams in *The World's Redemption* (1898) and a *Plea for Action* (1902 - reprinted in *The Advocate* 1920).

**ADDENDA**

1. The letter from Bro. Carter dated Feb. 6, 1957 ends on page 5. All of pages 1-5 are Amended writings.

2. The *History* beginning on page 5 is an Amended Christadelphian viewpoint and appeared in *The Christadelphian* Dec. 1986.

3. The article on page 26 *On Divine Covenants* is by Bro. Edward W. Farrar.

4. The dates and sources of the reprints are found on page 27.
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(AI) Letter from Bro. John Carter


I want this letter to be cordial yet frank, assured that both of us wish to get at truth both as to the teaching of the Bible and also the teaching of those who have been prominent in our community.

TW, before obeying the Truth, was a member of the Welsh Calvinistic Church. This church has a very strong sense of what is called "federal theology". This concerns a covenant God made with Adam and through him with the rest. This is the covenant of law, In Christ, is the covenant of grace. The system was worked out in elaborate detail which we need not follow.

The first thing that shook me badly in reading TW's writings, was his misuse of the word "law". Primarily, of course, law has the force of commandment, but when we speak of the law of nature we mean there is an operative series of sequences which are constant. We speak of habits as being the law of our being. In this way Paul speaks of "a law in my members" and in Romans 7 he works out a series of contrasts which provide us with two series of synonymous expressions.

Paul speaks of the flesh; evil present with me; a law in my members, and an "I" which does not do what Paul himself wanted to do. There is in contrast the inward man, the law of the mind, etc. These, of course, are two principles at work within us; the first is native to the flesh, the second is inculcated by the Word. The first Paul calls the "law of sin" which he amplifies in Rom. 8 as the "law of sin and death". In contrast to this he speaks of the "law of the spirit of life" which, of course, is the law of his mind of the inward mind.

Now TW, like JJA, but I think before JJA did it, interpreted the "law of sin and death" as the Edenic commandment, and then, after the habit of his boyhood worked out the federal principle concerning our being in Adam and our transfer to Christ, and he put all in Adam under the law of sin and death using "law" in the sense of the Edenic edict, and not at all in Paul's sense. He speaks of man passing from the "law of sin" to the "law of the spirit of life" as though they had transferred from one edict to another edict. This again is quite contrary to Paul's use of the words.

When I realized this basic slip on the part of TW I began to see that there was a system of thought in his teaching which went wrong at point after point. A few years ago I came into possession of 30 years of the Advocate, and I patiently went through them all. This error concerning the law of sin runs through them all from the first volume to the last, but I thought it was necessary to tabulate his views and this I did as I told you, and I send you a copy of extracts. I would like to assure you that no extracts are garbled or misrepresented the context.

Brief comments, then, on each section:

(1) We are involved in the effects of Adam's sin, but not in a legal sentence which extends to each one of us. This is federal theology. Neither are we guilty of Adam's sin. Neither do we need redeeming from his sin. We suffer the mortality and weakness which we inherit from him, but God in no wise holds us accountable for Adam's sin.

(2) The references are too many to permit the explanation that a reference that we are guilty of Adam's sin is due to a slip. The idea was repeated again and again. We never read in Scripture of our being forgiven Adam's sin. It is always for our own transgression.

(3) You observe again a distinction is made between a sentence and the effects. He
makes baptism the cancellation of the sentence. As I said in (1) we do not come under a sentence and baptism is always for the remission of sins.

(4) If we have got TW's position correctly it is shown that he makes baptism primarily a means of getting out of Adamic condemnation. Again the Scriptures never once associate the idea of baptism with the cancelling of Adamic condemnation.

(5) Needs no comment beyond the fact that prudence does not enter where divine commands are at issue.

(6) Alienation in Scripture is through ignorance or wicked works. If alienation was inherited then Christ was alienated and TW does not hesitate to teach under (7) that Jesus was personally alienated from God as the result of Adamic sin. I think we get to the crux of the position here because to me we can take Christ as a touchstone of the theory, and the theory breaks.

(8) It is quite logical that if baptism is to remove the sentence it only ensures emergence from the grave and is not the basis upon which we become heirs of eternal life. TW therefore taught that through our baptism and through Christ's death we only have the title to emergence from the grave. Our acceptance must be, then, by the law of works.

That TW realized how much his teaching differed is seen by his very blunt declaration that CCW had gone into "shameful apostasy". In the light of this legal, mechanical approach where moral issues are entirely subservient to legalistic theories, we can understand TW's views in The World's Redemption in the chapter on Judgment. He says the saints are raised under the law of the spirit of life (of course that is a misuse of Paul's words, as we have said before) but on TW's theory those who are outside Christ are still under the law of sin and death, hence he said that any God might raise outside Christ were not raised under law but by an arbitrary act of God. God never acts in an arbitrary way.

The more I studied TW's writings and the more I saw that it was not an incoherent system, so it became more and more evident to me that the whole set-up of his teaching in this connection was out of harmony with the Scriptures. I explained it, as I have said, first by the federal theology which he never shook off, and secondly by his consistent misuse of Paul's term "the law of sin and death".

I said on Sunday I did not want to hurt anyone's feelings. In my young days I had a very great admiration for TW and through my own studies I gradually came to see that his views in these matters could not be sustained by Scripture. Perhaps this will explain my attitude a little better. The subject is an involved one and I think of little profit to ordinary brethren and sisters.

(Correspondence by Bro. John Carter)

The teachings of THOS. WILLIAMS, arranged under headings illustrated by extracts from his writings.

(1) That all are personally involved in the sentence upon Adam as well as the physical effects of his sin.

"To put the matter still more clear: Let me ask you (Bro. Roberts) if an infant lived to be an adult without committing an act of sin, would it not be necessary for it to be baptized in order to be saved? Since baptism is for the remission of sin, what sin would it remit in this case from your standpoint, since you deny that Adam's sin is imputed to his children. (Advocate, June 1894, vol. 10.)

"The grounds of guilt are first Adamic sin, and second, an aggravation of Adamic sin by the wickedness of his descendants." (Advocate, Vol. 9 p.233)

"The redemption Christ wrought out was not simply from individual sins of our own,
but from the sin and all its consequences of Adam the first. (Advocate, Vol. 9 p.11)

(2) That all are "guilty" of Adam's sin and need forgiveness of it.

"Christ's blood was shed for the remission of sins. (I John 1:17) It was shed for himself, and he being without personal sins, the sin remitted, cleansed, pardoned, or covered must be of necessity Adamic. (Advocate Vol. 10, p.334)

"We are said (in Rom. 5:12, see margin) to have sinned in Adam. Does this need forgiveness? ANS: Yes ... to remit that which placed us in a condition needing reconciliation is to forgive the sin." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.233)

"Be baptized for the remission of sins — Adamic and individual." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.62)

"If it is this sin (that is, Adam's) that has placed us in alienation, does it not follow that it (i.e. Adam's sin) must be removed, remitted, pardoned, or whatever term is thought the most expressive, before reconciliation to God can be accomplished." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.10)

"Now Adam was on probation before he sinned; but he fell from that and had no right to 'run for eternal life' unless reconciliation took place and he became freed from the alienation his sin had caused. Now, if a child is born under the same condemnation that Adam brought upon himself, does it not follow that he is born under the bondage of that which causes alienation, and that before he can 'enter as a probationer' to 'run for eternal life' he must be freed from that bondage by passing out of Adam into Christ? And is not that what baptism primarily is for? although it includes the remission of individual sin." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.9)

"That 'if men are not partakers and guilty of Adam's sin (apart from its effects of evil and death), but require only forgiveness of their actual sins and personal wickedness,' it is not clear 'how the death of Christ ... can help them'." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.234)

"'Adam's sin must be removed, remitted, pardoned, or whatever term is thought most expressive, before reconciliation to God can be accomplished.'" (Advocate Vol. 9 p.10)

"That baptism is primarily for the remission, removal or pardon of Adam's sin, although it includes the remission of personal sins, which latter remission is only an incident." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.9)

"That "the condemnation, the alienation, the frowns of Jehovah upon the race by reason of Adam's sin" were removed from Christ at baptism. (Advocate Vol. 9 p.63)

(3) That the sentence on Adam in which all are personally involved must be cancelled by baptism in order that resurrection can take place, and that the physical effects are removed at the resurrection.

"The first thing for us to consider here is the discrimination between the sentence and the execution of the sentence. Why is it important to distinguish between the sentence and its execution? Because we claim that the sentence is the "condemnation", known as "Adamic condemnation;" and the execution is the physical effect of the sentence. Here is our first issue, and it is an important one in its bearing upon the doctrine of baptism; for if the "sentence" or "condemnation", is not distinguished from the physical effects, the design of baptism to remove the sentence, yet leaving us to wait for the "redemption of the body", cannot be understood." (Adamic Condemnation, p.3)

(4) That baptism is for the removal of Adamic condemnation and the forgiveness of sins is of secondary or incidental value.

"The passing out of Adam into Christ changes our relationship, but does not change our nature. Therefore, since the design of baptism is for this purpose, its root is to be found in the Adamic sentence
of death and burial; and its effect is the removal of this so that the sentence may be deprived of its power to hold us in death and dust, and thereby the resurrection became the means of final physical escape from the results of Adam’s sin."

"We are not personally responsible for Adam’s personal sin and are not therefore baptized for it in that sense; but federally we are all under Adam’s sin, and are baptized to remove the condemnation which came thereby, and to place us in Christ reconciled to God. Since it is known that we believe we are baptized for our personal sins, it is needless to state it.

Adamic condemnation brings a physical disability inherited from Adam. We are freed from this federal condemnation and reconciled to God at baptism, but we are not freed from physical disability till the change of body." (Adamic Condemnation. pages 14, 15)

"It is evident that if an infant could become an adult without committing a personal sin, baptism for the remission of sin (Adamic) would be necessary. (Advocate Vol. 9, p.234)

"An adult devoid of personal transgression would, upon being baptized into Christ, be forgiven Adamic sin." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.9).

(5) That refusal of baptism may be an act of prudence (and therefore a man can avoid judgment by disobedience).

"Another man is more careful. He counts the cost and concludes the way is too straight for his weak nature; and he decides not to identify himself with the name that he fears he may disgrace and he stands back; here is prudence. Now it does not seem right that this man should be raised from the dead to be punished at the tribunal of Christ for his prudence." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.202)

(6) That all inherit alienation by physical descent from Adam.

"What then do we need salvation from? Only our personal sins? What is to be done with this inherited condemnation that we are under and that even Christ was born under? Why did Christ have to die? Look at him holding the bitter cup in his hand, trembling and praying, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." — Why could not the cup pass? Come, brother Roberts, tell me why?" (Self-Defence, Chicago Ecclesia. Feb. 1900).

(7) That Jesus was alienated and a child of wrath until His baptism which reconciled him to God.

"Christ was born under and died to remove Adamic condemnation." (Self-Defence. Chicago Ecclesia pg.1)

"Christ was no exception to the rule, ‘Ye must be born again’ and ‘born of a woman’: he was born of the flesh; and ‘that which is born of the flesh is flesh.’ The latent mental and moral powers implanted in him by divine begettal had to be operated upon by the spirit of truth and produce a new creature, mentally and morally; and at baptism in his case as in ours, that new creature came to the birth, and with that God declared Himself well pleased. This was Christ born again. Had he remained where his birth of the flesh placed him he would have racially continued a child of wrath, alienated as Adam left him and all others." (Advocate 1894, p.388).

"Is not the first Adam a state of sickness, sorrow, pain and death; and if a death state a condemned or alienated state? If Jesus was included in the Adamic race then he must have been estranged from God as a mere flesh and blood being." (Advocate Supplement 1900).

"He (Jesus) must die according to God’s law. To die according to law is legal; and to die legally is to be ‘worthy’ of death in the legal sense. He was not ‘worthy’ of death legally for any personal sin of his own. What sin was it, then, that made the death
of Christ just? Racial sin or personal sin? Federal sin or individual sin? Racial and federal is the only answer the case will admit of; and that is to say that primarily Christ died to redeem himself from the sin and its effects that was committed by Adam, "in whom all — Christ included — have sinned." When he met the demands of God's law and drank that cup that no righteous law would allow to pass from him, he paid the demands of that law and its penalty; and being a righteous man he was free — led captivity captive and thus purchased gifts unto men, who could not purchase them for themselves." (Chicago Defence, p.72)

(8) That the death of Christ, being for the purpose of removing the Adamic sentence, what it achieves is simply emergence from the tomb. If Adamic sentence brings us to the grave and if not countermanded holds us there, then if the death of Christ removes the sentence it only confers a resurrection of the body and not necessarily eternal life.

“Death is an effect; there is no effect without a cause. The cause, one man; the effect, death. What is the antithesis of this? 'By man came death'; then man was the cause, death was the result. 'By man came also the resurrection of the dead.' The second man was the cause of the resurrection. Some will say, That means He was the cause of eternal life. That is true, but Paul does not say that here; let us stick to the word, as we say to 'orthodox' people when they say that means something else. Stick to the law and the testimony. 'By man came death'; then man was the cause, death was the result. 'By man came also the anastasis, 'standing again'; He was the cause, anastasis was the effect. If the first man had not come, the death would not have come. If the second had not come, the anastasis would not have come, unless you can have an effect without a cause.” (Advocate, Dec. 1907)

(AII) Amended Response To The Advocate Editorial Of September 1986

In the Editorial in the Christadelphian Advocate September 1986, which set out the issues of difference between the Unamended and Amended fellowships, the declarations describing the Amended viewpoint are not truly representative. Below is set out, under the same headings used in the Editorial, the Amended position on these issues.

The Nature of Man

The nature we bear is a direct consequence of Adam's transgression of God's law. For this reason, we are certain of death and prone to sin. We are not held in any way guilty for the nature we bear, because we are not responsible for it; nor are we under any other sentence.

The Nature and Sacrifice of Christ

Christ came into the world to save sinners and for this reason he fully shared our nature and, like us, was under no other sentence than the physical law in his being. By his sinless obedience and righteousness, he condemned sin in the flesh. Therefore, he was the lamb without spot and without blemish and, by command of his Father, was the perfect and acceptable sacrifice for our sins. He needed salvation from death and attained unto life by means of his death and resurrection from the dead. He was always in fellowship with his Father and bore no disfavour or displeasure at any time.

Baptism

Those who believe "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ" are baptized into his death, for the remission of their sins. Having thus
shared in his death they await the redemption of the body as the ultimate fruit of his victory over sin and death. Having now the relationship of sons of God and heirs according to the promise, they enter upon newness of life.

**Covenant Relationship**

God established covenant relationship with Abraham and David by giving them unconditional promises of a seed, an inheritance and a kingdom which constituted a promise of everlasting life for all those that believed in them. This covenant was confirmed by the death of Christ through whom the faithful receive forgiveness of sins and, like the patriarchs of old, are accounted righteous. This participation is achieved through their baptism into Christ.

**Resurrectional Responsibility**

Knowledge of the Divine will to a certain degree (determined, of course, solely by God Himself, as is the identity of any such responsible individual), renders a man the subject of a resurrectional judgement. Such responsibility is not created by nor dependent upon covenant relationship, which God creates when responsible persons act in accordance with their knowledge.

16.10.86

(AIII) The Light Of History

On Our Current Reunion Difficulties

What our first brethren believed.

When the truth was rediscovered in the middle of the nineteenth century by Dr. Thomas, the elements which showed that Christendom of his day was unScriptural were the ones which were stressed. Therefore the true nature of man and of Christ, the reality and finality of death, the importance of the promises to the fathers, the promise of an earthly kingdom etc., formed the basis of all the early statements of faith. Furthermore the doctrines of the Apostate church were specifically dealt with by means of a list of doctrines to be rejected.

There was also to some extent a development in these (positive and negative) declarations in the first few decades of the Truth’s organisation. These developments occurred by a process whereby when error was promulgated, additional statements or clarified wording were introduced. What is most interesting however, is that the first principles of the truth remained unchanged during this development. In some cases it proved necessary more accurately to define them, but in no case was there a substantial change of view on these essential matters.

An outstanding example of this process is the question of resurrectional responsibility. It has been claimed, more insistently of late, that in the earlier days of the Truth’s history there was allowed a degree of latitude in fellowship over this issue until the adoption and enforcement by the Birmingham Ecclesia of the “Amendment” produced the division. A corollary to this claim is the statement that the problem would now be resolved if there were a return to the original, that is, unamended, Statement of Faith.

That there were uncertainties about some details in the outworking of the principle, especially in an age when the Word is not attested by the same outward signs as in the days of the Apostles’ preaching and that of the Lord himself, cannot be denied. That in the sections of various ecclesial statements dealing with the judgement seat of Christ the wording concentrated upon the faithful and unfaithful servants is also true. The definition of those responsible to such judgement as being “those who know the will of God and have been called upon to submit to it” was a closer definition in the amendment to
Clause XXIV of the Birmingham Statement of Faith which dates from 1898.

The documentary evidence, however, makes it perfectly plain that the principle which the Amendment defines was clearly enunciated from the beginning: knowledge of the divine will, to a degree determined solely by God Himself, as is the identity of any such individual, renders a man the subject of a resurrectional judgement. This was always the True Principle in the application of which there might be Uncertain Details.

As early as 1869 this was spelled out by Dr. Thomas in The Revealed Mystery, a set of propositions concerning Scriptural truth of which number XLVI reads as follows:

"THE WICKED are those 'who know not God, and obey not the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.' Of these, there are three classes: first, sinners that never heard of the one true God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the gospel; and others who are physically incapable of faith and obedience; second, those who have come to an understanding of the gospel, but have rejected it; and third, those who have obeyed it, but do not hold fast the beginning of their confidence stedfast to the end. The first class dies and perishes as the beasts; the second also dies, but comes forth from the grave again to encounter the burning indignation of Christ, the Judge of the living and the dead, at his appearing and kingdom; and the third also comes forth to be judged, and to undergo, in condemnation, 'a sorer punishment' in the fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries."

The concept of three classes of wicked was basic to the teaching on judgement of the unfaithful.

In 1871, prior to the promulgation of his erroneous views on the atonement, Brother Andrew (see The Christadelphian, January, page 93) wrote to the Editor of a Scottish paper whose London correspondent had published certain misrepresentations about the Christadelphians:

"(Your correspondent) has evidently not perused the writings of Christadelphians carefully, or he would never have asserted that they believe in the resurrection of 'the whole family of man' ... On the contrary they believe that only a portion of the human race will be raised from the dead — that portion which is responsible by a knowledge of God's truth."

The Statement of Faith in use in 1877, in Birmingham and adopted by ecclesias elsewhere, in its first section on "truth to be received", does indeed concern itself solely with the judgement of the saints at Christ's coming, as following:

"That at the appearing of Christ, his servants, faithful and unfaithful, dead and living of both classes, will be summoned before his judgement seat "to be judged according to their works"; "and receive in body according to what they have done, whether it be good or bad."

However, in its second half it deals with "Fables to be Rejected", which are countered by a series of positive statements of the truth. Clauses XXVI & XXXI read:

"The 'FIRST RESURRECTION', — That the resurrection, at the appearing of Christ, is not confined to the faithful, but extends to all who have made a profession of his name, whether faithful or not."

"RESURRECTION OF HEATHENS, IDIOTS, BABES, &c. — That 'heathens', idiots, pagans, and very young children, will never see the light of resurrection, but pass away as though they had not been; the resurrection being restricted to those who are responsible to the divine law." (Italics ours)

The view that the doctrine of responsibility on the grounds of enlightenment — and resurrectional responsibility at that — was some kind of open question in the Brotherhood is not borne out by these facts. Reservations as to the application of the principle to individuals in certain epochs were not such as to call in question the principle itself. The oft-quoted, but misleading, reference to "the 1869 Edition of Christendom Astray" in fact confirms that this was so. The work in question was actually the original Twelve Lectures, in which the principle was affirmed but the matter of "time and place" was raised in the words 'May they (rejectors of the Word) not be dealt with at the end?' The subsequent revision of the work was carried out with additions, modifications and deletions, including the phrase by R.R. himself and first published as Christendom Astray in 1883, in which the following occurs (page 74):
'But when called from darkness to light, by the preaching of the gospel, whether they submit to that gospel or refuse submission they are 'not their own'. They neither live nor die to themselves formerly. They have passed into a special relationship to Deity, in which their lives, good or evil, come under divine supervision, and form the basis of a future accountability, unknown in their state of darkness, at which God winked.'

Equally emphatic are the answers to correspondents on this theme in The Christadelphian for 1882 — the year before the publication of the revised Twelve Lectures as Christendom Astray, a part of which is often quoted out of context to make R.R. appear to be saying the opposite of his real meaning, as he distinguishes between True Principles and Uncertain Details (compare also the lengthy article bearing that title in 1898):

"It is a pity to trouble yourself as to whether believing but disobedient Gentiles are amenable to resurrectional punishment or not."

The reading of the whole correspondence, however, leaves no doubt as to the teaching being put forward by R.R.:

"Their exclusion from the kingdom of God will be a great punishment. Doubtless, to realise the force of it, they must be there to see, as multitudes will ... The principle upon which the unjust are raised and made a witness of their own inestimable loss, does not turn upon a technicality, but upon broad grounds of righteous judgment ... It is an extraordinary representation of the righteous judgment of God to say that a man who tried to obey, in being baptised, and failed in other things, is to be raised to be punished; but that a man who refuses to try in anything, for fear of punishment, is to be allowed to sleep in oblivion undisturbed by resurrection because unbaptised! It is light that is the rule of responsibility and not a formality which is but the embodiment of the spirit of obedience ... (a man) be so much a sinner against the light as to be justly deserving of a recall from the grave, not because he is in Christ, but because he would have nothing to do with Christ. How far a man must be in the light before he is responsible to resurrection-judgment, God only knows and Christ will decide: but that a disregarded knowledge of His will entails this responsibility, is a plainly inculcated feature of divine wisdom ... As to its troubling an ecclesia, there is much greater objection to be made to those who deny the resurrection of the responsible disobedient, than to those who may extend the boundaries of the class unduly; for the former take out of our hands a weapon of warfare against the outer darkness."

The remaining comments on correspondence on this topic in the same issue of The Christadelphian serve only to emphasise the same teaching, which was accepted as the standard teaching of the Brotherhood.

Confirmatory evidence is provided by the fact that the division of 1885 was not concerned with this issue, and that although the brethren later known as "Suffolk Street" had a Statement of Faith without the amendment to Clause XXIV, their view was that which the amendment later defined more precisely. (This is the testimony of a Suffolk Street brother knowledgeable in the history of the ecclesia.) The matter of the principle of resurrectional responsibility was not therefore an issue in the Reunion negotiations in Britain, except in so far as there was a small minority, drawn from the former, "Advocate" group (another section had already rejoined the Temperance Hall Fellowship in Yorkshire), who had reservations, not as to the principle but as to the "time and place" of the judgement of the rejector.

J.J. Andrew and the Amendment

The quest for closer definition arose when the principle of resurrectional responsibility was challenged by the introduction by Brother J.J. Andrew of an entirely separate principle, that of responsibility through "the blood of the covenant". For the saints, it was declared, responsibility to a resurrectional judgement comes not through enlightenment but baptism. In putting forward this view Brother Andrew admitted to a change of mind (see the Andrew - Roberts debate, page 8, bottom of 2nd column). The resulting confusion on the Responsibility issue which prevailed in some quarters was over the doctrine of the Atonement as much as over the principles of judgement, and for the first time the Brotherhood was divided over the matter of two distinct bases of responsibility to Divine judgement, one for the
world at large and one for the Household — enlightenment and covenant relationship.

This was the issue the amendment was designed to clarify. It spelt out clearly what the original basis has always been. The reasons behind the decision to adopt the Amendment were stated as follows:

"Seeing that this doctrine is contained in the *Statement of Faith*, which forms our Basis of Fellowship, and that organised and active denial of it, in London and elsewhere, has taken place, also, that the matter has been thoroughly discussed in our literature for more than three years past; and seeing that further controversy concerning it resulting in division in certain ecclesias is still current, and that it is widely publicised and publicly alleged that we are fellowshipping or sheltering error on the matter, it is

RESOLVED
That we reaffirm Proposition XXIV of the *Statement of Faith* in the following amplified terms, and that we fellowship those only who hold the same doctrine ...

**The Teaching of Thomas Williams**

The issue confronting us today in the North American situation is not the same as that facing our early brethren over uncertain detail as to the application of a certain principle. It is the existence of two separate and distinct principles of responsibility to a resurrectional judgement which arise from a deeper divergence of view — that over the nature and purpose of the Atonement itself.

That this problem should be a peculiarly North American problem (the rest of the world-wide Brotherhood having accepted the principle of the Amendment made in 1898) is due to the influence of the teaching of Thomas Williams. In the magazine he commenced in 1885 in defence of the stand made by Robert Roberts against the teaching of partial inspiration, he later clearly enunciated his views on the matters raised by J.J. Andrew on the subject of Adamic condemnation and inherited alienation. The following quotations from his writings illustrate this:

"The grounds of guilt are first Adamic sin, and second, an aggravation of Adamic sin by the wickedness of his descendants." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.233)

"Be baptised for the remission of sins — Adamic and individual." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.62)

"If it is this sin (that is, Adam's) that has placed us in alienation, does it not follow that it (i.e. Adam's sin) must be removed, remitted, pardoned, or whatever term is thought most expressive, before reconciliation to God can be accomplished." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.10)

"That baptism is primarily for the remission, removal or pardon of Adam's sin, although it includes the remission of personal sins, which latter remission is only an incident." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.9)

"That 'the condemnation, the alienation, the frowns of Jehovah upon the race by reason of Adam's sin' were removed from Christ at baptism." (Advocate Vol. 9 p.63)

"Christ was no exception to the rule, 'ye must be born again' and 'born of a woman'; he was born of the flesh; and 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh'. The latent mental and moral powers implanted in him by divine begettal had to be operated on by the spirit of truth and produce a new creature, mentally and morally; and at baptism in his case as in ours, that new creature came to the birth, and with that God declared Himself well pleased. This was Christ born again. Had he remained where his birth of the flesh placed him he would have racially continued a child of wrath, alienated as Adam left him and all others." (Advocate 1894 p.388)

"Is not the first Adam a state of sickness, sorrow, pain and death; and if a death state, a condemned or alienated state? If Christ was included in the Adamic race then he must have been estranged from God as a mere fleshly human being." (Advocate supplement 1900)

"He (Jesus) must die according to God's law. To die according to law is legal; and to die legally is to be 'worthy' of death in the legal sense. He was not 'worthy' of death legally for any personal sin of his own. What sin was it, then, that made the death of Jesus just? Racial sin or personal sin? Federal sin or individual sin? Racial and federal is the only answer the case will admit of; and that is to say that primarily Christ died to redeem himself from the sin and its effects that was committed by Adam, 'in whom all — Christ included — have sinned'. When he met the demands of God's law and drank that cup that no righteous law would allow to pass from him, he paid the demands of that law and its penalty; and being a righteous man he was free — led captivity captive and thus purchased gifts unto men, who could
not purchase them for themselves." (Chicago defence p.72)

The real differences today
Although as has been stated above the most important point at issue is regarded as that of the responsibility question it is plain that the difficulties arise for the most part from divergent views on the nature of man and the nature and sacrifice of Christ.

Reunion or recognition?
Since it would be impossible for the two communities simply to merge together with their existing divergent beliefs on fundamental principles, the only acceptable way forward for all of us is to affirm the beliefs of our first brethren as set forth in this paper.

(BI) Commentary On Presentations Received
From Christadelphian Amended Brethren
At Rockford, Ill., USA, CFU Meeting, Oct. 18, 1986

Several documents were received from amended brethren at the meeting held under the sponsorship of Christadelphians For Unity (CFU) in October of 1986. These were:

A. I — A letter written by John Carter dated 6th Feb. 1957 in which he comments at considerable length on the teaching of Thomas Williams with numerous quotations, from the CMPA.

A. II — ‘Amended Response To The Advocate Editorial of September 1986’ received from The Christadelphian Magazine Publishing Association (CMPA).

A. III — An outline of Christadelphian history entitled ‘The Light of History On Our Current Reunion Difficulties’, received from the CMPA.

In the historical outline on the Teaching of Thomas Williams the CMPA uses extracts from A. I as the basis of their comments and conclusion.

The Amended Response (A. II) has been published in The Christadelphian Advocate as promised.

The following comments are now presented in response to A. I and A. III:

Initially we must observe that John Carter in his introductory paragraphs (A. I) has made a very questionable assumption on which he builds a great deal of his argument and is thereby influenced in his final conclusion. This is principally in paragraphs two and five of his letter where he indicates that in his youth Thos. Williams was influenced in his reasoning on the laws governing sin and death by his contact with the Calvinistic ‘federal theology’. We have reason to state that this assumption is incorrect.

In a letter written by Clement Williams, the eldest son of Thos. Williams (see Advocate Nov. 1983, pg. 248), he states that Thos. Williams was apprenticed to William Clement to learn the trade of a carpenter. Thos. Williams was sixteen years old at the time (1863). William Clement had become a Christadelphian shortly before that time. It is evident that William Clement had a strong influence on the young Thos. Williams who was baptized one year later at age seventeen. A few years later he married William Clement’s daughter Elizabeth (see The Life and Works of Thomas Williams, pg. 3). An interesting quotation bears on this subject, ‘He (T.W.) had been christened according to the practice of the Established Church, in irresponsible infancy; as he used to say in later life, that his godfather had repudiated the devil for him as a child, but that as a man he had repudiated the devil for himself in a way his sponsor never dreamed of.’

The view that Thos. Williams was influenced in his early thinking (16 yrs.) by William Clement is much more likely to be
the truth than the assumption that the Calvinistic teaching of childhood would be the basis of his mature reasoning. William Clement was evidently a highly respected Christadelphian and we find him listed as a speaker at “The Fraternal Gathering” of 1872 among the leading brethren. (Robert Roberts Autobiography, pg. 237). John Carter seems to have forgotten that John Thomas had set forth the “federal principle” in 1848 in Elpis Israel, (I) pg. 128 and 129. We quote: ‘The “original sin” was such as I have shown in previous pages. Adam and Eve committed it; and their posterity are suffering the consequences of it. The tribe of Levi paid tithes to Melchisedic many years before Levi was born. The apostle says, “Levi, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham.” Upon the same federal principle, (boldface ours) all mankind ate of the forbidden fruit, being in the loins of Adam when he transgressed. This is the only way men can by any possibility be guilty of the original sin. Because they sinned in Adam, therefore they return to the dust from which Adam came, says the apostle, “in whom all sinned”.’

‘There are two states or kingdoms, in God’s arrangements, which are distinguished by constitution. These are the Kingdom of Satan and the Kingdom of God. The sinners of the former are all sinners: the heirs of the latter are saints. Men cannot be born heirs by the will of the flesh; for natural birth confers no right to God’s Kingdom. Men must be born sinners before they can become saints; even as one must be born a foreigner before he can become an adopted citizen of the States. … Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh, and “that which is born of the flesh is flesh”, or sin. This is a misfortune, not a crime.’

It is thus evident that Thos. Williams who embraced Christadelphianism at an early age did not need to look beyond the teaching of John Thomas to find ‘the same federal principle’. We have firm evidence to show that it was the record of Elpis Israel, particularly the sections ‘The Constitution of Sin’ and ‘The Constitution of Righteousness’ upon which Thos. Williams based his reasoning. He devotes two full pages in the booklet ‘Adamic Condemnation and The Responsibility Question’, pages 12 and 13, with many quotations from the Constitution of Sin and The Constitution of Righteousness, to demonstrate that his teaching was in harmony with that of John Thomas.

We must ask the questions, Why is John Carter so disturbed when he finds this reasoning, which is so characteristic of the reasoning of John Thomas, in the writings of Thos. Williams? and, Why does he label Thos. Williams with the “federal theology” of the Welsh Calvinistic Church? Was John Carter’s own thinking on the subject different from that of John Thomas and Thos. Williams? It is evident that his purpose was to counter that reasoning. This is somewhat surprising for he surely must have been familiar with the teaching of John Thomas as found in ‘The Constitution of Sin’ and ‘The Constitution of Righteousness’, in Elpis Israel.

John Carter throughout his introductory paragraphs differs with Thos. Williams. In pars. 4 and 5 he equates “the law of sin” and the “law in my members” of Romans 7 with “the law of sin and death” of Romans 8; then protests the fact that Thos. Williams identifies “The law of sin and death” with the Edenic edict. He then proceeds to make comments, numbered (1) to (8).

Concerning these comments we must observe that his assumption is that “The law of sin” of Romans 7 is the same as “The law of sin and death” of Romans 8. We strongly question the validity of that assumption, and our reasoning is as follows:

AI (1) John Carter reasons in his letter that to teach that one of the effects of Adam’s sin is a legal sentence which extends to each one of us is federal theology. ‘Neither are we guilty of Adam’s sin. Neither do we need redeeming from his sin. We suffer the mor-
tality and weakness which we inherit from him, but God in no wise holds us accountable for Adam’s sin.’

Brother Carter objected to what he called ‘federal theology’; yet Brother John Thomas, as already shown, expounds on this as a principle which needs to be recognized.

This appears to be the point of departure. The amended brotherhood objects to a law of condemnation hanging over the head of mankind, which results from Adam’s sin. The unamended brotherhood, on the other hand, continues to teach that there is such a law of condemnation upon all of Adam’s descendants. The unamended teaching is in harmony with Bro. Thomas’s thinking. In support of this statement we further quote Elpis Israel, pg. 130:

‘Hence the apostle says, “By Adam’s disobedience the many were made sinners”, that is, they were endowed with a nature like his, which had become unclean, as the result of obedience; and by the constitution of the economy into which they were introduced by the will of the flesh, they were constituted transgressors before they were able to discern between right and wrong.’

‘Upon this principle he that is born of sinful flesh is a sinner; as he that is born of English parents is an English child. Such a sinner is an heir of all that is derivable from sin.’

Elpis Israel, pg. 131: ‘Thus men are sinners in a twofold sense: first by natural birth; and next by transgression.’

With further reference to the point of departure Brother Thomas clearly states that there is a sentence of condemnation, pgs. 132, 133 Elpis Israel under ‘The Constitution of Righteousness.’ He writes, ‘The apostle then brings to light two sentences, which are co-extensive, but not co-etaneous in their bearing on mankind. The one is the sentence of condemnation, which consigns “the many”, both believing Jews and Gentiles, to the dust of the ground; the other is a sentence which affects the same “many” and brings them out of the ground again to return thither no more. Hence of the saints it is said, “The body is dead because of sin; but the spirit (gives) life because of righteousness” (Rom 8:10,11); for “since by man came death, by a man also came a resurrection of dead persons. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall they all be made alive” (I Cor. 15:21-23).

So we see Bro. John Thomas recognizing that there is a ‘sentence of condemnation’ which is a sentence of death and consigns men to the dust of the ground; and further that this death came from Adam in whom all die.

AI (2) John Carter (J.C.) refers to the statements of Thomas Williams (T.W.) in which T.W. appears to be saying that we are guilty of Adam’s sin. J.C. has extracted many references from the writing of T.W.

Some of these same references have been utilized in a paper presented by the CMPA brethren at Rockford, Ill. Oct. 18/86, entitled “The Light of History on Our Current Reunion Difficulties”. We shall comment on this later.

AI (3) John Carter observes that T.W. makes a distinction between a sentence and its effects. This is true. We see this in “Adamic Condemnation” by T.W. where the author says, ‘the first thing for us to consider here is the discrimination between the sentence and the execution of the sentence’. ‘… we claim that the sentence is the condemnation … and the execution is the physical effect of the sentence. Here is our first issue, and it is an important one in its bearing upon the doctrine of baptism; for if the “sentence” or “condemnation” is not distinguished from the physical effects, the design of baptism to remove the sentence, yet leaving us to wait for the “redemption of the body” cannot be understood.”

We are quoting this at length because it does represent the unamended understanding. Moreover it seems evident that the early brethren believed in this concept as indicated by their use of the words “sentence” and “abrogate”. (See enclosed article on “Sin
Condemnation and Reconciliation’).

J.C. says we do not come under a sentence and baptism is always for the remission of sins.

It should be self-evident that it is through baptism that we come into Christ and are ‘in Christ’. The quotations cited from John Thomas, especially those from ‘The Constitution of Righteousness’, demonstrate that he believed that it was through Christ that many are brought ‘out of the ground again to return thither no more’ and this was a release from ‘the sentence of condemnation which consigns the many ... to the dust of the ground’. Brother Carter seems to have lost sight of this important consequence of coming into Christ and emphasizes that baptism is for the remission of sins. Elsewhere these are identified as personal sins.

In items (4) to (7) he refers to baptism relative to Adamic condemnation; to a reference to prudence; to alienation; to the breaking of T.W.’s reasoning (which he calls a theory) because he sees it teaching ‘that Jesus was personally alienated from God as a result of Adam’s sin.’

In item (8) he applies some strange reasoning. We quote: ‘It is quite logical that if baptism is to remove the sentence it only ensures emergence from the grave and is not the basis upon which we become heirs to eternal life. T.W. therefore taught that through our baptism and through Christ’s death we only have the title to emerge from the grave.’ In contrast to this assumption there is no doubt in the minds of those familiar with the writings of Thos. Williams that he believed that it is only through Christ that we have the hope of eternal life. It is necessary, however, to be released from sin and death before we can be the recipients of eternal life. Thos. Williams had much to say about the effects of baptism in ‘Adamic Condemnation and The Responsibility Question’. For example pg. 13, ‘Is not baptism a means of adoption? of being ‘born again’? of putting off the old man and putting on the new man’? of passing from ‘in Adam’ to ‘in Christ’? of becoming the ‘seed of Abraham’ instead of Gentiles? of putting on the saving name? of being ‘crucified with Christ’? of dying, being buried and raised with Christ? of becoming ‘new creatures’? of becoming ‘clean through the word’? of becoming ‘free from the law of sin and death’? of passing into that state wherein ‘there is therefore now no condemnation’? — Is it not a passing ‘from death into life’?

The logic of John Carter appears to be coloured with the desire to condemn Thos. Williams.

The balance of John Carter’s letter consists of quotations taken from the writings of Thos. Williams. In relation to these we must introduce a reprint of a tract entitled, A Plea for Action, etc. CIV, issued in June, 1902 and published in the January, 1920 issue of The Christadelphian Advocate. This was written by Thos. Williams as a reply to his critics, who, he felt, had misquoted or misapplied his earlier writings. We enclose C IV, ‘A Plea for Action in Furtherance of Justice, Looking Towards Union and Unity’.

In his letter, AI, John Carter quotes from Vol. 9 (1893) of The Advocate, also from The Advocate 1894 and supplement 1900 as well as other writings. The references mentioned herewith are also quoted in AIII, received from the CMPA at Rockford, found in the section entitled ‘The Teaching of Thomas Williams’. These quotations are cited to demonstrate that Thos. Williams held certain views on the subject of Adamic condemnation and inherited alienation which are divergent from those held by the CMPA and therefore present difficulties. In addition the underlining in J.C.’s letter emphasizes Thos. Williams’ statements which seem to declare that we are guilty of Adam’s sin. John Carter finds this unacceptable. There is an alleged inconsistency in certain statements by T.W.

When we read ‘A Plea for Action’, etc., we find Thos. Williams replying to charges
made against him, pgs. 3, 4. In effect his reply states that he (1) denies ever having taught that men are personally guilty of Adam's sin; (2) that the words "forgiven Adam's sin" had originated with brethren opposed to him. He proceeds to state that his belief is that Adam's sin resulted in all men being by inheritance in a state of sin, or as Dr. Thomas puts it, 'Constitutional sinners'. (3) He says that he does not believe that he ever gave expression to the words "baptized for Adam's sin". We do find, however, that he made a statement to this effect, see the fourth quotation, pg. 2, AI from Vol. 9, pg. 9. On the next page J.C. is quoting from 'Adamic Condemnation' by Thos. Williams, pgs. 14, 15 and here Thos. Williams is saying 'We are not personally responsible for Adam's personal sin, and are not, therefore, baptized for it in that sense'. It would be well to read this entire section in 'Adamic Condemnation'. Herein lies a difficulty. In 1893 Thos. Williams states 'that baptism is primarily for the ... pardon of Adam's sin' and in 1902 he writes saying emphatically that he believes he never made a statement to this effect. How is this to be explained?

We have seen that John Thomas wrote, 'Thus men are sinners in a twofold sense: first, by natural birth; and next by transgression'. Thos. Williams refers in his response in CIV to this teaching of Dr. Thomas in his explanation of the second charge against him. The most likely explanation of the apparent discrepancy is that Thos. Williams in his references to baptism for Adam's sin had reference to the teaching of Dr. Thomas on the subject of Constitutional Sin, i.e. the "unclean" or "naked" state into which all of Adam's progeny are born. We note that he is very careful in his phrasing in CIV, written in 1902 and in 'Adamic Condemnation' presented in 1907. His statement quoted in part in the preceding paragraph continues and says '... but federally we are all under Adam's sin and are baptized to remove the condemnation which came there-by, and to place us in Christ reconciled to God'. This is the position of Thos. Williams as set down in The World's Redemption, in Adamic Condemnation and The Responsibility Question and in A Plea For Action, etc., CIV. This is the understanding and belief of those who continue to support his teachings.

It is quite evident that Bro. John Carter did not accept the federal principle, even though it was taught by Bro. Thomas; for he repeatedly rejects it in his letter AI of Feb. 6, 1957.

There is perhaps another explanation of the apparent divergence in the writings of T.W. The two phrases: Adam's sin and Adamic sin are very similar and are Biblically interconnected. When T.W. used the phrase Adamic sin, he was referring to the whole economy and predicament into which mankind had fallen as a direct result of the personal sin which Adam personally committed in contravention of Divine law. This unique, one-of-a-kind personal sin of Adam is called, Adam's sin. Because of the direct interconnection between Adam's sin (i.e. his personal transgression) and Adam's sin (i.e. the predicament of mankind subsequent to the first transgression of Adam) it is likely that T.W. (via a slip of exactitude) used the expression Adam's sin when he really meant Adamic sin.

The only other explanation of the apparent divergence in T.W.'s writings is that T.W. either forgot what he had written earlier or that he changed his thinking in the years between 1893 and 1902. We think that the first two probabilities are much more likely than the suggestion that he changed his mind or had forgotten what he had written.

This leaves the question of Adamic condemnation and inherited alienation (see Par. 2 pg. 5 of the CMPA historical outline AIII. We are dealing with this in a separate paper.

(1) All quotations from Elpis Israel are from the 14th edition — Revised 1949.
This subject is cited in the CMPA presentation ‘The Light of History on our Current Reunion Difficulties’. AlII, where it is identified as ‘a deeper divergence of view—that over the nature and purpose of the Atonement itself’; more particularly identified as ‘the subject of Adamic condemnation and inherited alienation’ (See page 5).

Whether or not the ‘two separate and distinct principles of responsibility’ actually do arise from a divergence of view on the subject of the Atonement we cannot be sure. This was stated to be so by those who were contending on these matters immediately before and after the turn of the century. When we now try to think this through as a cause-and-effect relationship we do not see that one necessarily follows the other. Nevertheless we agree that there is a divergence of view in this area which we regret. We are inclined to think that these trends are more likely to have come from the influence of ‘clean flesh’ and ‘free life’ thinking which has been all too prevalent in Christadelphian writings.

We believe that all would agree that the transgression of Adam and Eve had great and serious consequences for themselves and their progeny, but all do not agree as to just what consequences were passed on from Adam to the race and how the effects came into being. Differences in thinking always come to focus on the nature of Christ and on the need for and application of his sacrificial death. If we can agree on the nature and sacrifice of Christ there will be no great problem with other aspects of the Atonement.

Since Jesus transgressed no law and therefore had no personal sins, whatever condemnation, defilement or ‘physical law of his being’ applied to him was also, as a consequence of Adam’s transgression, resting upon mankind as a whole, apart from the consequences of their own personal sins. These disadvantages are what is known as Adamic condemnation, i.e. those consequences of Adam’s condemnation which were passed on to his progeny.

Closely related to this subject is the matter of inherited alienation. This term refers to alienation from God as a consequence of Adam’s transgression and condemnation. Since it refers to that consequence which comes from Adam and rests upon his progeny it is an inherited consequence.

A detailed consideration is presented in the attached article entitled, ‘Sin, Condemnation and Reconciliation’. In addition we urgently recommend a study of Elpis Israel by Bro. John Thomas and of The Law of Moses by Bro. Robert Roberts, particularly those sections referred to in this study.

Included in this presentation are reprints of two articles: ‘Inherited Alienation’ by Bro. James Laird and ‘Adamic Condemnation’ by Bro. Paul L. Safford, both of which present intelligent studies of these subjects. All of these are valuable works which are part of our heritage. They should be studied and clearly understood. □ K.G. McPhee
and keep the need for brevity in mind.

This study is particularly directed to two questions. (1) Is there a sentence of condemnation in the legal sense resting upon the Adamic race? (2) Are we freed from legal condemnation by baptism?

**Sin**

Sin has been defined in a number of ways. The most readily understood is the definition in I John 3:4, “sin is the transgression of law”. The law is the law of God by which we are enclosed, guarded and protected from the detrimental effects of sin. Transgression is a stepping over or breaking through. When we break or break through the law(s) of God we sin and then must suffer the consequences.

Another definition is — a missing of the mark which implies that the goal, target or objective is to please God and obtain His favour. When we fall short of this, or stray from the way of righteousness, or by sins of omission, fail to please God, we sin, i.e. miss the mark.

In ‘Elpis Israel’ in his section on ‘The Constitution of Sin’ Bro. John Thomas says, ‘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’ (boldface ours). Further, he says, ‘Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature.’

**The First Transgression**

The first commandment given to man had to do with eating the fruit of the trees in the garden of Eden. This commandment was restrictive. “of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die” (Gen. 2:17). (Margin: “dying thou shalt die”).

Eve and then Adam did eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and were, consequently, condemned to death. The apostle Paul sets forth this cause-and-effect principle, “the wages of sin is death” (Rom. 6:23), which principle had its first application in the condemnation to death of Adam and Eve following their transgression of the divinely given law in Eden.

It is important that we understand the elements of transgression and its consequences. In sequential order they are:

First: The law — which was the commandment not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Second: The sentence — which was the pronounced condemnation to death; “dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.”

Third: The execution of the sentence — which was to involve two consequences, (a) They became dying creatures with a nature prone to sin. (b) They were without hope and without God and their destiny was death. They were perishing and when their life ended they would be dead and gone forever.

These three elements involve the law, the transgression of the law, and the consequences, namely, the sentence with its execution and are, therefore, properly recognized and identified as legal matters.

Reconciliation through Christ, when it came (in their case prospectively and provisionally) would rescue from (b) but would not change (a) until the time of resurrection and change to spirit beings.

**Sin and Its Consequences**

The first consequence of Adam and Eve’s sin was their condemnation. This was a personal consequence. They were found guilty and sentenced to death.

There were in addition, a whole series of personal consequences which were the result of their sin. There would be a continual enmity between the woman and the serpent, the symbol of sin, and between her seed and the seed of the serpent. This would be an ongoing conflict which would bring much suffering. The woman’s conception would
be increased and with it an increase in her sorrow. She was to be, henceforth, subject to her husband. The man would find that the ground was cursed. It would bring forth weeds, thorns and thistles, with which he must contend in the production of food for their living. He must continuously struggle against this adversity, "in the sweat of thy face", until he eventually returned, in his burial, to the inhospitable dust (Gen. 3:19).

Thus a sentence of death was declared to be upon Adam and Eve. It was a sentence which resulted from the breaking of God’s law, being therefore a legal sentence of condemnation to death. Moreover this sentence of condemnation to death was to rest upon their progeny also. In Romans 5:17, 18, Paul recognizes the effect of Adam’s sin upon his progeny, "... by one man's offense death reigned by one …" and "Therefore as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation ...". In these references Paul is contrasting the death that came by Adam with the life that comes by Christ, through grace.

Thus we see that the consequences of the original transgression were passed on to the progeny of Adam and Eve, as set forth in the Second and Third elements and in the foregoing.

Having once succumbed to temptation, mankind’s moral fibre was weakened and he would henceforth, because of his sin nature, have an inclination toward sin. Paul describes this and agonizes over this inborn inclination in himself, "I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I." and "Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not" (Rom. 7:14,15,17,18). The enmity and conflict between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent (sin) continues through all human history as the condemnation pronounced upon the serpent in the garden of Eden predicted and prophesied.

The progeny of Adam and Eve were henceforth to be dying creatures under a sentence of condemnation to death transmitted from Adam and not of their own doing. In these days we speak of "our biological clock" which refers to the fact that as mortal human beings we will run down, run out of time, and die of old age, even though we may not be suffering from a fatal disease. Today our limit is considered to be in the neighbourhood of eighty-five years. The Psalmist recognizes this same life-limiting factor when he says, "The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow: for it is soon cut off and we fly away" (Psalm 90:10). As mortals we do indeed have the sentence of death in ourselves.

After our first parents had sinned and thus became sinful, dying creatures, they were physically and morally unclean and unfit for association with their Creator. For this reason they were expelled from the garden and prevented from returning. Adam was driven out "to till the ground from whence he was taken". The harmony, approval and easy communication with the Lord God, which Adam had formerly enjoyed, had been broken by his own transgression. God was now very displeased with Adam, whereas Adam had previously been declared by God to be "very good". Adam, because of his own sin, had been moved from a very favourable situation to one of disfavour, all of which demonstrates that by his own action he had estranged himself from God. Since his progeny were all born after Adam and Eve were driven from the garden of Eden, their progeny would be in this same separated-from-God, estranged relationship. In order to once again draw near to God a reconciliation was needed.

Reconciliation Through Christ

Paul in writing on the subject of recon-
ciliation says, "But God commandeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more than, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement" (Rom. 5:8-12).

As "sinners" we are regarded by God as "enemies". There is a need for reconciliation. We are reconciled to God by the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ. Christ gave his life for us. Once reconciled we can then be saved. This is a reason for great rejoicing, for our sins have been atoned for and our relation with God has been changed from enmity and disfavour to one of closeness and favour and we are, as a consequence, in the way of salvation. Righteousness will be imputed to us "if we believe him that raised us Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification" (Rom. 4:24,25). If we believe in God and have faith in the means of reconciliation which He has provided through Christ, we too shall be raised, justified and given eternal life, provided that we have been faithful throughout our probationary walk in Christ. The means of reconciliation and salvation provided by God is through belief and baptism into Christ. As eternal beings, clothed with the righteousness of Christ, we shall have been accounted worthy to come into the presence of God and Christ; reconciliation, and identification with God, will be fully accomplished.

The Effect of Baptism

Salvation is promised to those who believe the gospel and are baptized into Christ (Mark 16:15,16). Belief in the gospel involves belief in the Name of Jesus Christ and all that he has accomplished in order to provide a way of salvation from the condemnation to death which came from Adam's offense (Rom. 5:18). When we are baptized into Christ we are no longer perishing creatures. We are no longer servants of sin. By baptism we come into Christ and become servants in the family of God. We are dead unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Sin shall not have dominion over us: for we are not then under law but under grace (Rom. 6:11,14,18,22). In Romans 6, Paul represents sin as a monarch who has reigned over us until we become baptized at which point we change from serving sin, resolve to serve God and are recognized by God as His servants. There is, therefore, a reconciliation accomplished by baptism and the estrangement resulting from Adam's transgression is healed. "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life" (Rom. 6:22). Through this reconciliation an entirely new relationship with God is established which contrasts with our previous situation. By baptism we have been reconciled from a state of alienation and enmity to one of peace with God made through the blood of the cross (Col. 1:20-23).

One consequence [earlier identified as Third (b)] of Adam's transgression has been remitted through baptism. There is in baptism, therefore, a change in our legal position with respect to our condemnation to death, and in our relationship with God. Some of the effects of Adam's sin are not changed by baptism. Our carnal nature with its inclination to sin is not changed. Also we are still dying creatures and will suffer death, the termination of this mortal existence (if the coming of our Lord does not preclude this). But we are released from the condemnation to everlasting death and instead given the hope of everlasting life.

Through baptism our personal sins are forgiven (Col. 1:14), and we are morally cleansed from the defilement resulting from our own sins and from our inherited sin
nature resulting from Adam's transgression (Rom. 5:19). Concerning this Bro. John Thomas says, 'Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and "that which is born of the flesh is flesh", or sin. This is a misfortune, not a crime.' The apostle John writes "... the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (I John 7), and so we see that baptism is most effective in countering the effects of sin, for we recognize that we become beneficiaries of Christ’s blood-shedding sacrifice when we are baptized.

By the act of baptism we enter into a covenant relationship with God, which of necessity involves a resurrection from the dead and an appearance before the judgment seat of Christ. If approved we shall receive God’s gift of eternal life and live with Him forever. Salvation will have been realized prospectively and provisionally through belief and baptism.

A Law AND a Principle

There are differing opinions among Christadelphians as to whether we are under a Law of Condemnation, a sentence of death in the legal sense, as a result of Adam’s transgression or whether we are simply the victims of a physical principle which causes us to die because we are dying creatures. The concept of "our biological clock", discussed in the foregoing, corresponds to this physical principle. The difference in belief on these matters is perhaps the most critical of the differences between the unamended and amended communities.

Principles are frequently called laws. Examples of these natural laws are: the law of gravity; the first and second laws of thermodynamics; the law of physics which states that in a stable system action and reaction are equal and opposite.

Those matters which we recognize as legal have to do with a command, commandment or regulation by an authority. This involves a rule of action or conduct established by a sovereign authority. The sovereign authority in our consideration is God. Also the consequences of breaking a command, resulting in the sentence of death and the consequent execution are properly identified as legal matters.

Brother John Thomas distinguishes clearly between these two concepts in Elpis Israel under The Constitution of Sin. He states in paragraph four: The word sin is used in two principle acceptations in the Scripture. It signifies in the first place, "The transgression of law". (The law transgressed was the commandment given to Adam and Eve forbidding them to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and this law, therefore, was a legal matter. KGM). ‘... in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature, which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh "which has the power of death" and it is called sin, because the development, or fixation, of this evil in the flesh, was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled "sinful flesh," that is, "flesh full of sin"; so that sin, in the sacred style, came to stand for the substance called man. In human flesh "dwells no good thing"; and all the evil a man does is the result of this principle dwelling in him." (Boldface ours)

It is quite evident that Bro. John Thomas discerned and distinguished between legal law and principle in this exposition. The principle which he styles ‘physical principle’ and ‘evil principle’ is identified with ‘sinful flesh’ and is inherited as a consequence of Adam’s transgression, the transgression of a God-given commandment. Herein Bro. Thomas recognizes Law AND Principle.

The legal establishment has long recognized that, ‘Law without sanctions is not law’. There must be a penalty specified or the declaration purporting to law is just empty rhetoric. In the foregoing extract from Bro. Thomas’s writings we should be able to discern that the ‘physical principle
... which is the cause of ... death” is one of the results of breaking a law. In fact, Bro. Thomas says just that, “... this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression”.

The Three Laws of Romans 8:2,3

Now let us take into consideration another important scripture which is very specific in its application to the question with which we are dealing.

From the beginning to this point in the letter to the Romans, Paul speaks frequently of law. He uses several terms: the law of faith, the law of Moses, the law of sin, the law of sin which is in my members, the law of God. Now we find him using two terms not used before: “The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus” and “the law of sin and death”. We need to discern what these are.

There seems no room for doubt that the law cited in verse 3 is a reference to legal commandments embodied in the law of Moses.

When we look at these three laws in their close proximity we must ask several questions. Was Paul here mixing law in the legal sense with principle? Was he speaking of principles only? Was he speaking of laws in the legal sense only? Is it possible for one principle to free from another principle? We must find a rational understanding. In every occurrence the word law in Rom. 8:2,3 has been translated from nomos, (Gr.) and this Greek work can be understood as either law in the sense of regulation or as principle, so that the Greek original does not help us.

Paul says that “the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me “free from the law of sin and death”. One law freed him from another. Shortly before he had said, “he that is dead is freed from sin” (Rom. 6:7). He is saying in Romans chapter six that through baptism (symbolic death) we are no longer servants of sin, no longer bondmen of sin but are through baptism made free from sin, become servants of God and the end everlasting life, and we are exhorted to walk in newness of life after the spirit, rather than walk after the flesh. This is a description of what it means to be freed from sin and death.

Obviously, since we are freed from “the law of sin and death” we are not, therefore, under these two laws at the same time. “The law of sin and death” is terminated by baptism and no longer in effect. If we sin following baptism we will again deserve death as the wages of our own sin, but this is another matter. It is a personal sin. Mercifully God will “forgive us our sins and ... cleanse us from all unrighteousness, if we confess our sins”, and “the blood of Christ ... cleanseth us from all sin” (I John 1:9,7).

The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus refers to a self imposed law — a law accepted voluntarily. It requires a spirit or attitude of mind, directed toward life in Christ Jesus. If sincerely motivated by this, we will be a law unto ourselves, which is to say, we will voluntarily adopt the moral standards which are based on the acceptance of the commandments of Christ. We will recognize that these are required by Christ and enforce them upon themselves. Thus we are under a law which we accept at baptism. This is a law in the legal sense because it is based upon commandments. Paul terms this conformity with Christ’s requirements, spiritual mindedness. (Margin: the minding of the Spirit) and says This is life and peace (Rom. 8:16). He further says, “But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his” (vs.9). The spirit of Christ is “the mind of Christ” (I Cor. 2:15,16; Phil. 2:5). The same teaching is set forth by Paul in Ephesians 5:22-24 and in Colossians 3:1-3.

Thus we see that Paul is saying in Romans 8 that baptism into Christ, coupled with dedication of self, walking in newness of life, spiritual mindedness and not walking after the flesh but after the spirit frees us from the law of sin and death, which is to say that we are no longer perishing but shall
receive the gift of life if we follow this course. "The wages of sin is death but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:23).

Now we must ask, What is changed at baptism? We are not physically changed and we therefore continue as dying creatures with the end of this life a certainty. Our inclination to sin, our sin nature, is not changed and furthermore we must continue to struggle against our fleshly tendencies after baptism. Yet Paul says there is a change. We are freed, at that time, from the law of sin and death, but we are not freed from the mortality of this body or the tendency to sin, which Paul identified as the law of sin which is in our members (Rom. 7:23). From what are we freed? We are freed from condemnation to death. Let there be no misunderstanding. We are not speaking of death in the sense of the inevitable termination of this mortal life. We are speaking of the condemnation to death permanently, which is the fate of all who go down to the grave with no hope in Christ Jesus. This is a consignment to absolute and eternal oblivion. In contrast, "There is ... now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus".

Until we were baptized into Christ we were under condemnation to death in the eternal sense. This was a legal condemnation. Since our physical, dying body is not changed by baptism there is only one possible change. It is a change from a state in which we were legally condemned to death in the eternal sense to a state of remission. To remit is to forego the right to punish. When we turn to God in Christ He does forego the right to punish us. The sanction, the penalty, which was encompassed in the law given to Adam is not imposed. We still are deserving of the penalty of death, but righteousness is imputed unto us because we believe in God's provision for forgiveness through Christ, and as a consequence we are clothed with Christ's righteousness. All these are legal considerations. Only a change in legal status takes place, but that change is all-important. It frees us from everlasting death, from eternal oblivion. The sentence pronounced upon Adam and all his posterity, is provisionally waived for those who come into Christ. Such is the wondrous grace and mercy of God.

We do agree that there is a change of relationship. What does this involve? From what to what? Undoubtedly we are changed to a new relationship with God, to a category in which we are described as a chosen generation, a holy nation, a peculiar (purchased) people, the people of God (I Peter 2).

From what are we changed? The opposite, of course! Before baptism we were "in Adam" with death as our certain destiny (I Cor. 15:22), under the constitution of sin and 'sinners in a twofold sense; first by natural birth; and next, by transgression' as described by Bro. John Thomas. We were "without hope and without God in the world". We were unacceptable to God. We were estranged, born outside the garden, in need of reconciliation, redemption, restoration to favour, remission and religion as correctly defined by John Thomas. All of these terms are interlocking and mutually supporting. They declare that the work of Christ was needed to restore us to a position of favour with God from a position of disfavour. The whole Adamic race came into a position of disfavour when Adam first sinned and we increase the disfavour by our own personal sinfulness.

The apostle Paul has identified these contrasting positions as "in Adam" versus "in Christ". "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (I Cor. 15:22). It is manifest that the term "in Christ" must be a legal or constitutional term, since there is no physical change. It therefore follows that the term "in Adam" is also a legal or constitutional term.

Has There Been a Change in Belief?

The 1877 Christadelphian Statement of Faith was a reprint of the Statement of Faith
adopted in Birmingham, Eng. in 1873. Since Bro. John Thomas died in 1871 we can expect that this Statement of Faith sets forth the understanding and belief of our earliest Christadelphian brethren.

In Clause II the statement is made:

'That God created Adam ... and placed him under a law through which continuance of life was contingent on obedience'

Implicit within this statement is the thought that there would not be a continuance of life if the law were disobeyed. In other words, disobedience, the breaking of this law, would result in death. The keeping or breaking of law is a legal matter. This is so simple that it is a statement of the obvious.

Clause III is in logical sequence and states:

'_that Adam broke this law, and was adjudged unworthy of immortality and sentenced to return to the ground from whence he was taken_

A sentence is a pronounced judgment. Adam was judged or adjudged by God as being worthy of death, and condemnation to death was pronounced upon him by God. So the sentence of death was pronounced upon Adam.

We are astonished when we now hear amended brethren say that there is no sentence of death hanging over us; that there is only a physical condition inherited from Adam.

Clause III continues and says:

1. a sentence carried into execution by the implementation of a physical law of decay, which works out dissolution and death,

2. and while a man is yet alive, gives him, where it is left to its uncontrolled operation, a tendency in the direction of sin.

3. This is the law of sin in the members, spoken of by Paul, which the new law established by the truth brings into subjection.

4. In Adam's sentence, all mankind are involved, in consequence of their being physically derived from his physically affected and unclean being.

1., 2., 3., and 4. all have reference to the physical effects of Adam's sin. This was the means, the manner and the process by which Adam and his descendants would die. This is the natural destiny of mankind. Nothing but perpetual death lies before the natural man.

We must recognize, however, that these statements refer to (a) a legal sentence which was a pronounced condemnation to death, and (b) a declaration of the means, manner and process by which death would come. These, (a) and (b), were separate entities.

Clause IV refers to God's kindness in conceiving a plan of restoration; Clause V refers to the inauguration of the plan in the promises made to Adam, Abraham and David; and Clause VI describes how the plan works to release us from death and raise us to immortality.

This thinking has been retained and is expressed in Clauses IV to VIII of Statements of Faith now in use.

Now Clause VI states that Jesus 'should purchase life by perfect obedience and by dying, abrogate the law of condemnation for those who were under condemnation and therefore for himself who was made in all points like them'. If there is no law of condemnation to death hanging over mankind what did he abrogate by dying? — and from what are we provisionally freed when we die, symbolically, in baptism? Is it possible to abrogate a principle, a natural law, such as the law of gravity? We have recently been told that such is possible, but this is scarcely credible and certainly not applicable in this context. All things are possible with God. He could make the earth spin in the opposite direction if He chose to apply His power and do so, but it was not this sort of thing that our early brethren were dealing with in Clause VI. To abrogate is to repeal, to annul, and is applied to the repeal of laws, decrees and ordinances. It refers to a change in a legal sense and that is the way in which
our early brethren used the word ‘abrogate’. They were speaking of the abrogation of the law of condemnation.

If, on the other hand, there is no law of condemnation hanging over us we then are freed from our past personal sins only, at baptism. This is not the teaching of Romans, chapter six, which states ‘ye are not under law but under grace’, having been baptized. The law from which we are released at baptism is the law of condemnation to death imposed upon Adam and resting upon his progeny. Paul says, Rom. 8:1, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus”. We are in Christ when we are baptized into Christ and we continue to be free of condemnation to oblivion if we walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.

When Paul, in the context of the first eight chapters of Romans, said, ‘For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death’ he was speaking of a freeing which had already taken place. He had been freed. It was not necessary for him to wait for his death and resurrection and change to immortality for this to happen, as some seem to say. He was already free from the law of sin and death.

The changes in belief expressed in our day are a matter of deep concern. There appears to be a migration from the way our pioneers understood bible teaching and so expressed themselves with clarity in our Statements of Faith. Freed from personal sins only, at baptism? No law of condemnation over mankind as a consequence of Adam’s transgression? This appears to be a dangerous drift which has a detrimental effect on the correct understanding of the nature of man and the efficacy of baptism. It gives us no joy to observe this.

The subject matter involved in the Atonement is dealt with by Bro. Robert Roberts in Chapter XVIII, ‘The Consecration of Aaron and His Sons’, of The Law of Moses. In this Bro. Roberts deals with Aaron and his introduction into the priesthood, Aaron as a type of Christ, the nature of Jesus Christ and the necessity for Christ’s redemption and cleansing as one of Adam’s race. The whole matter is beautifully reasoned and beautifully expressed. We shall not attempt to quote from this writing. It should be read as a whole by every Christadelphian.

The preface for The Law of Moses was written by Robert Roberts a day or two before his death. The contents of this book, therefore, are the product of a mature mind which had been devoted to the understanding of God’s word from boyhood. His exposition is consistent with the teaching of Bro. John Thomas and with the Statement of Faith. If all Christadelphians understood and accepted the exposition set forth in this chapter we would have no disagreement on the several areas of the Atonement.

\[ K.G. \text{ McPhee} \]

(BIV) Christ Jesus — Estranged, Alienated?

This subject is probably the most sensitive area of all the matters which are identified as coming under the subject of the Atonement. Bro. John Carter, speaking of T.W.’s writings speaks as follows: ‘T.W. does not hesitate to teach ... that Jesus was personally alienated from God as a result of Adam’s sin. I think we can get to the crux of the position here because to me we can take Christ as a touchstone of the theory, and the theory breaks’ [see AI pg. 2, item (6)]. J.C. highlights this as one teaching that is particularly unacceptable.

It seems to us that agreement on this subject should be quite possible if carefully stated and if inflammatory expressions are avoided. Surely the following facts are readily discerned:

1. Initially the sin in Eden caused an estrangement between God and Adam as a result of which Adam and Eve were thrust out of the garden and prevented
from returning.

2. Because of their sin they were in disfavour with God. They were in disfavour because they had broken God’s commandment. Their close relationship with God was terminated because they were sinful and morally unclean and as such were not acceptable in the presence of a perfect and morally pure God. Consequently they were not allowed to draw nigh to God.

3. All of Adam’s progeny have the same sinful nature as Adam. The fact that all of his progeny were born after he was thrust from the garden signifies that they too were born into the same estranged position.

4. A restoration to God’s favor was made possible by God who provided the means of redemption, remission, forgiveness and reconciliation. The means provided was a blood shedding sacrifice of clean animals, which sacrifices were typical of the perfect sacrifice to come, namely the sacrifice of Jesus the Christ.

From this we see that the introduction of sin by Adam’s transgression, caused a defilement and a change to a sin nature which affected Adam and all his posterity as recognized in clause 5 of the Christadelphian Statement of Faith. God in his mercy established a plan of restoration, recognized in clause 6. Jesus as a member of the race of Adam was of the same flesh and blood as all other humans, made in all things like unto his brethren and under the same condemnation, clause 8. Does it follow that Jesus was estranged? He, too, was born outside the garden and therefore in the same position and relationship as all members of Adam’s race. Clause 10 of the Statement of Faith identifies Christ as ‘begotten of God’, as ‘Emmanuel, God with us, God manifest in the flesh — yet was during his natural life, of like nature with mortal man, being made of a woman, of the house and lineage of David, and, therefore, a sufferer, in the days of his flesh, from all the effects that came by Adam’s transgression, including the death that passed upon all men, which he shared by partaking of their physical nature’.

It was necessary, therefore, that Jesus be released from the sentence of death (cl.5), the law of condemnation for himself (cl.8) and the death that passed upon all men (cl.10). Before that release he was not yet ready to enter into the presence of God. The release came as a result of his own sacrificial death, his final act of obedience. By his resurrection and immortalization he was released from ‘all the effects that came by Adam’s transgression, including the death that passed upon all men’, and ‘... Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him’ (Rom. 6:9). When the release from all the consequences of Adam’s transgression was complete, he then came into the presence of God, sitting at God’s right hand.

Since reconciliation, by these means, was necessary for Christ as well as for all those of Adam’s race who come into Christ, it follows that there were considerations in the constitution of Christ, namely his sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3) and in the position in which he stood, namely, under the law of condemnation (cl.8, S. Of F.) which were not acceptable by God until the process of reconciliation was realized. This is properly identified as a condition of estrangement. The word estrangement, O.T., is translated from the Hebrew word ZUWR which embodies the thought of being a foreigner, strange, hence the idea of being an alien, i.e. alienation. This was not a discredit to Christ. It was a condition and relationship into which he was born, which God had every desire to correct.

The thought that Jesus was displeasing to God, at any time in his life, should never be entertained. Every detail of information we have points to the fact that God was well pleased with him at every stage, but this did not alter the fact that he was of the Adamic race and therefore in need of redemption. Obviously there was a harmony of thought
and purpose and a strong bond of love between God and His only begotten Son. The harmony was the result of Christ's dedication to the achievement of God's purpose and his striving to serve God rather than the impulses of the flesh. Nevertheless as one of the Adamic race his will was not always identical with that of his Father, as exemplified in the garden of Gethsemane, (Mtt. 26:39; Luke 22:42). His likeness to his brethren is demonstrated in that:

— He needed to learn obedience (Heb. 5:8).
— He was not perfect but needed to be made perfect (Heb. 2:10; 5:9).
— The power of death within him, that is the devil, the inclination to sin, had to be destroyed (Heb. 2:14) (S. of F. IX).
— He needed to offer up sacrifice for his own sin(s) (Heb. 7:27) and did so when he offered himself.
— He needed to obtain eternal redemption and an entrance into the holy place by the shedding of his own sacrificial blood (Heb. 9:11,12) (S. of F. VII).
— He needed to be purged and purified by a blood-shedding sacrifice, in order to become the perfect embodiment of "the heavenly things themselves" (Heb. 9:22-26) (S. of F. V and VIII).
— He needed to be tempted in all points that he might be a merciful high priest, i.e. that he might be able to sympathize with us in our infirmities, having had the same experiences (Heb. 2:17,18; 4:15).

All of these scripturally attested facts were taken into account by the all-wise Heavenly Father who saw the necessity of this method of establishing the means of reconciliation between sinful man and Himself. The writings of Bro. Robert Roberts in 'The Consecration of Aaron and His Sons' explain these God-employed principles in a most effective and convincing way.

While all these things are true, the fact remains that God declared himself well pleased with Jesus at the time of his baptism by John when the voice from heaven said "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Mtt. 3:17). Moreover he was regarded by God as worthy of receiving the spirit of God, not with measure, i.e. not with limitation (Mtt. 3:16; John 3:34,35). God did not just commence loving Jesus at this moment. We know that God loved and approved of Jesus at a very early age, prior to the age of twelve. Even then, as a child, Jesus understood that he had a special mission and destiny, though Mary and Joseph did not. "The grace of God was upon him" and he went to the doctors of the law, in the temple, to enquire and to listen to their answers and thus to learn the word of God more perfectly (Luke 2:40-52). We are abundantly convinced that the provisions established by God, with Abraham, and in the giving of the Law through Moses were utilized by Jesus with understanding, belief and faith. He was circumcised on the eighth day. The Law of Moses was in effect and Jesus throughout his entire mortal life as a devout Jew would undoubtedly offer sacrifices and offerings which had been established in the law for the purpose of reconciliation, long before the age of thirty. There is no doubt in our mind that Jesus was consistently obedient and consistently faithful. With all of this his Father in Heaven would be well pleased.

How then could Jesus be said to be estranged or alienated from God? The answer is that the entire race was estranged as a consequence of Adam's transgression — and Jesus was a member of the race. Simply that and nothing more! He was destined from before his birth to lead his brethren out of that position of estrangement and bring about a reconciliation between God and man.

□ K.G.Mcphee
There has historically been a certain amount of confusion in the various translations of the Bible surrounding the translation of the Greek word diatheke. Liddell and Scott give the meaning of both testament and covenant for this word. This translation is confirmed by Strong and other authorities. When the Greek N.T. was translated into Latin, diatheke became, in Latin, testamentum. This Latin word, was carried over into many English translations as testament. The difficulty is that the English word testament carries only the meaning of will. A will, a testament, is a legal document by which a person makes disposition of his assets upon death. A will is an entirely different legal instrument from a covenant.

A will (or testament) is a unilateral instrument. No consent is needed by another party when a will is executed. The will is not effective until the death of the will-maker or testator. Up until the time of death, the will may be changed (at the whim of the testator) in any manner without consultation with the heirs, relatives or friends. Once the testator dies, the will is in force; its terms are binding and it cannot be changed. The wishes of the testator must be carried out to the letter.

In contrast, a covenant must involve more than one party. A covenant (agreement or contract) is a mutual legal instrument, voluntarily entered into, by two or more parties, whereby they stand solemnly bound to each other to perform the conditions and terms contracted for. A covenant is bilateral, inasmuch as both parties must understand and agree to the terms nominated in the contract. Once the agreement is consumated, it cannot be changed without the mutual consent of both parties joined thereto. A covenant either states or implies that a penalty is attached to either party who fails to comply with the agreed-upon terms.

In the case of the Mosaic covenant, the two parties were God and the Nation of Israel. The terms and conditions of the covenant were written by The Almighty and the Nation of Israel agreed to the contract. "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people;" (Ex. 19:5) The Nation of Israel then accepted and agreed to the terms of the covenant: "All the people answered together, All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do." (Ex. 19:8).

In the case of the Abrahamic covenant, the two parties involved were God and Abraham. In order to emphasize this point, Paul in Gal. 3: 15 refers to the contracts of men which are always bi-lateral. The covenant was not unconditional. It was conditional upon Abraham accepting the terms and conditions of the covenant. In law, this is called the principle of Mutual Consent. This is indicated by the fact that Abraham "talked with God" when the covenant was entered into and by the fact that Abraham tacitly agreed to uphold his side of the covenant by agreeing to "Walk before The Almighty God perfectly." (Blamelessly — RSV & NIV). Abraham's further compliance was indicated by his voluntary undertaking to confirm the covenant by the rite of circumcision (Gen 17:26-27).

In our own case, at baptism, we make a commitment to God; we join in the Abrahamic covenant in accordance with the terms thereof (Gen. 17:7) and are constituted the seed of Abraham by adoption. In addition, we become one of the parties joined to the existing Abrahamic covenant and hence a joint-heir of the promised inheritance. The judgment seat of Christ is for the purpose of appraising our performance of our commitment to the covenant. If our performance, during the days of our probation, is satisfactory, we will then be accounted worthy to be partakers of the divine nature and be granted the lot of our eternal inheritance.
(BVI) Consistency Evident in Writings on the Nature of Man and the Nature and Sacrifice of Christ

In the foregoing it has been shown that there was a consistency of thought and understanding by Bro. John Thomas, Bro. Robert Roberts as demonstrated in their writings — and by our early brethren who established The Statement of Faith of 1873-77. Later Statements based on this early Statement retained that consistency on these subjects. We now list these writings and others, and show the date of publication to demonstrate that the understanding of our earliest brethren has been retained by some, even to this day.

1. Elpis Israel — John Thomas (1848)

2. The Law of Moses — Robert Roberts (1898)
   See Chapter XVIII, ‘The Consecration of Aaron and His Sons’.

3. The World’s Redemption — Thomas Williams (1898)
   See Chapter XXII, ‘Salvation Exemplified in Christ’.

4. Inherited Alienation — James Laird (1901)
   Advocate Supplement, 1901; Reprinted Advocate, January 1954.

5. Adamic Condemnation — Paul L. Safford (1965)
   Advocate, July 1965.


(BVII) Observations Upon The Essay:
“The Light Of History On Our Current Reunion Difficulties.”

(Published by the CMPA and presented at the Rockford conference October 1986)

Part I of the History addresses itself to the question: “What our first brethren believed.” The beliefs, on the question of Resurrectional Responsibility held during the period of the 1860’s, 70’s and 80’s of three brethren (Bro. John Thomas; Bro. Robert Roberts; Bro. J.J. Andrew) are examined and documented.

The documentary evidence supports the following conclusions:

1. Bro. Thomas believed and taught: “he that understands the truth, but declines the obedience it commands, will be held accountable for its rejection in a day of judgment when the Deity shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.” (Anastasis. 1866 p. 41) (1920 reprint).

   This same teaching is plainly expounded in *The Revealed Mystery* first published in 1869, and also in *Elpis Israel* in the penultimate paragraph in the section, The Constitution of Sin, Part 1, Ch. 4.

2. It is granted by all students of the works of Bro. Roberts, that he believed and
taught that the enlightened rejector of God’s truth would be raised from the dead and judged for its rejection.

3. It is apparent that Bro. J.J. Andrew, in the period when he was one of Bro. Roberts’ staunchest supporters, believed that “that portion of the human race which is responsible by a knowledge of God’s truth, will be raised from the dead.” (See *The Christadelphian Magazine* January 1871 p. 93.)

Having stated these conclusions, we wish to make some observations.

a) In the 1877 Statement of Faith, Clause D (when discussing those who will appear at the judgment seat of Christ) confines itself to “his servants” that is, those who have come into covenant relationship with God by baptism.

b) The following Bible verses were used to support this statement:

- II Cor 5:10
- Rom 2:5-6, 16.
- I Cor. 4:5
- II Tim 4:1
- Rom 14:10-12
- Rev 11:18

c) In the Statement of Faith generally recognized by the Christadelphian brotherhood prior to 1898, the matter of those who are to appear at the judgment seat of Christ was worded as follows: “At the appearing of Christ, prior to the establishment of the Kingdom, the responsible (faithful and unfaithful) dead and living of both classes, will be summoned before his judgment seat …” These same seven citations from Scripture were cited to support the new wording.

d) When the statement was amended in 1898, those who were defined as responsible were said to be: “namely those who knew the revealed will of God, and have been called upon to submit to it.” What is ironical is this: at the time of the introduction of the amendment and its consequent basis for fellowship, *no additional verses from the Bible were cited to support the new amendment*. Here we have a marvellous situation. The same verses which were originally used to support the appearance at the judgment seat of the *baptized*, were now being used to support the appearance of the *enlightened*.

e) During the period from the 1870’s — (when the Unamended Statement of Faith was the statement generally in use by Christadelphians throughout the world), to 1898 (when the Amended statement was introduced) all Christadelphians were agreed that the baptized believers would appear before the judgment seat of Christ. There was not, however, universal agreement of the situation respecting enlightened persons outside of the household of Christ. We believe that Bro. Thomas Williams is a true witness to the situation that prevailed at that time. Here is his assessment: “Up to the time of the Birmingham amendment, brethren and sisters met at the Lord’s table for years in the bonds of love and peace, believing your proposition # 26 — ‘That at the appearance of Christ, prior to the establishment of the Kingdom, the responsible, faithful and unfaithful, dead and living of both classes, will be summoned before his judgment seat to be judged according to their works …’ and that some believed in a ‘third class’ resurrection and others did not.” (Life & works of T.W. p. 167).

Even in the period after 1892, when Bro. J.J. Andrew formally introduced his extreme views concerning resurrection, and up until 1898 (the year of Bro. Roberts’ death) the matter of the resurrection of enlightened rejectors was *not made a test of fellowship*. Evidence is lacking to demonstrate that these early brethren insisted upon the acceptance of their understanding on the subject of resurrectional responsibility as a requisite for membership in the ecclesia and for participation in the memorial service. In fact, it is generally understood that Bro. Roberts in the year 1898 was opposed to pressing this matter to the point of division. We have
been advised by a member of the CMPA that there is evidence on file which clearly establishes this.

In 1894, Bro. Roberts wrote a booklet entitled, *The Resurrection to Condemnation; Who will Come Forth to it?* This was a detailed study of Resurrectional Responsibility and constituted a reply to Bro. Andrew’s pamphlet *The Blood of the Covenant*. Bro. Roberts strongly defends his belief in the resurrection of enlightened rejectors. It is, however, enlightening to consider his concluding chapter. In it, he pays tribute to the ability of Bro. Thomas to discern “the solid foundations and leading outlines of divine truth” and, “his power of seeing the whole of a subject and logically construing the scattered elements”, while at the same time, recognizing that Bro. Thomas was not infallible and that there might be room for divergence of judgment on questions of doubtful interpretation.

We believe that Bro. Roberts did not view the resurrectional responsibility of enlightened rejectors as a doubtful question yet the sentence which follows his reference to Bro. Thomas reads:

“While this (Bro. Thomas’s view) is not in the abstract a conclusive argument, it is of some weight in a question which depends, for its right decision, upon the construction of widely-scattered and nebulous premises; and of overwhelming weight when it is perceived that the entire evidence is in harmony with Dr. Thomas’ judgment and the rival view in harmony only with a part of that evidence and in violent collision with many features of divine wisdom.” (our emphasis)

We respect the honesty and fairness of Bro. Roberts’ statements, but we claim the privilege of using our own best judgment as to whether or not Scripture declares that God will, of necessity, punish the enlightened rejector by raising him from the dead, in order to add to his punishment when he is “condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten son of God.” (John 3:18).

Bro. Roberts, himself, recognizes that judgment in such cases comes into play. This is of course, his human judgment and human judgment cannot be said to be authoritative. When “the question ... depends for its right decision, upon widely scattered and nebulous premises ...” it must be admitted that this is far from a definitive Scriptural statement, or a “Thus saith the Lord.” The right decision depends upon human judgment and no brother is privileged to declare that his judgment must govern in the matter.

We have written, elsewhere, on this subject in detail and we do not concede that the Unamended view on this subject is “in violent collision with many features of divine wisdom.” In referring to the “Unamended view” we are citing the statements and assurances set forth by the Continental Christadelphian Unamended Reunion Committee, in November 1975, in their Statement of Position. It is our opinion that it is the amended teaching on this subject which is out of harmony with a correct understanding of scriptural teaching on Resurrection, Baptism and Covenant Relationship.

We now wish to make some observations on certain comments made in the CMPA submission on the subject of Statements of Faith in use during the last three decades of the last century.

i) The reference to “a list of doctrines to be rejected” (end, Par. I p. 1) which refers to “all the early Statements of Faith” is not accurate with respect to the 1877 Statement of Faith (declared to be based upon the 1873, S. of F.)

ii) The 1877 S. of F. is divided into two main sections: Part I is entitled, Truth to be received. Part II is entitled, “Fables to be refused.” These latter are not handled in the same manner as were the problems dealt with in later Statements of Faith under the heading, “Doctrines to be rejected.” In fact, Part II of the 1877 S. of F. comprises doctrines which must be believed, not rejected.

iii) Clause D. Part I, of the 1877 S. of F.
At the appearing of Christ, his servants, faithful and unfaithful, dead and living of both classes, will be summoned before his judgment seat … (italics ours). The very word, both confines this reference to two classes only.

iv) Part II consists of 17 clauses dealing with errors held by Christendom, such as The Trinity; Supernatural Personal Devil; Immortal Resurrection etc. These errors are set up in black-face type at the start of each clause. Then the truth to be received is set forth in regular-face type.

v) Clause xxxi of Part II addresses the error: Resurrection of Heathens, Idiots, Babies &c. The truth to be received under this clause is “‘That ‘heathens, idiots and babies will never see the light of resurrection …, the resurrection being restricted to those who are responsible to divine law.’”

vi) Clause xxxi does not really define “those responsible to divine law.” Since it is ambiguous, it is difficult to say with certainty to what divine law men are said to be resurrectionally responsible. Is it, “The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus?” It cannot be the general universal commands of God under which all men are subject and responsible, since this would encompass universal resurrection. If the ‘divine law’ is “‘The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus’” then it follows that the resurrection is said to be restricted to those who are “‘in Christ” and in covenant relationship with God.

vii) Summary: The 1877 S. of F. specifies that at the appearing of Christ, his servants will be summoned before his judgment seat. It denies such doctrines as immortal emergence; universal resurrection etc. The further statement that the resurrection is restricted to those who are responsible to divine law falls far short of two concepts:

a) That the “‘responsible’” are defined with certainty to comprise those who know the revealed will of God and who have been called upon to submit to it.

b) That the doctrine of the certain resurrection of enlightened rejectors is an article of saving truth and therefore, one which must be made a test of fellowship.

When the division came about in 1898, the Unamended section of the Christadelphian community, found itself composed of two viewpoints. Some members believed that the Scriptural evidence was lacking to say with certainty that any outside of covenant relationship would be raised and judged. Others believed that enlightenment and understanding of God’s will would, in certain cases, be sufficient grounds for a resurrectional judgment. The common ground among the Unamended brethren was that the issue of a resurrectional judgment of those outside of covenant relationship was not to be made a test of fellowship.

It was for this reason that, during Reunion discussions at the Continental level, the Unamended Committee never insisted that Amended brethren change their mind on this issue, but only that Amended brethren allow to the Unamended brethren the same liberty of conscience as we were willing to allow them.

The latter part of the “‘History’” which deals with the teachings of Bro. T. Williams has been covered herein under the title “‘Commentary On Presentations … etc.’”, i.e. B.I.

□ K.G. McPhee

(CI) The Teaching of Thomas Williams

The following excerpt from *The World's Redemption*, chapter 23, by Thos. Williams sets forth the significance of the sacrifice of Christ in our redemption. In this he recognizes “the law of sin and death” for what it really is and identifies its origin. We are freed from the law of sin and death by the sacrifice of Christ and our belief in Christ.
and our voluntary identification with him in baptism. This is the way of salvation which our Heavenly Father has provided.

"Without the shedding of blood there is no remission" is a truth which the sacrifices of the law had set forth and emphasized most fully; and this reminds us that the penalty resting upon us is death and that God required death in which there was the shedding of blood by one who personally was sinless, as a means of redemption. Hence the abundance of scripture which predicates salvation upon the blood of Christ. The Apostle Paul says, "If one died for all, then were all dead." All were under the sentence of death, and the necessity in the case was that "one die for all." If the "all" had been alike, without any exception, then all must have for ever remained under death's domination, and "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return" would have been the eternal destiny of all mankind. But if there could be an exception and one could come to the rescue who would voluntarily render to death all that it could lawfully claim, by suffering a violent death in which there would be a sacrificial shedding of blood, and allowing death to take its victim down into its prison house, the grave, then death's rights and claims would end there — because the law of sin and death had no further claim. It was the sin of the race, federally in Adam, that gave the law of sin and death its power to take its victims into dust; but when this demand had been met voluntarily and sacrificially by one who had rendered to God a perfect life of holiness, the law of sin and death had no further claim, and therefore the bands were unloosed, the shackles opened. "He that died was now freed from sin's dominion" and "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth unto God." — Rom. 6: 7-10. There was only one kind of death, therefore, that would meet the requirements of the case; and there was only one kind of person whose death would do. The kind of death must be a voluntary one by the shedding of blood; and the kind of person to die such a death must be one possessed of an absolutely holy character. Therefore there never was and never will be salvation in any other than in Christ; there never was redeeming efficacy in any other blood than the blood of Christ; for he alone used the life of the blood of sin's flesh, with every heart-beat of his fleshly existence, to render complete service to God, even to the extent of shedding the blood of sin's flesh and relying upon his Father for restoration to life to die no more, by virtue of being a "holy one". As in the case of Christ, so with every one that will be saved, "He that dies is freed from [the dominion of] sin." But a literal death of a personal sinner will not free from sin. A death that will free from sin must in some manner connect itself with the only death that was equal to all the requirements in the case, and it must derive its sin-freeing and sin-remitting efficacy from that one death, even the death of Christ. Like the death which first "freed from sin", every death that depends upon that must be voluntary; and all who die such a death can no more be permanently held in the grave than could Christ. Hence the apostle says, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."
In the progress of the Truth’s history new issues arise, and old ones assume a new form. Those who take a vital, intelligent interest in what they do believe, can never be indifferent concerning these issues. All doctrines professedly founded on the Word of God should be calmly and impartially examined in the full light of that Word. Divine instruction has been given “line upon line, precept upon precept” for divers reasons. Students of the Word realize that all the facts of any doctrine are rarely, if ever, expressed in any given portion of Scripture. Hence the necessity of not only “rightly dividing the word of truth”, but also of examining every portion of Scripture bearing on the subject under consideration, in order that the whole truth may be expounded and comprehended.

This is the example set before us in the practice of Christ who, “beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself”. It is the principle employed by Dr. Thomas and constitutes one great reason why his writings are so fascinating and instructive. It is the principle we have endeavored to follow in our study of the Word; remembering that it is all the Word of God; that, therefore, no part should be either ignored or exalted to the exclusion or prejudice of any other part, and that every part should find its harmonious adjustment in the subject to which it stands related.

We are of those who have most profound reverence for the things which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Christ. Under the tuition of Dr. Thomas and Brother Roberts our knowledge of the Christ has expanded, our faith has been confirmed and strengthened and we have confidently invited the fullest and most impartial investigation of facts which we believe Moses, and the prophets and the Psalms teach concerning Christ.

In the Old Testament many of the truths concerning Christ are revealed in an obscure manner, for “it is the glory of God to conceal a thing, but the honor of kings is to search out a matter”. By the light which the New Testament sheds upon the Old Testament some of those hidden things are disclosed, and in them we behold the beauty and the perfection of Divine wisdom, and also obtain some of the strongest confirmations of our faith.

Notwithstanding the miraculous conception of Christ which was well known to Paul, we have the apostle’s express declaration: “Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren” (Heb. 2:17). This identity of flesh and blood nature not only was an absolute essential to his qualification as a sin-offering, it also established his relation to that constitution, or state of sin and death, into which all mankind are born. Hence the Psalmist, speaking prophetically of Christ, says, “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me”. This
was sufficient to cause his flesh to be like our flesh, that is "flesh of sin", described by Dr. Thomas as "weak, emotional, unclean". "Hence the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean." This "sin in the flesh is hereditary" or inherited, consequently "mankind are natural born citizens of Satan's kingdom" and of necessity must be "natural born" aliens to the kingdom of God. It is also written that "men must be born sinners before they can become saints, ... even as one must be born a foreigner before he can become an adopted citizen of any country". "Children are born sinners, or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh." Christ was born of sinful flesh, therefore "Christ's body was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for"; for he was born of a woman, and "not one can bring a clean body out of a defiled body". By the aid of the apostle Paul we trace this "defiled body" to its origin and discover that, "By Adam's disobedience the many were made sinners", that is, "they were endowed with a nature like his, which had become unclean as the result of disobedience, and ... they were constituted transgressors before they were able to discern between right and wrong", and as such are "condemned already" to the dust as "natural-born sinners".

Students of Dr. Thomas will recognize the source of our quotations; readers of "Elpis Israel" and "Eureka" can decide as to their verity or fallacy. Brethren of intelligence and candor will admit that Dr. Thomas taught that mankind inherit a condition of being that must, in the very necessity caused by the absolute holiness of the Deity, be a cause of separation between Him and man. On page 138 of "Elpis Israel" it is written, "Until he ate of the forbidden fruit there was no breach of friendship, no misunderstanding, no alienation between him and the Lord God".

We have shown through Dr. Thom-
to prove it. How are we to prove that the "days" of Dan. 12 are not days but years, or that the river Euphrates of Rev. 16 is not a river at all, but a country? There is no text to prove the view held by the brethren as a whole, but there are brethren who do not accept of that view, and insist upon a text to prove it. How are we to prove the Bible teaching concerning the "Devil"? Not by anyone text which plainly sets it forth, but by reasoning on all the testimony bearing on the subject. How did Dr. Thomas prove that Adam was the priest who offered the sacrificial blood for the sin he had committed in the garden of Eden? How do our dissenting brethren prove that they are still under condemnation, when the apostle Paul, after seven chapters of the most cogent and profound reasoning contained in the entire volume of inspiration, emphasizes his conclusion that saints in Christ Jesus, who walk worthy, are under no condemnation?

When the apostle Paul proved that the Jesus whom the Jews had crucified was the Messiah promised in Moses and the prophets, what were the means employed? Certainly there is no text from Moses to Malachi that proved it, as our brethren would quickly discover if they discussed the question with either a Jew or an atheist. Where is the text in the Old Testament which plainly says that the blood of bulls and goats could never take away sin? According to our dissenting brethren a truth of such transcendant importance should not have been concealed for the first 4,000 years of God's revelation to man. We submit that these two great truths were proven in the Jewish synagogues throughout the Roman world in Paul's "reasoning from the Scriptures" without the aid of any one text that would plainly or specifically prove either of them. Therefore, in view of the honorable precedents quoted, we submit that the doctrine of inherited alienation should not be rejected even if no text could be adduced which painfully proves it.

Now we do not for one moment minimize the great truth that men are alienated from the Deity and are His enemies by their wicked works; neither do we for one moment teach that Christ was alienated from the Father through wrong moral actions. Inherited alienation relates to man's physical being; acquired alienation results from individual wicked works; the two combined estrange men physically and morally from the Deity. Men are constituted sinners, unclean, and under condemnation by virtue of their descent from the original sinner, but no one would therefore deny the great truth that men can on their own account incur additional uncleanness, transgression and condemnation. Therefore we are not compelled, logically or scripturally, to deny inherited alienation in order to believe in acquired alienation. Those of our brethren who believe that there are men under a double condemnation because they are sinners in a two-fold sense, ought not to find a difficulty in believing men are also estranged from the Deity in the two-fold sense contained in double alienation. We consider that double alienation is proven by the same "reasoning from the Scriptures" that proves double uncleaness and double condemnation. (Italics by Editor.)

That there is such a condition as inherited alienation is proven, not only by reasoning from the Scriptures", but also by the most simple and obvious and direct teaching of Eph. 2:12. Let us examine this text without prejudice. Paul calls the Ephesians to remember that in time past they were Gentiles in the flesh. We point out that there never was a period in their past lives when they were anything else but Gentiles. At the very moment of their birth they were Gentiles. By hereditary descent
or inheritance they were Gentiles, and as such, in the language of Dr. Thomas, they "were natural-born citizens of Satan's kingdom". "Wherefore remember that at that time ye were without Christ." This must be true; all brethren must admit that a newborn babe is without Christ. Who then will deny or explain away Paul's most obvious conclusion, that "they are aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenants of promise having no hope and without God in the world"? We do not believe there is a true-hearted lover of truth in our entire brotherhood that will carefully consider this testimony and then deny that there is a text which plainly proves inherited alienation. Hence we conclude that in the sad legacy bequeathed by Adam to all his posterity is included inherited alienation. God has chosen the family of Israel as His peculiar inheritance to whom He has made all His promises. Therefore Gentiles have absolutely no access to the "Hope of Israel" or to the "Covenants of Promise" apart from adoption into the Royal Family of the Deity. By their very descent they are "outside", "alien", "foreign", to all God's promises. Why should any brother intelligent in the Word deny this conclusion? What is there in the doctrine of inherited alienation that it should be so strenuously antagonized?

It has been said that if the doctrine of inherited alienation be true, and this condition be removed (morally, not physically) at baptism, then it yields the conclusion that Christ was also alienated by inheritance, and remained in that condition until his baptism at the age of thirty years. We demur to the latter clause contained in this conclusion. Do our brethren who believe that Christ was "unclean", a "constituted sinner", "under condemnation", likewise believe that he lived for thirty years without a provisional and typical cleansing and justification from that condition? Surely not. Do they not believe that the Lord Jesus offered for himself? If they do, we ask them to refer us to the offering under the law which was its type. If they do this, then they will be enabled to see that under the law there was a typical and provisional cleansing for sin's flesh. Christ's alienation was not his fault any more than was his uncleanness. It was his misfortune, if we may be permitted to so express it. But if his misfortune, still it was a fact, and as a fact had to be taken cognizance of by the Deity in His plan of redemption.

Accepting the words of the Psalmist, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me", as true of the entire human race, and of necessity causing every member of the race to be unclean in the sight of the Deity, alienated from His friendship, constituted sinners and under condemnation of death, the interesting question arises—Would the Deity have intercourse with men in such a condition? Would He accept the approaches of men in such a state, without an offering which would be at once, a type of the blood of purification and provide a cleansing which would be provisional or for the time then present? The entire history of God's dealings with our race returns one emphatic negative to this question.

It is the misfortune of men that they are, by their descent from defiled ancestors, in this defiled condition, and therefore unfit to have intercourse with the Deity. And He in His abundant mercy has always provided for its provisional cleansing.

In Lev. 20:24-26 the Scripture speaking of Israel says, "I am the Lord your God which have separated you from other people, and ye shall be holy unto me". In Exod. 19:6, God declared that Israel was to be a "holy nation", "carried" by the Deity "from the womb" (Isa. 46:3). On what
principle were they to be holy? By obeying his voice and keeping his covenant. What did this involve? It involved the great principle of blood-shedding as a covering for uncleanness and iniquity, as it is written: “Almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission” (Heb. 9:22). Can anyone name anything under the law that was not purged by blood, the poverty of the offerer only causing an exception? and Exod. 30:12-16 may also be one exception. Is it credible that a law framed or designed by the Deity to purge from all uncleanness should entirely ignore the “constituted” uncleanness of the race? Who will venture an answer in the affirmative?

In the study of the law of Moses we find three kinds of offerings. There is the burnt-offering, the sin-offering, and the trespass-offering. So far as we can learn from the Scriptures there was neither sin-offering, nor trespass-offering from Adam to Moses. “The diversity of offerings cannot surely be without signification. That they all relate to sin is evident from the fact that in all of them animals required to be slain. All were for atonement, but atonement for different degrees of sin, as we might express it. There is sin of natural state, sin of ignorance, and sin of weakness: the first, the constitutional uncleanness that has come into the world by sin, which ‘is no more I . . . but sin that dwelleth in me’; the second, when men do wrong without knowing it, as sin of ignorance; and third, acts of known disobedience but not deliberate or intentional, but the result of infirmity deplored. For these three phases of sin, the burnt-offering, the sin-offering and the trespass-offering appear to have been provided.

“The burnt-offering was an act of worship on the part of a mortal being apart from special offense. Thus Noah, saved from destruction by the flood, took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl and offered burnt-offerings upon the altar. Thus also the test of Abraham’s faith was to offer Isaac for a burnt-offering. That burnt-offering should be required in the absence of particular offence shows that our unclean state, as the death-doomed children of Adam, itself unfit us for approach to the Deity apart from the recognition and acknowledgement of which the burnt-offering was the form required and supplied (emphasis in this sentence is ours). It was because of the ‘uncleanness of the children of Israel’ as well as because of their transgressions in all their sins ‘that atonement was required for even the tabernacle of the congregation’ (Lev. 16:16). The type involved in complete burning is self-manifest—it is consumption of sin nature. This is the great promise and prophecy and requirement of every form of the truth: the destruction of the body of sin (Rom. 6:5). 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.” (Italics ours.)

The preceding extract is taken from Brother Roberts’ latest standard work, “The Law of Moses”, a work specially devoted to an exposition of the “Patterns of things in the heavens”. The above quotation presents the relevant part of Brother Roberts’ elucidation of the meaning typified by the sacrifice of burnt-offering. In it there is much for our profitable reflection. If our “unclean state as the death-doomed children of Adam itself unfit us for approach to the Deity”, and all mankind are born into this state, then surely we have inherited alienation. If mankind by reason of their natural descent cannot approach to the Deity, then it follows as an irrefutable logical conclusion that they are not in a neutral position, they are in a negative or sepa-
rated position. How were they during the Mosaic dispensation brought nigh to the Deity through the sacrifice of burnt-offering? The burnt-offering then was "supplied and required" as a provisional covering for the inherited uncleanness entailed upon Adam's posterity for or because of Adam's sin—which is the view we have held for twenty years or over.

Having by the authority of Brother Roberts established the meaning or purpose of the sacrifice of burnt-offering, let us apply it to the case in hand. The children of Israel, because of inherited uncleanness—as well as because of personal sins—were "un-holy" and unfit to approach to the Deity. How were they rendered holy and acceptable to the Divine Majesty? Only one answer can be returned. On the principle of blood-shedding they were provisionally purified and made clean from inherited uncleanness. By what offering? Not a sin-offering, nor a trespass-offering, because they were instituted for personal sins. Therefore it must be, as Brother Roberts teaches, by the sacrifice of burnt-offering. Now as the children of Israel were separated and holy to the Deity from their very birth, there is only one form of sacrifice under the law that fully meets the requirements of the situation, namely, the evening-morning sacrifice. It is called in Exod. 29:38-42, a "continual burnt-offering", to be offered "throughout your generations". By this offering the children of Israel, upon the very day of their birth, were provisionally purified and justified from all inherited disabilities, and reckoned "holy" in God's sight. Such is the type. In the antitype the true seed of Abraham upon the day of their water birth ceremonially share in what Christ accomplished as the antitypical Lamb of Burnt Offering, and are then brought from a "far-off", "unclean", "alienated", "condemned" state to a state which is the very anti-thesis—"nigh", "holy" or "clean", "reconciled," "justified".

Thus we see that the doctrine of inherited alienation—taught both by Dr. Thomas and Brother Roberts—does not, neither in Scripture nor in reason, entail the conclusion that Christ was alienated until he was thirty years of age. On the contrary, the Scripture expressly teaches that, "I was cast upon thee from the womb". "Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts." Could these statements apply to Gentile children? If not, why not? Do they apply to Christ? If so, upon what principle? We cannot affirm that they apply to Christ on the principle of natural descent without a radical departure from the truth as delivered by Dr. Thomas and upheld by Brother Roberts.

There must have been some divine-ly appointed principle whereby unclean and therefore alienated, condemned flesh and blood could be made holy to the Lord. That principle we know: without the shedding of blood there is no purification, no remission of anything that separates man from God. In Brother Roberts' exposition of the burnt-offering, the sin-offering and the trespass-offering, to meet the three phases of sin for which God has provided and will accept an offering, we have vividly presented before us the absolute holiness of the Divine Majesty, which would not accept the approaches of uncleaned sin's flesh, the perfection and beautiful blending of Divine wisdom, mercy and justice in "supplying and requiring" in the patterns of the heavenlies, an offering for inherited uncleanness, as well as for sins of ignorance and sins of weakness or infirmity.

Pursuing our study of this subject we ask our brethren, who so vigorously oppose us, if Jesus observed Israel's day of atonement? Only in the affirmative can the answer be returned. Then we inquire, Why should he, see-
ing he had no personal sins for which to atone? The Scripture says, "Whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people". Beyond a doubt Jesus observed the national day of atonement. In what way would a sacrifice be necessary for him, who committed no sin? What reason would exist for the Sinless One to afflict his soul, in view of the statement that it was "to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year"? Those who believe that sinners are baptized for something else besides personal sins find no difficulty in returning an answer. By a reference to the Scriptures we observe that the ceremonies of that most solemn day were commenced by burnt offering.

We have already seen the significance of burnt-offering. It was for "sin of natural state", as Brother Roberts has expressed it, or "inherited sin", as others have expressed it, caused by Adam's transgression. Christ was in this "sin of natural state" or "inherited sin" state and therefore a mortal man, a "death-doomed son of Adam". This being so, we readily perceive that Jesus would be no merely nominal participant in the "affliction" which the law enjoined. Far from it; the Scripture represents Jesus as offering "up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him who was able to save him from death—the death which he inherited—and was heard in that he feared". So that, by the blood of the everlasting covenant he was brought again from the dead (Heb. 13:20). Therefore we affirm that the very fact that Jesus, the One utterly devoid of personal sin, observed the national day of atonement, bears upon its face ample evidence that among the various sacrifices offered upon that day there must have been at least one sacrifice "supplied and required" for that "sin of natural state" which he shared in common with his brethren. The Passover sacrifices also commenced with burnt offerings (Num. 28:19), and we might add, all the "solemn feasts" of Divine appointment. Sacrifice for "sin of natural state" or "inherited sin" we believe to be taught in many types in the law of Moses.

In Lev. 16:16, Moses was commanded to make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation. This we understand to be the first holy wherein the priests daily ministered. Christ was "our forerunner", therefore he was the first to enter the antitypical "holy state"; after him, all who have been baptized into him. An "atonement" required to be made for the typical holy, for two reasons. The first reason is because of the "uncleanness of the children of Israel"; the other, "because of their transgressions in all their sins". Applied to the Great Antitype, we ask, Will anyone deny that he was one of the children of Israel? If one of the children of Israel, then unclean; and if unclean, then requiring purification by the blood of the one great offering. We have seen that there was a yearly calling to remembrance of inherited uncleanness in Jesus "afflicting his soul" on the national day of atonement; we now see that an offering for uncleanness was required before Jesus would enter the antitypical holy. Jesus ceremonially shared in the offering that was to be accomplished when he was baptized of John in Jordan. In his symbolic death, burial, and resurrection he manifested his faith in what would be accomplished for himself through his own offering, and by that act was again ceremonially cleansed and justified from inherited sin and uncleanness, or "sin of natural state", and then entered into the antitypical holy and commenced its duties. Those who are baptized into Christ not only have this "uncleanness" as the "death-doomed children of Adam", they also have "their transgressions in all their
sins". When they are baptized into Christ an "atonement" or "covering" is provided for both; they are then constituents of the holy, being priests unto God. In what other way can this phase of the type as the "atonement for the holy" be expounded?

It is beyond the design of this article to allude to even a small minority of the types. Indeed, no necessity exists for it, inasmuch as the whole subject has been admirably expounded by Brother Roberts in his latest standard work, "The Law of Moses". The object of this article, written in the spirit inculcated in 2 Tim. 2:25, is rather to draw attention to what has been long since taught in our authoritative literature, in the hope that our brethren may be assisted to recover from the error which they have so zealously espoused. In order to facilitate the attainment of our object we respectfully invite our dissenting brethren to give us, through the medium of either of their magazines, an exhaustive exposition of some of the chapters in Leviticus, such as the eighth, ninth and sixteenth. We consider these chapters most extremely interesting and instructive, abounding in phases of profound truths typically revealed. These chapters are part of the Scriptures that are profitable for doctrine. What is the doctrine they contain? An exposition of these chapters by those who believe that baptism is for the forgiveness of personal sins only, is a duty they owe to those whom they have excommunicated.

In Heb. 9, Paul says that "Moses ... took the blood of calves and of goats ... and sprinkled both the book, and all the people ... Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood." In view of this most unmistakable teaching of Paul, our brethren must acknowledge that under the law sacrifices were for something else beside personal sins. Sacrifices for personal sins figure largely in the "Patterns of the Heavens", but it is an inexpungable fact that sacrifices for other things figure largely also. Seeing that this fact cannot be denied, we ask, What is the doctrine taught? what is the correspondence in the antitype? We respectfully desire our brethren who limit baptism to forgiveness of personal sins only, to expound for us the antitypical significance of this fact. We believe Christ is the great antitype—Christ personal and Christ mystical or multitudinous. In the language of Brother Roberts, "Christ is the antitypical Aaron, the antitypical altar, the antitypical mercy seat, the antitypical everything. The types all converge upon and have their substance in Christ. There must therefore be a sense in which Christ was purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice. Christ must have been the subject of a personal cleansing (italics ours) in the process by which he opened up 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? Great difficulty is experienced by various classes of thinkers in receiving this view; needlessly so, it should seem. There is first the express declaration that the matter stands so: 'It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices); but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these' (Heb. 9:23). It was 'of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer' (8:3). 'By reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins' (5:3). 'By his own blood he
entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption (for us, is an addition inconsistent with the middle voice of the verb employed, which imports a thing done by one to one's own self) (9:12). There was next the necessity that it should be so. The word 'necessity', it will be perceived, occurs frequently in the course of Paul's argument. The necessity arises from the position in which men stood as regards the law of sin and death, and the position in which the Lord stood as their redeemer from that position (italics ours). The position of men was that they were under condemnation to die because of sin, and that not their own sin, but ancestral sin at the beginning. The forgiveness of personal offenses is the prominent feature in 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" (italics ours). "We see him (Christ) 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. 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."

The foregoing extracts are from chapter 18 of "The Law of Moses". We wish we had room for the whole chapter. We most earnestly recommend every brother and sister to procure a copy of "The Law of Moses" and read it carefully. They will be greatly benefited and enabled to decide intelligently on the question now before the household. It will be observed that Brother Roberts teaches there are two features in the apostolic proclamation and two barriers to salvation. One comes from our own sins, the other comes from "ancestral sins". Then redemption from this latter position, he expressly says on page 158, is a work of "mercy and forgiveness". Will our brethren who have cast us from their fellowship read "The Law of Moses" and then decide whether Brother Roberts taught that baptism was for personal sins only? On page 147 Brother Roberts says: "Under apostolic guidance, we see Christ both in the bullock, in the furniture, in the veil, in the high priest, and, in brief, in all these Mosaic 'patterns', which he says were 'a shadow of things to come' (Heb. 8:5; 9:23; 10:1; 3:5). All were both atoning and atoned for (Lev. 16:33). There is no counterpart to this if Christ is kept out of his own sacrifice, as some thoughts would do. He cannot be kept out if place is given to all the testimony—an express part of which is, that as the sum total of the things signified by these patterns, he was 'purified with' a better sacrifice than bulls and goats, viz., his own sacrifice (Heb. 9:23, 12). If he was 'purified', there was something to be purified from. What was it? Look at his hereditary death taint as the son of Adam, through whom death entered the world by sin, and there is no difficulty."

Do our brethren accept or reject the above teaching from Brother Roberts? If they accept it, why should they oppose us in teaching that in the sense in which Christ offered for himself, he offered for us? We have the same "hereditary death taint", the same "sin of natural state", the same "uncleanness" under the same "condemnation"; and if these are included in the reasons why he offered for himself, then they must be included in the reasons why he offered for us. We are reckoned as dying with Christ, we ceremonially share in what he accomplished for himself and also have our sins forgiven us.

On page 141 Brother Roberts says that there was an "alienated state established at the beginning" and a
"perfectly reconciled state that will be reached at the end". This is what we teach and believe. Every member of our race is born into this "alienated state established at the beginning", and must be "reconciled" from it as well as have his personal sins forgiven (Christ excluded) before "he can reach the perfectly reconciled state at the end"; the entire work, in its dual aspect, being a work of "mercy and forgiveness" on the part of the Deity.

We have shown that Dr. Thomas taught inherited uncleanness, that Christ shared this uncleanness. By reference to "Eureka", Vol. 2, p. 234, where Dr. Thomas is expounding the "altar," we read: "The Flesh made by the Spirit out of Mary's substance, and rightly claimed therefore in 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'" (italics ours). From this testimony we see that although the Spirit claimed the flesh as His own, yet as it was flesh defiled by the presence of sin inherited, He would not accept of it as the altar until cleansed by the blood of purification. Dr. Thomas and Brother Roberts unite in teaching that Christ was purified or cleansed from inherited uncleanness by his own sacrificial blood. Will our brethren deny this? We feel sure they will not. Will anyone say we have garbled their writings, to appear to make them teach what they really do not teach? We hope not. Nothing could be farther from our desire or intention than to wrest the teaching of anyone to support what we believe to be true. With much that has been said on the "fallacy of quotations" we fully agree, and yet we must quote from the Bible and standard works in order to prove our agreement therewith. We have quoted fairly from the writings of Dr. Thomas and Brother Roberts to show that Christ required to offer for himself and also to show why he so required to offer. We claim to have fairly proven that it was for something inherited from Adam. We submit as a self-evident proposition that all who admit that Christ offered for himself because of uncleanness derived, through his mother, from sinful ancestors cannot with candor and intelligence, deny that he offered for us for the same reason. It therefore follows as an irrefutable Scriptural conclusion that we morally and ceremonially participate in this cleansing sacrifice at baptism.

We all admit that "character" is what God desires. A character perfected under trial is so precious in His sight that He has promised to invest it with immortality. This character is evolved in an unclean body, a death-doomed body, a body in this condition because of "ancestral sin". The body therefore must be changed, or the character developed must perish. When the body is changed it is made a "partaker of the divine nature", it is then in its highest sense the "habitation of the Deity", and Solomon's question "Will God indeed dwell on the earth?" will be answered. The "temple of the Deity" will be seen upon the earth when He dwells in that vast multitude of the redeemed whose bodies have been transformed by His eternal power to consist substantially with His own holy spirit nature. Thus we see that the "body" made in the image of the Elohim, awaits a glorious destiny. This being so, it would seem reasonable, apart from Scripture entirely, to conclude that the body would be the subject of a ceremonial cleansing and purification at baptism. Has the Deity a habitation now upon the earth? We know that He dwelt in the temple Solomon built. That temple He forsook; that temple He caused to be destroyed. Before He dwelt in the temple He dwelt in the tabernacle Moses reared in the wilderness. On
both of these occasions, before taking up His representative abode, sacrifices were offered to God. In the case of the tabernacle, it is expressly stated that there was “atonement for the holy sanctuary, and for the tabernacle of the congregation”. In the case of the temple before “the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord” it is written that Solomon “and all the congregation of Israel that were assembled unto Him were with him before the ark sacrificing sheep and oxen that could not be told nor numbered for multitude”. We thus see from these two types that the Deity required the shedding of blood to cleanse or purify His dwelling place upon the earth. The question now before us in the application of the type is: Has God now a dwelling place upon the earth? If so, where is it? If He has such a dwelling place upon the earth, would it not be in harmony with the foregoing types? Would it not be in harmony with an enlightened conception of the superlative holiness of the Deity? Would it not be in harmony with the New Testament teaching to conclude that His dwelling place would be purified with the “better sacrifice”? In 1 Cor. 3:16, 17, it is written, “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.”

In the sixth chapter, Paul is still more explicit, and his meaning placed beyond all doubt. Paul says, “What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.” Our “bodies are the members of Christ” and the “temple of the Deity”. The scripture teaches that God has bought our bodies and dwells in them. We have seen that these bodies are constituted unclean by being born of defiled ancestors. We have seen that these bodies will ultimately be changed to Holy Spirit nature, when they will be “clean” in the most exalted sense of the word. What lies between these two extremes? We repeat that there is a provisional purification, etc., and ceremonial or symbolic justification from inherited uncleanness and all that “uncleanness” involves, such as alienation, condemnation, etc., as well as from the “uncleanness” of personal iniquity. Personal iniquity causes a defiled conscience, and may also cause a visibly defiled body. We readily grant that where the apostle speaks of such he refers to acquired defilement. But this defiled condition of body—very frequently quite invisible to the natural eye—is the subject of sanctification.

Such is Paul’s teaching in 1 Cor. 6; he says, “But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified”. This refers to the body, as the context clearly shows. The “body” is washed, and as a result it is sanctified and justified from its defiled condition, acquired by the wicked works enumerated in verses 9, 10. No physical change takes place. To the natural eye the body is precisely the same as before “washing”. The inherited “uncleanness” of our bodies is quite invisible to the natural eye; acquired “uncleanness” may often be also. The Scriptures teach that both are visible to God. We, no doubt, all admit that men are “cleansed” from the latter at baptism, without any physical change in the body itself. Paul expressly says they are washed, sanctified, and justified. Thus we have Scripture evidence to prove that our bodies are “cleansed” from acquired uncleanness at baptism without any physical change occurring. If the same ceremony does not “cleanse” them from inherited uncleanness then the body is still “unclean” and as such could not be “holy” to the Lord, nor could it be His temple.
The Scriptures teach us that Christ is the chief corner stone in this temple. As Christ is our "forerunner", if we are constituents of the Divine Temple now, so likewise was Christ its chief corner stone in the days of his flesh—as well as now. The Father dwelt in him then, as it is written, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself". We have seen that the Christ character was evolved in an "unclean" body. We ask, Was this "unclean" body ceremonially purified or cleansed before the Father Spirit took up His abode therein? We respectfully ask our dissenting brethren to tell us if the writings of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms shed any light upon this question. If you believe they do, expound to us the scriptures that teach it. If you believe they do not, then expound for us those scriptures which tell that the blood of the sacrifices was applied to the inanimate things which, under the law, were consecrated to the Divine service.

There is no scripture which verbally reads that men are baptized for "inherited sin" or "inherited uncleanness". But there is much scripture that we cannot understand if that teaching is denied. Paul in Heb. 10:22 teaches that our hearts are "sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water". "Washing" is for the purpose of making clean. The natural eye discerns neither the "uncleanness" nor the "cleanness". The "body" appears the same. To God it is otherwise. Before baptism it was unclean and he would not dwell in it. Now it is reckoned as "clean" through obedience to His Word, and has become His temple. It thenceforth becomes a duty "to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (Rom. 12:1).

Saints in Christ Jesus are also exhorted to "cleansse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit", which indicates that our flesh being reckoned "clean" at baptism from all uncleanness, our duty is to preserve it in that state of purity in which it is constituted by our symbolic death and burial to all that we had inherited or acquired, and our resurrection as constituents of a "new creation". If this be not so, and the bodies of believers are not ceremonially washed, sanctified, justified and made holy for a habitation of the Deity, then we respectfully ask our dissenting brethren to expound to us the meaning of the types of the atonement of the "tabernacle of the congregation" and of the "holy" and the dedication of the temple as the habitation of the Deity, and also to expound to us upon what principle, consonant with the absolute holiness of the Deity, He can dwell in bodies unclean because derived from sinful ancestors.

We feel that we cannot conclude this very brief presentation without beseeching our dissenting brethren to reconsider their position. The facts or doctrine herein set forth are not "new". Previous to our baptism, now nearly a quarter of a century ago, we believed in "inherited alienation" and its removal at baptism as firmly and intelligently as we do to-day, and not until quite recently were we aware that a cardinal doctrine of the "household of faith" was that the "redemptive work of Christ had nothing whatever to do with Adam's sin", and that "baptism was for the forgiveness of personal sins only". We understand that the apostacy teaches that men's souls are sent to a burning hell for Adam's sin, or because of their descent from Adam, and that Christ died, not for himself in any sense, but to save souls from this hell. We understand the truth to be that mankind are condemned to death for Adam's sin, or perhaps better expressed in these criticising times, because their nature is derived from Adam, and that the sacrifice of Christ was pre-eminently to deliver himself and
his brethren from that condition inherited from Adam. While believing this we never made light of "personal sins". How could we when Paul, in Rom. 5:20, teaches that the "offence" which brought death was aggravated, as it were, by the abounding offences made manifest by the law? These required that "grace did much more abound". This is what we understand Brother Roberts to mean when he teaches that the forgiveness of personal offenses is the prominent feature in the apostolic proclamation, because personal offenses are the greater barrier. They constitute the greater barrier on the principle that if one sin committed by one man in the beginning separated that man and all his posterity from God, how much greater must the separation be between God and men who individually commit multitudes of sins. If our brethren agree with Brother Roberts, then we respectfully request them to tell us what is the obscure or less prominent feature in the apostolic proclamation. Some of the brethren opposed to us are known to us personally, and we esteem them very highly indeed, believing them to be honorable, conscientious, God-fearing men, as sincerely desirous of being in harmony with truth as we are; with them we have taken sweet counsel in days gone by. Those not known to us we have heard very highly spoken of, and we readily assert that they are actuated by the highest of all motives; viz., that they believe they are doing God service with a pure conscience.

Believing these things, we appeal to you one and all to take an impartial, comprehensive consideration of all the testimonies bearing on iniquity, uncleanness, sacrifice, atonement and reconciliation in type and applied antitype. Do this and we feel assured that you will perceive that baptism for personal sins only is not all that is included in "Christ as the sin-covering name".

—Advocate Supplement, 1901.

ADAMIC CONDEMNATION

The use of this term often evokes criticism, although it has been used by numerous reputable brethren in the annals of the Christadelphians for several generations. Why is this term objected to? We suggest several reasons.

First, it is not a Scriptural term, but this is hardly a just criticism. Words, terms and phrases not found in the Scriptures are used by all brethren who speak or write, in order to communicate, to express their thoughts and ideas, to be understood. How circumscribed they would be, if, in any exegesis, they could not use their own idiom!

Another criticism is, not its use, but its use by certain brethren. If some brethren can use the term, why not others? This is neither reasonable nor logical; and such criticism savors of prejudice, is unfair, and not deserving of any defense.

The third criticism is that the term is not understandable, and means different things to different people. We believe that it is not only understandable, but that notable brethren have used it since the days of Bro. R. Roberts, used it in the same way and with the same meaning. We believe that this is demonstrable, and will attempt to prove that such is the case.

Let us first look at the related terms, "Adamic sin" and "Adamic guilt". Both are in common use by brethren, and I believe that their meaning is well understood, though the terms are not to be found in the Scriptures. They refer to Adam's sin; i.e., disobedience to God's specific command or law. They are practically synonymous, for at the moment Adam
sinned his guilt was established. Are we guilty of Adam's sin; i.e., are we held responsible for that sinful act committed nearly six thousand years ago? No, in no way; but we do suffer from its effects.

After the Adamic sin (and consequent guilt) came the penalty—condemnation. What was this condemnation? Death. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return". That body which had been pronounced "very good" was now a body of death; death was in his members. His (Adam's) life from then on was one of trouble and sorrow, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shalt it bring forth to thee... in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground..." (Gen. 3:17-19). Further, Adam was no longer fit to commune with God, nor to live longer in the Edenic paradise; a wall or barrier was erected between them.

Like begots like. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one" (Job 14:4). "How then can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?" (Job 25:4).

So Adam's condemnation resulted in the inheritance of that condemnation by all his posterity. We all inherit the evil consequences of his sin; we are all born subject to death; we are all born into a condemned state. As stated in Article 5 of the Statement of Faith, Adam's defilement, as a result of his sin, "became a physical law of his being, and was transmitted to all his posterity".

The Apostle Paul speaks at length of this condition in his epistle to the Romans. In Romans 6:6 he speaks of our body as a "body of sin"; and in Romans 7:23-24 he speaks of "the law of sin which is in my members", and adds: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" That we inherited this condemnation is clearly stated in Rom. 5:18, "Therefore, indeed, as through one offense, sentence came on all men to condemnation; so also, through one righteous act, sentence came on all men to justification of life" (Emph. Diag.).

In "Revealed Mystery", page 24, Dr. Thomas expresses it thus, "All mankind are born of corruptible parents into a state of sin. By this natural birth, they become members of this sinful evil state, and heirs of all its disabilities. By virtue of this birth, they are 'constituted sinners', though they could not help, and had no hand in the matter."

Dr. Thomas has much to say about this Constitution of Sin, in Elpis Israel, which we suggest for study. On page 115 (4th edition) he states, "Sin in the flesh is hereditary; and entailed upon mankind as the consequence of Adam's violation of the Eden law. The 'original sin' was such as I have shown in previous pages. Adam and Eve committed it; and their posterity are suffering the consequences of it." Further, on page 116, he says, "Men must be born sinners before they can become saints... It is absurd to say that children are born holy... None are born holy, but such as are born of the Spirit into the Kingdom of God. Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh', or sin. This is a misfortune, not a crime... Hence, new-born babes suffer all the evil of the peculiar department of Satan, or sin's kingdom, to which they belong."

In "Ways of Providence", 1881 edition, page 210, Brother R. Roberts speaks of man's "present state of racial alienation", and in "Law of Moses", 1910 edition, page 173, he states that, "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."

Now Brother Thomas Williams taught these same basic truths. In the CHRISTADELPHIANS ADVOCATE (1902), he had this to say, "My belief is that Adam's sin resulted in all men being by inheritance in a state of sin, or, as
Dr. Thomas puts it, 'Constitutional Sinners'. That this state, as well as our being sinners by actual transgression, is represented in the Scriptures as an 'unclean' state or a 'naked' state, which must be legally or provisionally cleansed, as well as our personal sins forgiven, before there can be reconciliation to God.

We would also quote Brother Williams from "World's Redemption", 1951 edition, pages 85-86, as follows: "From this lost, condemned state into which we came by natural birth, we must sever our relation by being 'born again'. It is by the new birth that we become the children of God, not by natural birth. We are not born into covenant relationship with God by natural birth, but when we are 'born again', then we enter into that covenant relation which makes us one with God, the children of the covenant; because we are then in Him who is the covenant sacrifice and are reconciled to God in Christ where alone reconciliation can take place from that alienation imposed by Adam upon all the race."

This "new birth" and "covenant relationship" needs no explanation to any Christadelphian worthy of the name; it is all our expectation, desire and hope. That God offers this reconciliation through the medium of his only begotten Son is an accepted fact, as expressed in Articles 8, 7, and 8 of the Statement of Faith. We would refer particularly to Article 8, where it speaks of Jesus Christ "raised up of the condemned (italics ours) race of Adam", of "wearing the condemned nature", "and by dying, abrogate the law of condemnation (italics ours) for himself, and all who should believe and obey him".

This condemnation can only refer to Adamic condemnation, or that condemnation that resulted from Adamic sin. As has been pointed out, we have, or had, this condemnation together with all other sons of Adam, including Jesus, as stated in this Article 8, and also in Article 10, where he, Jesus, is spoken of as "a sufferer, in the days of his flesh, from all the effects that came by Adam's transgression, including the death that passed upon all men, which he shared by partaking of their physical nature."

Note the supporting scriptural testimony cited in Articles 8, 9 and 10, particularly Romans 1:3; Galatians 4:4; Romans 6:9; Hebrews 2:14-17; Hebrews 5:3; 5:7. A careful, analytical study of these proves conclusively that: Jesus was made like unto his brethren; that he was made of a woman, therefore unclean in his nature (Job 25:4); that he was a sufferer of all the evils inherited from Adam's sin; that he possessed the sin or condemned nature; that in dying he offered for himself; that in dying, death had no more dominion over him.

Supporting this principle is Bro. Roberts', "Christ could not righteously die if death had no dominion over him, and it could not have this dominion except through Adam, through Abraham, David, and his mother, for he had no sin of his own" (The Blood of Christ, page 17). Dr. Thomas states it in this way, "Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus, if it had not existed there. His body was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for" (Epis Israel, 4th edition, page 114).

Having established that Jesus had to die for his sin nature (not for personal sins, for he had none), does it not follow that he died for his brethren for the same reason? Certainly; and it is so stated in Article 8, that he, by his perfect obedience, and by dying, abrogated (or set aside) "the law of condemnation for himself, and all who should believe and obey him". What does this mean? That for all who accept him and take on his name, this law of condemnation is set aside; i.e., it is, in the vernacular, "paid for". This is testified to in Romans 8:1, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (The rest of this passage, "who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit", is not to be found in either
the Sinaitic or Alexandrian MSS.).

Who are "in Christ Jesus"? In this Christian era they are those who have made a covenant with him through the medium of baptism, where, as shown in Romans 6th chapter, the believer dies figuratively, even as Jesus died literally. So, if, by Jesus death, he abrogated the condemnation inherited from Adam, it follows that, for his brethren this occurs when they show forth his death when they are "buried with him, by baptism into his death"; and numerous reputable brethren have so testified, as we shall proceed to prove.

First, we wish to quote Bro. Thomas Williams, in "Adamic Condemnation": "We believe in baptism there is a transition from a state of alienation in Adam to citizenship in Christ; and that through it we shall ultimately be freed from the physical effects of Adam's sin. That in baptism we are freed from Adamic condemnation so far as relationship is concerned, that is, that instead of being "far off" in Adam, we are "made nigh" in Christ. That Christ was born under, and died to remove, Adamic condemnation" (page 14). Further, he stated, "Adamic condemnation brings a physical disability inherited from Adam. We are freed from this federal condemnation and reconciled to God at Baptism, but we are not freed from physical disability till the change of body" (page 15).

Dr. Thomas, in "Revealed Mystery", page 27, states, "The being gotten of the water by the word, is the passing from the sentence of death to the sentence of life. . . ." And in "Eureka", vol. 1, page 303, 1869 edition, he said this, "The apostles taught that death had been cancelled, and immortality, that is, deathlessness, or life and incorruptibility, brought to light by Jesus Christ . . . that the writing of death against the saints had been crossed, or blotted, out . . . ."

Brother Roberts, as Editor of The Christadelphian for many years, has put himself on record as teaching these same basic truths. In the May issue of that magazine, 1878, we read this, "Legally, a man is freed from the Adamic condemnation (italics ours) at the time he obeys the truth and receives the remission of sins; but actually its physical effects remain till 'this mortal' (that is, this Adamic condemned nature) is swallowed up in the life that Christ will bestow upon his brethren at his coming". In the Nov., 1875, issue, page 520, he said, "A saint . . . dies under the racial condemnation that has passed upon all men. But none the less he is a forgiven man, and a man released from condemnation . . . ."

Brother Roberts expressed himself in more specific terms when he conducted the funeral of a sister, as reported in The Christadelphian, July, 1883, page 306: "Our sister may have been said to have died for a different reason from that which explains the occurrence of death in the case of mankind in general. They die and return unto their dust in harmony with the sentence which was pronounced upon their progenitor by whom 'sin entered into the world, and death by sin'. But she rest not beneath that law. She was under it by natural birth, but she has escaped from it by a divine arrangement provided for that purpose, for all the sons and daughters of men who are willing to avail themselves of it. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made her free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2). There was therefore no legal necessity for her death. Had she 'by reason of strength' been able to live until the return of Christ . . . she would not have been required to taste death at all, but would have been changed in a moment from a state of mortality to one of incorruptibility."

I have before me a pamphlet, "Redemption in Christ Jesus", by Brother W. F. Barling, which was first published as a series of articles in The Christadelphian, in 1946. We quote extracts from it to substantiate what these other brethren we have mentioned, taught and wrote. Brother
Barling says, "God deals with men on the federal principle...by it men inherit and are redeemed from Adamic condemnation (italics ours). To accomplish the salvation of man the Redeemer had to be identical in physical nature with those he came to save." (page 7). The Christadelphian view, he explains, is that "Jesus, as the son of Mary, was identical in nature with all humanity, in order to share Adamic condemnation with those he came to save" (page 9). Further, he says, "Thus when death dissolved Christ's association with the iniquities of those in him; it enabled them to be made free from the law of sin and death" (page 25). Treating of this same theme (page 38) he has this to say, "God offers not exemption from death, but the same triumph over it as Christ accomplished. This He does by mercifully including them federally in the sinless Jesus, whose righteousness He imputes to them as a covering for sin, thus counting them free from condemnation."

We have this suggestion to make: that a thorough study be made of the scriptural evidence presented, and also an examination of the various works from which we have quoted, as reassurance that, by taking portions out of context, we have not distorted the intended meaning of the writers.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10).

Thus exhorts the Apostle. The subjects of which we have written, namely, condemnation, the nature of man, and the atonement, are most vital. Sometimes using the same language and sometimes not, it will be found, if viewed objectively, that the brethren we have quoted (and others also), did "speak the same thing" on these matters.

P. L. Safford

A PLEA FOR ACTION IN FURTHERANCE OF JUSTICE, LOOKING TO-WARDS UNION AND UNITY

By BRO. THOS. WILLIAMS

To the Christadelphians Throughout the World.

Beloved in the Lord:—I address you individually and collectively as fellow-sojourners in the world's wilderness. I address you as one who is in the bonds of the same covenant that you are in, and whose law is the same, whose obligations are the same, and whose hope is the same.

In addressing you thus I do so with a deep feeling of reverence to God and of obligations to you as being one with you in the struggle for life eternal—that obligation which should be felt one towards another by all who are constituents of the one body of Christ.

I address you in the hope that you will not simply read what I say and then lay it aside and pass on. I desire that you receive what I say as a matter which seriously concerns you, whether I am personally known to you or not. I urge this because what I say to you involves the question of right and wrong, of justice and injustice as between you and me and between God and us all. I want our motto to be "God, you and me."
I feel that I am performing an imperative duty, and that I 
must hold myself ready to do my duty in the matter involved 
whatever it may be—to do it too as if it were to be my last act 
before being ushered into the presence of our Lord to be judged. 
I beg you, seriously, earnestly, brotherly, affectionately, to take 
the matter in hand yourself, yourselves, in the same manner 
and with the same feelings.

No Postponement

Do not say, “Let it go to the judgment seat.” It will go 
there, of course, but it is our duty to try, try, and try again to 
right all wrongs in which we may be involved before we are 
called to the judgment seat. This letter shall be a witness of 
my endeavor in that direction. I send it to you as such. I 
dedicate it to the great cause of eternal truth as such. Will you 
take hold of the matter with me and try to straighten out the 
crooked things that are troubling and dividing the one body?

My case is one that none of you are too old or too young, too 
rich or too poor, too learned or too unlearned, too popular or 
too obscure, too far or too near—not one of you, individually 
or ecclesially, have the divine right to ignore it. I claim (but 
humbly, in the fear of God) your attention. I acknowledge your 
right to claim my attention to any request and demand you may 
make of me in the same spirit, and with the same object.

Are You Ready to Act?

Now what do you say? Are you ready to do this duty so 
far as it is in your power? If I cannot suggest the best way of 
doing it, will you suggest a way? Remember the words, 
“Blessed are the peace makers.” Act upon these words; for 
words without action will not mend matters.

I believe we have been too indifferent towards those who 
have been in error, and those who have been regarded as in 
error, rightly or otherwise. Do you think it is ever right for 
us now to cease striving to “gain thy brother” and to “convert 
the sinner from the error of his ways”? Is there anything more 
incumbent upon us? Do you think we can perform any other 
duties to God acceptably while this is neglected?

It may appear to you that I am obtruding myself upon your 
attention in a matter in which many others are involved; but in 
this humiliating appearance I am a helpless creature of circum-
stances. The blame, so far as the matter in America is con-
cerned, has been repeatedly and publicly placed upon me; and 
my name has been much used by many in referring to the trou-
ble, in some instances even to the extent of making a test of 
fellowship upon the question, “Would you fellowship Brother 
Williams?” These facts must be my apology for appearing 
forward. So please bear with me in this.

With me it is no trifling matter to be represented as a cause 
of division and a setter forth of strange doctrines: It grieves 
my heart to see my name associated with such things. I try 
to keep from getting angry, and I think I have succeeded; and
I have mentally subjected myself to examination to see whether I was deceiving myself and deserved the blame put upon me. The weight of the matter is made heavier by the thought that I am supposed to have led many astray; and I cannot bear to think that others are looked upon as bearing my sins. If it is so I want to know it, and to repent of it and to ask forgiveness; if it is not so I want it known, and I hope others will be as willing to right the wrongs as I am sure I am.

This is a long introduction, you will say. Yes, but the situation calls for it, for in view of all the facts in the case the words of inspiration are specially applicable to us at this time—"Awake to righteousness and sin not." And now to

The Question, What is It?

There is a division of the body on the question known as Adamic Condemnation and Resurrectional Responsibility; and I am charged with being the cause of it in America. The charges have been made in the following form:

1. That Brother Williams teaches that men are personally guilty of Adam's sin.
2. That at baptism we are forgiven Adam's sin.
3. That we are baptized for Adam's sin.
4. That God will not, and that by His law He has tied His hands so that He cannot, raise from the dead and punish any who die during the Gentile dispensation, except those who are baptized into Christ.

Now my desire is to show that I have been misunderstood and misrepresented by forms of words I never coined and never used except as coming from those who originated them; and my principal object now is to openly, and as clearly as I possibly can answer these charges, in the hope of arousing the brotherhood of the world to accept my explanation as sufficient to reunite those who may have been divided by misunderstanding. I will number my answers to correspond with the numbers of the charges.

1. My answer to the first charge is that I positively deny ever having taught such a thing.
2. To the second charge my answer is that the words "forgiven Adam's sin" originated with brethren who are opposed to me, and that my subsequent use of them has been misunderstood by some and misused by others. My belief is that Adam's sin resulted in all men being by inheritance in a state of sin, or, as Dr. Thomas puts it, "Constitutional sinners." That this state, as well as our being sinners by actual transgression, is represented in the scriptures as an "unclean" state or a "naked" state, which must be legally, or provisionally cleansed, as well as our personal sins forgiven, before there can be reconciliation to God, and that after we have passed through "the waters of separation" by baptism, and therein received the provisional cleansing efficacy of the blood of Christ, God looks upon us through Christ, as it were, and allows us who were "far off" to come "nigh," because our "old Adam" nakedness has been
clothed by the righteousness of Christ in our putting on the "new man."

3. To the third charge my answer is that I do not believe that I ever formulated or gave expression to the words, "baptized for Adam's sin," and I most positively and fearlessly repudiate the meaning many have attached to them and attributed to me, and by which some have been deceived and consequently become prejudiced against me.

4. My answer to the fourth charge is that I never taught that God had "tied His own hands" by a law so that He could not raise any from the dead except those who in the Gentile dispensation had been baptized into Christ; and my belief now is that God has the right and the power to raise and punish Gentiles without infringing upon that law of resurrection and judgment which comprehends all those who are in Christ and therefore on probation for good and bad, according to their deeds.

I think these four charges comprise all that constitute the cause of the present division and estrangement of the brethren and ecclesias; and my answers, which so far are in negative form, would be sufficient were it not that the use and misuse of terms and phrases have made more elaborate explanation necessary and affirmative statements needful; and I prefer appearing repetitious, verbose and tautological rather than fail in this effort to make myself understood.

Further Explanation

Now charge No. 1 needs no explanation. An unqualified denial is all it calls for. We have said enough in answer to charge No. 2; but the gist of the matter is in charge No. 3—"We are baptized for Adam's sin." By the use, or rather misuse, of this form of words some have been persuaded that I believe that we are baptized for Adam's sin in the sense of one man committing one act of sin and another man being baptized for that one act. The palpable absurdity of this ought to have been its own defeat. If I have ever used the words "Adam's sin" in its relation to the race it has been in the sense of "Adamic sin," a phrase which I do not understand to mean personal sin; but sin in the federal sense, that which has placed mankind in a mortal, "unclean," sinful flesh state and of which the Apostle Paul says, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," or, as Dr. Thomas renders it, "in whom all have sinned." By the use, therefore, of "Adamic sin" I mean the world's great evil in all its various forms, which originated in the transgression of the law in Eden.

Now the sentence, "We are baptized for Adam's sin," which has been invented by those who have opposed me, may be called an elliptical sentence, in which a discerning mind may, if so disposed, mentally see truth, while others could only see the absurdity of, as it were, John being baptized for one act of sin committed by William. Here is a scripture sentence whose meaning can be in the same way discerned by the intelligent,
While ridiculed by others—

“Christ Died for Our Sins”

Of this the unenlightened might say, “There! look at that!! Christ died for our sins”! We commit sins and the punishment was imposed upon Christ. That is the same as if John committed murder and William was hanged for it!” The trouble with those who talk thus is that they cannot fill in the ellipsis of the sentence. The scripturally enlightened man would verbally pronounce only the words of the text; but mentally he would read thus:

“Christ died” (as a sacrifice) “for” (to redeem us from) “our sins” (and from death, the consequence of sin).

It may be put in another form:

“Christ died” (in order that we may be forgiven) “our sins” (and be redeemed from death unto life eternal).

Now the sentence which has been so mischievous would not deceive an enlightened mind capable of mentally filling in the ellipsis while verbally only pronouncing the words. The only way that I could ever be justly charged with the sentence would be as follows:

“We are baptized for” (to be redeemed from the lost state into which we fell by) “Adam’s sin.”

Can any enlightened brother or sister object to this? If not, then the cause of dispute and division on this charge is removed. And now are you all ready to act accordingly? for it is useless to think and talk without acting. Will you individually or ecclesi­ally be a party to a movement to disfellowship one brother, or a thousand brethren, on such a misuse and misunderstanding of words as have been manifest in this case?

But some will say, judging from the past, that I have not yet stated all I believe in regard to the relation of baptism to Adamic sin. And in an effort to satisfy the most inquisitive and the most suspicious I will add, that I believe that by reason of the fall of our first parents we are born into a state of sin, which is viewed as “unclean” in the sight of God, and that in addition to this we become sinners by wicked works. We are therefore aliens by nature and by wicked works—or as Gentiles we were aliens before we became sinners by actual transgression. Now I believe that baptism is the means of adoption from an alienated state to sonship with God, or a transition from a state of alienation in Adam to a relationship of citizenship in Christ. Since we are regarded as “unclean” by nature, I believe that baptism is the antitype of the “waters of separation,” and that in God’s mind it effects a cleansing in a legal and provisional sense to the extent that our bodies become fit to be the temple of God through the spirit or the word, and we are then a holy priesthood. We are viewed through Christ, as it were, He being a sin-covering or a garment of righteousness for us which, by the remission of our personal sins, in which our “hearts are sprinkled from an evil conscience;” and by the legal cleansing through having “our bodies washed with pure water,” we
are brought into atonement or at-one-ment with God, termed a state of "reconciliation," and we are then sons of God and joint heirs with Christ, on probation for eternal life, which will be rendered to us if we "patiently continue in well doing."

Is There a Change of Body?

If I am asked if there is a change of the body, I answer, no, but a change of its relationship, similar to what took place when the altar, etc., was cleansed and brought into a state of "atonement" as shown in Lev. viii: 10-17; xvi: 29-34. There was no change in the material sense in any of those things so "atoned" for by the blood of the sacrifice; but there was such a change as caused God to view them at first as unholy and afterwards as holy; and the best word that I know of to describe the change is the word "legal." Mortality is an "unclean" state, because it is the result of sin. Christ was mortal and was required to make a sin-offering for Himself to cleanse His nature. This was literally done by his death, resurrection and change to immortality. We are baptized into his death and thereby we are sin-covered; but our literal change from mortality to immortality we are "waiting" for, in that "sonship, to wit, the redemption of the body" (Rom. viii).

I have dealt with this aspect of the subject more in detail than I believe it is necessary for a candidate for baptism or a "babe" in Christ to understand; and if I am asked why then do I encumber the subject with what may be beyond the full comprehension of such, my answer is, I do so because my writings on this aspect of the subject have been misused by a displacement of words; and I am now striving to make myself so understood that all may see the mistake that has been made in dividing the brethren upon a superficial use of the words "forgiven Adam's sin," "baptized for Adam's sin," etc.

The Old Landmarks

I am not satisfied with a presentation of my case in my own words; but I desire to show that I am in perfect harmony with the truth as heretofore set forth by brother Thomas and brother Roberts. I will first give a few quotations from brother Thomas.

Elpis Israel p. 114.—Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature. Hence the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean.

* * * God "made Him sin for us, who knew no sin."

* * * His body was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for; for he was born of a woman, and not one can bring a clean body out of a defiled body. Page 115—Sin in the flesh is hereditary; and entailed upon mankind as the consequence of Adam's violation of the Eden law. The original sin was such as I have shown in previous pages. Adam and Eve committed it and their posterity are suffering the consequences of it. The tribe of Levi paid tithes to Melchisedec many years before Levi was born. The apostle says, "Levi, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham." Upon the same federal principle all mankind ate of the forbidden fruit, being in the loins of Adam when he transgressed. This is the only way men can by any possibility be
guilty of the original sin. Because they sinned in Adam, therefore they return to the dust from which Adam came—says the apostle, in whom all sinned. * * * Mankind being born of the flesh, and of the will of men, are born into the world under the constitution of sin. That is, they are the natural born citizens of Satan's kingdom. By their fleshly birth they are entitled to all that sin can impart to them. What creates the distinction of bodies politic among the sons of Adam? It is constitution. By constitution, then, one man is English, and another is American. The former is British because he is born of the flesh under the British constitution. * * * There are two states, or kingdoms, in God's arrangements, which are distinguished by constitution. These are the kingdom of Satan and the Kingdom of God. The citizens of the former are sinners; the heirs of the latter are saints. Men cannot be born heirs by the will of the flesh; for natural birth confers no right to God's kingdom. Men must be born sinners before they can become saints, even as one must be born a foreigner before he can be an adopted citizen of the States. It is absurd to say that children are born holy, except in the sense of their being legitimate. None are born holy, but such as are born of the spirit into the kingdom of God, children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of sinful flesh; and "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," or sin. Page 118—As the constitution of sin hath its root in the disobedience of the first Adam, so also hath the constitution of righteousness root in the obedience of the second Adam. Hence the apostle says, "As through one offense (sentence was pronounced) upon all men unto condemnation; so also through one righteousness (sentence was pronounced) upon all men (Jews and Gentiles) unto a pardon of life. For as through the disobedience of the one the many were constituted sinners; so also through the obedience of the one the many were constituted righteous." The two Adams are two federal chiefs; the first being figurative of the second in these relations. All sinners are in the first Adam; and all the righteous in the second, only on a different principle. Sinners were in the loins of the former when he transgressed; but not in the loins of the latter when he was obedient unto death; therefore "the flesh profiteth nothing." For this cause, then, for sons of Adam to become sons of God, they must be the subjects of adoption, which is attainable only by some divinely appointed means. Page 121—"Having ascertained this (what he must do), he does it; and in doing it is born out of water." Having been begotten of the Father by the word of truth, and out of water, the first stage of the process is complete. He is constitutionally in Christ. Page 122—This action is representative of his faith in the resurrection of Jesus; and of his hope, that as he had been planted with him in the similitude of his death, he shall hereafter be also in the likeness of his resurrection, and so enter the kingdom of God.
What Brother Roberts Wrote

Now I will give a few quotations from brother Roberts which will be seen to be in perfect harmony with my position:

Legally a man is freed from Adamic condemnation at the time he obeys the truth and receives remission of sins (Two things here in baptism—Ed.), but actually its physical effects remain until this mortal (that is this Adamic condemned nature) is swallowed up.—Christadelphian, 1878, p. 225. Of this brother Roberts said in the Roberts-Andrew Debate: "I fully endorse that."

I understand God gives the obedient believer a clean slate. * * * Everything is wiped out that stands against us in any way, whether in Adam or ourselves—Roberts, in Roberts-Andrew Debate.

Andrew—Then there is a passing out of Adam (At baptism—Ed.) into Christ?

Roberts—Certainly. When he passes into Christ his relation to the whole death dispensation which Adam introduced is put off.—R.A. Debate.

Baptism * * * is the means of that present (legal) union with Christ.—Declaration, p. 46.

Being born of Adam's condemned race, and partaking of their condemned nature, Christ was made subject, equally with him, to the consequences of Adam's transgression. Therefore his public execution was a public exhibition of what was due to man from God. It pleased God to require this before inviting man to reconciliation through the man in whom this vindication should take place—Instructor, p. 22.

Jesus Christ: Man's Redeemer

The best known and most quoted verse in the Bible is John 3:16, which reads, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Herein is recognized the fact that our God is merciful and gracious and "not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance." It was God who provided a redeemer in the person of his own Son. It was God who had initially provided a proper and effective covering for sin immediately following the introduction of sin and death by our first parents. "Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them" (Gen. 3:21). Thus we see that God had a plan of redemption in mind from the time when the need first arose. The plan was resolutely carried to its culmination, even though it necessitated the suffering and death of God's own son on the cross (stauros). "Sacrifice and offering [of bulls and goats] thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me." The Son, in turn, recognized his part in the grand scheme of salvation and was obedient to the Father's will. "Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will O God" (Heb. 10:5,7).
The Need for Redemption

God had forewarned Adam and Eve of the consequences of breaking his commandment to refrain from eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil: "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:17). They disobeyed and became dying creatures. Moreover, the all the progeny of the original parents, Adam and Eve—so that a Redeemer was needed for all of mankind.

It is interesting to see that Job refers to God as his redeemer, "I know that my redeemer liveth . . ." (Job 19:25), and that Isaiah writes in similar manner, "Thus saith the Lord, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb . . . " (Isa. 44:24). So God himself was recognized as the Redeemer. This is fitting for God indeed determined to redeem sinners and he provided the necessary redemption price. Brother Thomas Williams recognizes this principle and quotes "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" (II Cor. 5:18,19).

To redeem is to buy back, to pay a ransom in order to recover, to release, to deliver. From whom or what are we to be bought back and released? Paul is very graphic in the language he uses in Romans 5 and 6, where he talks of reconciliation through baptism. "Sin" and "death" are represented as monarchs reigning over us. In our natural state we are servants of sin. Sin reigns in our mortal body. Sin has dominion over us. The wages of sin is death (Rom. 6:23), and if we yield ourselves as servants of sin it will be "sin unto death" (Rom. 6:16); "sin hath reigned unto death" (Rom. 5:21). But sin need not reign unto death for we can change our allegiance and the means has been freely provided by God. "Now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:22,23).

Reconciliation and Atonement

Inherent within the words reconciliation and reconcile is the thought that some estrangement, antagonism or enmity exists which must be set right. Paul refers to this repeatedly in Romans 5 and in verse 10 says, "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Relative to this Dr. Thomas says in Epistles under the heading, The Constitution of Sin, "If there had been no sin there would have been no 'enmity' between God and man; and consequently no antagonism by which to educe good out of evil". The evil was introduced by Adam and Eve when the first sin was committed. All of mankind have been subject to and sufferers from that evil since Adam's act was committed in Eden. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners" (Rom. 5:12,19). The sin of Adam placed the entire race under condemnation. Our condemned state is further complicated by our own transgressions. Wherefore we are doubly involved with sin, i.e., we are sinners in two senses. With reference to this Dr. Thomas writes:

"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". Adam is the federal head of the race and we, as members of
his race, are under condemnation to death from the moment we are born. Again from Dr. Thomas, "By Adam's disobedience the many were made sinners; that is they were endowed with a nature like his, which had become unclean, as a result of disobedience; and by the constitution of the economy into which they were introduced by the will of the flesh. They were constituted transgressors before they were able to discern between right and wrong. Upon this principle, he that is born of sinful flesh is a sinner. Thus men are sinners in a two-fold sense; first, by natural birth; and next by transgression."

Concerning this same subject Brother Thomas Williams writes, "We find that we have been born into a lost state and then, if possible, riveted the shackles of sin and death more firmly upon ourselves by actual personal sins."

The perpetuation of sinfulness is not according to God's purpose. It is his purpose to take out of the nations a people who will be identified by His Name. Ultimately they will dwell with God forever in a state of purity (Rev. 21: 1,2,7,8,27). But sin defiles. Therefore, men must be redeemed and cleansed from the constitution of sin in which they are unclean, before they are fit to dwell with God and Christ (I Pet. 1:22,23; Dan. 12:10).

**Redemption Through Blood**

"Sin cannot be covered or remitted, without the shedding of blood." This statement by Dr. Thomas is amply supported by Hebrews 9:32, "without shedding of blood is no remission." Reference to this principle is frequent in Scripture. The reference is to the shed blood of Jesus, the Christ, who as the Lamb of God shed his blood in sacrifice, upon the cross/stauros. Paul expresses it as follows in Colossians 1:13,14, "his dear Son in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." When Paul gave his final charge to the elders at Ephesus he admonished them "to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." The purchase price was the blood of his Son, Jesus.

The new song which is to be sung to the honour of the Lamb (Rev. 5:8-12) expresses the matter: "for thou hast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." So we are to be "redeemed to God," ransom and released from "Sin" and "Death" in order that we may be brought back to God. The purchase price was the blood, the life-blood, of Christ.

**The Redeemer**

Dr. Thomas says, "The great principle to be compassed was the condemnation of sin in sinful flesh, innocent of actual transgression." He is referring to Paul's teaching in Romans 8:3 and the fact that only a sacrifice of this calibre would suffice to establish the means of salvation. The animal sacrifices were not sufficiently effective. A transgressor put to death for his own sins would not accomplish the redemption of his brethren. According to God's requirement and consistent with God's justice (Rom. 3:24-26), the sacrifice must be a man, in the same state as his brethren but innocent of actual transgression.

Now the writer to the Hebrews makes it clear that Jesus was in the same state and condition as his brethren. He was not an immaculate son born of an immaculate mother. He was not in the same state as Adam before Adam sinned, for he was of the progeny of Adam which progeny was produced after Adam transgressed, and he was there-
fore, of the Adamic race which was under the condemnation of death resulting from sin. So we see Jesus described as not yet perfect in the days of his mortality but as "the captain of their salvation (made) perfect through suffering." The suffering came upon him through temptation, "For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted" (Heb. 2:10,18). In this he compares with all of us for "He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15).

He is described as partaking of the same flesh and blood as his brothers and sisters, i.e., "the children which God hath given me" (Heb. 2:13,14). There were two reasons for this. First he had to conquer the devil, that which had the power of death within him, or sin in the flesh, or the inclination towards sinning which is inherent in all flesh. He did this when he came to the end of his mortal life, never having yielded to temptation—never having transgressed (Heb. 2:14). Secondly it was necessary, if he was to be a merciful and faithful high priest, that he experience the same trials and temptations as the other members of mankind. Having gone through these ordeals he can, as our Mediator, fully empathize with us in our trials and temptations.

His sacrificial death was not simply an altruistic act—for two reasons. The first of these was that he, too, needed redemption. As a member of Adam's race he, too, was under the sentence of death and prior to his death and resurrection, death had dominion over him (Rom. 6:9). As the antitype of the high priest he offered for himself, "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). In his case the sin involved was not transgression of law but the sin which passed upon all descendants of Adam, which Dr. Thomas has identified. "Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature. Hence, the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean." Since sin defiles and the sin of Adam brought defilement upon the entire race we read that Jesus was "purged" and "purified" by the "shedding of blood," his own blood which was a "better sacrifice," as a pre-requisite before entering into the "holy places," into "heaven itself," into "the presence of God" (Heb. 9:22-24). So Jesus was a beneficiary of his own sacrifice.

The second reason that Christ's offering was not altogether altruistic is that he, as a result of his life of obedience and sacrificial death, stood to gain a great reward. He knew this, and "for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God" (Heb. 12:2). This same concept is expressed in Hebrews 9:12, "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." The italicized words for us should not be included.

Nevertheless his offering opened the way of salvation for his brethren so that in fact, "He offered first for himself and then for his brethren," Yet Paul emphasizes his incomparable self-sacrifice, "For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:7,8). Because of his love for mankind God required this offering. Christ gave up his life, magnanimously, realizing mankind's need and, in this manifes-
Redemption Through Baptism

Christ died for sinners and in doing so opened up the way of salvation. Salvation, however, is confined to those who see, and believe, and identify themselves with Christ in the way prescribed. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” (Mark 16:16). Belief is counted for righteousness (Rom. 4:3, 23-25). This belief is a belief in the promises of God, the greatest of which have to do with the redemptive work of Christ. Belief must be combined with obedience, the commitment to God by baptism into Christ.

The ritual of baptism signifies and symbolizes the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life” (Rom. 6:3,4). We recognize that by immersion in water we symbolically die and are buried, which signifies that we accept God’s ruling that as sinners we must die—our life as a sinner must be brought to an end and having ended we have been made “free from the law of sin and death.”

This is a release from the condemnation to death upon all those in Adam, and from the consequences of our own sins, for in all cases “the wages of sin is death.” In baptism our sins are remitted, not held against us. Symbolically we rise to a “newness of life,” a fresh beginning in which we are now under “the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 6:4,23; 8:2). This does not constitute a change of nature, for we continue in mortal life which ends in death, and we are still subject to all the temptations of the fleshly nature. It does, however, effect a great change. We are no longer under condemnation to eternal death for all sin has been forgiven and washed away. We are no longer enemies, estranged from God, but are reconciled to God by the death of his Son. “Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses” (Rom. 4:10; Col. 2:9-14).

Baptism symbolizes the death of Christ, and the death of Christ was a sacrificial death in which his blood was shed. So the requirement for remission of sins was met. In effect we, as followers of Christ, also commit our lives to God as a sacrifice, i.e., we have chosen, as did Moses, to suffer affliction with the people of God rather than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season. We must sacrifice worldly and fleshly ambitions throughout our remaining lifetime, which we recognize as our probationary period. If we yield and sin during our probation we shall be, upon confession, forgiven through Christ and cleansed from unrighteousness (I John 1:9). When our probation is finished we shall, if accounted worthy, receive eternal life as the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord (Rom. 6:23).

Through baptism we enter into the everlasting covenant, which covenant was ratified and irreversibly established by the shedding of Christ’s blood. When Jesus established the memorial supper he gave his disciples the cup and said, “Drink of it, all of you; for this is my blood of the cove-
nant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" (Matt. 26:28 RSV). The way of redemption was opened and the plan of salvation established when Christ poured out his life-blood upon the cross.

In Summary

Through the obedience and sacrifice of Jesus Christ, our Redeemer, the way was provided to release us from Adamic condemnation, to forgive us our personal sins; and to restore us to God’s favour. It is in this way that redemption is accomplished and we, having “been baptized into Christ have put on Christ... And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise” (Gal. 3:27,29).

The way of redemption was provided by a Heavenly Father who is righteous, just, patient, forebearing and rich in mercy, for “God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.”

K. G. McPhee
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(CVI) Extracts from The Law of Moses

The reason that we are herewith appending pertinent extracts from The Law of Moses is because it was written by a learned and respected brother. In addition, it was written close to the end of his life (1898) and would constitute the mature thinking and understanding of a brother, having spent his whole life around Bible teaching. Since the book is still offered for sale by all persuasions of Christadelphians, it is assumed that the positions taken by Bro. Roberts on the matters discussed in this compendium, are still taught and accepted.

We are, therefore, reproducing the whole chapter (18) entitled, The Consecration of Aaron and his Sons. In this chapter, Bro. Roberts deals with the very issues which we feel are important in the understanding of the Atonement, The Origin of Sin & Death, Adamic Condemnation and Justification.

We have added, as well, a few pertinent quotations from Chapters 19, 25, 26, 28 which we feel have a direct bearing upon this subject.

THE CONSECRATION OF AARON AND HIS SONS

In about twelve months from the night that Israel broke up their settlement at Rameses in Egypt, and marched at the command of Moses to their first encampment at Succoth, the various parts and appurtenances of the Tabernacle had been made and finished, and were brought to Moses by those of the children of Israel who had made them. “According to all that the Lord commanded Moses, so the children of Israel made all the work. And Moses did look upon all the work, and, behold, they had done it
as the Lord commanded, even so had they done it: and Moses blessed them” (Exod. 39:42-43).

Moses then received orders to set up the Tabernacle “on the first day of the first month of the second year”. Moses did so, fixing the sockets, rearing up the pillars, fastening the cords, and placing the various coverings and hangings in their several specified positions: putting the ark and the mercy-seat and the cherubim inside the veil, and the candlestick and the table, etc., in the holy place, in the various places appointed for them. Having set the bread in order, and lighted the lamps, and offered incense on the golden altar, there remained the consecration of Aaron and his sons for the exercise of the priest’s office—as to which, elaborate directions had been given and were now carried out.

“This”, said Moses to the assembled congregation, as he proceeded with the ceremony of consecration, “is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done”, and the narrative describes in great detail what was done, including the investiture of Aaron with the holy garments—in the order of which, as remarked in the last chapter, it may be possible to discover the shadowed history of the development of the antitype: for in his official relations, Aaron was undoubtedly a type of Christ.

First, Moses washed Aaron with water. This is the type of moral cleansing as we saw in connection with the laver, as also shown in David’s expression, “Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity” (Psa. 51:2). “Water”, as a figure, is used by Jesus to represent the Holy Spirit (John 7:38-39). Aaron stood to represent the seed of Abraham. The washing of Aaron with water was, therefore, a prefiguration of the moral cleansing to be effected in a son of Abraham by the Spirit in preparation for the priestly office. The application of this in the antitype may be discerned in the operation of the Spirit, which, though resulting in a son of David according to the laws of maternity, produced such a Son of David as the world had never seen before, viz., a sinless man: human nature morally cleansed. “He did always those things that pleased the Father.” He could ask, without fear of successful answer, “Which of you convicteth me of sin?” “He did no sin.” He was in this sense “without spot”, which could not be affirmed of any other son of Abraham.

Some experience a difficulty here. They say that if the begettal of Jesus by the Spirit had such an effect as this, he was not of the
same nature as ourselves. The simple answer may suggest itself in the question: Are there not different sorts of the same nature in everything? Contrast a crab-apple with a delicious Blenheim: a worn-out cart-horse with a high-blooded charger: a mumbling savage with a British peer—different sorts, but the same nature. Jesus was a man, but not as other men in his powerful affinity for God, and his abhorrence for everything in opposition to His will. He was human nature mentally washed in this sense by the Spirit. If it were not so, to what can we attribute his spotless divinity of character? It is there: was it an effect without a cause? Education cannot account for it—for other Jewish children had as good an education as he. Education had something to do with it, doubtless, but it was only as the culture of good seed in good soil. The parable of the sower touches the subject: the same seed produced different results, according to the nature of the soil. The "soil" differs in different men, and yet they are all men. Christ was a man, yet his mental soil differed from all men's. He had the impulses common to all men, but conjoined with these, a power of control possessed by no man. And this was the result of the antitypical washing to which, in him, the seed of David was subjected in harmony with the Mosaic figure.

Then Moses put upon Aaron the coat of fine linen, in which we may recognize righteousness as the work of instruction superimposed upon the prepared nature (see last chapter: item 1—The Coat). Then, the girdle of the coat—righteous principle blooming into the activity of a righteous life. Then the robe of blue, with the bells and pomegranates—healing developed for us by the stripes to which he submitted, in conformity with the revealed necessities of the case: in connection with the (bell) words and (pomegranate) deeds of his obedient life, followed by his healing resurrection—a healing in which both he and his brethren are joint partakers—and the proclamation thereof, when he went into the holy place (heaven itself).

Then Moses put on Aaron the ephod, with all its memorial adjuncts of "glory and beauty"—the shoulder onyx stones and the breastplate, followed by the mitre and the holy crown of gold, engraved, "Holiness to the Lord" (as particularized in last chapter). Christ became the fully equipped High Priest in the particulars symbolized by these, after his resurrection. Entering heaven itself, "to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24), he "bears the iniquity of the holy things" (after the type of Aaron)
in that the blemished approaches of his people (who come in his name, and merge their individuality in his), are forgiven and accepted for his sake: in whom sin has been condemned (Rom. 8:3): the curse of the law endured (Gal. 3:13): and the righteousness of God declared (Rom. 3:25-26).

The names of all the saints he bears,
Engraven on his heart;
Nor shall the meanest saint complain
That he hath lost his part.

His priesthood in the age to come is only a continuation and enlargement of this work. He is a priest "after the order of Melchizedek", in the sense of having an unchangeable and humanly undervived priesthood, in contrast with the Levitical priesthood which was dependent upon family extraction, and limited to a certain period of mortal life (see Heb. 7:20-28).

Thus is the development of the antitypical priest in harmony with the order of Aaron's investiture with the holy garments.

But Aaron was not fully qualified to enter on the priest's office until he was also anointed with the holy oil, and sanctified by the blood of the sin-offering commanded to be offered (see Lev. 8:10, 14, 30). The meaning of this in the antitype is manifest.

1. The Holy Oil.—The testimony is that Jesus was anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows (Heb. 1:9). This was the Spirit, as Peter declares: "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit, and with power" (Acts 10:38). It was not enough that he should be the sinless seed of David according to the flesh: it was needful that "the Spirit of the Lord God should be upon him" (Isa. 61:1), by which he should be "anointed to preach good tidings to the meek", as Jesus declared was fulfilled in him (Luke 4:18-21). This was a further extension of the Spirit's work beyond the work symbolized by the washing of Aaron with water. The Spirit not only begat Jesus, but when he was 30 years of age, it descended upon him in a visible shape, and abode upon him (John 1:32-33), and remained with him in measureless fulness (John 3:34), enabling him to say, "The Father dwelleth in me". Without this, he would not have been able to do the works which bore witness of him that the Father had sent him (John 5:36): for as he said "of mine own self, I can do nothing" (John 5:30). The anointing of the Spirit was essential to the
completion of his priesthood in other respects: how otherwise could he "through the eternal Spirit have offered himself without spot unto God"? (Heb. 9:14). How otherwise could he have known for whom to intercede? (Rom. 8:26). How otherwise could he have "searched the reins and hearts, to give every man according to his works"? (Rev. 2:23).

The holy oil was also sprinkled upon "the Tabernacle and all that was therein", and upon "the altar and all his vessels", and upon "the laver and his foot" (Lev. 8:10-11). The proximate and Mosaic purpose of this was "to sanctify them". The antitypical significance was the same as the anointing of Aaron; for all the elements of the Tabernacle and its furniture represented some phase or other of the work of God in Christ, as we have seen: and therefore all had to be anointed with the typical oil to fill in the "pattern".

2. The Sacrificial Blood.—But the sacrificial blood was applied to everything as well—Aaron and his sons included (see Lev. 8:14-15; 23-24). An atonement had to be made by the shedding and the 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 things in the heavens", which it is admitted on all hands converge upon and have their substance in Christ. There must, therefore, be a sense in which Christ (the antitypical Aaron, the antitypical altar, the antitypical mercy-seat, the antitypical everything), must not only have been sanctified by the action of the antitypical oil of the Holy Spirit, but purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice.

This conclusion is supposed to be weakened by the statement of Lev. 16:16, that the atonement for the holy place, altar, etc., was to be made "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins". That is, it is argued from this, that the holy things would have had no uncleanness in themselves apart from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. This must be granted, but it must also be recognized that because the children of Israel were sinful and polluted, the holy things were reckoned as having contracted defilement in having been fabricated by them and through remaining in their midst. This cannot be denied on a full survey of the testimony. They were ceremonially unclean, because of the uncleanness of the
children of Israel, and had to be cleansed by the holy oil and the sacrificial blood before they were acceptable in the Mosaic service.

Now, this is part of the Mosaic figure. There must be an antitype to it. What was it? 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"? (Heb. 9:23).

Great difficulty is experienced by various classes of thinkers in receiving this view. Needlessly so, it should seem. There is first the express declaration that the matter stands so; "it was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices); but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these" (Heb. 9:23). "It was of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer" (8:3). "By reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins" (5:3). "By his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (for us, is an addition inconsistent with the middle voice of the verb employed, which imports a thing done by one to one's own self) (9:12).

There was next the necessity that it should be so. The word "necessity", it will be perceived, occurs frequently in the course of Paul's argument. The necessity arises from the position in which men stood as regards the law of sin and death, and the position in which the Lord stood as their redeemer from this position. The position of men was that they were under condemnation to die because of sin, and that not their own sin, in the first instance, but ancestral sin at the beginning. The forgiveness of personal offences is the prominent feature of the apostolic proclamation, because personal offences 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 (of their conformity to which, he should be appointed sole judge).

How to effect this blending and poising of apparently opposing principles and differing requirements—mercy and justice; forgiveness and righteousness; goodness and severity—would have been impossible for human wisdom. It has not been impossible with God, to whom all things are possible. We see the perfect adjustment of all the apparently incompatible elements of the problem in His work in Christ, "who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30).

We have only to receive the simple facts testified in the case to reach the end of all difficulty. With immortal soulism and eternal torments, the solution is impossible. With the doctrine of human mortality, it is otherwise. We see Jesus born of a woman, and therefore a partaker of the identical nature condemned to death in Eden. We see him a member of imperfect human society, subject to toil and weakness, dishonour and sorrow, poverty and hatred, and all the other evils that have resulted from the advent of sin upon the earth. We see him down in the evil which he was sent to cure: not outside of it, not untouched by it, but in it, to put it away. "He was made perfect through suffering" (Heb. 2:10), but he was not perfect till he was through it. He was saved from death (5:7), but not until he died. He obtained redemption (Heb. 9:12), but not until his own blood was shed.

That 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 centre 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. He was a mortal man: he is now immortal. He was a sorrowful man; he is now "full of joy with thy (the Father’s) countenance". He was an Adamic body of death, corruptible and unclean: he is now a spiritual body, incorruptible, pure, and holy. What lies between the one state and the other? His own death and resurrection. Therefore, by these, he has been purified, and no one else has been so purified as yet. Any one else delivered will be delivered by him, as the result of what he did in himself.

If there was one injunction of the law more strenuous than another, it was that contact with death in any form, however remote or indirect, was defiling. Even to touch a bone made a man unclean: or to be touched by a man unclean from such a cause had the same effect. We have the perfect antitype in the Lord born of a death-bound woman, and therefore made subject to death: it was "that he, by the grace of God, might taste death for every man"; but he was the first to taste, in the process of redemption from it. He was a "body prepared" for the work: prepared as to its power to evolve sinlessness of character, but prepared also as to subjection to that death which it was designed to abolish (2 Tim. 1:10). In him were combined the antitypical "holy things" requiring atonement, "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins."

The reverence for Christ commands respect which leads some men to 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". All these objects blend together, but they are separable. One of them was to "condemn sin in the flesh", as Paul says (Rom. 8:3). The stumblings that have taken place over this expression are doubtless due to that other truth, that Christ did no sin, and in this sense was the "Lamb of God without spot". But the stumblings do not get rid of the expression as affirning a truth. Some would explain it as meaning the moral condemnation of sin by Christ during his life. This cannot be the meaning in view of the statement with which it is conjoined that what was done was "what the law could not do". The law condemned sin so thoroughly in the moral sense that it is called "the ministration of condemnation". Then some have
suggested that it means the flesh of the sacrificial animals. This is precluded by the intimation that Christ was sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh" for the accomplishment of the work in question—the condemnation of sin in the flesh. This is, in fact, the reliable clue to the meaning. That he was sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh" for the accomplishment of the work shows that it was a work to be done in him. Some try to get away from this conclusion (and this is the popular habit) by seizing on the word "likeness" and contending that this means not the same, but only like. This contention is precluded by the use of the same term as to his manhood: "he was made in the likeness of men". He was really a man, in being in the likeness of men: and he was really sinful flesh, in being in "the likeness of sinful flesh". Paul, in Heb. 2:14-17, declares the likeness to have been in the sense of sameness: "Forasmuch as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, it became him likewise to take part of the same".

The statement remains in its undiminished force that "God sent his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for (as an offering for) sin condemned sin in the flesh". It is, in fact, a complete and coherent statement of what was accomplished in the death of Christ, and a perfect explanation of the reason why he first came in the flesh, and of the reason why John the apostle insisted so strenuously on the maintenance of the doctrine that he had so come in the flesh. Possessing sinful flesh was no sin to him, who kept it under perfect control, and "did always those things that pleased the Father". At the same time, being the sinful flesh derived from the condemned transgressors of Eden, it admitted of sin being publicly condemned in him, without any collision with the claims of his personal righteousness, which were to be met by an immediate and glorious resurrection.

There was a purpose in it, which is variously stated. These various statements conjointly admit us to what may be called God's objects in the case—apart from which, there can be no understanding of the matter. With those objects in view, it is not only intelligible but admirable. But those objects cannot be discerned or appreciated apart from God Himself. The subject begins there. That is why the subject remains dim, so long after other parts of the truth are understood. We cannot understand God, yet we can have some idea of the relation between Creator and created. We may know that the rights are all on the side of
the Creator, and that the reasonable attitude of the created is that of absolute submission, and that any departure from this attitude is treason, and that death is just in the case of treason. We may also find it easy to recognize that though He is kind, and ready to forgive, He cannot grant forgiveness apart from such an amende honourable as will preserve intact the mutual relations of Creator and created. This, in simple language, is the explanation of the entrance of death by sin, and the granting of life by forgiveness for Christ's sake, after "setting him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood" (Rom. 3:25). We are "justified by his blood" if we believe—(see Rom 5:9; Acts 13:38-39). There is no difference between the shedding of the blood of Christ, and the condemnation of sin in the flesh. For this blood-shedding is what is otherwise expressed as "the pouring out of his soul unto death". And what is death but the condemnation of sin? Christ did not sin, but he inherited the condemnation of sin in deriving his nature from a daughter of Adam, the condemned: and he was considered as having the sins of his people laid upon him, in so far as the sins of his people were to be forgiven for the sake of what should be done in him. "He shall bear the sin of many," "God hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all." "He was wounded for our transgressions." "He was made sin for us, who knew no sin." "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world."

For this view of blood-shedding we are indebted to the explanation vouchsafed in the law, as to the requirement of blood in sacrifice. This explanation is as follows: "The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul" (Lev. 17:11). The pouring out of the blood was therefore the pouring out of the life—therefore the infliction of death: and therefore an illustration of what was due to sin, and an acknowledgment on the part of the offerer that it was so. But being the blood of an animal which had nothing to do with sin, it was only a typical illustration or declaration of God's righteousness in the case. It was not a condemnation of sin in its own flesh, but a mere shadow which God was pleased to establish in Israel's midst, in educational preparation for the actual condemnation which was to be carried out in His own Son, in whom, "sent forth in the likeness of sinful flesh" for (as an offering for) sin, He "condemned sin in the flesh".
This sacrificial condemnation of sin in the eyes of all the world (for by record and report, all the world has seen Jesus on the cross), is otherwise said "to declare the righteousness of God for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God" (Rom. 3:25). These terms are as lucid as profound. They constitute an inspired definition of the object in the case. No view can be right that cannot be brought within the terms of that definition. It is, in fact, the final easement of all difficulty where the mind is able to rise to the Divine point of view involved in the statement. The crucifixion was a Divine declaration and enforcement of what is due to sin, and as it was God's righteous appointment that this should be due to sin, the infliction of it was a declaration of God's righteousness.

If we limit our view to the individual "man Christ Jesus", and look at him in the light of what is due to individual character as between man and man according to the "justice" of common parlance, we may have a difficulty in seeing how the righteousness of God was declared in the scourging and death of a righteous man. But this is not looking at the subject in the light in which it is prophetically and apostolically exhibited. It is not looking at it in the character that belongs to it. Jesus did not come into the world as an individual, but as a representative, though an individual. In this sense, he came "not for himself", but for others, though he was included in the coming. And it was to carry out Divine objects towards all. As he said, "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me". He speaks of the work which the Father had given him to do. This work was to establish salvation by forgiveness, but forgiveness on conditions, and these conditions involved the declaration of the Father's righteousness in the public condemnation of sin in its own flesh in the person of a guiltless possessor of that flesh. Paul declares it was so, and controversy really ends with his words.

It only remains that we realize how completely the fact is in harmony with the statement. We cannot see this unless we recognize that Jesus was a wearer of Adam's condemned nature, and the bearer of the sins of the people—not that Christ might be punished for others, but that God's righteousness might be declared for others to recognize, that they might be forgiven. The gospel provides an opportunity of close identification with what was done: "Buried with him by baptism into death"; "Crucified with
Christ". In this posture, they receive the remission of sins "through the forbearance of God" (Rom. 3:25). This is the other great fact of the case—God's forbearance, His kindness, His readiness to pardon when His claims are conceded. This excludes the popular view of vicarious suffering. If Christ paid our debts, there would be no forgiveness, but exaction, and thus would be blotted out the crowning glory of the apostolic proclamation. God is kind and will forgive, but God is great and will be exalted: and in the matter of life eternal, He has provided His own method both of exalting Himself and humbling us; and in the presence of it, there is nothing left for us but to bow in reverence—before the crucified but resurrected son of His love.

We may appear to have wandered far away from the sacrificial blood sprinkled on the sanctuary and the altar, and the laver, and on Aaron "to make an atonement for them". Not really have we done so. The operation was a type of God's work in Christ, and it helps us to understand that work rightly, and especially in that one aspect of it which the doctrine of human immortality has made it so difficult for moderns to receive, viz., that 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 necessity for Christ coming personally into the operation first, comes out very clearly—perhaps more clearly than anywhere—in the study of Paul's statement concerning Israel: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law". The method of this work is before us without any fog. First Paul says he was made under the law to redeem them that were under the law (Gal. 4:4). He was himself born under the law that he might work the work that was to be done for others in that position. Not only so, but in bearing the curse of the law away, it had to act on himself. This will be seen if we ask how he took the law away; he did it by bearing it: "Being made a curse for us". How? Instead of us? No: by himself coming under it. This is Paul's teaching. "As it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." It might seem in Moses that the clause about the cursedness of hanging on a tree means mere human infamy: but we must suspend our impressions in the presence of the Spirit of God in Paul. Mere human infamy is not the curse that Christ has redeemed us from, but the curse of God, as evident from his statement in the immedi-
As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse, for it is written, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them" (Gal. 3:10).

Christ was cursed by the law in the mode of his death. He could not be cursed in any other way, for he was not a transgressor of the law. But in this way, he was cursed. And it is probable that this clause was inserted in the law for this very purpose—that Christ might innocently die under the curse of the law, and so take it away: for the law can do nothing more than kill. When he died he was no longer under the law, which was made for mortal men, and had dominion over a man only as long as he lived (Rom. 7:1). When he rose, he was free from the curse of the law—redeemed by his death. It is by union with him as a resurrected free man that we obtain this redemption wrought in him. This is what Paul says: "Ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead." He was born under the law and redeemed from the law, that we might be redeemed by sharing his redemption. This view of the matter enables us to understand Paul's allusion to what the death of Christ accomplished in relation to the law: that he "abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of the commandments contained in ordinances" (Eph. 2:15); "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross" (Col. 2:14). But the result was achieved in himself.

This is the whole principle: redemption achieved in Christ for us to have, on condition of faith and obedience. It is not only that Israel are saved from the law of Moses on this principle, but it is the principle upon which we are saved from the law of sin and death, whose operation we inherit in deriving our nature from Adam. Christ partook of this nature to deliver it from death, as Paul teaches in Heb. 2:14, and other places: "Forasmuch 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 devil". Understanding by the devil, the hereditary death-power that has reigned among men by Adam through sin, we may understand how Christ, who took part in the death-inheriting nature, destroyed the power of death by dying and rising. We then understand how "He put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." We may also understand
how "our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed" (Rom. 6:6), and how he "died unto sin once", but now liveth unto God, to die no more (verses 9-10).

All of which enables us to understand why the typical holy things were purified with sacrificial blood, and why the high priest, in his typical and official capacity had to be touched with blood as well as anointed with the holy oil before entering upon his work. When we say, as some in their reverence for Christ prefer to say, that the death of Christ was not for himself but only for us, they destroy all these typical analogies, and in truth, if their view could prevail, they would make it impossible that it could be for us at all: for it only operates "for us" when we unite ourselves with him in whom, as the firstborn, it had its first effect.

THE LAW OF MOSES Chapter 19 p. 181

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

There is no counterpart to this if Christ is kept out of his own sacrifice, as some thoughts would do. He cannot so be kept out if place is given to all the testimony — an express part of which is that as the sum total of the things signified by these patterns, he was "purified with" a better sacrifice than bulls and goats — viz. his own sacrifice (Heb. ix. 23, 12). If he was "purified," there was a something to be purified from. What was it? Look at his hereditary death-taint, as the son of Adam, through whom death entered the world by sin, and there is no difficulty. Look at the curse of God brought on him in hanging on a tree (Gal. iii. 13; Deut. xxi. 22-23). We must not get away from the testimony. As the antitypical bullock without the camp, Jesus was a sin-offering — an offering to be burnt, consumed — to be which, he had to be the very nature cursed by sin, that, "the body of sin might be destroyed" (Rom. vi. 6). As the antitypical victim of the accused tree, he personally bore the very curse of the law, as Paul argues: that thus, God might lay on him the iniquity of us all, and make him to be sin for us who knew no sin: and that thus, in being baptised into his death, we might be washed from our sins in his own blood, God forgiving us for Christ's sake (Eph. iv. 32). (boldface ours)

THE LAW OF MOSES
Chapter 25 pp. 237-8

1. THE BURNT-OFFERING. — The burnt-offering was burnt wholly on the altar (Lev. i. 8-9). It was left to smoulder all night into ashes, and the ashes were removed in the morning. It was called the burnt-offering "because of the burning upon the altar all night unto the morning" (vi. 9). It was an act of worship on the part of a mortal being apart from guilt of specific offence. Thus Noah, saved from destruction by the flood, "took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl and offered burnt-offerings on the altar" (Gen. viii. 20). Thus also the test of Abraham's faith was to offer Issac "for a burnt-offering" (Gen. xxii. 2). That burnt-offering should be required in the absence of particular offence shows that our unclean state as the death-doomed
children of Adam itself unfit us for approach to the Deity apart from the recognition and acknowledgment of which the burnt-offering was the form required and supplied. It was "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel," as well as "because of their transgressions in all their sins," that atonement was required for even the tabernacle of the congregation (Lev. xvi. 16).

The type involved in complete burning is self-manifest: it is consumption of sin nature. This is the great promise and prophecy and requirement of every form of the truth: the destruction of the body of sin (Rom. vi. 6). It was destroyed in Christ's crucifixion — the "one great offering": we ceremonially share it in our baptism: "crucified with Christ," "baptised unto 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. "We shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye!" (boldface ours)

**THE LAW OF MOSES**

Chapter 26 pp. 250-251

Whether all these details are involved in the veiled significance of the type, we cannot err in the interpretation of its main features, literal and typical: 1. Mother nor child was eligible for approach to the sanctuary till circumcision, lapse of time, and sacrifice had opened the way: the teaching, that God is holy and man unclean: that God will be sanctified in them that approach to Him: *ergo*, that in its natural state, human nature is disqualified for divine relations, but may attain to this qualification by conformity to the divine appointments that have been made for the purpose. 2. That the whole human race considered as the woman in the transgression and separated by uncleanness, "shall be clean" in the upshot of things, when the provision made to that end shall be fully applied, in the justification of a sufficient number to inherit the earth under the last Adam, as his anti-typical help-meet, with fulness of love and joy, everlasting. (boldface ours)

**THE LAW OF MOSES**

Chapter 27 p. 258

This is only a difficulty with those who do not realize the position occupied by Jesus while yet a mortal man. He was the Sin Bearer in every way in which such an expression can be understood — an expression which excludes by its very form all suggestion of his having been himself a sinner: a sinner could not be a sin-bearer in the sense of a taker-away of sin, for this required spotlessness — sinlessness — that resurrection might come after death had put the sin away. At the same time, it is an expression that involves this other idea, that there was something for him to be cleansed from. Three facts tell us what: he possessed our mortal nature, which is an heir of death because of sin; he came under the personal curse of the law in the mode of his death (Gal. iii. 13); God had laid on him the iniquities of us all in the sense that he was going to deal with him as a representative of all, that he might forgive us for his sake, "that he might be just and the justifier" at the same time (Rom. iii. 26).

That the second bird should be dipped in the blood of the first bird is, therefore, in harmony with what has since been revealed concerning Christ as the anti-typical sacrifice. He was cleansed by his own death from the stain of death to which he was subject in common with us, as a descendant of the first sinner, and as the appointed sufferer from it that he might take it away. When he rose, he was "the living bird let loose in the open field" — "made higher than the heavens," "set far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but also in that which is to come" (Heb. vii. 26; Eph. i 21). (boldface ours)
Being, in essence, the life of the universe, and incorporating that life in divers forms for His own pleasure, we may understand how death, as the negation of His own work and the penalty of treason against Himself, should come under the peculiar reprobation manifest in the Mosaic ordinance, that contact with death made a man defiled with a defilement calling for instant cleansing.

From this ceremonial shadow, we easily go to the substance. The ashes of a slain heifer applied to a man defiled by death, was a curing of death by death. This is precisely what has happened in the antitype: Christ, “through death, destroyed that having the power of death, that is, the devil” (Heb. ii. 14). How could he do this if he had not in himself the power of death to destroy by dying? He has destroyed death. But in whom? In himself alone as yet. Believers will obtain the benefit by incorporation with him at the resurrection; but, at the present time, the victory is his alone. The fact is plain to everyone. Some who admire Christ are horror-struck at the idea of his having been a partaker of the Adamic condemned nature — a nature defiled by death because of sin. Their horror is due wholly to too great a confinement of view. They fix their attention on the idea of “defilement,” without remembering that the defilement was undertaken expressly with a view to removal.

We must have God’s revealed object in view. The power of death was there that it might be destroyed. If it was not there, it could not be destroyed. This is the mischief of what may be truly called the Papal view. By denying that Jesus came in the very dying flesh of Adam, it changes the character of the death of Christ into a martyrdom or a punishing of the innocent for the guilty instead of being what it is revealed to have been — a declaration of the righteousness of God that he might be just while the justifier of those who have faith in it for the forgiveness of their sins (Rom. iii. 24-26). (boldface ours)