

A RE-AFFIRMATION

Of
The Statement Of Faith
And
The 10 Point Statement
Of 1940

Supported By A Multitude
Of Quotations
From Bro. Dr. Thomas, Bro. Roberts
Bro. Growcott, Bro. Smallwood
And Others. -
In Their
Common Interpretation Of
The Scriptures
As They Apply To
The Sacrifice Of Christ

INDEX

INTRODUCTION - OPENING

A = B.A.S.F. - CLAUSE #24

BEREAN RESTATEMENT - REGARDING CLAUSE #24

B = HISTORY OF ERROR - 1894-1898, 1923, etc.

C = CHRIST'S DEFILED, UNCLEAN NATURE

D = MEDIATORSHIP

E = SIN AND SIN OFFERING.

F = LAW OF MOSES AND SACRIFICES

G = BAPTISM

H = POTENTIAL AND EVENTUAL

I = JUSTIFICATION

J = BARRIER AND BREACH

K = OUT OF ADAM, INTO CHRIST, - IN ADAM/~~IN~~ CHRIST

L = ADAMIC CONDEMNATION

M = CHILDREN OF WRATH

N = ATONEMENT - THE SACRIFICIAL BLOOD

O = ALIENATION

P = LEGAL MORTALITY

Q = THE ERROR OF ANDREWISM - IMPUTED GUILT

R = THE ERROR OF STRICKLERISM

S = SIGNATURES OF RICHARD ECCLESIA

A RE-AFFIRMATION

The following material has been compiled to present the Berean understanding of the Truth in relation to the essential understanding of the work of God accomplished in "The life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ." This is scripturally defined as "The things concerning the name of Jesus Christ," or perhaps commonly as "The nature and sacrifice of Christ."

Much literature has been produced regarding this subject since the days of Bro. Thomas and his wonderful exposition Elpis Israel. We believe that his presentation of the Truth on this matter is lucid and understandable and has stood the test of intervening years. Quotations from scripture and from all the pioneers are included in the following pages. To these writings we appeal as Bereans and upon these writings - the B.A.S.F., the Ten (10) point statement and the Berean Re-Statement are based. We believe these things are required to be understood and agreed to as members of the Berean Brotherhood.

Sadly, the foundation set out by Bro. Thomas and so clearly defended by subsequent pioneers, has been assailed by adversaries to the right and left hand of this sound basis. These have caused divisions in the Brotherhood from the days of Bro. Roberts in the early 1870's. The false reasonings of Bro. E. Turney began these departures. Subsequently, divergent views have been advanced by such as Bre. J. J. Andrew, Bell (Australia) and A. D. Strickler. More recently, questionable declarations have been set out by Bro. P. O. Barnard, who desired to clarify what he thought Bre. Thomas and Roberts had declared.

Recent endeavors (during the past 20 years) toward reunification of some of the bodies holding divergent views, on this vital subject, have caused the proliferation of such in Christadelphia generally. The Truth regarding these ideas have, in many cases, been relegated to a secondary place as not involving fellowship, with the resultant compromise of sound doctrine. As the time before the return of the Master draws ever closer, there is danger that the body will lose the foundations of salvation. As we are exposed to these false expositions, it becomes a matter of urgency that we re-affirm our sound position on this vital foundation.

The Truth lies in between the theories of what are known as Andrewism and Stricklerism. The Truth is clear. The reasonings on either side are set forth in varying shades of questionable and false statements. It is for this reason the following material has been based on the Truth and the doctrine of Andrewism and Stricklersim set out as error.

This condensation is an endeavor to elicit your agreement and re-affirmation of the Truth in its positive dimensions and your whole-hearted rejection of what is error on either side of the Truth. We believe that the salient, important and necessary points which

have been of some question amongst you are all covered in what follows. We trust and pray that this endeavor will prove a means of restoring harmony amongst your members and lead to the productive prosecution of the Truth in Richard and the comfort of all concerned there and amongst the Berean Brotherhood generally.

These issues are not new or novel amongst Christadelphia and they have been answered many times in the past. God, in His infinite wisdom, permits them to arise from generation to generation to increase our knowledge of His Word and equip us to rightly defend our faith. Truly it is a trial, but not without a loving purpose. Wars have been waged in former centuries over divergent theories on this matter. The truly faithful have had to flee for their lives to defend the right. God indeed chastens us, but does not abandon us in our trials. Let us, in faithfulness to Him, not abandon His most precious gift to us; the redemption we all have in His dear son, Jesus Christ, our Mediator and High Priest.

Some of the following statements may appear redundant, but they are set out to assure that we all speak the same things.

A. BASF, BEREAN RESTATEMENT, CLAUSE 24

We Agree That: -

A - The Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith, known as the BASF, in its clauses 4-5-8-12 is a definition of the Truth concerning the Nature of Man and the Nature and Sacrifice of Christ, as accepted by all Berean Brethren and Sisters.

The Clause #24, of the BASF (the basis of the 1898 Amendment), is a safe-guard against the false theory of J. J. Andrew, perpetuated by the teachings of Thomas Williams and others to this day. That this false teaching denies the responsibility of the Enlightened Rejectors of God's redeeming salvation to appear before and answer to the Judgment Seat of Christ.

The Berean Restatement, embodying the 10 point Statement of 1940 (Errors to be rejected and Truths to be accepted regarding the Nature and Sacrifice of Christ), is a detailed statement of the understanding of faithful brethren to safe-guard the Truth against the false teachings emanating from the teachings of A. D. Strickler and others of like persuasion.

B. HISTORY OF ERROR (1894-1898, 1923, ETC.)

We Agree That: -

B - A re-affirmation is necessary concerning the truth that Christ did offer for himself, as well as for all the race, the bloodshedding

alienate

sacrifice required in the redemption of mankind. But, though possessing this defiled unclean nature, it did not alienate him from God. Nor does man's condemned nature (of itself alone) prevent resurrection from the dead. Light (knowledge) is the basis of resurrectional responsibility.

C. CHRIST'S DEFILED UNCLEAN NATURE

We Agree That: -

- C-1 Even though Christ was born by the power of God upon the Virgin Mary, the body materially produced was a defiled, unclean human; because nothing born of a woman is clean physically. It was 'sin's flesh'.
- C-3 Christ bore our sins in being made of 'sin's flesh'; and, therefore, he personally needed a cleansing sacrifice.
- C-6 Sin is the very fiber of our being, as constituted of the Adamic Nature.
- C-7 Sin had to be condemned publicly in the very nature that had, in all but ~~XF~~, transgressed.
- C-8 If we believe that Christ did not have "to offer for himself", we do not believe in the Christ of True Christadelphians.
- C-9
- C-10 The corruptive principle pervaded the flesh of Jesus. _____
- C-11 Christ's sacrificial death was in no sense a 'punishment' of anybody - he perfectly repudiated and subdued the 'mind of the flesh'; 'sin in the flesh', 'the law of sin in his members', 'the Diabolos' and held it absolutely powerless, and voluntarily joined with God in a final, once for all, public condemnation of it on the cross. _____
- C-12 The flesh through which God was manifested for 33 years, inferior to angelic nature, had been purified by the sprinkling of its own blood on the cross.
- C-13-14 God appointed a purifying, bloodshed sacrifice. Christ was purposely created of the race, as part of the race, to represent the race, to be the race. What he did, he did for himself as part of the race, and for the race as such. Thus a natural death was not adequate in the wisdom of God. This is the whole principle: redemption achieved in Christ for us to have, on condition of faith and obedience.
- C-16 If Christ did not have 'sinful flesh', and did not need a 'bloodshed sacrifice', we have a substitute Christ and not a representative of the race. Substitution is orthodox church doctrine.

Re-Affirmation (C-Continued) -

- C-18 Christ was not perfect until he had gone through the suffering of a life and death, required by his Father, and not until his own blood was shed.
- C-19 Christ in his offering sacrifice was the antitype of "the brazen serpent" lifted up in the wilderness, and "the filthy garments" of Joshua the High Priest.
- C-20 Those who say Christ's total life and death offering to God was not for his own purifying and perfecting repudiate the Truth and all the teaching of Bro. Thomas and Bro. Roberts.
- C-21 Christ as the antitype of all Mosaic holy things contacted defilement from his mother's side of a sinful race and this needed purging with his own "better sacrifice."
- C-23 Christ obtained eternal redemption in and for himself first.
- C-24 Christ is part of the Adamic Race and cannot be separated from it.
- C-26 Christ actually was the overcoming and putting to death of 'sin's flesh', 'the Diabolos'; the perfect, life-long, victorious sacrifice, by which he 'obtained redemption', was 'made perfect', was 'the heavenly things purified', and was 'brought again from the dead'.

D. MEDIATORSHIP

We Agree That: -

- D - Prayers of unbaptized individuals, and especially those influenced by a developing understanding of the gospel, are heard and responded to by God as the utterances of creatures to their creator who have no SPIRITUAL relationship to Him whatsoever. Prayer, as a SPIRITUAL SACRIFICE acceptable to God can only be offered by children of the covenant THROUGH the covering name of Jesus Christ with which they have invested themselves; who, as the anointed being with which the Logos clothed himself as the bearer of the 'filthy garments' typical of the 'infirmity with which he was compassed', (which infirmity - called himself) was the mediator in regard to his own better sacrifice. As such, he poured out his blood as a covering for sin. Sin's flesh is imperfect and well adapted for the condemnation of sin therein.

thru
the
Eternal
Spirit as
tabernacled
in the flesh
of sin nature

E. SIN (AND SIN OFFERING)

We Agree That: -

- E-1 Sin in scripture language is a synonym for human nature with all its affections and lusts.
- E-2 That Christ offered up sacrifice, for his own sins. That his own sins were his own sin-defiled human nature, which he inherited from Adam through his mother, Mary. That God's method of return of sinful man to favor required putting to death of man's condemned and evil nature in a representative of that nature, but whose character was spotless.

Re-Affirmation (E - Continued) -

E-3 That Christ's work was overcoming and destroying and publicly repudiating and condemning and putting to death of sin in himself, and it was necessarily for himself that Christ had to cleanse himself from sin--to destroy sin in himself--by a life-death work--that this is the root and basis and meaning of sacrifice.

E-4 Sin in the flesh is the devil destroyed by Jesus in his death.

E-5 That Jesus, though perfectly sinless, was redeemed and cleansed by his own sacrifice, from the defilement of his physical relationship to the sin-and-death constitution.

E-6 That the scriptural expressions "sinful flesh", "sin in the flesh", "made sin", "our sins in his own body", all apply to Christ, that these expressions reveal the very heart and meaning of Christ's sacrifice.

E-7 That the word "sin" is used in 2 principal acceptations in scripture.

"As the transgression of law" and "the physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death and resolution into dust".

That "sin" is a synonym for human nature and that this nature is invariably regarded as unclean.

E-8 That the diabolos - law-of-sin-in-the-members of every one of Adam's descendants is scripturally "sin".

E-9 That in Jesus being "made sin for us", was his inheriting of the nature of the condemned race.

E-10 That human flesh is scripturally "sin" and that God has by metonymy extended the word 'sin' to apply to the sin principle in all human flesh.

see E-20

11 & 16 That sin-in-the-flesh principle in all human flesh has the power of death and is called the devil or diabolos.

E-12 That Christ had to offer for himself that he might be saved by his own blood.

E-13 That Christ's flesh was unclean flesh, "sin's flesh", "filthy garments".

E-14 That Christ offered for himself, that his sacrifice was necessary for his own cleansing and salvation from sin, the whole sin constitution.

E-15 That the physical constitution of the whole race is defined as "indwelling sin".

Re-Affirmation (E - Continued) -

- E-17 Jesus, in his "bearing the sins of many", accomplished this ^{by} inheriting Adamic nature; and that by this method "he carried our sins in his body to the tree.
- E-21 That God created man "very good", but because of the Law of Sin in his members Paul states "in him dwelt no good thing".
- That Christ's life had to be a perfect obedience voluntarily completed and terminated by a blood shedding death that publicly condemned sin (in ALL its aspects).
- E-23 That "Original Sin" was the transgression of Adam and Eve; their posterity suffer the consequences, because the result of their offense was "sin in the flesh".
- E-25 That Christ did not "pay the penalty" for anyone, but he actually did the job of destroying sin and he did it in and for himself.
- E-28 God gave the name "Sin" to the evil principle in all human flesh.

F. THE LAW OF MOSES, AND SACRIFICES

We Agree That: -

F-1 Christ was the actual substance of the offering of all animal sacrifices and DID in himself and for himself what needed to be done; overcome and destroy the Diabolos, offer the cleansing, bloodshed sacrifice that God's wisdom had appointed for the cleansing of "Sin's Flesh", and break out of the law of sin and death that held all mankind including himself in bondage. // *Apr 23/84*

F-2 & 3 The burnt offering required in the absence of particular offence shows the unclean death-doomed state of all Adam's descendants unfits them for approach to God, unless there is a Divinely followed method which declares God's righteousness, and the unclean state we are in. That this offering fulfilled by Christ made crystal clear that it was the Body of Sin, Sin's Flesh, the "Law of Sin in the Members" that was being condemned and put to death, in the cleansing of the race from sin, in harmony with God's Holiness.

That unless we see this picture we completely miss the point of Christ's crucifixion.

F-4 That ^(the?) our ^{"Diabolos"} death-doomed, unclean state ^{SITF - see G 8 Trunk} unfits us for approach to God, and is thus a barrier, and thus ^(the?) our state had to be cleansed and purged.

F-5 Sacrifice in Old and New Testaments means to "Slay" and "To offer". This is a basic scriptural sacrifice-and means to "slaughter", a putting to death.

While Christ's obedient life was an offering and his death was a sacrifice, they are the one indivisible sacrificial offering. His whole life and death was the supreme sacrifice-offering.

- F-6 The complete burnt offering shows the consumption of sin-nature and is the basis of all redeeming truth, the destruction of the body of sin. *Beginning with dedication of self in obedience*
- F-7 The flesh of Christ had to be purified, as shown by Bro. Thomas and Bro. Roberts as the fulfillment of all the shadows of the Law of Moses.
- F-8 Christ as one of the Adamic race needed what the whole race needed, the reality that is simply shadowed by the "ritual of sacrifice". He needed, as we need, the flesh-cleansing, sin-condemning, grave-opening perfect-life-shed-blood death reality that God's holiness and wisdom demanded.
- F-12 Sacrifice is not a symbol of punishment, or "paying a penalty", although it involves the recognition that sin as a totality-centered in sin-nature must be publicly condemned and put to death IN the body of one totally free from personal transgression.

G. BAPTISM

We Agree That: -

- G-3 The sentence upon Adam was not "eternal death", but simply a return to the dust from which he was created, a condition from which, unless God had provided an escape in the way of life would have endured for ever.

We are justified from sin's flesh at baptism only in a 'prospective' sense. *See I 5-Trunk.*

Two points effected by baptism - First, cleansed from personal sins; Second, lifted up to a way leading to final physical cleansing.

- G-4 Racial condemnation is cancelled (potentially) at baptism. - Our nature does need cleansing. It will be cleansed at the resurrection. And it will be because of Christ's obedience unto death. And it will be because all, through baptism have entered into him. Condemnation, as a result of descent from Adam commences to be taken away at baptism. At baptism anything standing in the way from Adam or ourselves is 'wiped out'.
- G-5 Baptism is to put us into Christ and into all he stands for and embodies, to take our feet out of the way of death and to set them in motion in the way of life.
- G-7 We at baptism, are crucified with Christ, 'baptised into his death'. We morally participate in it in putting the old man to death, in 'denying ungodliness and worldly lusts'. And the HOPE before us is the prospect of becoming subject to such a physical change as will change it into glorious nature of the Spirit. *See Q.8*

* The term "old man" synonymous with "body of sin", "diabolos", "sin-in-the-flesh", etc. "Old man" morally put to death by putting off the 'deeds' of the 'old man' - initially at baptism, thereafter thru a daily crucifixion of the flesh with the lusts thereof, by the strength and grace of Yahweh thru and for the sake of Christ & what was accomplished in and thru him. *mental plunging*

Re-Affirmation (G - Continued) -

- G-9 It is not true to claim that we are actually (really) justified from 'sin-in-the-flesh' at baptism. This only comes when we stand justified at Christ's Judgment Seat.
- G-12 Christ's sacrifice was a baptism. ^{why XT was baptized} Therefore, he submitted to John's baptism as a type of what he actually experienced. Therefore, our association with Christ's death at baptism is a freedom from the law of sin-and-death. This is a process that starts at our baptism, but is only complete at final resurrection. It is not Andrewism to say that baptism (potentially and eventually) frees us from Adamic Condemnation. But we should avoid phrases which at any time convey wrong impressions, leading to controversy.

H. 'POTENTIAL' AND 'EVENTUAL'

We Agree That: -

- H-10 Our ultimate cleansing can only come by physical change of our nature at Christ's judgment. Baptism is the beginning of a process leading ultimately to that glorious climax.

I. JUSTIFICATION

We Agree That: -

- I-1-2 Justification of the faithful from Adamic condemnation which they inherit, is only commenced at baptism and eventually we are justified in the completed sense when we are made immortal. A baby, therefore, cannot be justified.
- I-3 We are justified by belief (faith) in what God has done and is doing in Christ Jesus. Our baptism is the obedience of this faith, as the induction into Christ, to begin the process of justification from mortality, sin and death when Christ returns.
- I-4 We are only new men and women morally at baptism. - We experience a legal creation at Christ's judgment seat. Baptism only changes God's favor toward us. Therefore, it is unreasonable to speak of our actually being justified from sin-in-the-flesh at our baptism.
- I-5 As the final result of baptism, and dependent upon baptism, we are justified from Adamic Condemnation. This is a two stage process, which essentially blends into one. Without the first the final is not possible.

J. 'BARRIER' AND 'BREACH'

We Agree That: -

- J-1-2 Our personal offenses are the greatest barrier to approach to God. Christ always pleased his Father. He was always one with

J-1-2 (Continued)

God. But his defiled nature was a barrier both to him and us. He could not be one with God in a perfect, eternal totality and substance until that barrier was removed, not a moral barrier, but a physical one, not a guilt, but a misfortune, a disability, an inherited disease of the flesh, that must be cleansed in God's required way.

- J-4 The barrier between us and God that is removed at baptism is our transgressions - at baptism all our past personal sins are 'washed away'; forgiven, we stand morally perfect before God. We can approach God as justified and cleansed men and women, washed in Christ's shed blood. But our nature is unchanged, though our Adamic destiny is reversed.

K. OUT OF ADAM INTO CHRIST; IN ADAM/IN CHRIST

We Agree That: -

- K-1 There is a passing into Christ at baptism. Our relation to the whole death dispensation which Adam introduced is changed. There is preliminary deliverance at baptism, but it is not ACTUAL till resurrection. We are baptised into Christ; we are, after baptism, in Christ. We do not LITERALLY pass out of Adam at baptism. It is unscriptural to believe and teach, as did J.J. Andrew and others, that to be 'IN CHRIST' we are 'OUT OF ADAM' constitutionally and are released from "eternal death".

L. ADAMIC CONDEMNATION

We Agree That: -

- L-1 It is wise not to use the expression of "Passing out of Adam into Christ", because of the misuse and false Andrew teaching associated with it: that wise brethren will avoid its use for fear of being misunderstood.

That the Andrew "violent death" theory is absolutely wrong, which is that the sentence on Adam was 'violent death', averted from the sinning Adam by animal sacrifice, and carried out on the sinless Christ. 'Violent death' is not a scriptural term.

We concur with the scriptural conception of the condemning of sin's flesh by a voluntary nailing of this flesh to the cross and purification from all forms and aspects of "sin" by God's appointed way of the sacrificial blood-shedding of a perfect, voluntary self-offering. Jesus was not "liable" to a "violent death".

- L-2 Adam's death was not a 'violent death' which was set aside. He was simply sentenced to a return to the dust from whence he came, which actually came to pass 930 years after his creation.

L-2 (Continued)

The law of corruption of all God's creation was simply permitted to take its course, which it did after many years in his case and does with all his descendants, unless arrested by the redeeming power of God in the way He has devised through Christ Jesus.

M. CHILDREN OF WRATH

We Agree That: -

- M-1 Children are not born as "children of wrath", they are children who grow to an age of responsibility as men and women who provoke God's wrath by disobedience. As babes the wrath has not begun.
- M-2 Mortality is a physical condition and it is an uncleanness, but it is not a guilt. It does not require forgiveness, it requires cleansing.

N. ATONEMENT

We Agree That: -

- N-1 Christ the substance, the antitype of all that is spoken of as needing atonement* under the law, needed a purging, a personal physical cleansing, a purifying, by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice.
- N-2 Christ was the antitype of the Mosaic High Priest who offered for himself. He required redemption from Adamic nature equally with his brethren and the method of redemption which God chose was a perfect obedience, culminating in a sacrificial death.
- N-3 Christ's personal cleansing is the essence of the whole process of our (the human race's) salvation. It was an actual personal process of conquering and self-cleansing, a being 'made perfect by suffering'.
- N-5 The word "atonement"* as the rendering of the Hebrew "Kaphar" in the Old Testament expresses the idea of paying a penalty, of Christ being punished due to the transgression of sinners, so sinners can go free. The scriptural meaning is redemption, purifying, cleansing, or covering. Therefore, to avoid misunderstandings, it is better to stick to these scriptural terms and ideas. This will clear the sacrifice of Christ of much confusion and contention.

O. ALIENATION

We Agree That: -

- O-1 By man's inheritance of Adamic nature, which includes Christ, he does not inherit any alienation or estrangement

Re-Affirmation (0 - Continued) -

- 0-1 (Continued)
from God, or any divine anger or wrath in consequence. The barrier exists not because of alienation, but because of the uncleanness, the defilement of that nature. To remove this barrier a cleansing, a washing, a purging is essential. This is God's glorious plan in the redemptive work of Christ.
- 0-2 Our service to the diabolos is what does 'alienate' us from God and make us 'children of wrath'. This everyone is guilty of and worthy of death, a putting to death, all except Christ.
- 0-3 The Berean body does not believe that Christ was 'alienated' from God or was a 'child of wrath' or was 'liable' to a 'violent death'.

P. 'LEGAL MORTALITY'

We agree That: -

- P-1-2 What is cancelled at baptism (and it is cancelled only potentially - for there is an 'IF' all the way through) is the condemnation resting upon us as individual sinners, AND the racial condemnation we physically inherit. 'Legal mortality' is that which is constituted, ordered, or determined by law. In this sense, we pass (potentially) from death to life at baptism, for without it there could be no hope of the physical deliverance that waits at the coming of Christ. In this sense 'legal mortality', we pass from death to life at baptism.

Q. THE ERROR OF ANDREWISM

- Q-1 Andrewism basically has to do with the non-responsibility of the enlightened to appear at Christ's judgment seat. The matters of the relation of the Law of Sin and Death to baptism, and to Christ's offering for himself are side issues, because of a theory Bro. Andrew developed to support his theory that the unbaptised will not be raised to judgment.

Andrew claimed, by baptism we are justified from Adamic condemnation, thus making resurrection from the dead possible. This is the basis of his theory that we are "OUT OF ADAM" at baptism.

Andrew claimed that Christ by his death, and we by our baptism are 'cleansed' or 'justified' from 'imputed guilt' of Adam. His theory compelled him to believe that the condemnation that came on all men (including Christ) was 'imputed guilt'.

The Andrew theory states that freedom from the law of sin and death at baptism is a 'legal' release from the Adamic sentence of 'eternal death', uninterrupted death, enabling resurrection to occur.

- Q-2 The danger in not being aware of the Andrew theory, is that we may go too far to the left in combatting the extreme 'clean flesh' theory of Stricklerism.
- Q-4 Some, in very correctly denying the errors of Andrew, are going too far and thus denying the Truth that Brethren Thomas and Roberts brought to light.

Q. 'IMPUTED GUILT' (ANDREWISM)

- Q-5 The Andrew theory taught that the cleansing of inanimate objects under the Law were types of cleansing from 'imputed guilt' which came upon all men (including Christ).
- Q-6 Andrew taught that babies carried (at birth) 'imputed guilt' and were thus 'children of wrath'.
- Q-8 Andrew contended that 'atonement' (in the orthodox sense of pacifying wrath or anger) is what was accomplished in Christ's death and by baptism on our part. This is the basis of his theory of 'imputed guilt' as Adamic condemnation.

R. THE ERROR OF STRICKLERISM

- R-1 Stricklerism taught that Christ did not need a purifying sacrifice for his own redemption. There is no such actual, physical thing as 'sin in the flesh', 'the diabolos', 'the law of sin in the members', 'sin's flesh', 'sin that dwelleth in me', etc., but these are simply expressions referring to actual transgressions, not to our physical nature.
- R-2 Jesus did not offer an atoning sacrifice for himself to redeem himself.

It was not necessary for Christ, morally or physically, to offer for his cleansing an offering for atonement.

The sin 'put away' by 'the sacrifice of himself' was actual transgression and not sin in his nature; the 'sin' without which Christ appears the second time unto salvation (Heb. 9:28) is sin in his brethren, or, a sin-offering.

STATEMENTS OF TRUTHS
BELIEVED AND UPHELD BY
THE BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIAN FELLOWSHIP

STATEMENTS OF TRUTHS
BELIEVED AND UPHELD BY
THE BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIAN FELLOWSHIP
CONCERNING THE NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST
AND RELATED SUBJECTS

What follows are excerpts from brethren Thomas, Roberts, Growcott, and other stalwart brethren. These statements are presented in excerpt form only for the sake of brevity. We are absolutely in full agreement with each article in its entirety.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
<u>OPENING</u>	1
<u>THE USE OF LANGUAGE AND THE BASIC IDEA OF COMMUNICATION</u>	2
A. <u>FROM: BASF, BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIAN RESTATEMENT, CLAUSE 24</u>	3
BASF.	3
BASF - CLAUSE 24.	4
BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIAN RESTATEMENT.	5
REGARDING CLAUSE 24	6
B. <u>HISTORY OF ERROR (1894-1898, 1923, ETC.)</u>	6
C. <u>CHRIST'S DEFILED UNCLEAN NATURE</u>	8
D. <u>MEDIATORSHIP</u>	15
E. <u>SIN (AND SIN OFFERING)</u>	15
METYONYMY	24
F. <u>THE LAW OF MOSES, AND SACRIFICES</u>	25
GOD REQUIRED AN ACTUAL DESTROYING OF SIN.	25
SACRIFICE	26
DID CHRIST NEED A "SACRIFICE"?	27
G. <u>BAPTISM</u>	29
H. <u>"POTENTIAL" AND "EVENTUAL"</u>	33
I. <u>JUSTIFICATION</u>	35
J. <u>"BARRIER" AND "BREACH"</u>	37
K. <u>OUT OF ADAM INTO CHRIST; IN ADAM IN CHRIST</u>	38
L. <u>ADAMIC CONDEMNATION</u>	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

M.	<u>CHILDREN OF WRATH.</u>	41
N.	<u>ATONEMENT.</u>	41
O.	<u>ALIENATION</u>	44
P.	<u>"LEGAL MORTALITY".</u>	45
Q.	<u>THE ERROR OF ANDREWISM</u>	45
	<u>"IMPUTED QUILT" (Q. CONTINUED)</u>	47
R.	<u>THE ERROR OF STRICKLERISM.</u>	48

INTRODUCTION

This synopsis contains both declarative statements of truths, which are believed and upheld by the Berean Christadelphians,

AND

Sections Q and R identifying the errors of Andrewism and Stricklerism (including theoretical premises and unsound arguments), which are rejected by the brotherhood.

OPENING

ANDREWISM & STRICKLERISM: THE LATTER MORE DANGEROUS

Some who oppose bro. A's theories have gone to the other extreme. No one can unbiasedly read the Law of Moses without perceiving that bro. R largely had his eye on the Renunciationist/Strickler-type "Christ didn't offer for himself" errors. The whole spirit, tenor and essence of his many and extensive expoundings of the sacrifice of Christ are to the effect that he must accomplish the work for and in himself first - work out his own physical purification by perfect life and death obedience as God required, and then open it up for the benefit of others.

This is the essential link that the current advocates of Stricklerism are missing. This is the reality of his work that makes it more than just a ritual and shadow.

Even though Andrewism was at the time a very current issue (Law of Moses appeared serially 1894-1898), still it was the opposite error (also then current: bro. Harry Fry was withdrawn from for Stricklerism in 1898) that bro. R could see was the principal one that the Truth needed defending against.

There seems to be an incomprehensible squeamishness about robustly accepting this clear pivotal Truth: the vital link that takes the Sacrifice of Christ out of the powerless, shadowy realm of just one more type and figure, and gives it substance as an actual and essential accomplishment: a terrible, wonderful, personal self-sacrificial purging and cleansing: "made perfect by suffering."

How dreadful, how beautiful, how glorious a victorious self-purification it was. What a deadly Enemy within! What a perfect, personal victory over the dread Sin Power of the Flesh that held all his brethren in hopeless bondage! What marvelous meaning we see thereafter in the symbol and type and ritual of "sacrifice"!

What do they have but dead types and shadows who cannot see this reality? It seems to be feared that the acceptance of this great Truth will give the whole case away to Andrewism. Far from it! The fear is groundless. All sound brethren have held this Truth for over 100 years with no taint of Andrewism.

Rather it would greatly strengthen the case for the Truth: for it would supply the missing link that makes the Strickler concept of Christ's Sacrifice another dead shadow, instead of a living reality, an actual accomplishment, a real destruction of Sin at its root. - Berean 1979 p. 312

THE USE OF LANGUAGE AND THE BASIC IDEA OF COMMUNICATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purifying of the Heavenly - Berean, Nov. 1978 p. 386

A. FROM: BASF, BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIAN RESTATEMENT, CLAUSE 24BASF

4. That the first man was Adam, whom God created out of the dust of the ground as a living soul, or natural body of life, "very good" in kind and condition, and placed him under a law through which the continuance of life was contingent on obedience.

Gen.2:7; 18:27; Job 4:19; 33:6; 1 Cor.15:46-49; Gen.2:17

5. That Adam broke this law, and was adjudged unworthy of immortality, and sentenced to return to the ground from whence he was taken - a sentence which defiled and became a physical law of his being, and was transmitted to all his posterity.

Gen.3:15-19,22-23; 2 Cor.1:9; Rm. 7:24; 2 Cor.5:2-4; Rm.7:18-23; Gal.5:16-17; Rm.6:12; 7:21; John 3:6; Rm.5:12; 1Cor.15:22; Psa.51;5; Job 14:4

8. That these promises had reference to Jesus Christ, who was to be raised up in the condemned line of Abraham and David, and who, though wearing their condemned nature, was to obtain a title to resurrection by perfect obedience, and, by dying, abrogate the law of condemnation for himself, and all who should believe and obey him.

1 Cor.15:45; Heb.2:14-16; Rm.1:3; Heb.5:8-9; 1:9; Rm.5:19-21; Gal.4:4-5; Rm.8:3-4; Heb.2:15; 9:26; Gal.1:4; Heb.7:27; 5:3-7; 2:17; Rm.6:10; 6:9; Ac.13:34-37; Rev.1:18; Jn.5:21-22,26,27; 14:3; Rev.2:7; 3:21; Mat.25:21; Heb.5:9; Mk.16:16; Ac.13:38,39; Rm.3:22; Psa.2:6-9; Dan.7:13-14; Rev.11:15; Jer.23:5; Zec.14:9; Eph.1:9-10.

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

Lk.19:47; 20:1-26; Jn.11:45-53; Ac.10:38,39; 13:26-29; 4:27-28; Rm.8:3; Heb.10:10; Rm.3:25; Ac.13:38; 1 Jn.1:7; Jn.14:6; Ac.4:12; 1 Pt.3:18; 2:24; Heb.9:14; 7:27; 9:26-28; Gal.1:4; Rm.3:25; 15:8; Gal.3:21-22; 2:21; 4:4-5; Heb. 9:15; Lk.22:20; 24:26,46,47; Mt.26:28.

BASF - CLAUSE 24

24. That at the appearing of Christ prior to the establishment of the Kingdom, the responsible (namely, those who know the revealed will of God, and have been called upon to submit to it), dead and living - obedient and disobedient - will be summoned before his Judgment Seat "to be judged according to their works;" and "receive in body according to what they have done, whether it be good or bad."

2 Cor. 5:10

"We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ."

John 12:48

"He that rejecteth me, the Word shall judge him in the last day."

Mark 16:15

"Preach to every creature: he that believeth not shall be condemned."

John 3:19

"This is condemnation, that light is come into the world."

Acts 24:25

"As Paul reasoned of...judgment to come, Felix trembled."

Hebrews 9:27

"It is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment."

Job 21:30

"The wicked shall be brought forth for the day of wrath."

Luke 29:27

"Those mine enemies which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me."

1 Peter 4:3-5

"Gentiles...speak evil of you...shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead."

James 4:17

"To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

Romans 2:5-16

"The day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, Who will render to every man according to his deeds...to them that do not obey the Truth... wrath upon every man that doeth evil...Jew first, and also Gentile...as many as have sinned under law shall be judged...in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus."

2 Thes. 1:6-9

"God...recompense tribulation to them that trouble you... when Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven... taking vengeance on them that obey not Gospel...who shall be punished with everlasting destruction."

Etc., Etc.

BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIAN RESTATEMENT1. THE NATURE AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST

It was the determined agreement of the former Bereans who took part in the Jersey City Conference to insist upon an acceptance of the Ten Point Statement on the Nature and Sacrifice of Christ as a minimum safeguard against the erroneous theories long current in the Central group. Under pressure, this determination was not maintained.

We firmly believe that any who do not WILLINGLY AND READILY express their approval of the Ten Point Statement designed to defend Truth and guard against error, are not of one mind with us, and consequently a union in fellowship with such would not be mutually beneficial. The Ten Point Statement (formulated by the Los Angeles ecclesia, and accepted by Central in 1940 as a sound basis for reunion on the question) is as follows:

FOUR ERRORS TO BE REJECTED

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

SIX TRUTHS TO BE ACCEPTED

1. That death came into the world extraneous to the nature bestowed upon Adam in Eden, and was not inherent in him before sentence.
2. That the sentence defiled him (Adam) and became a physical law of his being, and was transmitted to all his posterity.
3. That the word "sin" is used in 2 principal acceptations in the Scriptures. It signifies in the first place "the transgression of law," and in the next it represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution to dust.
4. That Jesus possessed our nature, which was a defiled, condemned nature.
5. That it was therefore necessary that Jesus should offer for himself for the purging of his own nature, first, from the uncleanness of death, that, having by his own blood obtained eternal redemption for himself, he might

defiled brought about not just into sentence. affect until this

Physical principle cause of transgression

be able afterward to save to the uttermost those that come to God by him.

6. That the doctrine of substitution (that is, that a righteous man can, by suffering the penalty due to the sinner, free the sinner from the penalty of his sins) is foreign to Scripture and is a dogma of heathen mythology.

We earnestly desire fellowship on the basis of a wholehearted oneness of mind, but we believe recent events have shown the fallacy of attempting to build fellowship on any basis involving compromise or insufficient investigation. We believe the principle of uniting first and "straightening things out" later is neither scripturally sound nor practically workable.

There must be a willingness to face the facts of the past that have brought about the problems of the present. Essential truths have been assailed. Friends of the Truth will GLADLY make clear their position: yea, will be ANXIOUS to make it clear.

Nov 27
1988.

REGARDING CLAUSE 24

2. "The refusal to affirm a doctrine is equivalent to its repudiation; which is a much more serious thing than inability to see it, especially when combined with avowed antagonism to it, as in the present case. The decision of the assembly left bro. Lake and those who act with him NO ALTERNATIVE BUT THE COURSE THEY HAVE ADOPTED" -Editor.

Christadelphian, May 1894, p. 203,204

This was the beginning of the separation from Resurrectional Responsibility error, and the reaffirmed sound fellowship stand for the Truth, that culminated (in 1898) in the clarification by amendment of Clause 24 of the Basis of Fellowship, and of the consequent necessary separation from all who did not accept that amendment (these becoming what was thereafter known as the "Unamended" or "Advocate" group.) It appears conclusive from the above that they are wrong who claim that bro. Roberts would not have withdrawn from bro. Andrew. He says the withdrawers in London had "NO ALTERNATIVE." His later statements confirm this.

Berean, 1980, p. 264

B. HISTORY OF ERROR (1894-1898, 1923, ETC.)

1. BOURNEMOUTH: "We have had trouble in our midst, which has resulted in division. Bro. L publicly proclaimed the doctrine that Jesus was not in a position requiring to offer himself as a sacrifice to secure his own redemption; that

the sacrifice of Christ was required only to effect the salvation of actual transgressors. Jesus being no transgressor, for himself this sacrifice was not needed.

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

"It was necessary to meet this error in order to maintain the purity of the Truth. After private and collective effort, which proved fruitless, it was decided to reaffirm and define our doctrinal basis of faith upon this subject; and as to those who refuse to acknowledge and accept it, we feel duty bound from such to stand aside.

"Ecclesial News" of May, 1898 Christadelphian

(It was the same issue in 1923 with Stricklerism, but with bro. R gone, action was not so sound.)

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

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

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

Christadelphians have understood and believed and taught the Truth for over 100 years, and have repeatedly repudiated all the errors. It is, therefore, foolishness at this late date to ignore the soundness and stability of the past, and keep starting over to see if we can find the Truth.

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

"For Himself," Berean, 1979, p. 65

C. CHRIST'S DEFILED UNCLEAN NATURE

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

2. 10. You say that the body of Christ was not sinful flesh, but a "likeness" of it. In what did the likeness flesh consist, if it was not of the same sort? It is testified that he was made in the "likeness of men" (Ph. 2:8). Would you therefore say he was "not a man but a likeness of one"? If not - if you say he was a man though Paul says he was made in the likeness - why not say he was sinful flesh, though Paul says he was sent in the likeness of it?

11. Paul says that God, sending forth His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, "condemned sin in the flesh" (Rm.8:3). How could this have been done IF THERE BE NO SUCH THING AS "SIN IN THE FLESH," and if Christ was not SINFUL FLESH, but a likeness of it?

12. Moses says that Adam begat a son "in his own likeness" (Gen.5:3). Does this mean that the son so begotten was, in any sense, of a dissimilar nature to his father? If you say No, as you are bound to, why do you contend that a "likeness of sinful flesh" is dissimilar to sinful flesh itself? October, 1873 Chrisdadelphian
 "Must Christ Offer for Himself?"
 Berean, Nov. 1979, p. 382

3. That is: He came to save the race. He bore our sins in being made of Sin's Flesh. Being made of Sin's Flesh, he personally needed a cleansing sacrifice. Being, as one of the race, so cleansed, that cleansing covers all who become part of him. @ncompasse
 "Is It Andrewism or Truth?"
 Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 416

4. "Sinful flesh was laid upon him." Elpis Israel p. 99

5. 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 Sacrificial Blood," Berean 1979, p. 106

6. As a race, we ARE Sin. Everything we do naturally is Sin. Sin is the very fiber of our being: "Conceived in Sin, and shapen in Iniquity" (Psa. 51:5). If this was true of Christ (and bre. T & R correctly apply it to him), then how much more of us. "Redeeming the Race," 1979 Berean, p. 309

7. Sin had to be condemned in the nature that ^{in all but Christ} transgressed. For this cause, he was made a little lower than the angels, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the diabolos, or elements of corruption in our nature inciting it to transgression, and therefore called Sin working death in us. Eureka I:106

8. Those who say Christ did not offer for himself repudiate the scriptural Christadelphian Christ of bre. T & R and of the whole Body for over 100 years: the Christ who (as these brethren so beautifully open up and manifest) -

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He did not just go through more typical, shadowy, powerless ritual, as those say who claim he did not offer for himself. They must come out of the shadows and perceive the glorious reality of what he did. He alone achieved immortality through a real SACRIFICE: even his WHOLE life and death laid on the divine altar - "Sacrifice (ritual) Thou wouldest not, but a BODY Thou hast prepared me."

(Heb. 10)

He accomplished in himself and FOR himself what God demanded for human salvation: a perfect sacrifice of self - absolute and entire - and the death that completed and crowned it cannot be separated from the life of perfection that gave it its God-pleasing, purifying power. It was by this REAL life-sacrifice that HE was saved, and all who, in God's mercy, are allowed to get INTO him.

"For Himself," Berean, 1979, p. 65-66

9. We see Jesus born of a woman, and therefore a partaker of the identical nature condemned to death in Eden. We see him a member of imperfect human society, subject to toil and weakness, dishonor and sorrow, poverty and hatred, and all the other evils that have resulted from the advent of sin upon the earth. We see him down in the evil which he was sent to cure: not outside of it, not untouched by it, but in it, to put it away. "He was made perfect through suffering" (Heb. 2:10), but he was not perfect till he was through it. He was saved from death (5:7), but not until he died. He obtained redemption (Heb. 9:12), but not until his own blood was shed. Law of Moses, p. 192
10. If the principle of corruption had not pervaded the flesh of Jesus, or if he were not flesh, he could not have been tried in all points as we; nor could sin have been condemned there; nor could he have "borne our sins IN his own body on the tree." Eureka I:203
11. Christ did not "deserve" the punishment of death, nor any other punishment. This is cloudy orthodoxy. His sacrificial death was in no sense a "punishment" of anybody. It was a triumph, a victory, a voluntary testimony of obedience and love. By life and death (one unit) he perfectly repudiated and subdued the "mind of the flesh," "sin in the flesh," the "law of sin in the members," "the Diabolos" - held it absolutely powerless - and voluntarily joined with God in a final, once for all, public condemnation of it on the cross. "Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p.390
12. The flesh in or through which the Deity was manifested was - for the brief space of 33 years - inferior to the angelic nature. It had been "purified" by the sprinkling of its own blood on the cross. Catechesis 12
13. QUES: What would have been the consequences had Christ died a natural death?
ANS: Had the will of God been so, his resurrection would have followed immediately, and our salvation equally secured. For the triumph lay here: that he rose after dying for sin. But a natural death would not have been the same trial of Christ's obedience...It does not appear that the mode of death would have made any difference to the result as regards us, except insofar as might have borne on the question of Christ's obedience. Christadelphian 1973, p.322

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

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

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

We just prattle when we speak of Christ "apart from the race." His very name tells us this: Christ Jesus, Anointed Savior. Anointed for what? Savior of whom?

"Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p. 389

14. If brethren once grasp the central idea in connection with the work of God in Christ, they will be proof against the kind of error the writer is opposing. This "central idea" is that God in Christ was working out redemption from curse and death in a representative man of His own providing, who, though a possessor of the sin nature and tempted in all points like his brethren, was able to evolve sinlessness of character, thus triumphing over sin and abolishing death in himself, that others might share in the results achieved (through the forbearance of God) on compliance with the prescribed conditions.

The principles of divine wisdom required that the work of redemption should be wrought out in Christ himself first, before others could be redeemed through him. As brother Roberts has said, "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 on which we are saved from the law of sin and death, whose operation we inherit in deriving our nature from Adam."

Sin and Sacrifice - bro. Smallwood, p. 87

15. "Become sin for us," "sin condemned in the flesh," "our sins borne in his body upon the tree"
 -these things could not have been accomplished in a nature destitute of that physical principle styled "Sin in the flesh" Christadelphian, 1873:361
 "Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there" Eureka I:128

16. As soon as we say there was no "sin" in Christ's flesh, and/or that the sin in Christ's flesh did not need condemnation and cleansing away, we immediately make him a substitute instead of a representative, a shadow instead of a substance. The essence of the whole transaction is the REALITY of its destruction. Christ DID what all the sacrifices before him merely shadowed. He really and actually destroyed Sin - the Diabolos - and it had to BE

THERE in order to be destroyed. It was not just a figure of speech, a type, a shadow, like all the preceding sacrifices.
 "The Diabolos in Christ," Berean, 1978, p. 153

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

"God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh" (Rm. 8:3).

"By His Own Blood He Entered,"
 Berean, April 1980, p. 134

18. We have only to receive the simple facts testified in the case to reach the end of all difficulty. We see Jesus born of a woman, and therefore a partaker of the identical nature condemned to death in Eden. We see him a member of imperfect human society, subject to toil and weakness, dishonor and sorrow, poverty and hatred, and all the other evils that have resulted from the advent of sin upon the earth. We see him down in the evil which he was sent to cure: not outside of it, not untouched by it, but IN it, to put it away.

"He was made perfect through suffering" (Heb. 2:10) - but he was not perfect till he was through it. He was saved from death (Heb. 5:7) - but not until he died. He obtained redemption (Heb. 9:12) - but NOT UNTIL HIS OWN BLOOD WAS SHED.

"Christ's Self-Cleansing, Self Perfecting Sacrifice"
 Berean, 1979, p. 218

19. With this agrees the fact that Christ "in the days of his flesh" was the antitype of the brazen serpent (Jn.3:14), the antitype again of Joshua the High Priest, "clothed with filthy garments" (Zech. 3:1-9), significant of the "filthiness of the flesh" (2 Cor.7:1).

With this agrees also the saying that Christ was made "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rm. 8:3); that he took part of "the same" flesh and blood as that of which the children were partakers whom he came to deliver (Heb. 2:14); and that he died so with the object of destroying the devil, or sin-power of death to which the flesh of which he partook was subject...

In John's later days, the original believers of the Truth had come to be divided into those who held to the belief that Christ had come in the flesh, and those who denied this fact (1 Jn. 4:1-3). This latter, says John, is "the spirit of antichrist." Now the denial that Christ had come "in the flesh" was the denial that he had come in the

maculate flesh common to the posterity of the first transgressor.

"The Flesh of Christ," Berean, May 1978, p. 171,172

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

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

"For Himself," Berean 1979, p. 66

21. 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)?

Law of Moses, p. 171

22. Bro. R taught it was the necessary God-appointed cleansing from the physical defilement of the sin-nature that made him one with his brethren in need of a sacrifice.

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?", Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 416

23. The statement of Paul (Heb. 7:27) is that Christ did "once" in his death what the high priests under the Law did daily, namely, offered "first for his own sins, and then for the people's." But there is all the difference between the two cases that there always is between shadow and substance. Christ's "own sins" were not like the sins of the priests: they were not sins of his own committing. He was without sin, so far as his own actions were concerned.

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

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

"For Himself," Berean 1979, p. 61

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

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

"Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p. 389

25. We see Jesus born of a woman, and therefore a partaker of the identical nature condemned to death in Eden. We see him a member of imperfect human society, subject to toil and weakness, dishonor and sorrow, poverty and hatred, and all other evils that have resulted from the advent of sin upon earth. We see him down in the evil which he was sent to cure. Not outside of it, not untouched by it, but IN IT, to put it away - "He was MADE PERFECT through suffering" (Heb. 2:10) - but he was not perfect until he was through it. He was "saved from death" (v. 7), but not until he died. He "obtained redemption" (Heb. 9:12), but not until his own blood was shed.

The statement that he did these things "for us" has blinded many to the fact that he did them FOR HIMSELF first - without which he could not have done them for us, for it was by doing them for himself that he did them for us. He did them for us ONLY as we may become part of him by taking part in his death, and putting on his Name and sharing his life afterwards.

"The Sacrificial Blood," Berean, 1979, p. 105,106

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

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

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

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

"For Himself," Berean, 1979, p. 66

D. MEDIATORSHIP (Supplement re: Prayer)

"Those who have obeyed the gospel of the Kingdom can alone offer acceptable prayer to God through Jesus Christ; for all the clouds of perfume John saw ascending from the golden vials to the throne, were 'the prayers of the SAINTS.' He saw no others; and could see none: for there is no fragrance in the exhalations of the disobedient; Prayer is a SPIRITUAL SACRIFICE ACCEPTABLE TO GOD THROUGH JESUS CHRIST;" and such sacrifice can only be offered by true believers, who have been introduced into Him by faith and the obedience it prescribes. Men have yet to learn that "TO OBEY IS BETTER THAN SACRIFICE." Prayers, and alms giving, and praises, and breaking of bread, and morality of life (speaking in the dialect of men) are acceptable and delightful odors when offered by the saints; who are as 'golden vials' in the temple of the Lord; but when they burn from the hearts of the disobedient, the stench of corruption mingles with their incense, and becomes abomination in the nostrils of Him, whose precepts they disregard."

"He hears not sinners, be they devout or impious: His ears are not open to their prayers. In time of trouble 'They cry; but there is none to save them; even unto Jehovah, but he answers them not.' Christ dwells not in their hearts by faith of the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus." Acceptable prayer is the expression of the desires of a heart purified by belief of the truth."

-- "Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come" Vol 5 p. 104

"Acceptable worship can only be offered by the children of the covenant."

"Praise, thanksgiving and prayer are spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ, which can only be offered acceptably by God's own priests. These...are people whom Jesus has purchased for God by his own blood, and made kings and priests - Rev 5:9,10; 1 Pet 2:2,5,9 - those who have believed and obeyed the gospel of the kingdom...These sacrifices belong to the Altar and the Holy Place, where no sinners can be found, except on pain of death; that is, of the Second."

--"Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come" Vol 9 p. 132

"A scripturally instructed teacher would show that we are all by nature sinners; and that prayer is the privilege only of those who are constituted the Saints of God. That a child who is born a sinner, must learn the Truth; and then when they are old enough to choose for themselves between good and evil, they will have the privilege of obeying it, and so becoming saints. Then being in Christ, they have to come to him in the proper and only way they can get at him since his departure from earth; and are through him eligible to approach the Father who is in heaven, and to make their requests known to Him."

--"Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come" Vol 2 p. 23

"If it is our duty to testify the truth to people in general...surely it would be an oversight of a serious kind to neglect our children, over whose minds we exercise a supreme influence. It would be throwing away the finest opportunity God puts in our way. BUT THERE ARE LIMITATIONS TO BE OBSERVED. Children, as such, are purely of the flesh, AND HAVE NO SPIRITUAL RELATION WHATEVER. The enlightenment which cleanses and saves the parent is the only thing that will avail the children. Children, per se, are, 'by nature, children of wrath,' as much as ever their parents were. Fascination and guilelessness are incidents of childhood, not qualities of it. Growth dissipates the charm, and reveals the Old Adam - strong and ugly...Worship is legitimate, and acceptable only, where Christ dwells in the heart by faith. This worship takes a collective shape wherever 'two or three' are gathered together in his name; but if a brother or sister find themselves alone in the midst, it may be, of a large family, their worship takes the form indicated in Matt 6:6. His or her duty to the family is discharged in the act of instruction. Part of this instruction will be to teach them that in Adam they are under condemnation, and EXILED from the Father's paternal regard; and that if they would become His children, whose prayers will be heard in the name of the Anointed Elder Brother and High Priest, they must believe the gospel, and give themselves up to his service."

Just
suppose
they close in

--"Ambassador" Vol 3, p. 184,185

"Now, it is the most elementary principle in Scriptural instruction that we are to love and fear God, and pray to Him; and we cannot teach the children godliness without teaching them this. But you ask: how can we teach them to say 'Our Father,' when God is Father only to His sons, viz., those who become such by adoption through Christ? It is obvious, that in the perfect sense, they cannot use these words; but there is an imperfect sense illustrated in the Scripture statement that God is the Father of all, and the Saviour of all (Eph 4:6; 1 Tim. 4:10). In this imperfect sense they are creatures having their existence in God, and dependent upon Him for the continuance of their being: for God giveth to all life, breath, and all things. This creature dependence is a fact which God is pleased to see recognised, as evidenced in the case of the Ninevites. This recognition will not be displeasing to the Father of all when accorded by the children of His own servants; and it will be a wholesome exercise for them. It is only when this recognition is linked with the assumption of an eternal relationship and heirship of salvation which do not exist, that the recognition in question is out of place and unacceptable. When the true position is discerned, it is far otherwise; especially in view of the standing invitation there is to our children and to all men to ascend a stage higher, and become 'the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus' (Gal. 3:26)."

--"Berean" 1931, p 130

D. MEDIATORSHIP

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

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

Upon this principle, "His own self bare our sins IN HIS OWN BODY to the tree" (1 Pet. 2:24). Sins borne in a body prove that body to be imperfect; and characterize it as "Sin's Flesh (sarx amartias). Sin's Flesh is imperfect, and well adapted for the condemnation of sin therein.

By brother John Thomas, Herald, 1860, pg. 12
Berean 1978, p. 422

E. SIN (AND SIN OFFERING)

1. "SIN" is a word in Paul's argument (in Rm. 7) which stands for human nature, with its affections and desires. Hence, to "become sin," or for one to be "made sin" for others (2 Cor. 5:21) is to become flesh and blood. This is called "sin," or "Sin's flesh" because it is what it is in consequence of sin, or transgression. Eureka I:247
2. God's method for the return of sinful man to favor required and appointed the putting to death of man's condemned and evil nature IN a representative man of spotless character whom He should provide, to declare and uphold the righteousness of God as the first condition of restoration, that He might be just while justifying the unjust, who should believingly approach through him in humility, confession and reformation -
 - "God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh" (Rm. 8).
 - "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14).
 - "Who his own self bare our sins IN HIS OWN BODY to the tree" (1 Pet. 2:24).
 - "Our old man is crucified with him, that the BODY OF SIN might be destroyed" (Rm. 6:6).
 - "He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15).
 - "Be of good cheer, I have OVERCOME THE WORLD" (Jn. 16:33).
 - "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the

forebearance of God: to declare, I say, at this time, His righteousness, that He might be just, and the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus" (Rm.3:25-26).

Christ was himself saved in the redemption he wrought out for us-

"In the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayer and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to SAVE HIM FROM DEATH, and was heard in that he feared. Though he were a son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered. And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him" (Heb. 5:7-9).

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

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

As the antitypical High Priest, it was necessary that he should offer FOR HIMSELF, as well as for those whom he represented -

"And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also FOR HIMSELF, to offer for sins. And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest" (Heb. 5:3).

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

"Who needeth not DAILY, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the people's: for THIS HE DID ONCE when he offered up himself" (Heb. 7:27).

"It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens (that is, the symbols employed under the Law) should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices), but the HEAVENLY THINGS THEMSELVES (that is, Christ who is the substance prefigured in the Law) with better sacrifices than these (that is, the sacrifice of Christ) (Heb. 9:23).

Christadelphian, September, 1896, p. 339.

"For Himself," Berean, February 1979, p. 63

3. CHRIST TOTALLY DEFEATED AND DESTROYED SIN IN HIMSELF
The work Christ did - the essential, race-redeeming work that was pre-ordained and fore-shadowed from the beginning - was the overcoming and destroying and publicly repudiating and condemning and putting to death of Sin IN himself, and, necessarily, FOR himself - not as a personal, selfish motive, but as a practical, necessary operation to achieve the race's redemption.

As a moral and physical actuality, Christ could conquer and destroy Sin only IN HIMSELF. That was the arena of his

total and perfect victory over Sin, by which he laid the eternal foundation for his further work. He will complete the battle against sin by: 1) absorbing into his own perfect, Sin-free self all who accept this deliverance that God has provided and do what God requires them to do to receive it; and 2) physically destroying all who do not accept him and enter into him. In this way, the whole race will eventually be purged and saved (as a race though not all individuals of it).

Christ - in the God-appointed way, and with the indispensable God-provided help and guidance and strengthening - had to: 1) Cleanse himself from Sin, and 2) Destroy Sin in himself - by his total, inseparable life-AND-death work. That is the root and basis and meaning of what we call "sacrifice." It was his only way to his own personal salvation. He was "made perfect by suffering" (Heb. 2:10), and THIS was the "suffering" required. He was "redeemed by his own blood" (Heb. 9:12).

"Redeeming the Race," Berean 1979, p. 309

4. Sin in the flesh is the devil destroyed by Jesus in his death. Christendom Astray, Lec. 7, p. 172

5. A POINT TO PONDER
It is recorded in the legislation concerning the Nazarite that -

"If any man die very suddenly by him, and he hath defiled the head of his consecration; then he shall shave his head in the day of his cleansing, on the 7th day he shall shave it. And on the 8th day he shall bring 2 turtles or 2 young pigeons to the priest...and the priest shall offer the one for a SIN OFFERING, and the other for a burnt offering, and make an atonement (kaphar: cleansing) for him, for that he SINNED by the dead...and he shall bring a lamb for a TRESPASS offering" (Num. 6:9-12).

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

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

him and us that makes his death a testimony to God's righteousness, and effectual for our salvation.

"Nazarite's Guiltless 'Sin' and Sacrificial Cleansing"
Berean, 1979, p. 135

6. There are 4 expressions scripturally applied to Christ that those who cannot accept the key truth concerning Christ's offering "first for himself" have difficulty with. We find these expressions treated very gingerly, or laboriously explained away. They are "sinful flesh," "sin in the flesh," "made sin," "our sins in his own body," (Rm.8:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Pet. 2:24).

As bre. Thomas and Roberts so beautifully and satisfyingly explain, these passages reveal the very heart and meaning of Christ's sacrifice. To grasp their significance, as bre. T & R so robustly and soundly expound them, is the only way to get a clear understanding of that sacrifice, and to escape the orthodox confusion of "substitution" and "vicarious sacrifice."

"Sin and Sin Offering," Berean, January 1979, p. 28

7. The word "sin" is used in 2 principal acceptations in the Scripture. It signifies in the first place "the transgression of law;" and in the next it represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh "which has the power of death," and it is called "sin" because the development or fixation of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled "sinful flesh," that is, flesh full of sin, so that "sin," in the sacred style, came to stand for the substance called "man." Elpis Israel 126

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

"The Diabolos in Christ," Berean 1978, p. 153

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

"For Himself," Berean, 1979, p. 66

9. It is testified that he was "made sin for us" (2 Cor. 5:21). As he was not of sinful character, this could only apply to his physical nature, drawn from the veins of Mary.
Christadelphian 1869, p. 83
God sent forth Jesus in the nature of the condemned, that sin might be condemned in him. Hence, he was "made sin" (2 Cor. 5:21).
Christadelphian 1873, p.402
10. HUMAN FLESH IS SCRIPTURALLY "SIN"
Happily, bre. Thomas and Roberts have pointed out from Scripture a rational, God-honoring, God's-justice-manifesting, actual Sin-destroying (not just in shadow) explanation. There is in all human flesh - as a result of the sin and sentence of Adam - an evil, destructive, defiling principle that the Scriptures call "Sin-in-the-flesh," "the Law of Sin in the members," "Sin that dwelleth in me," "Sin working Death in me," etc. It is Paul, in Rm. 7, who goes into this most fully; but what the Spirit says all throughout the Scriptures about the "flesh" and the "natural mind" and the "heart of man" repeatedly testifies to this Sin-defiled condition of all human flesh that caused Paul the righteous to cry (Rom. 7:24) -
"Who shall deliver me from the body of this Death?" (marg. this Body of Death).
As bre. T & R point out, the Sin-caused and Sin-causing principle that is in every cell of human flesh is called "Sin" by the Scriptures. Certainly this is "metonymy." "Metonymy" is simply a title for this "figure of speech" by which the name of something is extended to its related aspects.
"Sin" - literally and narrowly and primarily - is an act of disobedience against God's law. By "metonymy," and very reasonably, God extends the name "Sin" to that principle of evil in all human flesh that came by Sin and causes Sin - and that inevitably makes all men sinners (except in the one special case where God stepped in for the sake of the race, and made special arrangements).
But let us not get hung up here on the word "metonymy," and continue thereafter to just go in circles on this spot. Having established by "metonymy" that God has extended the name "Sin" to include this evil, sinful principle in all human flesh, let us go on from there. WHY did He do so? And what bearing does the fact have on salvation? We find that the fact He did so is a very important step in the developing picture. Paul, continuing his exposition from ch. 7, says -
"To be fleshly-minded is death...the fleshly mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed CAN be, so that they that are in the flesh CANNOT please God" (Rom. 8:6-8).
This is certainly enough to identify the flesh as "Sin," and to justify the name the Scriptures give it. What better

definition of Sin is there than "enmity against God: not subject to God, nor CAN be"? That is the flesh: all mortal flesh: Sin's Flesh. That is why it had to be crucified. That is why the crucifixion of Christ was a declaration of God's justice and holiness and righteousness. That is why Christ, who successfully fought Sin's Flesh all his life, voluntarily crucified it in life and in death: wholly: completely.

Look up "flesh" in Strong's - especially throughout Romans, but also all through the New Testament. If the "works of the flesh" are what Paul tells the Galatians they are (5:19), and if the "flesh lusted AGAINST the Spirit" (Gal. 5:17), then what else is the flesh but SIN?

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 308

11. "That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil," or sin in the flesh.
Elpis Israel p. 99

12. All the priests under the Law were sinners in the sense of being transgressors of the Law. Christ was not so. Yet- "THIS he did once...offer...first for his own sins" (Heb. 7:27).

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

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

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

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

The Christadelphian, Dec., 1910, pgs. 538,547

13. His human flesh was unclean flesh, "Sin's-flesh," "filthy garments." This was the tremendous burden he carried, the tremendous battle he fought every moment of his life. Let us not be squeamishly afraid to give the name SIN to the very root of sin: the Diabolos itself. The Scriptures do. Bre. T & R do. If we do not see this, we miss the whole point of Christ's sacrifice. We can juggle words like "metonymy" all we wish. They do not obliterate the facts: they are just a way of attempting to define them. This is not Andrewism: this is TRUTH.
"Purifying the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p. 388

14. Once we frankly and robustly take our stand with bre. T & R, and say clearly -
"Yes! Christ offered for himself. His sacrifice was

necessary for his own cleansing and salvation from Sin, the whole Sin Constitution. He 'obtained eternal redemption and entered the Holy Place by his own blood' (Heb. 9:12). He was 'brought from the dead through the blood of the Everlasting Covenant' (Heb. 12:20). He actually in himself destroyed Sin by his perfect sacrifice."

- then the picture is clear, and controversy ceases. Until we snap this vital link shut, we leave his sacrifice an isolated enigma, a shadow, unrelated to reality and accomplishment: a type, a symbol, nothing more: a yawning chasm between his work and our need. Bre. T & R say (in many forms of words, and this is one) -

"Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus if it had not existed there...The purpose of God was to condemn Sin in the flesh, a thing that could not have been accomplished if there were no Sin there" (Eureka I:128)

Bre. T & R saw so clearly, and stated so unequivocally, that Christ's "destruction of the devil" in his death had to be a reality, and not just a shadow. It is not logical or reasonable that after 4000 years of preparatory, foreshadowing rituals, God would be satisfied with settling the great conflict with Sin - the Diabolos - with just one more ritual of what should be. He required the fulfillment.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 312

15. That physical principle or quality of the flesh styled "indwelling sin." Elpis Israel p. 137

16. What is that which hath the power of death? It is the "exceedingly great sinner SIN," in the sense of the "Law of Sin and Death" within all the posterity of Adam, without exception. This, then, is Paul's Diabolos, which he says "has the power of death;" which "power" he also saith is "sin, the sting of death." Eureka I:249

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

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

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

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

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

This is an inspired definition and comment.

The Christadelphian, April, 1902, p. 148

18. What is meant by "devil" in Heb. 2:14 and 1 John 3:8?
 Ans: Sin in the flesh. Good Confession p. 120
19. "Iniquities laid on him"...This is a figurative description of what was literally done in God sending forth His Son made of a woman...This was "laid on" Jesus in his being made of our nature. Christadelphian, 1873, p. 400
20. Paul said, "In me, that is, IN MY FLESH, dwelleth no good thing" (Rm. 7:18). And Jesus could say exactly the same. That is why he crucified it, and tells us we must do the same. And the fact that he could say this with Paul is what makes him one with us in our problem. It is what makes his putting the flesh to death a manifestation of God's justice, in which he himself totally concurred. In fact, in that death, Jesus is saying exactly what Paul said: publicly, humbly, God-honoringly.
 "In my flesh dwelleth no good thing. This is what Sin's Flesh deserves. I have never yielded to it for a moment. I have always crucified it within me. And now, in obedience to the Father, and in full agreement with Him, I am putting it to death IN ME once and for all: destroying the diabolos. That is the kernel and essence and climax of my work of perfecting MYSELF so that I may save YOU.:
 "Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 310
21. God created man "very good" - free from Sin, free from Death. Man disobeyed God, and this brought Sin and Death upon the race. While Adam was created "very good," Paul very powerfully states that in his flesh (one of the best of men) was "no good thing" (Rm. 7:18). And this "no good" condition of his flesh he repeatedly calls "Sin." With Adam's sin and sentence, Sin infected the whole race, diseased the whole race, defiled the whole race, brought the whole race under "condemnation" to Death. This condemnation was on the whole race.
 After Adam sinned, God inaugurated a plan to cleanse the race from Sin, and redeem it from Death. This plan was that, of the race itself, there had to be one man to voluntarily give himself to remove from the race that condemnation of Death, and its cause, Sin. He must be ONE OF THE RACE - subject to all the evils and disabilities and defilements brought on the race by Adam's disobedience, and with them equally in need of deliverance from those evils, disabilities and defilements. These were the typical "filthy garments" of the typical High Priest Joshua (Zech. 3:4), who was typically cleansed and re-arrayed in the purity of glorious Sin-freed immortal nature.
 This Representative Man must overcome and destroy Sin, and abolish Death. He must thus achieve salvation from these two evils for himself, in full harmony with God's law and justice and holiness.

He must do it by a life of perfect obedience voluntarily completed and terminated by a blood-shedding death that publicly condemned Sin (in ALL its aspects), justified God's law, exalted God's holiness, and manifested God's justice. The obedient life was to defeat and conquer and subdue Sin in himself. The obedient death that completed that obedient life was to condemn and destroy Sin in himself.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 307

22. This perishing body is "sin"; and left to perish because of "sin." "Sin," in its application to the body, stands for all its constituents and laws. The power of death is in its very constitution, so that the law of its nature is styled the "law of Sin and Death." In the combination of the elements of the law, the power of death resides, so that "to destroy that having the power of death" is to abolish this physical law of sin and death, and instead thereof, to substitute the physical "law of the spirit of life," by which the same body would be changed in its constitution, and live for ever. Eureka I:248
23. 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 consequence of it. Elpis Israel p.128
24. The devil is the scriptural personification of Sin in the flesh. Declaration, prop. 28
25. His great work was not a mere shadow, not a mere form, not a mere symbol illustrating what should be done to someone else. It was an actual, essential accomplishment: the self-cleansing from, and destruction of, Sin. He didn't just typify this - he DID it. He didn't "pay the penalty" for anyone. He did the actual job of destroying Sin that God's holiness required to be done for the race to be saved. He did it in and for himself. There was no other way or place he could do it.
As to motive, he did it - not for himself - but in love and obedience to his Father, and for the sake of the glorious "Seed" whose eternal redemption and joy was and will ever be, his eternal "satisfaction" (Isa. 53:10-11).
"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 309-310
26. "Him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil (or sin in the flesh)." Instructor 55
27. Sin is a term of double import in the Scriptures. It has a physical as well as a mortal application.
Bro. Boulton, "Hebrews," pg. 181

The apostle Paul is very precise in his references to sin as a physical principle inherent in human flesh: "body of sin," "Sin wrought in me," "Sin revived," "Sin beguiled me," "Sin working death in me," "sin that dwelleth in me," "Law of sin in my members." Sin as spoken of in these verses must necessarily be considered as something different from actual transgression. It is "sin" within that leads to sin in action.

Bro. Boulton, "Hebrews," pg. 182

28.

(METONYMY)

"METONYMY" is not an alternate to reality. It does not mean mere shadow and type. It is simply the extension of one term to include a related aspect of the same entity. To say something is called something "by metonymy" doesn't brush it away as a fact. The dictionary definition of "metonymy" is -

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Berean, 1978, p. 424

F. THE LAW OF MOSES, AND SACRIFICES

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

"Did Christ Have to Offer for Himself?"

Berean, December 1978, p. 420

2. GOD REQUIRED AN ACTUAL DESTROYING OF SIN

God required - not a symbol, not a shadow - but a REALITY: a real overcoming and conquering of Sin, a real condemning and destroying of Sin. And that is what Jesus accomplished for himself. His obedient death was as real and necessary a part of his earning his salvation as was his obedient life. And what he did in his death was no more a mere shadow or ritual than what he did in his life.

The blood-shedding, specifically cut-off death (rather than a "natural" death) was required by God for Sin's public condemnation, and God's public justification and glorification: a public repudiation of Sin, a public confession that God's sentence on Sin - the whole Sin-constitution through Adam - was just.

The putting to death of Christ was to manifest God's justice. How did it do so if Christ never sinned? How can it possibly manifest God's justice to put a perfectly righteous man to death? Why - if Sin must be publicly condemned and God publicly justified for His condemnation of Sin to death - why, of all people pick the only one man who never sinned to do it to? THEREIN IS THE CLUE, Christ had no sins. Therefore his death made the issue crystal clear that it was the Body of Sin, Sin's Flesh, the "Law of Sin in the members," that was being condemned and put to death. And it had to be done in this way before any one of the race - Christ included - could be cleansed from the Sin Constitution, the Law of Sin and Death in the members. This was God's requirement for cleansing the race from Sin, in harmony with His holiness.

All orthodoxy, and some others, say his "sacrifice" was simply a type, a shadow, a symbol. They say God is simply saying to man -

"This is what by justice should happen to you. It shouldn't happen to this man; he has no connection with it, but I am just doing it to him to illustrate what should be done to you."

It is hard to see either logic or justice in this. They say this is how sin was "condemned" - and God's justice was "manifested": by just arbitrarily putting to death the one person who had never sinned, just as a sample of what should

happen to sinners. This would be a strange way of portraying God's justice: to pick as the example of what should be done to sin the one man who had nothing to do with sin.

If we do not see Christ's relation to Sin's Flesh, and God's plan for cleansing the whole race from Sin's Flesh - the "motions of Sin in the members" - we shall never make any real sense out of Christ's blood-shedding death, or see HOW it destroys Sin and manifests God's justice.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 307-308

we have to put to death these motions NOW! That is substitution

3. 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 unfits us for approach to the Deity apart from the recognition and acknowledgment of which the burnt offering was the form required and supplied. Law of Moses, p. 237

4. SACRIFICE

The actual accomplishment which God required of some one member of the race, and which Christ voluntarily undertook to do for the race, is the root and meaning of the ritual and shadow that we call "sacrifice." As an English word, "sacrifice" has various meanings that may or may not be relevant. Its literal, root meaning is simply "holy work" (Latin: sacra, holy, sacred; and facio, to make or do).

Its current, common meaning is "the giving up or foregoing of something for the sake of something better." Certainly this principle is involved in scriptural sacrifice. It is the basic principle of choosing the truly beneficial good, and eschewing the pleasant (or seemingly pleasant) evil. But this is certainly not the whole picture of scriptural "sacrifice," or even the heart and core of the picture.

In the Scriptures (and here is where we must really get our definitions), there are 2 conceptions in the terms used to describe what comes under the heading of what we commonly call "sacrifice." they are: 1) to slay, and 2) to offer.

A glance at Young's, pgs. 829-30, will reveal that, in the overwhelming number of cases, the words in the original (both OT and NT) translated "sacrifice" mean "a slaughter": zeback in the Hebrew, and thurion in the Greek. Let us bear this in mind: it is fundamental. Scriptural "sacrifice" is a putting to death.

And a study of pgs. 710-11 of Young's will illustrate the other aspect: offering up to God, causing to ascend, bringing near to God (all under "offer," etc.).

We could say that Christ's life was an offering, and his death was a sacrifice. And that would be true. But actually they are a one-and-indivisible sacrificial offering. His whole life was a putting to death: his death was the supreme offering.

* * *

Ritual "sacrifice" from the beginning was an obedient act of manifestation of faith in God's promised provision of the "Seed of the Woman" to "take away the Sin of the world." It was faith in Christ and his work.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 306

5. 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. 6:6). It was destroyed in Christ's crucifixion - the "one great offering;" we ceremonially share it in our baptism: "crucified with Christ," "baptized unto his death."

The Law of Moses, p. 238

6. Bre. T & R strongly emphasized that Christ was the fulfillment of all the shadows of the Law of Moses: that everything in the Tabernacle service (each symbolizing Christ) had to be cleansed by sacrificial blood. Here are some statements by them (and many others could be produced: their writings abound with them)-

"The flesh (of Christ) had been purified by the sprinkling of its own blood" Catechesis 12

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

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

Eureka II:224

"Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p. 387

7. DID CHRIST NEED A "SACRIFICE"?

But did Christ "need a sacrifice"? Perhaps we can see it more clearly this way. Christ, as one of the race, and as the embodiment of the race, needed what the whole race needed - the reality that is simply shadowed by the ritual of "sacrifice." He did not need a "sacrifice" as such, in the shadowy, typical sense of the term: and nor do we. We need, as he with us needed, the flesh-cleansing, sin-condemning, grave-opening perfect-life-and-shed-blood-death REALITY that God's holiness and wisdom demanded from some one man for the salvation of any of the race.

Starting within the condemned, defiled, Sin-and-Death-cursed race, he, with God's strengthening - earned his way out of it. That work was his "sacrifice."

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 310

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

"The Diabolos in Christ," Berean, 1978, p. 154

9. There must therefore be a sense in which Christ (the antitypical Aaron, altar, mercyseat, the antitypical everything) must not only have been sanctified by the action of the antitypical oil of the Holy Spirit, but purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice...

If the typical holy things contracted defilement from connection with a sinful congregation, were not the antitypical (Christ) holy things in a similar state, through derivation on his mother's side from a sinful race? If not, how came they to NEED PURGING with his own "better sacrifice"?...

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

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

(End quotes from bro. C's "Hebrews")
bro. Roberts (Law of Moses, p. 92)

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

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

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

A sacrifice must be offered at his birth. Why? What did it mean? They were very poor. It was just 2 common little birds. But what tremendous import! He was one of

us, and we are one with him. What was the fulfilled REALITY of that typical, shadowy, forward-pointing offering that Mary made because HE was born of Adam's race? He fulfilled on Calvary the offering made at his birth.

"Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p. 391

11. Sacrifice has to do with Sin. Its background and framework is in relation to Sin. It arose from the problem created by Sin. It takes into consideration the punishment of Sin. It recognizes that Sin must inevitably bring Death. But it is not a punishment for Sin, or even a symbol of punishment for Sin. It is the very OPPOSITE of that: it is a conquering of Sin, a victory over Sin, a deliverance from Sin.

Sacrifice is not a symbol of "punishment" or "paying a penalty," although it does involve the conception and confession that "The wages of Sin is Death." And it does involve the recognition that Sin as a totality - concentered in the Sin-Nature - must be publicly condemned and put to death IN the body of one who is totally free from personal transgression.

We tend to make a mistake when we say that Christ "offered a sacrifice." We are coming at it from the wrong direction. We should say that Christ DID A WORK that became the basis of and gave meaning to the shadow and type that is popularly called sacrifice.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 307

G. BAPTISM

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

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

Berean, April, 1979, p. 134

*link with
sin nature
Baptism
offering*

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

Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 414

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

FROM RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY DEBATE

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

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

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

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?", Berean, 1978, p. 417

3. Now, are we cleansed from the "Body of Sin" by Christ's sacrifice? Yes! But not in the artificial, legalistic, ritualistic way of bro. Andrew's technical "justification from eternal death so as to come out of the grave" theory. We are cleansed (eventually, as the final result) from the Body of Sin by the blood of Christ, if we have been faithful to the end. And we cannot possibly be cleansed from the Body of Sin without the shed blood of Christ. This was bro. R's point (see Debate, Q. 468, etc.)

We are not justified from Sin's Flesh at baptism (as bro. A claimed, and built his theory on), except in the prospective sense that bro. R explained. At baptism we are: 1) washed and cleansed from our own transgressions (literally, they are forgiven, blotted out of record against us); and 2) we are lifted out of the path of certain death in which Adam put us, and are set on the path that will lead us at last (if we are faithful) to total cleansing and deliverance from Sin's Flesh, from the Constitution of Sin, from

the Sin Nature and its Sin impulses to which, as natural creatures, we are in hopeless, death-ending bondage.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 310,311

4. It will be noted from the above that on the relationship of baptism to Adamic Condemnation and the Law of Sin and Death, bro. R fully agreed with bro. A that -

FROM RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY DEBATE

Racial condemnation is cancelled (potentially: bro. R) at baptism (Preface). In the sense of "legal mortality" (as bro. R defines), we pass from death to life at baptism (Preface).

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

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

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

We pass out of Adam into Christ at baptism. (Another expression bro. R subsequently refrained from using, because of bro. A's misuse of it) (692).

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

"Is it Andrewism or Truth," Berean, 1978, p. 419

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

"Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p. 391

6. Ritual can never save anyone. It is true that ritual may be required by God (as baptism in this dispensation, and circumcision and sacrifice in the Mosaic), as an act of humility and obedience to connect us with the reality and to bring us its benefits. And when God requires a ritual, then salvation is impossible without that ritual. But a ritual must have a fulfilling reality; a shadow must have a fulfilling substance. Christ's actual Sin-destroying accomplishment - his overcoming, his self-perfecting - is the reality and substance of which baptism and breaking of bread, sacrifice and circumcision, are the representative rituals.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 310

DEFINITION OF "OLD MAN" (Supplement to G-7)

"For if we have been united with him by the likeness of his death, we shall be also by the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that OUR OLD MAN HAS BEEN CRUCIFIED WITH HIM, that the body of sin might be destroyed.' (Rom. 6:5-6.) THE 'OLD MAN' THAT WAS CRUCIFIED WITH CHRIST IS NONE OTHER THAN SIN'S FLESH; WHICH IS SYNONYMOUS WITH THE 'BODY OF SIN.' THE ONE IS SAID TO HAVE BEEN 'CRUCIFIED,' THE OTHER 'DESTROYED,' DIFFERENT WAYS OF DESCRIBING THE SAME THING, NAMELY, THE CONDEMNATION AND DESTRUCTION OF SIN IN THE FLESH. IF JESUS HAD NOT BEEN MADE OF 'OUR OLD MAN' NATURE, OR HAD NOT POSSESSED THE 'BODY OF SIN,' it would have been impossible for the one to have been 'destroyed' or the other 'crucified,' and without this there would have been no hope of resurrection through him. Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead" (I. Cor. 15:21.)

--"Sin & Sacrifice" p. 35

"It is true that 'he was wounded for (on account of) our transgressions,' but OUR TRANSGRESSIONS WERE NOT NAILED TO THE TREE. IT WAS THE 'OLD MAN' OF SIN'S FLESH THAT WAS NAILED TO THE TREE. JESUS WAS WHOLLY FREE FROM 'THE DEEDS' OF THE 'OLD MAN,' nevertheless he was burdened with him throughout his mortal days. Therefore it is written:- 'our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed.' (Rom. 6:6.) The 'body of sin' was destroyed through the crucifixion of the man Jesus, which could not have been done had he not had a sin body. IT IS STYLED 'OUR OLD MAN' BECAUSE HIS NATURE AND THAT OF HIS BRETHREN WERE THE SAME.

--"Sin & Sacrifice" p 67

"We have ascertained, satisfactorily, because scripturally, as it appears to me, that the thing, styled in the GREEK NEW TESTAMENT DIABOLOS, and rendered DEVIL in the English version, is SIN IN THE FLESH, He that 'walks according to the flesh', 'serves sin', DIABOLOS or the devil. The mortal body is 'THE BODY OF SIN,' or Sin Incarnate, which with its affections, lusts, and transgressions, is styled 'THE OLD MAN; than whom no imaginary devil can be more wicked, and defiant of God and His law. The Old Man in his individual, social, and political manifestations is the DIABOLOS or devil of the New Testament MYSTERY, (I Tim. 3:16 - The New Testament is the exhibition of THE GREAT MYSTERY OF GODLINESS), and treated accordingly."

--"Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come", p. 200

"...whatever may be the difficulty of modern professing Christians in discovering any significance or EFFICACY IN THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM, the apostles saw much of both. They recognised in it a CONSTITUTIONAL TRANSITION from one relationship to another, - a REPRESENTATIVE PUTTING OFF OF THE OLD MAN, or ADAM NATURE, and A PUTTING ON OF THE NEW MAN, OR CHRIST, WHO IS THE ONE COVERING NAME, IN WHICH, WHEN THE NAKED SON OF ADAM IS INVESTED, HE STANDS CLOTHED BEFORE JEHOVAH, AND IS APPROVED IN HIS SIGHT. Of course this effect is IMPUTATIVE; that is to say, it is not brought about by the mere act of submersion

in water, which in itself has no religious virtue whatever, but is THE RESULT RECOGNISED BY GOD when the act is performed in connection with an intelligent apprehension and affectionate belief of the truth."

--"Christendom Astray", p. 409-410

"THE OLD MAN" IS A FIGURATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE MORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ORIGINAL HUMAN NATURE LEFT TO ITSELF, as it is in all of us at first. It is old by contrast with the new man sampled in Christ, and brought to bear upon us in the preaching of him. When the preaching is understood and received, and Christ implanted in the heart in the enlightenment and love of faith, the new man is formed within us, and God is pleased with our 'conformity with the image of His son' which is both the result and method of 'putting on the new man.' The new man so developed within us is 'made perfect through suffering' as Christ was, but THE OLD MAN IS NOT ACTUALLY DESTROYED TILL HE IS 'SWALLOWED UP' IN THE TRANSFORMING OPERATION OF THE SPIRIT AT THE JUDGEMENT SEAT. The new man is only a moral creation at baptism; a legal creation at the judgement seat; and an actual physical creation when 'this corruptible' is changed to the incorruptible. At our baptism we symbolically identify ourselves not only with death but with all that has been actually accomplished in Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection. But the results are not real except as to God's favour; therefore as you say, it is as unreasonable to speak of our being actually justified from 'sin in the flesh' as it would be to claim that we are actually clothed with the new body to which Christ attained as the resurrection.

--"Christadelphian" 1895, p. 24

CONSUMPTION OF SIN NATURE

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

SITF 800
G 8
We cannot do much about mortal nature, but we can do something about SITF as defined in G.8.

It was a beautiful requirement of the wisdom of God in the beginning of things that He should require an act of worship that typified the repudiation of sinful nature as the basis of divine fellowship and acceptability.

Those who deny Christ's participation thereof DENY ITS REMOVAL BY SACRIFICE, and thereby deny the fundamental testimony of the Gospel that he is "the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world." Law of Moses, p. 237

"Burnt Offering," Berean, 1979, p. 106

8. Christ's death was a representative condemnation of sin in the flesh. "Sin in the flesh" is that peculiarity in its physical constitution that inclines it to selfgratification, regardless of the law of God. At our baptism, we symbolically identify ourselves not only with death but with all that has been actually accomplished in Christ in his death, burial and resurrection. But the results are not real, except as to God's favor, therefore it is as unreasonable to speak of our being actually justified from "sin in the flesh" as it would be to claim we are actually clothed with the new body to which Christ attained at the resurrection."

We can do something about this by denying it symbolically. XJ denied SITF thruout his life, but it was only after his resurrection that it was actually removed. The same must apply to us.

Christadelphian, 1895, p. 24

"Christ and Sin," Berean, 1979, p. 101

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

"Is it Andrewism or Truth," Berean, 1978, p. 418

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

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

"Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1979, p. 390

11. Bro. R taught that we are freed "potentially" at baptism from the Law of Sin and Death, and by this he

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

Bro. R taught that as a FINAL result of baptism, and dependent upon baptism, we are justified from Adamic Condemnation (that is our nature is cleansed) at the resurrection by change of body.

Bro. R taught that "justification from Adamic Condemnation" is, in its fullness, a physical change (though he recognized it had a present bearing as to relationship to life or death - "cancelled potentially at baptism").

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

"Is it Andrewism or Truth," Berean, 1978, p. 415

H. "POTENTIAL" AND "EVENTUAL"

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

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?", Berean, Dec. 1978

2. Bro. R did agree that Adamic condemnation is COMMENCED to be taken away at baptism. That is, that baptism is related to the (eventual) removal of Adamic condemnation.

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?", Berean, 1978, p. 417

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

We would urge a careful reading of the preface to the debate, where bro. R explains why he gave certain answers to some of bro. A's questions - because he and the audience knew the false meanings bro. A attached to some of the words

in the questions, and the wrong inferences bro. A drew from certain truths.

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?", Berean, 1978, p. 415

4. It will be noted that on the relationship of baptism to Adamic Condemnation and the Law of Sin and Death, bro. R fully agreed with bro. A that -

Racial condemnation is cancelled (potentially: bro. R) at baptism.

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

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

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 419

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

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 414-415

6. Bro. R did not deny that baptism had a relation to the Law of Sin and Death. But he did deny that it had the relation that bro. A asserted. Bro. R recognized that baptism "potentially and eventually" frees from the Law of Sin and Death, and that there can be no freedom from that law without baptism (in the present dispensation). Summing up the debate, he says afterwards, in the preface -

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

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
Berean, December 1978, p. 414

7. Bro. Roberts insisted that justification (cleansing) from the diabolos sin-nature is not a legal fiction that

occurs at baptism to all, but an actual change of nature that occurs at last-day acceptance only to the righteous. But he did recognize that this could only come through baptism, and that baptism is effective only through the Sacrifice of Christ. In this way we achieve physical cleansing by baptism.

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

"Andrewism and Stricklerism," Berean, 1979, p. 134

8. Bro. R did not deny that baptism had a relation to the Law of Sin and Death. But he did deny that it had the relation that bro. A asserted. Bro. R recognized that baptism "potentially and eventually" frees from the Law of Sin and Death, and that there can be no freedom from that law without baptism (in the present dispensation).

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 414

I. JUSTIFICATION

1. FROM THE RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY DEBATE
431. Does not that justification (of the faithful by the blood of Christ, 430) include justification from the Adamic condemnation they inherited? R: I have no issue with you as to the righteous.
437. Does not a baby require justification? R: You cannot justify a baby.
2. ...the faithful are eventually justified from Adamic Condemnation by the blood of Christ, when they are made immortal.
"Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 417
3. Abraham was the subject of a two-fold justification as it were; first, of a justification by faith; and secondly, of a justification by works,...I have termed it a twofold justification by way of illustration; but it is in fact, only one...It is a justification which begins with the remission of sins that are past, and is perfected in obedience unto death..."
Elpis Israel pp. 260-261

4. It is true, that all men do die; but it is not true that they are all the subjects of justification. Those who are justified are "the many," who are sentenced to live for ever. Of the rest we shall speak hereafter.

The sentence to justification of life is through Jesus Christ. In being made a sacrifice for sin by the pouring out of his blood upon the cross, he was set forth as a blood-sprinkled mercy seat to all believers of the gospel of the kingdom, who have faith in this remission of sins through the shedding of his blood. "He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification," that is, for the pardon of those who believe in the gospel; as it is written, "He that believeth the gospel and is baptized shall be saved." Hence, "the obedience of faith" is made the condition of righteousness; and this obedience implies the existence of a "law of faith," as attested by that of Moses, which is "the law of works." The law of faith says to him who believes the gospel of the kingdom, "Be renewed, and be ye every one of you baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins." Elpis Israel, p. 133

5. The new man is only a moral creation at baptism; a legal creation at the judgment seat; and an actual physical creation when "this corruptible" is changed to the incorruptible. At our baptism we symbolically identify ourselves not only with death but with all that has been actually accomplished in Christ in His death, burial, and resurrection. But the results are not real except as to God's favor; therefore as you say, it is as unreasonable to speak of our being actually justified from "sin in the flesh" as it would be to claim that we are actually clothed with the new body to which Christ attained as the resurrection. It is all very much a matter of verbiage. Unskilful and artificial forms of speech are responsible for much of the fog that has been raised over a very simple and most comforting matter. Christadelphian, Jan. 1895, p. 24

? what was accomplished at God's right in the condemnation of S I T I S & the removal of sin nature

6. Bro. R taught that as a FINAL result of baptism, and dependent upon baptism, we are justified from Adamic Condemnation (that is, our nature is cleansed) at the resurrection by change of body.

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 415

Bro. R taught that "justification from Adamic Condemnation" is, in its fullness, a physical change (though he recognized it had a present bearing as to relationship to life or death - "cancelled potentially at baptism.")

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 415

J. "BARRIER" AND "BREACH"

1. The forgiveness of personal offenses is the prominent feature of the apostolic proclamation, because personal offenses are the greater barrier. Nevertheless, men are mortal because of sin, quite independently of their own transgressions. Their redemption from THIS position is a work of mercy and forgiveness, yet a work to be effected in harmony with the righteousness of God, that He might be just while justifying those believing in the Redeemer. It is so declared (Rom. 3:26).

It was not to be done by setting aside the Law of Sin and Death, but by righteously nullifying it in one who should obtain THIS redemption in his own right, and who should be authorized to offer to other men a partnership in his right, subject to required conditions.

"The Sacrificial Blood," Berean, 1979, p. 105

2. Christ was always one with God. There was never any barrier separating them morally, though he was of Sin-defiled flesh. But still the defiled nature is (was) a barrier in one sense, both for him and us. He could not be one with God in perfect and eternal totality and substance, as he now is, until that barrier was removed, not a moral barrier, but a physical one: not a "guilt," but a misfortune, a disability, an inherited disease of the flesh that must be cleansed in God's required way.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 311

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

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

"Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p. 392

4. DOES HIS SACRIFICE CLEANSE US FROM SINS' FLESH?

What is the "barrier" between us and God that is removed at baptism? - our nature (legalistically), or our transgressions? Certainly our transgressions. At baptism all our past personal sins are "washed away," forgiven: we stand morally perfect before God. We can approach God as justified and cleansed men, washed in Christ's shed blood.

Our nature is unchanged, though our Adamic destiny is reversed.

We are confronted by those who differ with us with many quotations from bre. T and R that Christ died for our personal sins: our actual transgressions. This has never been questioned. It is beside the real point. This emphasis on certain agreed truths diverts attention from the real issue on which there is a difference.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 311

5. Hence religion is the act of binding again, or that which heals a breach previously existing between two parties. Elpis Israel, p. 156
6. Hence, in the breach between God and man, it is God's prerogative alone to prescribe; and all that men have liberty to do is to accept, or reject, the conditions of amity and peace. Elpis Israel p. 157

K. OUT OF ADAM INTO CHRIST; IN ADAM IN CHRIST

FROM RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY DEBATE

1. 692. Then there's a passing out of Adam in Christ at baptism? R: CERTAINLY.
693. When a man passes into Christ, what had he in Adam that he loses when he passes into Christ? R: His relation to the whole death dispensation which Adam introduced. There is a preliminary deliverance at baptism, but it is not actual till the resurrection.
"Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 418
2. Those currently teaching the Strickler theory make the same mistake as bro. Andrew. They separate Christ from his brethren. They say -
"We need a blood-shed sacrifice for our salvation: Christ only needed a simple death."
They are hung up on "sacrificial" ritual. They completely miss what he actually did. Any theory that has 2 different salvations - one for Christ and one for his brethren - must be wrong. We all - the whole race - need the same thing. And what we need is not just a ritual that points, but an accomplishment - a real, actual victory over the Sin Nature that we can (in God's mercy) enter into and share.
God deals with the race as a race, but on an individual basis. That sounds like a contradiction, but it is not. God is saving the race, as the race, IN and through Christ. But not the whole race: just those members of the race who individually take advantage of God's provision of salvation for the race.

"IN Adam all die;" that is the natural - our natural destiny in Adam. "IN Christ shall all be made alive:" that is the spiritual - our spiritual destiny in Christ, if we enter into Christ, and stay in Christ:

"Abide IN me...if a man abide not in me, he is cast forth...and burned" (Jn. 15:4-6).

Naturally, in Adam, we die with Adam. Spiritually, in Christ, we live with Christ. One man took himself down, and us with him. The second man took himself up, and us with him, IF we enter him, and stay in him.

Christ redeemed and saved himself, and - at first, only himself. Then, having "obtained eternal redemption," the salvation he won for himself was, in God's mercy and as planned from the beginning, extended to all who make themselves part of him.

"Redeeming the Race,"

Berean, Sept., 1979, p. 313

3. We pass out of Adam into Christ at baptism. (Another expression bro. Roberts SUBSEQUENTLY REFRAINED FROM USING, BECAUSE OF BRO. ANDREW'S MISUSE OF IT.)

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
Berean, Dec. 1978, p. 419

L. ADAMIC CONDEMNATION

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

* * * *

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

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

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

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

* * * *

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

"Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p. 391

2. The recently-suggested idea of "violent death" being the threatened penalty of Adam's disobedience is disproved by the terms of the sentence actually passed, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," and by the fact that Adam went to dust, but did not die a violent death. The fact that sacrifice involves violent death proves nothing to the point, because the object of sacrifice was to ritually exhibit death as the wages of sin, and to enable the offerer to make this confession in approaching God. This object could not be accomplished except by killing the animal. The recent confinement of the phrase "Adamic condemnation" to death overt is too restricted, since that condemnation included a life of toil and the curse on the ground.

The theory is out of harmony with the fact that Christ did not suffer "violent death" on the very day he came under the hereditary sentence that lies on all death. Nor is it scriptural (seeing he did not "turn to dust," as the sentence on Adam decreed) to speak of his death as a suffering of Adamic condemnation. It was a representative condemnation of sin in the flesh, and a declaration of the righteousness of God, that mercy might be offered without compromise of supremacy. "Adam's condemnation," as proved by Rom. 5:12, is simply death in whatever form it comes. A man dies under it, whether by hanging, drowning, mutilation, gun-shot, or natural dissolution.

Christadelphian, Jan. 1895

M. CHILDREN OF WRATH

FROM RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY DEBATE

1. 422. Are not they (babies) "children of wrath," and do they not die under the condemnation under which they were born? R: They are children who would grow up to be men who would provoke God's wrath by disobedience if they lived, but as babies the wrath is not begun.
 "Is it Andrewism or Truth?",
 Berean, Dec., 1978, p. 417

2. Bro. Roberts always tried to pull the picture back into practical reality from bro. A's technical legalisms, and to emphasize that our diabolos, like our mortality to which it is inseparably related, is strictly of itself a physical condition. It is an uncleanness, not a guilt. It does not require forgiveness, but cleansing. It motivates God's pity, not His wrath.
 "Andrewism and Stricklerism,"
 Berean, 1979, p. 134

N. ATONEMENT

1. The sacrificial blood was applied to everything - Aaron and his sons included (see Lv. 8:14-24). An atonement had to be made by the shedding and sprinkling of blood for and upon them all (Lv. 16:33). As Paul remarks -
 "Almost all things by the Law are purged with blood"
 (Heb. 9:22).
 Now all these things were declared to be "patterns of the things in the heavens," which it is admitted on all hands converge on, and have their substance in, Christ. There must, therefore, be a sense in which Christ, the antitypical Aaron, the antitypical Altar, the antitypical Mercyseat - the antitypical everything - must not only have been sanctified by the action of the antitypical oil of the Holy Spirit, but purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice...
 The holy things, we know, in brief, are Christ. He must, therefore, have been the subject of a personal cleansing in the process by which he opened the way of sanctification for his people. If the typical holy things contracted defilement from connection with a sinful congregation, were not the antitypical (Christ) holy things in a similar state, through derivation on his mother's side from a sinful race? If not, how came they to need purging with his own better sacrifice?

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

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

"By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12).
Law of Moses, Ch. 18, pgs. 170-177

THE SACRIFICIAL BLOOD

2. We see Christ in the bullock, the furniture, the Veil, the High Priest...all the Mosaic patterns...All were both atoning and atoned for. Law of Moses, Ch.19, p.181

Let me call your attention to the priesthood Christ received, "He ought, as for the people, so for himself, to offer for sins" (Heb.5:2-3). If Christ's offering did not comprehend himself, how are we to understand Heb. 7:27? As Christ was the antitype of the high priest who "offered for himself" (Heb. 9:7), is it not required that his sacrifice should comprehend himself? If you deny this, how do you explain Eze. 45:22, "The Prince shall prepare for himself ...a sin offering?" Do you deny the future age sacrifices are memorial? Christadelphian 1973, p.466

The Christ of your theory needed no "purging." Does it not follow he is not the Christ of Paul, who required purging from the law of sin and death by his own sacrifice?...It was a necessity that he should offer up himself, for the purging of his own nature.

Christadelphian, '73, p. 468

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

Christadelphian, 1895, p. 262

"Purifying of the Heavenly,"

Berean, 1978, p. 887

3. The total life-and-death work of Sin-destroying that was laid upon him as THE Representative Man of the race, was essential for his own cleansing and salvation, as part of the race. In fact, it WAS his cleansing - that was its whole essence and actuality. He, as THE Representative Man, the embodiment and new nucleus of the race, must first himself be transformed from a defiled, condemned condition to a totally purified and perfected condition.

And his culminating blood-shedding death on the cross was an inseparable Divinely-required part of that work of racial salvation. He was not just ritually "cleansed" by "sacrifice." It was not just an arbitrary form that God required him to go through as an act of obedience, or to symbolize something. It was an actual personal process of conquering and self-cleansing: a being "made perfect by suffering."

Could he have attained to immortality without that blood-shedding death? NO. Because he must share the common racial salvation, or it was no benefit for us. God had several threads of purpose in that death and its form. In God's wisdom that particular death was essential to lay a sound basis for the salvation of the race. And Christ was, and IS, the Race. He is all mankind. None can live eternally except within him and as part of him.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 310

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

"Is it Andrewism or Truth"
Berean, Dec., 1978, p. 419

5. (THE TERM "ATONEMENT" CAN BE MISLEADING)

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

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

"For Himself," Berean, 1979, p. 65

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

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

It is the blood of Christ, the perfect sacrifice, that first "covers," then "cleanses" us - not ritually, but

practically and gloriously. He did not die to "atone" for our sins in the orthodox sense. He lived and died to become and provide a cleansing medium by which our sins are first mercifully "covered," and then progressively - and at last completely and perfectly - cleansed from us: "washed away."
 "Atonement," Berean, Sept. 1977, p. 311

O. ALIENATION

1. Some suppose that because Christ's offering was for himself, as well as for the people (Heb. 7:27) that his inherited mortality "alienated" him from God. This would mean that Jesus was alienated by a physical condition for which he was in no way responsible.
 "Alienation & Reconciliation"
 Berean, April, 1959, p. 122
2. Christ had it in common with all the race, but it did not "alienate" him from God, or make him a "child of wrath" for the 30 years prior to his baptism. That is, in any reasonable, scriptural meaning of "alienate" and "wrath" - of course, it is possible, by "black = white" definitions, to make anything say anything. Bro. Roberts strenuously fought the application of these terms to Christ as the foundation of bro. A's theories of Resurrectional Responsibility. What does "alienate" us from God and make us "children of wrath" is service to the diabolos sin-motions that pervade our flesh. And this everyone is guilty of, and worthy of a cutting-off death - a putting to death - for, except Christ.
 "Andrewism and Stricklerism"
 Berean, 1979, p. 134
3. The Berean fellowship does not believe that Christ was alienated from God or was a "child of wrath," or was "liable" to a "violent death." If he had been "liable" to it, he could not have offered himself voluntarily to fulfil God's requirement of the perfect sacrifice ("holy work"). To be the "holy work" that God required as a foundation of righteousness within which others can approach also, it had to be a willing submission to God's appointment, right through to the very end.
 "Purifying of the Heavenly," Berean, 1978, p. 390,391
4. ALIENATION is defined as "estrangement" or "transfer of affections." The cause of alienation is given in Col. 1:21: "Alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works." Note the hostility or enmity that makes them enemies of God.

Those accepting the theory of "inherited alienation" should realize that it could not be attributed to evil-mindedness before the mind had been developed in us. Alienation involves enmity, which is a state of animosity or hostility toward God. This is seen from the following -

"The carnal mind is enmity against God" (Rom. 8:7).

"Alienation and Reconciliation,"
Berean, 1959, p. 111

P. "LEGAL MORTALITY"

1. SUMMING UP THE DEBATE,
HE SAYS AFTERWARDS, IN THE PREFACE -
What is cancelled at baptism (and it is only cancelled potentially - for there is an "if" all the way through) is the condemnation resting upon us as individual sinners, AND the racial condemnation which we physically inherit. I have never diverged from this view... "Legal mortality" would be that which is constituted, ordered, or determined by law. In this sense, we pass (potentially) from death to life at baptism - which is a very important sense certainly, for without it there could be no hope of the physical deliverance that waits at the coming of Christ."
"Is it Andrewism or Truth"
Berean, Dec., 1978, p. 414
2. In the sense of "legal mortality" (as bro. R defines), we pass from death to life at baptism (Preface).
"Is it Andrewism or Truth"
Berean, Dec., 1978, p. 419

Q. THE ERROR OF ANDREWISM

1. Andrewism had to do with Resurrectional Responsibility. The debate between bre. A and R was the "Resurrectional Responsibility Debate." The book bro. R wrote to defend the Truth against Andrewism was "The Resurrection to Condemnation." The matters of the relation of the Law of Sin and Death to baptism, and of Christ's offering for himself are side issues, because of a theory bro. A developed to support his theory that the unbaptized will not be raised to judgment.
The theory went like this: The sentence on Adam ("Adamic Condemnation") was eternal, uninterruptible death. Once the grave doors snapped shut, no one - not even God - could open them to bring out anyone who had died under Adamic Condemnation. Bro. A did not deny God's intrinsic power to do anything He chose. But he argued that, within

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

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

Berean, Dec., 1978

But bro. A taught that, by baptism, we are "justified" from Adamic condemnation immediately, making resurrection possible.

Bro. Andrew agreed Christ shed his blood for himself, and could not otherwise attain to life. But bro. A contended it was to "atone" (in the orthodox sense) for the "imputed guilt" of Adam.

As to the matter of Christ needing, and being cleansed and saved by, his own sacrifice, bre. A and R were agreed. But bro. A, to support his theories, repeatedly pressed bro. R to say that Christ needed a cleansing sacrifice apart from the race.

Berean, Dec., 1978

Bro. A tried to get bro. R to say that Christ, by his bloodshed, and we at our baptism, are "cleansed" or "justified" from the imputed guilt of Adam. Bro. A's theory compelled him to believe that the condemnation that came on all men (including Christ) was "imputed guilt."

To bro. A, the freedom from the Law of Sin and Death at baptism is a "legal" release from the Adamic sentence of eternal, uninterruptible death, enabling resurrection to occur.

Berean, Dec., 1978, p. 414-419

- 2. We must, on the other hand, avoid the rather subtle Andrew error that -

Our physical diabolos as such "alienates" us from God, and makes us "children of wrath," and in some mysterious, ritual way we are "justified" from it at baptism.

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

"Andrewism and Stricklerism"

Berean, 1979, p. 134

- 3. Andrewism is a mixture of Truth and Error, often in the same sentence. We have no desire to go into its ramifications. As a totality, we repudiate it.

But some, in very rightly denying its errors, are going too far and are denying the heart of the Truth that bre. T and R brought to light.

"Redeeming the Race," Berean, 1979, p. 313

"IMPUTED GUILT"
(Q. CONTINUED)

4. FROM THE RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY DEBATE
403. Did not the inanimate things of the Mosaic Tabernacle require to be cleansed, justified, or atoned for, by bloodshedding? R: Yes, as a shadow, doubtless.
404. Was there any moral guilt attaching to them? R: You do not require me to answer that, of course?
405. Then it was for imputed guilt.
THIS was what bro. A was driving at; and THIS was what bro. R was denying. Here we can see why bro. R was so very cautious and seemingly evasive. Bro. A was trying to get bro. R to say that Christ, by his bloodshed, and we at our baptism, are "cleansed" or "justified" from the "imputed guilt" of Adam. Bro. A's theory compelled him to believe that the "condemnation" that came on all men (including Christ) was "imputed guilt."
"Is it Andrewism or Truth?"
Berean, Dec., 1978, p. 416
5. FROM THE RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY DEBATE
422. JJA: Are not they (babies) "children of wrath," and do they not die under the condemnation under which they were born? R: They are children who would grow up to be men who would provoke God's wrath by disobedience if they lived, but as babies the wrath is not begun.
(Here is where bro. R takes issue with bro. A's mechanical theory of "justifying" babies by the blood of Christ from the "imputed guilt" of Adam. We must observe where he agrees and where he takes issue. He agrees that the faithful are eventually justified from Adamic Condemnation by the blood of Christ, when they are made immortal.)
"Is it Andrewism or Truth?"
Berean, Dec., 1978, p. 417
6. FROM THE RESURRECTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY DEBATE
114. I said "acquittal from actual or imputed guilt."
(Here is bro. A's theory of "imputed guilt" showing through. This is why bro. R had to be careful in answering).
"Is it Andrewism or Truth?"
Berean, Dec., 1978, p. 415
7. Bro. A agreed with bro. R that Christ shed his blood for himself, and could not otherwise attain to life. But bro. A contended it was to "atone" (in the orthodox sense)

for the imputed guilt of Adam. (In contrast, see what the Scriptures and bro. R taught all through Section C of this document and note particularly point #22.)

"Is it Andrewism or Truth?"
Berean, Dec., 1978, p. 415

R. THE ERROR OF STRICKLERISM

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

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

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

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

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

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

Berean, 1979, p. 134

2. ERRORS OF STRICKLERISM AS SUMMARIZED BY BRO. SMALLWOOD
 - 1st. That the Apostle in 2 Cor. 5:21, in teaching that Jesus "was made sin for us" does not mean that he was made a bearer of our sinful nature, but that he was made a transgressor of the Mosaic law, in being brought, by his Father's contrivance, under its curse.

2nd. That the Apostle does not teach in Heb. 7:27 "that Christ offered 'for his own sins,' either in or out of the flesh." That he did not and could not possibly have offered for himself as a priest during the days of his flesh.

3rd. That the accumulated sins of his brethren of all ages were, in some indefinable way, laid upon Jesus, and he bore them in, or on his body "to the tree." Sins were symbolically laid upon him, in the same way as they were laid upon the goats in the sacrifices made under the Mosaic law.

4th. That Jesus did not offer an atoning sacrifice for himself to redeem himself. That "it was not necessary for Christ, morally or physically, that he should offer for his cleansing an offering for atonement."

5th. That Jesus was not made unclean by his nature, but was defiled as an altar, by the transgressions of his brethren that were laid upon him, and which he bore "to the tree;" from which defilement he was cleansed by his own blood.

6th. That the sacrifice of Christ was for purging from moral defilement only, not from "sin in the flesh" as well.

7th. That there never was a divine atoning sacrifice offered under the Mosaic system, where there was not transgression.

8th. That it was "the life, the character" of Jesus that was "sentenced to death."

9th. That Jesus "suffered the penalty due for the sins of his brethren"; "suffered the punishment due to sin."

10th. That the sin "put away" by the "sacrifice of himself" was actual transgression and not sin in his nature, and that the "sin" without which he appears the second time unto salvation (Heb. 9:28) is sin in his brethren, or, a sin-offering.

"Sin and Sacrifice," p. 86,87