

“THE ATONEMENT”

by C.C.Walker

X-RAYED

by A.L.Wilson

The X-Rays

While we grant there is much valuable instruction, definitions and figures of speech in friend Walker’s pamphlet on “The Atonement,” it utterly fails to convince us that he has demonstrated The Divine Principle of Redemption.

Regarding language it is declared that every language under the sun is traceable to one Mother Tongue and the farther back through the ages we go, the language becomes the more metaphorical. There is, however, one figure which has pleased God to reserve to Himself alone, viz. *prolapsis* - *pro* - “before”; *lepsis* - “I take.” God can, therefore, in safety say, “He chose us in Him - *pro katabolees koshou*.” God alone can employ a past tense for a future accomplishment; “Before I formed thee in the womb, I knew thee.” Did anyone know himself then?

This figure confounds for all time the pagan delusion of pre-existence and three co-equal, co-eternal gods. If we take Philippians 2:5-8 as it stands in the Authorised Version, no soul could deny pre-existence; Christ is there represented by King James’ translators as having left heaven, and humbled himself even to be made a Man, but the English rules of proximity and priority demand that the last clause of that Scripture ought to be the first. E.g., “Having been made in the likeness of man, and being in condition as a man...” The Apostle here forces the irrevocable necessity of Jesus first being made, or created, before He could possibly undertake the subordinate “serving” here referred to. His “being made” was the first requisite and, please note particularly, Jesus, not the Actor in His own creation. Active transitive verbs govern nouns in the objective case and demonstrate that Jesus required first to be made. Hence the translation is a crafty Trinitarian trick!

Proximity and Priority

To an English reader, Greek is an inverted and extremely dislocated language, hence the necessity for strict adherence to the above rules. Proximity demands that “no word, phrase, nor clause should come between antecedent and its relative,” to avoid which, authorities advise “priority” when possible.

Example of dislocation: “Handsome cottage for sale, by old lady covered with ivy.” Every translation I have examined of Hebrews 9:15 presents an absurd paradox, viz., “The redemption of transgressions.”

The Greek thought is “so that a death having taken place for the deliverance (*apo lactrosin*) of those (*ton*) under the first covenant transgressions...”

Here the Greek term *ton*, as in many other instances, takes the function of a plural relative pronoun; e.g. “Of those (*ton*) prisoners;” of those (*ton*) being ill-treated; of those (*ton*) leading” (Hebrews 13:3; 7:20). “For those (*tov*) (sins) of the people” (9:7); “By those (*tov*) having heard” (2:3, etc.,etc.).

Metaphor

Metaphor is a change of form. The very term explains itself, when we say, “He was a lion in the fight.” It is more forcible than the simile, which is a mere likeness. We also have, “The lion of the Tribe of Judah.” This very metaphor spells “conquering and to conquer.” Was He not also “The Lamb of God” (1 Peter 1:19). Our “ransom (*anti-lutron*) price”? This is the most comprehensive metaphor on earth, because He willingly laid down his life’s blood, a ransom (*anti-lutron*) in place of man. I challenge the world to refute this Divine Greek truth.

Synonym

There are fewer of these than the majority imagine. Parable and allegory are similar, only the latter is taller than the former.

Metonym

Metonym is a change of name, an ellipsis, or an abridgement of speech; e.g. “The foolishness of God is wiser than men,” or “the kettle boils.” I pronounce painful to behold you pouring out the water and attempting to drink the kettle. Paul stands ever dux on this figure. This fact called forth Peter’s warning, not to misconstrue Paul’s words to our own destruction (2 Peter 3:16). We are, therefore, grateful for your reminder of these “Divine rules,” by which all of us can be guided. Being in possession of these Divine rules, then, let us get to business straightaway.

Redeem and Deliver

Are these terms synonymous? If not, are they antagonistic? If not, does deliverance nullify the fact that in the sacrifice of Christ there was a ransom paid for man? Could the sinner possibly have been delivered apart from a ransom? Spit out and speak plainly. Shall I actually require to define these terms and point out the shades of difference? God alone gives the unmistakable and concise distinction between these terms: “Deliver him from going down into the pit, I have found a ransom” (Job 33:24). Will you say this deliverance could possibly have taken place apart from this ransom? Then in Paul’s words, “Christ died in vain” Galatians 2:21). Pagan hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh has dazzled your eyes from perceiving that the term redeem is pregnant with the thought that the article previously belonged to God. Did Adam belong to God? Did not God desire to buy Adam back? Now we are getting to business. Can a human soul refute this Divine truth?

Ordinary purchase contains no thought of previous possession and redemption, whereas deliverance is positively destitute of the two distinctions. We can deliver by any means apart from a ransom, but can you redeem apart from a ransom? Hence the context must ever decide whether deliverance is the result of previous ransom.

Ransom

On page 4 you say:

“Thus, as to ransom, Jesus says, The Son of man came not to be served, but to serve and to give His life a ransom for man (Matthew 20:28).” “There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus who gave himself a ransom for many” (1 Timothy 2:6, Mark 10:45).

I reply, the above selection of glorious Divine truth from the pen of a man who is spending his strength to refute ransom is inconceivable! You commenced your pamphlet as a Past Master and Exponent of Figures, Terms and Definitions. I ask, what prevented your definition and exposition of

the Greek thought in these very terms you quote? viz., “He gave his life a ransom in place of (*anti-lutron*) many?” The accurate definition of this term alone annihilates root and branch, the cause which forces you to reject the ransom, viz., your assumption that Jesus required to go through the jaws of execution to extricate Himself from your double curse against Him. It is not the Word of God you quote which we regret, but your subtle, fallacious construction you put on it; also your “perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3.”

Thank God alone there is no room for quibble regarding the Greek term “*anti-lutron*” - A ransom in place of. No Greek scholar on earth, even atheist, would expose his stupidity even to attempt to deny it. Will you, please, risk a professional test on this point, for insertion in your Magazine?

The thought, yea, the only thought contained in it is, as the Master declared, “The Son of man came, not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom - *anti-lutron* - in place of many.” The one Federal Head involved all, even those not yet born. The second Federal Head can extricate whosoever will (John 3:16).

The same thought is irrefutably expressed in the terms Redeem, Redeemed, Redeemer and Redemption but we crave special attention to the term Ransom, because it expresses the thought in the purest, unmistakable form. To a Christadelphian the Highest Authority on earth is Dr. Thomas. Let us then by all means hear him. He says:

“Redemption means to buy back, hence it is release for a ransom. All who become God’s servants are, therefore, released from a former lord by purchase. The Purchaser is God, and the price, or ransom paid, is the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, even without spot.”

I pronounce the above the best and the most accurate pronouncement of Divine truth in latter day theology. Dare you, therefore, uproot that Divine thought in the very texts you quote, even the oath of God containing the identical terms the Dr. demonstrates in the above? Could you read into these Divine terms your pagan assumption of the beloved of God requiring to go through the jaws of execution before He could extricate Himself from your double curse against Him? God in heaven! Wrench from off your eyes the veil of her who has intoxicated all nations and permit all to extend to each other that Holy Kiss before the fatal bell shall toll.

Why spend your literary powers to blot out God’s just ransom? While these terms ever convey the thought of a price having been paid, they also convey the thought of release, or the liberation of those who accept the gracious gift. If therefore, you involve Jesus in any curse whatever, then explain how a man on earth, or an angel from heaven, could sacrifice his own debt? Could you possibly exhibit two more antagonistic terms? Does not the very term debt blaspheme sacrifice? With such an assumption, where, O tell me where, the glory of Christ on Calvary comes in?

How long will you read the Scriptures for the other fellow? You might find it beneficial to reserve a brief season to “pull the beam out of your own eye.” The time is brief when there will be no more sacrifice for sin, neither fraudulent deliverance, when the lawful captive shall not be delivered (Isaiah 49:24).

I pray you will find the divinely appointed Passover Lamb, substitute, ransom and surety of the better covenant before then, lest you be forced against your will, to go through all that Jesus went through. Your pretence of going through all that Jesus went through, by your crafty ambiguous middle term may yet laugh at your calamity and mock when your fear cometh. (See your booklet, page 32, and “Christendom Astray,” page 114).

Substitution

It is a remarkable fact that neither that term nor Representative can be found in The Book, while the synonym of both permeates The Book from alpha to omega. Every animal slain for the sin of man was a representative, which was effective for the time present alone.

Paul is most specific on this distinction; he expounds the merits of Type and Antitype, Representative and Substitute, and the intrinsic value the latter had over the former. The type, or representative, perfected nothing (Hebrews 7:11-19). The Anti-type, or Surety, accomplished and exhibited the Glory of God in the eternal welfare of man (Hebrews 10). Will you then, point out one instance in the many occurrences of the term *anti* (priority and antagonism excepted) where it does not mean “in place of” and oblige?

To your booklet denouncing substitution, which you put out many years ago, wherein you declared;

“The command of the Father was that Jesus should lay down His life by crucifixion as an exhibition for all time of what was due from God to man for sin.”

I then replied, “This is substitution to the hilt, and the wrath of a pagan god with a vengeance. God is not the party who nurses wrath to keep it warm.”

No. The part due man, as Dr Thomas declared, is that Lord on the other side. Paul confirms the Dr. - “Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are (Possessive Case) to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness.”

Observe particularly it is ever the Possessive Case, as in Romans 8:3. God’s fundamental Law of private ownership, which you, by your “perfectly good rendering” blotted out by sliding in your adjective “sinful,” in order to involve Jesus under your double curse for His supposed hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh.

Well, then, if Jesus in your own terms, “endured what was due to man for sin,” will you please define the principle involved? Your attempted escape you then offered was your inclusion of Jesus under the same condemnation on His own account. I replied, if Jesus was under the same condemnation, this would have no balance by which your debt could possibly be wiped out. What is the deduction? A pure dilemma! First, you are either a false witness regarding Christ’s debt, or a defrauder of the Law by stealing in without payment! (John 3:16, 10:1). Awake to your confusion here. Well, you attempted to escape the second horn of your dilemma by resorting to an ambiguous middle term. If you did this on purpose, it is the meanest subtlety. You truly said:

“When the substitute dies, the survivor escapes the penalty, and lives; but it was not so with Jesus,”

I ask, when God slew His own Lamb in Eden, did not Adam live? Do not facts pronounce your deduction contemptible? (Genesis 3:21, 22:8, Revelation 13:8, John 3:16, Ephesians 1:4).

Then to support your denial of ransom with the semblance of a “thus saith the Lord,” you declared:

“We have yet to do with the death of Jesus inasmuch as an Apostle hath said, I am crucified with Christ, and buried with him in baptism.”

Now one little question here exposed your fallacy. I asked, does every believer in Christ require to undergo literal crucifixion? Did you not perceive your trick had failed? You used two totally

distinct things as if they were identical, and of equal legal value, viz., the literal crucifixion of Jesus with Paul's mere symbol in baptism, thus confounding the literal with the symbolic, by which Robert Roberts and you dazzled the mental eyes of your innocent, unskilled thinkers. Could you exhibit a more destructive argument to deny the literal ransom, by your attempt to make it appear we must go through all that Christ went through, when, on examination, the symbol is all that is required at our hands? Had Jesus turned to your booklet, page 32, and to "Christendom Astray," page 114, He had discovered a tricky escape from literal crucifixion by choosing the mere symbol in baptism.

Remission

Do we yet require to define that term and point out that there are two Divine methods and two distinct stages by which this is obtainable? When sins are remitted the sinner is released from Sin's claim. This is accomplished, first by redemption, as in the case of Adam (Genesis 3:21; Revelation 13:8); second, by forgiveness alone, as in the case of those under Grace, where no further ransom is necessary. If obtained by the former, then Jesus paid the price for their release. If by the latter, then release is obtained by forgiveness alone, but the person must previously have been the subject of the former because, "without the shedding of blood there is no remission," nor release to effect the Edenic federal redemption. There was one sin and one sinner for whom alone the one ransom sacrifice was imperative and divinely provided, there being no provision for remission by forgiveness alone, neither in the Edenic nor under the Mosaic Laws.

The federal principle alone explains why we, upon enlightenment, must individually participate in symbol, in this federal redemption (Romans 5, 1 Corinthians 15). Out of the Adamic relation into Christ, who declares, "This is the ground of condemnation that light is come into the world, but men (even Editors) love darkness rather than light."

On page 4, paragraph 2, you say;

"So also with redemption, of which the word ransom is a much shrunken form, believers are justified freely through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus (Romans 3:24). Of Him, God, "are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption."

So again with regard to

"Propitiation and propitiatory, always understanding that no idea of substitution, or satisfaction in the sense of commercial transaction, as it has been profanely expressed, underlies the Divine usage of the terms."

In regard to your libel of profanity, I feel disposed to employ a dilemma. If you are ignorant of what you are talking about, your case demands pity; if you are qualified to define these terms employed and purposely decline to do so as a safeguard against the Divine ransom, then Satan is exhibited as an angel of light.

Now, it is a deplorable fact against you that the term "redemption" is positively absent in the Greek of that text you employ. Will you refute this painful fact? The term Paul employs is *apolutrosis* - deliverance, not redemption. The Apostle is therefore, comforting the brethren by what has been accomplished by, even the glorious result of the ransom, viz., their deliverance. That term, of itself contains no thought of a price having been paid, since deliverance can be effected by any means apart from a ransom; but not so with redemption. Dr. Thomas stands ever dux on the definition of redemption, who, in strict conformity with the Greek language, settled that point for all time. Hear him:

“Redemption means to buy back. Hence it is release for a ransom. All who became God’s servants are therefore, released from a former lord by purchase; the Purchaser is God, and the price, or ransom paid, is the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, even without spot.” (“Eureka,” Volume 1, pages 20-21).

Regarding deliverance, the context alone must ever decide whether such deliverance is dependent upon, or is the result of, a price having been paid. The point for solution is therefore, could a son of Adam have been delivered apart from this Divinely appointed ransom in place of, *anti lutron*, man, even the unclaimed life blood of Christ alone? (John 3:16, 12:24, Revelation 13:8).

Commercial Transaction

You pronounce the idea of a just ransom, re “the redemption of man,” profanity! Permit, on the spot, a test of the two ideas.

You charge Christ under the double curse (Edenic and Mosaic) and of His having contracted hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh which you declare, “render His very nature obnoxious to the curse,” and you also pretend “to go through all that Christ went through.” (“Christendom Astray” page 114 and your booklet page 32).

If your premises are accurate your deduction makes ransom absurdly impossible, such a one would be hopelessly powerless to redeem himself, to say nothing of another human soul. Such transaction would involve the very God of Heaven in your stratagem of handing over to the Devil, One you declare, who was already under your double curse - a tricky, fraudulent deliverance.

Permit me now to point out that instead of commercial transaction being profane, there are two systems which permeate the Word of God, from alpha to omega. One is Divine, the other Diabolical.

Divine Commercial Transaction

This system permeates God’s Book from alpha to omega and does not even close there, but becomes the very Song of the Redeemed. Just listen how they take up the strain. “Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed (*egorasos*, bought us back) us to God by Thy blood.” Revelation 5:9).

Now please note particularly that no soul could learn that song who profane God’s just ransom (Revelation 14:3, Hebrews 10:26, Malachi 1:12-14). Then the Master discovered treasure (the human race) in a field, and for joy went and sold (*peprake*) all that He had and bought (*agorazai*) that field. He even terms Himself a Merchant (*emporos*). I ask, does not commercial transaction become interesting? Again, our first century brethren “sold their possessions and had all things common.” No axe to grind here. Finally, “though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that we, through His poverty, might become rich.” Dear Lord!

The Diabolical Commerce

Esau sold his birthright for a mess of sinful flesh pottage. Similarly, you blotted out the possessive case in order to secure Jesus under your curse, and out of Romans 8:3 served to your infants anything but a wholesome dish. Then Judas sold the Master for thirty pieces of silver; and Ananias and Sapphira sold their possessions but kept back part of the price, as you did by your “perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3.” They lied against the Holy Spirit; you, by your fatal adjective, kept back the hidden manna from famishing thousands. Instead of choosing the Good Shepherd who was on the eve of laying down His life for the sheep, a glorious Ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) the sheep, you cobbled up Romans 8:3 to mean “This is the heir in hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh, come, let us kill Him and the inheritance will be ours.”

How long will you persist in squaring your debt by handing over to your Creditor a condemned (coin) Representative? Is not your association of a condemned Representative the Diabolos section of the disputed commercial transaction? Listen to

Dr. Thomas and Moses

“Having arrived at the place, built an altar, and laid the wood in order, Abraham bound Isaac, his son, and laid him on the altar upon the wood... A ram, caught in the thicket... The angel of the Lord called to him out of heaven, and commanded him to do the lad no harm. The ram was appointed as a substitute for Isaac, which was, therefore, substitutionally slain for Isaac.” (“Elpis Israel”, page 257).

Hear now the glorious harmony of Moses:

“And Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son.” - Genesis 22:8-13.

Even the name of the place was afterwards called “The Lord will provide.” Thank God.

The Dr. further declares, “No one can walk in the steps of Abraham’s faith who does not believe these things.”

Will you please do me the favour of pointing out in God’s Book one sacrifice for sin, type or anti-type, that was not substitutionary? Until you succeed in this your “libel of profanity” spells blasphemy. When a sinner brought a lamb to the priest, was it the sinner or the lamb that was put to death? Cannot you, therefore, “behold the Lamb of God”? I do not write in venom: your pitiable absurdity forcibly recalls to my mind an incident which occurred between a clergyman and a boy returning home from school. Of course, all know that “His Rev.” must ever hold a fuss, especially with boys whose parents are members of his denomination.

Rev. Well, Tom, getting home from school?

Boy. Yes, your Reverence.

Rev. Do you like school?

Boy. O yes! I like it all right

Rev. Where do you stand in your class?

Boy. Oh! I stand dux

Rev. Smart boy. Do you get catechism?

Boy. You bet. We must not skip it.

Rev. What length are you through it?

Boy. Oh, I am past “Redemption” and into “The pains of hell forever.”

Rev. Amen.

I sometimes wonder whether you are the man of whom Dr Thomas prophesied:

“A skimmer of the surface of things, having obtained a smattering of same, swells out like a frog in the fable, until it burst, when all your wisdom turns out to be gas, and nothing more. This same declaration (Romans 8:3) is blazoned as if you were its special guardian and that no one knew it but yourself.” (“Anastasis,” page 34).

Raiment

On page 7 you narrate the change of clothing from leaves to skins and you certify

“the first clothing, therefore, was not a climatic requirement, but was a moral not a physical necessity.”

I pronounce this the Truth of God, if you would but allow it to remain at that, because “there is nothing unclean of itself” (Romans 14:14, Acts 10:28, 11:8). But you scarcely move an inch to your next paragraph, where, in the same self-confidence of your independent proficiency you assure us that, “Hence forward, in the Divine economy, clothing appointed by God represented God’s covering for sin, and consequent forgiveness, while nakedness represented sinful flesh.”

Is not this painful in the extreme? Here you instantly cut asunder the figure from the literal and clutch at flesh as you cast aside the possessive case in Romans 8:3 and made sandwich of it, and, like the carnivorous Israelites, you still keep on yelling “Give us flesh to eat” (Numbers 11:4). Remarkable phenomena have been known in nature. I have seen a lamb with two heads, children born with teeth, a calf with eight legs; but never, in the Lord’s creation, was it known of children being born with garments! Why confound garments with flesh? The flesh of those whom God covered remained the same as that of those uncovered, but the former now stand in a different relation toward God. Your sinful flesh assumption forces you ever to confound the physical with the legal, which would irrevocably involve Christ, if such a freak was true. Christ was under no curse on account of His flesh!

Ever on the prowl for flesh you next escort us over the hills to Zechariah 3 where you also entangle yourself over your choice slice, viz., “Joshua was clothed in filthy garments,” requiring a change of raiment, not flesh. You are therefore wide of the mark to confound Joshua’s filthy garments with your libel that they represented our Lord’s supposed hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh! In this interview we are assured of a change of the Priesthood that perfected nothing (Hebrews 7:19, 9:9), not a Lamb of God under your double curse for supposed sinful flesh. And in the raiment we behold righteousness. In Adam all our righteousness was as filthy rags; but here we behold one willing, yea, eager to clothe us with white linen, the righteousness of His saints.

In verse 8 then, we behold God, the first Person, addressing Joshua, the second person, regarding a third person whom He styles, My Servant, The Branch, who would remove, not supposed sinful flesh but the iniquity of the land in one day. Thus, even here you have utterly failed to find your choice flesh (HAM-artia) where Jesus stands clear at the Bar. Still you persist in the commerce of the most fatal flesh that ever was introduced into the Theological market, which has kept commercial transactions brisk for ages. The scrutiny will be, not the quality of flesh, but that of character and ownership (Romans 8:3). God created the flesh, we the character.

Back to Eden

Out of the mouths of babes, even sucklings hast thou ordained praise and taken the wise in their own craftiness. Jesus thanked His Father He did so. I pronounce the Amen.

In regard to the legal aspect in Eden, the case of Adam was similar to that of a murderer in our day. Adam stood under sentence of death; his execution was imminent, but God loved Adam! Could that love of itself cancel the oath of the Law of sin and death? If so, then as Paul declares, “Christ died in vain.” Such would nullify the necessity of His being brought into the world at all, whereas Jesus declares, “To this end was I born, even for this cause came I into the world.” The Master well knew that the Law of sin and death was as irrevocable as the Law of the Spirit of Life. When He intimated this truth to His disciples they understood it not. The law of sin and death declared, The soul that sinneth shall die. Without shedding of blood, no remission. Now ponder the Master’s two questions here; what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and forfeit (*zemiothe*) his life? Or what shall a man give in exchange (*en antallagma*) in ransom (*anti lutron*) in place of his life? The soul that fails to perceive the necessity here for the God-provided ransom is to be pitied indeed!

Thus, if God is to honour and magnify His word above His Name - Isaiah 42:21 - ransom is imperative to God's attribute of verity. Paul clinches this point for all time;

“Being justified freely by His Grace (*charite*) through the deliverance {*apolutrosos*} that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a Mercy Seat through faith in (*en*) the blood of Him, for an exhibition of His (God's) righteousness... in order that He might be just (with the Law of sin and death, which demanded the life blood of the sinner) before justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus.”

John confirms Paul. God so loved the world that He stooped to this (obligation) on man's account - John 3:16, Romans 3:26. Has not God been gracious?

Adam landed himself in an irrevocable fix (Matthew 16:26), to counteract which God alone could undertake; but if this one whom God provided was under your double curse, you reverse the glorious honesty of Paul's just God to a fraudulent transaction. All this pretended aversion to substitution is forced (innocently, I verily believe) to uphold your pagan assumption of hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh.

You yell, “No! It is not substitution, but representative association.”

I ask, if in Christadelphian terms the nature of Jesus was obnoxious to the curse, why do you mince and omit the one help of your principle? Why not be honest and say, “the association of a condemned representative” or, “the condemned representative association”?

God's servants of all ages declared that God, distressed over Adam's calamity, instantly ordered His *elohim* to deliver him from going down into the pit, “I have found a ransom” (Job 33:24). This is the most accurate and concise distinction between the terms redeem and deliver we have in print. This settled all. King Sin justly demanded the life blood of Adam (Genesis 2:17). Did God slay Adam? This had annihilated the race on the spot. What procured and secured our continued existence? God slew His own Lamb, a Ransom instead of (*anti lutron*) Adam. Thank God! (Genesis 3:21, 22:8, Revelation 13:8. Ephesians 1:4. John 3:16).

Now God paid this ransom by a paper note (type) in Eden but ever true to His Word, He honestly (Romans 3:26) tabled down His sovereign on Calvary. Then types, shadows, representatives gave place to our Antitype, Substitute, Surety of the better covenant (Hebrews 7:22). Thus Adam stood arbitrarily delivered by ransom and by faith in the Antitype promised, in a position to enter a second probation. Now is your chance.

Whether Adam instantly availed himself of this golden opportunity is not stated, but the conditions were like those of subsequent Abraham and every other human soul since, viz., that God has provided a Lamb for a burnt offering (Genesis 22:8).

Jesus clinches, “No man cometh unto the Father but by me.” “Other foundation can no man lay.” All who would therefore enter the New Covenant must comply with God's pleasant conditions, viz., “the quiet waters by.”

“Down in the valley with my Saviour I would go,
Where the flowers are blooming and the sweet waters flow,”

An individual passing through the symbol of His crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection to new life in Christ is an indispensable preliminary to our acceptance with God. By this ransom (*anti lutron*) God has enabled us to hand in our ticket (receipt) to the jailor (Psalm 142:7) and to walk out of prison, to adoption and freedom. “If the Son shall make you free, then shall ye be free indeed.” Cannot you now perceive that if Christ was under any obligation whatever to be slain before His own supposed debt could be wiped out, His abode today would be the grave? Lest there be any further

difficulty in your mind re the distinction between the terms redeem and deliver, permit a homely illustration: John, having fallen into the water, was instantly hauled out by his mother and saved from a watery grave. Would you say he had been redeemed? Why, then abuse language to involve the Beloved of God under your double curse? You charge Him of hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh and the Mosaic curse, though passively having been hung there; blasphemous theology, I reiterate: the context alone must ever decide whether deliverance is dependent on, or is the result of ransom, since of itself it contains no thought of a price having been paid.

When this important distinction is grasped a glorious concord is heard in the “Song of the Redeemed.” “Thou wast slain, and didst buy us back (*egorasas*) to God by Thy blood.” Strictly Dr.Thomas’ definition. Why be stubborn? Now just permit a test how your assumption would chord that song. Did they sing, “Thou wast slain for Thyself.--” etc., cannot you hear the “Conductor” instantly calling “Halt”? Let us now hear how your assumption would appeal from the lips of Jesus. This is the severest scrutiny to which any theory can be subjected, even deductive logic is forced to take a back seat. Hear Jesus first:

“When He had given thanks, He broke the bread, and said, This is my (sinful) body which must be slain for myself. You know that sin could not be condemned in my body if it was not there. This is the body of your Condemned Representative which must be slain to cleanse Myself, and you must go through all that I go through.” (Your booklet, page 32; “Christendom Astray,” page 114).

“After the same manner also He took the cup saying, This is the New Testament in my sinful blood which I received through the veins of Mary” (Robert Roberts).

You know that

“As regards physical constitution, I am as much under the curse as you are” (J.J.Hadley).

“My very nature is obnoxious to the curse” (Robert Roberts).

You all know that I have “a black and a white side” (Dr.Thomas)

- and so on ad infinitum.

Hear Paul

“No man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed” (1 Corinthians 12:3). Again, “There is nothing unclean of itself” (Romans 14:14). Again, “Every sin man committeth is outside the body” (1 Corinthians 6:18). Thus your sinful flesh hobby is stabled not in Romans 8:3, nor in any other part of God’s realm. Not until you discover this truth can you ever behold the Lamb of God. You would then discover that instead of His being under your curse, He owes His very existence to that calamity. “To this end was I born. For this cause came I into the world.” (John 18:37).

On page 18 you present us with a powerful refutation of your own assumption. This is the chief characteristic of every Christadelphian who uses ink on this theme, viz.,

“Sin, the prince, the Devil had nothing in Jesus, no death claim, no real fault in Him. No, nor even Herod; and Pilate washed his hands of the case.”

We endorse that glorious pronouncement with our whole soul. It ought to be framed in gold, but we wonder when you will wash your hands of this case. Had you confronted Pilate and those other gentlemen you name, all of them had changed their mind, and Pilate, instead of washing his hands, had pronounced the Master’s crucifixion on the spot.

How should Pilate, the Devil and Herod have hearkened the collective Christadelphian charge against Jesus, viz., your charge of His double curse, “Edenic and Mosaic,” and hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh? The Christadelphian evidence against Jesus excels in rank blasphemy that of the Jews.

Christadelphian Evidence Against Jesus

“There is no “if” in it, you know: He was made sin by being made of a woman” (C. Smith).

“His body was as unclean as those for whom He died, requiring cleansing from sin nature by His sacrificial death.”

Think of Sacrificing His own debt! “He was as much under the curse as those He came to save.” (J.J.Hadley).

“The sin-nature of His mother, the combination of condemned human nature.” (“Christendom Astray,” pages 113,114).

How should the Devil, Herod and Pilate have taken the above evidence?

Mortal Body

On page 17 you say:

“the body of sin is our mortal body” (Romans 6:6, 8:11), “mortal because of sin.”

I prefer to say the phrase “the body of sin” in Greek means “the body belonging to sin” not a “sinful body.” This Divine truth nullifies your assumption throughout and reduces your hobby to a will-o’-the-wisp. Does the adjective mortal predicate that the flesh has been changed? This is your death trap. Has not the sinner changed his relation to Law, which has pronounced his execution? You are ever on the prowl for flesh! Would you say a pigeon or a horse is mortal? Please say yes or no.

Inflexions of Mortal

MORTAL: Is the Adjective form (2 Chronicles 14:11, Job 4:11, Romans 6:12, 8:11).

MORTALITY: Is the Noun form (2 Corinthians 5:4).

MORTALLY: Is the Adverb form (Deuteronomy 19:11), “If a man smite his neighbour mortally that he die” etc. Here the adverb modifies the verb “to smite,” it cannot qualify the man’s flesh, a noun!

MORTIFY: This is the Verbal form (Romans 8:13). “Mortify” - “put to death the deeds of the body, and ye shall live.”

Cannot you now perceive that if you mortify - put to death - your body instead of the deeds, then you commit suicide and thwart the purpose of God?

Does not this general analysis demonstrate that the term “mortal” is wholly restricted to the legal and criminal vocabulary and department, while the “physical” remains unchanged? A condemned representative under execution on his own account could benefit no soul, not even himself. The late Robert Roberts wrote in strict conformity with the foregoing:

“There is no evidence of this change whatever, the presumption and evidence are entirely the opposite direction. There was a change in Adam’s relation to his Maker, but not in the nature of his physical organization.”

That declaration alone most powerfully clears Jesus at the Bar and is in strict conformity with Paul: “There is nothing unclean of itself” (Romans 14:14, Acts 10:28).

The Late Dr. Thomas, in “The Herald of the Kingdom,” volume 5, page 159, declared:

“Death and corruption, with reproduction, is the fundamental law of the physical system of the six days. Adam and Eve and all the other animals born of the earth with themselves would have died and gone to corruption, if there had been no transgression, provided there had been no further interference with the physical system than Moses records in the history of the six days. The lives and the deaths of Adam and Eve were predicated not upon any peculiarity of their animal constitution, but upon the relation they may come to sustain to the two trees in paradise. From this we learn that they placed themselves under the Law which sentenced them to death.

From these premises it will be seen that we dissent from our correspondent’s notion that ‘All creation became corrupt,’ by which we understand him to mean constitutionally impregnated with corruptibility at the fall, we believe that the change was moral, not physical.”

Let us now hear the late Brother Edward Turney:

“The animals, we learn from Genesis, sprang from the ground by Almighty Power. They have all the same breath. All are flesh, that is, they are corruptible. You may call them mortal if you like, in a loose or general sense, but it is more strictly correct to style them corruptible, because mortal means sentenced to death through breach of law.”

Is it possible that more strict unanimity could be exhibited on any theme in theology? That glorious sample presented will permit of no “yes” today and “no” tomorrow. Why then, violate the very fundamental laws of thought to involve the Beloved of God under the curse on account of His flesh? Which would render Him so blasphemously unfit for the purpose for which the Gracious God brought Him into existence. The purpose for, and the development of the Redemption was the same yesterday, is today and will be until the Beloved One delivers up the Kingdom to His Father, when God shall be all and in all. “As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with my Glory.”

All this aversion to substitution, or just ransom (*anti lutron*) in place of man, is forced to uphold the pagan delusion of sinful flesh, which if true, would irrevocably have involved Christ. Divine truth alone can remove every barrier preventing our perception of the true Anointed of God, and saves from all subtle, double-dealing to present a black and a white Christ to uphold the pagan delusion. “No man cometh unto the Father but by me.” “Other foundation can no man lay.” Ask yourself, did God lay a condemned foundation? (Isaiah 28:16-19). Ask yourself whether the just God redeemed – bought back - man by the shed blood of a condemned representative? (1 Peter 1:18). Ask whether such could possibly be a sacrifice?

Satan against Satan

All the glorious admissions in the foregoing by our Christadelphian friends are reversed by the late J.J. Andrew. In his “Blood of the Everlasting Covenant,” pages 6 and 7 he declares:

“A change must therefore have taken place in Adam’s physical constitution as the result of this decree... How the change was effected is not revealed, neither is it necessary to know.”

I ask, must we therefore, take this unrevealed assumption wholesale without ever a pinch of salt? This supposed contraction of hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh is the delusion of the dark ages. Not until it is analysed and compared with the Word of God alone are the fatal results disclosed. It forces the advocate to block out the glorious sacrificial ransom the Beloved of God laid down for man. It involves Christ under your curse where no soul, not even angel from heaven, could sacrifice his own debt. I pronounce your “perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3,” therefore, a fatal error. Your fatal adjective is not there in the Greek. That assumption is the parent of “no mere man is able to keep the commands of God.” a premium on crime. It restricts the purpose for the Divine begetting of Jesus, “for the arming of Jesus with super-human power in order to conquer this supposed demon in His flesh, which renders every other human soul utterly powerless to keep the commandments of God.” (Shorter Catechism).

This state of apostasy enslaved even Dr. Thomas, who declared;

“A circumcised person was bound to keep that which he could not possibly keep, which if he did keep, could not benefit him.” (“Echoes of Past Controversies,” page 13).

Cannot you perceive the havoc your assumption of sinful flesh has wrought in the earth? The late J.J.Hadley declared;

“We are not born with desires to disobey for disobedience’s sake, but with desires which possess a strength out of proportion to our power of self control.”

The Master sent His disciples to cast out devils, but I cannot find where either He or they ever encountered hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh, but I do find where God tries no man above what he is able to bear, even makes a way of escape that he may be able to bear it. I implore every sinful flesh advocate to pick up a concordance and scan the references to the pleadings of the gracious God to obey, keep, do, and hearken, then ask himself how God would receive his reply, “No mere man is able”! The Master must have been ignorant of sinful flesh because instead of this alien excuse of inability, He takes the opposite way out. “When ye have done all that was commanded you,” then say, “We are unprofitable servants, we have done only what was commanded us.”

Well then, if Jesus was granted super-human power, a machine gun, say, before He could conquer this hyphenated demon in His flesh while every other soul must face that monster with bare fists alone, will you please point out to me where the credit and glory come in? Bluntly, your assumption is a premium on crime. Kindle the fire with your “Shorter Catechism Theologic.” God graciously invites all to join His covenant and worship Him, not in blasphemy, but in the Name of Him whom God provided, whose blood alone could ratify that covenant (Hebrews 10).

Sinful flesh blames God all through and damns man. The assumption is a libel on a just God, an abuse of reason, which sinks the advocate far below the line of God’s spirit level. “It cripples all energy, paralyses all effort, blasphemes the goodness of God, impugns His wisdom and turns His mercy into gall. It changes the creature of His hand into a prone puppet, who is lashed for his inevitable movements. The impression magnetizes man into the very obliquity he deplores and invokes the tears and lamentations of a hypocrite,” but by analytical examination it is discovered to be “the strongest of all delusions,” and the most “contrary literature under heaven.”

Made Sin

To clinch your assumption that the very nature of Jesus was obnoxious to the curse, you cite 2 Corinthians 5:21, viz., “For He hath made him, who knew no sin, sin for us.”

Permit a logical analysis. First, the apostle does not say that God made Him sinful flesh, not even Judas Iscariot, but *amartian* - sin-offering. The more speedily this truth is demonstrated the better for all concerned. Now this Scripture contains a Divine, balanced antithesis with a tight dilemma for the ‘flesh hunter.’

Whatever Jesus is made here, we are made the exact opposite. All abstract nouns have their opposites (see Galatians 5:19). Now the opposite of sin is righteousness - exactly what the Scriptures declare. If, therefore, Jesus was made physical sin at birth, then we were made physical righteousness. How would righteous flesh suit your palate? But we must not confound the legal with the physical and stupidly conclude that the flesh itself has been changed. Cannot you perceive you have left the rails of pure deduction?

Now in this very text you quote to curse Jesus, there is an adjectival clause to Jesus which contains a past tense, which must ever dominate in priority that of a present tense. If therefore, you persist that Jesus was made sin at birth, then you are irrevocably forced back to pre-existence; e.g. “For He hath made (complete present tense) Him who knew (past tense) no sin.” This demonstrates that Jesus was 33 years old when God made Him *hamartian* - a sin offering - for us. If you persist it refers to His birth of a woman, then get out of pre-existence as best you can. Contend accurately, commit the Shorter Catechism to the flames and try your hand with Romans 8:3 once more, and I assure you that your sinful flesh is not there, in the Greek, nor in any other part of God’s Book.

Flesh of Sin

This phrase is universally understood to mean sinful flesh and we are reminded that both the A.V. and the R.V. agree, which you pronounce “a perfectly good rendering” of the Greek “flesh of sin.”

I unreservedly pronounce this pitiable! The reverse is the case. It is the most fatal death-trap that ever was introduced into Theology, because such would involve Christ under your flesh curse. The Revisers of the A.V. and the R.V. dwell snugly with “Lady Rule All”, 17 Apocalyptic Avenue, Pandemonium, whom Dr. Thomas denounced as “spiritual policemen” to guard that Old Lady

What on earth tempted you to flee to that hotel? The accommodate rendering of Romans 8:3 can be found in the writings of Dr. Thomas, though he reluctantly gave it to a correspondent in “The Rock,” when pressed. Pity when you were up among the Revisers you neglected their favour to define for you the term soul, when their prompt reply had been “the immortal part of man.”

You commenced your pamphlet with a good display of rhetoric parsing, but instantly your assumption was in danger you cobbled up Romans 8:3 and gave up, or annihilated the possessive case and, to refute just ransom, refused to dethrone that pagan intruder “sinful flesh.” Is sinful flesh a perfectly good rendering of the Greek - flesh of sin? For the benefit of those that have ears to hear, I assure them that the adjective sinful is not there in the Greek: it is a noun in the Greek genitive case, indicating possession, not an adjective indicating the quality of flesh. It is therefore, irrevocably a question of the possession of God, or the possession of sin, the devil - the two possessors mentioned in Romans 8:3.

The Greek does not use our English form of the possessive case, but ever the genitive. We also use the genitive form, but only when the possessor is neuter, e.g., “the roof of the house.” We do not

say “the house’s roof.” The following is a puzzle to many: “If Moses was the son of Pharaoh’s daughter, then he was the daughter of Pharaoh’s son.” We do not say Pharaoh’s daughter’s son.”

What then, prevented your consulting the writings of Dr. Thomas for the Greek phrase *sarkos amartias* - the flesh of sin - sin’s flesh? But lo and behold, you reverse the Doctors accurate rendering, yet you deem it blasphemy if any other soul, except yourself, gainsay Dr. Thomas. Thus the accurate rendering of Romans 8:3 demonstrates that Jesus belonged to God, all others were the devil’s flesh, and therefore Jesus stood clear at the Bar.

Metonymy

Metonymy is an abridged, shortened form of speech by changing the name; *meta* - change, *onoma* - name, Paul was a past-master in the use of this figure. This fact forced Peter’s caution for our carefulness not to misconstrue Paul’s words to our own destruction. This is exactly what you have done with Romans 8:3 and 2 Corinthians 5:21. You strangle Paul’s words to curse Jesus. I now ask you to note the late Robert Roberts who exhibited your gross error more powerfully than the foregoing. He declared:

“The phrase sin in the flesh is metonymical. It is not the expression of a literal element, or principle pervading physical organization. Literally, sin is disobedience, or an act of rebellion. The impulses which lead to this reside in the flesh, and metonymically came to be called by the name of the act to which they gave birth. In defining first principles, we must be accurate.”

I ask, where does that glorious pronouncement of Divine truth from the pen of your predecessor land “your perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3”? You make neither a kirk nor a mill of it. Yet the above Divine truth ought to be framed in gold because it clears Jesus at the Bar.

There is a world-wide metonym, viz., the kettle boils; but when I beheld you pouring out the water and attempting to drink the kettle I pitied your flock. “The leaders of the people cause them to err.”

Satisfied that your “perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3” lands Jesus down below, all you imagine requisite now is just to quote that Jesus was a Man. Smart, is it not? All this absurdity is aside from the point at issue. We dispute not that Jesus was a Man; but we deny that He was a Man under condemnation. You quote: “Christ Himself likewise took part of the same flesh and blood, that through death He might destroy him having the power of death.”

Was there ever a Law Court under heaven which could convict a human soul, even Jesus, that had contracted hyphenated sin-in-the-flesh, and rendered his very nature obnoxious to your curse? Contemptible logic! You must have an acute nose for sinful flesh, but it is not even there. Had you gone back to where the apostle says, “but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels...” but we dare not read into it a curse on Jesus. What is the apostle’s adverbial of purpose for Jesus being a little lower than the angels? Does the apostle hint that Jesus stood condemned on account of His flesh? Infernal inference! The purpose was that He “by the grace of God should taste death for every man.” Was it not therefore, imperative He should be made lower than the angels, for this specific purpose? To have made Him equal to the angels who cannot die, you had thwarted the purpose of God; but no unsophisticated soul could read into this a curse on Jesus. “No man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed” 1 Corinthians 12:3. The apostle is as silent as a corpse re the kind of flesh for which you are for ever on the prowl; the apostle’s reason herein because “you speak not by the Spirit of God.”

The Federal Principle

Our last section closed with the Divine consolation that Jesus tasted death for every man. We ask, how could Jesus in justice to our creditor, the devil, taste death to redeem that 144,000 by the life blood of one man. They ascribe to Him the glory and honour in the New Song, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed (*egorasas* - bought us back) to God by thy blood. Had they sung "Thou wast slain to redeem thyself from thy sinful flesh and we came through all that thou came through," the Conductor had called "Halt" on the spot.

The Federal Principle alone explains and solves the one for many in both sections. Where one involved all, it is divinely just that one should extricate whosoever will. (Romans 5, 1 Corinthians 15).

Had God declined a ransom for Adam we had never drawn the breath of life. Or, had God adopted the Individual Principle then every individual sinner had required a separate individual ransom. In that case, as Paul truly points out. "Jesus must often have had to suffer since the foundation of the world" (Hebrews 9:26). But on the Federal Principle, "once at the close of the age hath he appeared to put away sin offerings by the sacrifice of himself." One ransom sacrificed for one Federal head, whose many members can be saved by faith and obedience to the appointed symbol of His crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection to a new relation and life in Christ (Romans 6). Our Adamic relation we leave in the symbolic grave of Christ.

The question must therefore ever be not the quality of our flesh, which God alone made; but in what relation do we stand toward God? Are we His sons and daughters? (1 John 3:2). The possessive case (Romans 8:3) God's Fundamental Law of Private Ownership (genitive case) (Romans 8:3).

Deliver and Redeem

God knew the accurate definition and distinction between these terms when He commanded His Elohim to "deliver him from going down into the pit, I have found a ransom" (Job 33:24). He well knew that to deliver Adam it would cost Him no less than the life blood of His own Son. Did not God, therefore, in type, slay His own Lamb in Eden? ^{*see footnote.} (Genesis 3:21, 22:8, Revelation 13:8, Ephesians 1:4, John 3:16, Isaiah 53). Otherwise we had never drawn the breath of life. Will not Calvary witness to all eternity the love of God and His Lamb? (Revelation 5:6).

You next string together three texts into which you sling in your fallacious implication that Jesus was under the curse.

On page 18 you say:-

"So by His bearing of sin, He is Himself saved out of death, through death, through the blood of the covenant."

*[*Footnote: In light of Matthew 21:24, we feel this would be better expressed by saying that God 'allowed wicked men to slay His beloved Son' rather than that God slew Him. – Editor.]*

Now, please permit an analysis of your implicated triune assumption. First, Hebrews 5:7 contains not the ghost of a hint that "the blood of Jesus required to be shed on His own account," but it is a glorious confirmation of the ransom of (in place of - *anti lutron*) man. He had previously merited His title to immortality. Had you been expert on the Greek middle voice, and our English nominative absolute, you ought to have known that our Lord, before He voluntarily laid down His life's blood a ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) man, the hour had come when He should have been glorified, but had

this taken place before laying down His life a ransom for man, He says He had remained alone (John 12:24). Could the Beloved One have made it plainer? The Greek middle voice, and our English nominative absolute, establish this Divine truth beyond refutation, e.g. “Having obtained a rifle, James shot the lion.” Now, an infant in grammar knows that the obtaining of the rifle preceded the shooting of the lion. So Jesus also having obtained eternal deliverance (*aionian lutrosin*) entered once for all into the Holy Place” (Hebrews 9:12. See also verse 15, *eis apolutrosin*).

Now, what was God’s specific purpose with His Grain of Wheat? I reply, to raise a crop. What was God’s next requisite in the process? I reply, before a crop can be raised, God’s own Grain must first die. But if God had sown not His Grain, what had the result been? I, with Jesus, reply, it had remained eternally with God (John 12:24). Is there a soul under heaven so dense, so grossly blind to the Divine deduction that the sacrifice of the life blood of Christ was not by any means for Himself, but for the crop of wheat? Does not God’s wheat field become interesting the more so when the devil came on the scene with his tares - his condemned representative association? Thus, the present tense, both of the Greek middle voice and that of our English nominative absolute, runs parallel with the past tense of the principal sentence. This peculiarity to many sounds a paradox, yet is simple indeed; e.g. “Coming (present tense) over the stile, I fell (past tense) and broke (past tense) my leg.” Now, the function of both can be filled by a simple adverbial of time, e.g. “(When I was) coming over the stile I fell and broke my leg. It would not do to say, “Coming through the garden, the grass wet my feet,” because the grass did not walk through the garden!

Atonement

On page 18 you say:

“So by reason of His bearing of sin, He is Himself saved out of death, through death, through the blood of the everlasting covenant.”

Let us now test whether you adorn this theme, and ascertain whether Jesus by bearing His own supposed sinful flesh was saved out of death, through death, through the blood of the everlasting covenant.

I have not yet found in God’s Book where blood had anything to do as a debt claimed against Jesus, neither against His character, nor against His flesh, nor that His resurrection depended upon His own shed blood, but I do find that it was because “He loved righteousness and hated iniquity, that God could not suffer His Holy One to see corruption” (Hebrews 1:9). Paul goes direct counter to your conception of the case. In your attempt to prove your fatal charge against Jesus, that His salvation from His supposed cursed flesh depended on His own shed blood, you expose your inference to the contempt of every honest philosopher. Inductive logic is ever 95% doubtful, for the simple reason that it forces you to reason from the known to the unknown and man is ever prone to bring in too much. John declares “In Him is no sin.” You say, He was sinful. Let us then, test whether Jesus was saved from His supposed condemned nature through the blood of the covenant (Hebrews 13:20).

A GENERAL ANALYSIS

ADJECTIVAL	PRINCIPLE	ADVERBIAL
of peace, who brought again from the dead the Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep	God make you (not Jesus) perfect.	in the blood of the everlasting covenant

Your blunder consists in applying the adverbial phrase “in the blood of the covenant” to the verb of a subordinate adjectival clause instead of applying it to the verb “make” in the principal sentence. This will be seen if, for the moment, we strike out the adjectival clauses, e.g. “God make you perfect.” If we ask how, or by what means, God accomplished this, then the adverbial phrase “in the blood of the everlasting covenant” settles the question for all time. Besides, had the apostle wished us to understand “that the blood of Jesus required to be shed on His own account,” then he would have used the preposition *dia* - through, but he did not, the terms he employs is *en* - in. How consistent, then, to read, “Now may the God of peace in the blood of the everlasting covenant make you (not Jesus) perfect.” This truth stands irrefutably intact, altogether independent of the adjectival clauses and pronounces Jesus clear at the Bar.

For Us

On page 19 you say:-

“It is true that Jesus died for us, for the ungodly, for all; but “for” here means “on account of,” “on behalf of,” as in the case of making intercession for us. Why should the innocent be put to death and the guilty allowed to live? Substitution would be unjust.”

Before I deal with your preposition “for,” permit me to point out that your last pronouncement fixes you in the tightest dilemma any soul was ever clenched. If it would be unjust on the part of God to put the innocent to death and allow the guilty to live, this would prove either, first, that Jesus was guilty; or second God was unjust. Which horn do you choose? Whether you would say “Jesus was guilty,” or “God was unjust”? Could a condemned representative assist you? The sooner you quit that association the better for you and all enslaved by it.

Peter specifically declares that “He was put to death, the Just for the unjust,” “bruised for our iniquities” (Isaiah 53).

I agree that in a case of deliberate, malignant, defiant crime, it would be unjust to put the innocent to death and allow the guilty to live. Substitution in such a case would be diabolical. This argument powerfully betrays your indiscrimination and demonstrates your inability to separate things that differ. The dullest brain will perceive that the above is a case of crime, demanding prompt retribution. We must not confound this with “the grace of God” in His provision of a ransom (*anti lutron*) in place of man to prevent the annihilation of the race (John 3:16). Jesus by the grace of God, tasted death for every man. The substitution of the life blood of the Beloved One for Adam was the exact opposite in motive to the brutal motive you miserably read into it. His case was to “restore that which he took not away.” (Psalm 69:4).

Another brutal case is found in Matthew 5:38. Literally, the law said “an eye in place of (anti) an eye” but the wicked aggressors eye did not restore the sight of, nor replace the victim’s eye. Both eyes perished. An instance where the just Law of God demanded that the wicked aggressor shall suffer the exact loss for his wicked crime. It requires no special mental alertness to detect irrelevant cases, independent of which *anti* ever performs its own function.

Priority, Antagonism, or In Place Of, For

On page 19 you string a list of texts containing the preposition “for” (*gar*), as an onion vendor strings onions for sale. This procedure, while it indicates the direction of the wind, fails lamentably to demonstrate Divine truth. Our first duty here is whether “for” (*gar*), “on behalf of” (*huper*), or “in place of” (*anti*), are antagonistic. You are exceedingly eager these prepositions should be antagonistic, otherwise your sinful flesh hobby should be reduced to a will-o’-the-wisp. Instead of these prepositions being antagonistic, the simplest task on earth is to demonstrate them to be the

closest “bosom friends,” though they have separate functions. Let us suppose that you, like Adam, through adverse circumstances, were reduced to beggary, your creditor, to secure his own, demands the sale of your possessions (life and inheritance). Along comes a kind, wealthy friend with the salutation, “Cheer up, dear C.C.Walker, I have plenty to spare, more than ever I shall require (John 12:24), I will square your bill for [gar), on your behalf (*huper*); in place of (anti) you.” Is there a Law Court under heaven could force you, dear friend C.C.Walker, to pay it over again? This is exactly what Jesus did for (gar), on behalf of (*huper*), in place of (*anti*) Adam. Thank God! I ask you, friend Walker, do you possess the strength to wrench asunder this threefold cord? (Exodus 4:12). Thus *gar*, *huper*, and *anti*, defy the powers of darkness to involve Jesus under the curse, and blot out the God-provided ransom and the Divine oath that “He restored that which He took not away.”

A Wealthy Friend

Let Paul now speak:- “Tho’ He was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that we, through his poverty, might become rich.” Thank God again!

Does not common sense alone force the Divine deduction that a condemned representative would irrevocably be as poor as those He came to save? I therefore counsel thee to quit the association of a condemned representative and buy of Jesus, our Surety, Substitute of the better covenant, gold tried in the fire, if you desire to become rich and wear white raiment instead of sinful flesh that the shame of thy nakedness in your rendering of Romans 8:3 do not appear, and anoint thine eyes that thou mayest see that a condemned representative would be blasphemously unfit for the purpose for which God brought Him into existence and hopelessly powerless to redeem Himself, to say nothing of another human soul!

Hitherto you pronounce ransom unjust and profanity, while you retain audacity to use the term yourself, but should an anxious enquirer ask your favour to define the term, then, to the most subtle double dealing on earth he would hearken. If it unjust on the part of God, and profanity to table down a ransom price in order to buy back to Himself (Dr. Thomas’s definition), how much more heinously unjust is your assumption of God’s handing over One whose very nature, you declare, was obnoxious to the curse? You strongly impress me that you are concerned neither about just nor unjust, so long as your sinful flesh hobby can trot. Would to God the dumb beast would once more break the silence and in man’s voice forbid the madness of the prophet.

On page 19 you cite an instance of what you imagine God’s intolerance of substitution, viz.,

“When Israel made the Golden Calf, Moses interceded for them saying to God, If Thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not blot me, I pray Thee, out of the Book which Thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses. Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my Book.” (Exodus 32:32).

Then you comment:- “Substitution was not tolerated.”

To clench your accuracy of this intolerance you ask the following questions:-

First: “If Christ died instead of us, why do we die?”

Second: “And why did Christ rise?”

Third: “And how can God be said to forgive sins for Christ’s sake?”

Here again you skim the surface of things. I ask, did God repudiate substitution, or repudiate Moses as the substitute? Irrefutably the latter. He could not tolerate Moses as the substitute because Moses required to be redeemed, bought back as much so as Judas Iscariot. (Ponder Romans 5 where

this truth is reiterated no less than seven times). Moreover, no soul who has some sins could substitute others with more sins. Besides Moses had been eternally blotted out of the Book of Life. Like Paul, who also could have wished himself accursed from Christ for his brethren's sake, who had a zeal of God but not according to knowledge. Hence this hyperbolic emphasis, both of Moses and Paul, if literally put into effect had landed both companies, with their noble leaders, in an eternal grave.

The substitute man required was one who could give His life's blood a ransom (*anti lutron*) in place of man and rise and sing, "O death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" This One God alone provided: "Unto us a child is born! Unto us a Son is given!" The stone cut out of the mountain without hands accomplished the glory of God, which you, hitherto, have failed to touch, even the hem of His garment.

The prophet says, "No man can by any means redeem - buy back - his brethren." Jesus confirms, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." "I am the door," the second Adam. "I come not to be served but to serve and to give my life a ransom (*anti lutron*) in place of many."

I now undertake to reply to your questions which you imagine puts substitution out of the question. You ask, if Christ died as our substitute, or instead of us

Why do we Die?

I reply, why did not Enoch and Elijah die? It has not yet dawned on you to enquire why do we live? Had the Gracious God declined a ransom for Adam we had never drawn the breath of life (Revelation 13:8, Ephesians 1:14, John 3:16). Permit the Master to answer your query why we die. He declares "He that committeth sin is the servant of sin, and the servant abideth not in the house to the age" (*eis ton aiona*) but the Son abideth to the age (*eis ton aiona*). If therefore, the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." If they must go through the grave on account of your sinful flesh, do you not blankly contradict the Master here? Paul substantiates the Master: "There is therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Does the soul breathe who will refute the possibility of escaping death on the fulfilment of the conditions herein stated?

Why we Die

Jesus declared: "If any man keep my word, he shall by no means see death" to the age [*eis ton aiona*]. The Jews, like our Christadelphian friends, replied, "Now we know thou hast a demon, Abraham died, and the prophets, but thou sayest, if any man keep my word, he shall by no means see death to the age (*eis ton aiona*). Art thou greater than our father Abraham who died, and the prophets; Who is this son of man?" Cannot you perceive your conspicuous photo among those Jews?

Again Jesus declared: "This is that bread which came down from heaven, so that any man may eat of it and not die (*me apothenee*). Here is a positive declaration which is demonstrated by the cases of Enoch and Elijah. "Enoch was translated that he should not see death." Why? "Because he was well pleasing to God." Now hear Jesus but once more: "He that keepeth my word shall by no means see death to the age (*eis ton aiaona*). Thus, instead of wearing the gloomy crepe shroud of death which you cast over Jesus and His people by your "perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3," we receive the garments of praise for the spirit of heaviness, garments smelling of myrrh (Isaiah 63:1, Psalm 45:3), to be kept clean - that is, in Paul's words, "put on Christ."

Why did Christ Rise?

You next ask “If Jesus died as our substitute, why did He rise?”

This question, hitherto, has perplexed many but before I reply to your question permit me to ask another, do you imagine your sin-claimed representative an improvement here? Permit a test: if Jesus, by rising, cease to substitute for us, does not your sin-claimed Representative, by rising, equally cease to represent you? This weapon cuts equally well both ways. Instead of shaking hands with yourself, therefore, you ought to have prayed for light - but a more total subtlety lurks concealed in your very question which you hitherto have failed to perceive, viz., a condemned Representative would prevent, not only His own rising, but also that of every other human soul. How do you escape the dilemma? You attempt it by resorting to a tricky ambiguous middle term. You say, “We have yet to do with the death of Jesus, inasmuch as an apostle hath said, “I am crucified with Christ, buried with him in baptism” (Booklet page 32).

This is smart, but one little question will expose your fallacy, viz., do we require to go through literal crucifixion? Now your trick stands naked! This leap from the literal to the symbolic is a subtle quibble with Divine truth, which diverts the mind of the innocent, unqualified discriminator. Your pretence by a symbol of going through all Christ went through, by an apparent “thus saith the Lord” has played itself out. Is our baptism of equal legal value as the literal crucifixion? Then, I ask why did the Beloved One die at all? Had He turned to “Christendom Astray,” page 114, and your booklet, page 32, He had discovered a tricky escape from literal crucifixion.

I now reply to your next question, viz. - “If Jesus died as our substitute

Why did Christ Die?”

It gives pleasure to point out how Christ could and did substitute us in death, and triumph over the grave. This is the express purpose for which the gracious God sent Him into the world: “The Son of man came, not to be served, but to serve and to give His life a ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) many.” Is there a Greek scholar on earth who will refute this? (Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:45, 1 Timothy 2:6). Here is irrefutable evidence that this was so, but you pronounce it unjust to put the innocent to death and allow the guilty to live. I cannot help that but I can believe that Peter was no juggler, viz., “Christ suffered for sins, the Just for the unjust” (1 Peter 3:18, Isaiah 53).

His own Father, depend upon it, did not commence to “build His house without first sitting down and counting the cost” (Luke 14:28). Then “He laid in Zion a stone, a tried stone, a sure foundation. Judgment also He laid to the line even righteousness to the plummet, and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies (of those that pronounce this Stone under a double curse.” (See Malachi 1:12-14, 1 Corinthians 12:3, Hebrews 10:28, 29). “And the waters shall overflow the hiding place (Ecclesia).” Your covenant with death, even your agreement with the grave shall not stand (on a Condemned Representative).

Why Jesus Rose

He rose in accordance with previous Divine oath and the law of just ransom, as He had previously sacrificed His life’s blood in place of man in accordance with Divine oath (Isaiah 53). The Divine right, provision and conditions were first, “He was God’s own Son,” a truth you, by your “perfectly good rendering,” blotted out of Romans 8:3 and preferred sinful flesh; second, the Divine condition was “Not my will, but thine be done.” Did Jesus do this? “In him was no sin.” At this stage He declared, “The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified,” but unless He, like the grain of wheat, first die, He should remain alone (John 12:24). Hence it was not possible God should leave His Holy One to see corruption (Hebrew 1:2-9).

I now climax the foregoing from your own pen –

“Sin, the Prince, the Devil, had nothing in Jesus, no death claim, no real fault to find. Even Pilate said, I find no fault in Him. No, nor even Herod, and Pilate washed his hands of the case.”

I ask, when will you wash your hands of this case? Could you give a more infamous exhibition of juggling with the Word of God, to declare at the same time that “His very nature was obnoxious to the curse”?

You quote, “He came not to be served, but to serve and give his life a ransom for many” and that “the devil had nothing in Jesus, no death claim.”

What prevented your definition and exposition of the term ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) many? That very term settles the question. Will you open the pages of your Magazine for my affirmative and your negative? If, as you admit, “the devil had nothing in Jesus, no death claim.” His blood was either pure, a just ransom price in place of (*anti lutron*) man or the most brutal murder ever committed under heaven! And blacker still if it was on His own account!

It is a remarkable fact that neither the term “representative” nor “substitute” occurs in God’s Book, while the synonym of both permeates the Book from Alpha to Omega, e.g. type, antitype, representative, surety or substitute, shadow, substance, etc. I agree that a representative can render you an obligation, but not in this case. Permit a test: “And it came to pass in those days that decree went out from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed, and all went to be taxed, every man to his own city.”

Now suppose you had been an invalid unable to go: your representative could oblige by taking with him your cash which would entail him no extra trouble seeing he was irrevocably bound to go and pay his own account - a black hole in which to land the Beloved of God!

Now you must not forget that it is cash Caesar, the devil, ever demands. Also don’t forget that even in this case, you must first furnish your representative with your own cash; otherwise he cannot even represent you. If he pays your tax then he substitutes his cash to square your debt. This is exactly what Jesus did for Adam, on behalf of (*huper*), in place of (*anti*) Adam. He became surety (*egguos*) or substitute of the better covenant (Hebrews 7:22).

The Gracious God also arranged a taxing (Romans 5) but the exact opposite to that of Caesar. God decided to pay the tax for all (John 3:16, Romans 8:3) and He still pleads, “him that cometh unto me, I will by no means cast out,” but will freely hand him the receipt (1 Peter 1:18). Has not God been gracious? But if God had accepted your stratagem of paying this account by handing over to his black majesty one of his very own coins, one whose very nature, you declare, “was obnoxious to the curse,” could you point out to me in history a blacker fraud?

When the two Greeks came up to Jerusalem at the Feast to worship, who desired to see Jesus and came to Philip stating their request, Philip told Andrew and both took the Greeks to Jesus who replied: “The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified, but except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit” (John 12:24).

Just permit your assumption here: **C.C.Walker:**

“Excuse me, Lord, you could not remain alone except you first go through execution for yourself. Your very nature is obnoxious to the curse. You require to attend our Birmingham Lectures and become acquainted with our Basis of Fellowship.”

The severest test to which a pet assumption can be subjected is to read it into God's Word. Even pure deductive logic is then forced to take a back seat. Can you not perceive that in the above interview with the Master, how forcibly He demonstrated that He had a reserve in the Bank upon which He could fall back? He well knew that His own Father was an honest Banker. Jesus at this stage, by perfect obedience to His Father's will, had safeguarded His claim to incorruptibility there and then, His birthright, and like the grain of wheat, in a position to surrender His natural life blood a ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) man.

It was not, therefore, possible the Just God could suffer His Holy One to see corruption. This answers your question how Jesus could, and did, substitute us in death, and exclaim, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" I warn you once more, and implore you to deposit your treasure with this Banker also. It is not a question of sinful flesh but sin's flesh - belonging to sin. Read Romans 8:3 once more and you will there find that Jesus belonged to God and that the Gracious God, by the sacrifice of His own Son in flesh, condemned sin. It was not sin in flesh but Jesus in flesh who was sacrificed to accomplish this. Peter clenches Paul's declaration beyond refutation: "He was put to death in flesh (*sarki*), but was quickened (made alive) in spirit – *pneumatic* 1 Peter 3:18).

Thus your assumption that Christ's very nature was obnoxious to the curse, demanding His execution on His own account is absent from God's Book. Commercial transaction with the Word (John 2:16) will shortly vanish. When He returns the merchants (*emporos*) no more buy (*agorazo*) sinful flesh (Revelation 18:15); you artfully blot out the possessive case in Romans 5 and sling in your favourite adjective "sinful," a horrid dish for infants!

Regeneration

Peter distinctly declares this is not the putting away of supposed filth of flesh but the answer of a good conscience toward God. Paul confirms Peter's declaration: "There is nothing unclean of itself (Romans 14:14). This is a universal negative proposition which excludes not only man but all creation from your pagan assumption of sinful flesh. These declarations guide us as to how a right relation toward God is attained, that it is not a physical quality, but a legal question as to how man can be reconciled to God and become again God's people, God's fundamental law of private ownership.

A Just God cannot steal man back from sin's captivity. It is not, therefore, the quality of flesh but a legal question of pure just redemption. Ponder, "Nothing unclean of itself" (Romans 14:14, Acts 10:28,11:8), "Every sin man committeth is outside the body" (1 Corinthians 6:18). Our right relation to God, then, is reached by our implicit faith that His Son gave His life a ransom in place of (*anti lutro*) man. Then the glorious symbol in baptism, crucifying, dying and burying our Adamic relation and deeds, and rising to new life and relation to God in Christ Jesus.

The Order

BEGOTTEN	1 Peter 1:3, 1 John 5:18, Philemon 10
BORN	1 John 3:9, 1:13, 3:5, 1 Peter 1:23
BABES	Psalm 8:2, Isaiah 3:4, Romans 2:20, Matthew 11:25
MILK	Isaiah 55:1, 1 Corinthians 3:2, 10:3, Hebrews 5:12
SOLID FOOD	John 4:32, 1 Corinthians 3:2, 10:3, Hebrews 5:14
SONS	Galatians 3:26, 4:7, 1 John 3:2, Hebrews 5:12
STATURE	Ephesians 4:11-16. 1 Corinthians 14.20, Hebrews 5:14

"Behold! I and the children whom God hath given me are for signs and wonders." "He shall see the travail of his soul and be satisfied." God's grain of wheat tasted death to yield this crop of wheat, otherwise He had remained alone (John 12:24). This is God's wheat field, but the enemy, ever desirous to improve God's work tried tares among the wheat, the association of a condemned Representative - the uprooting of which is at hand.

Then you say:

“The taking away of sin includes allusions to flesh, blood, body, life and death.”

We agree and we shall examine these in their sequence to ascertain whether your assumption can honestly be read into them and see whether it adorns the gospel of Christ.

Flesh

Jesus: “I am the bread of life. The bread that I will give you is my flesh, which I give for the life of the world.”

C.C.Walker: “Dear Lord, you have neglected to qualify your flesh with my adjective “sinful” (Romans 8:3), a perfectly good rendering, and that you require to give your flesh for yourself also.”

Paul: “You hath he quickened in the body of His flesh, through death.”

C.C.Walker: “Excuse me, Paul, you have not given even a cough regarding the Master’s sin nature, on account of which He required His own blood to be shed before He could possibly be cleansed.”

Blood

Jesus: “This is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many.” “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in yourselves.”

C.C.Walker: Dear Lord, excuse me, I cannot understand why you keep concealed up your sleeve the major prop of our Birmingham Basis of Fellowship. You are still as silent as a corpse regarding that kind of blood you received through the veins of Mary (R.R). Dear Lord, you cannot spare one drop of your blood for us to drink - you will require every drop before you can be cleansed from your own sin nature. Moreover, you utterly surprise me by your pressing us to drink your blood, seeing we must go through all that you, our Condemned Representative, go through (Christendom Astray, p 114 and Booklet, p. 32). Besides, dear Lord, why press us to such profane commercial transaction?”

Body

Jesus: “This is my body which is given for you.” “A body hast thou prepared me,” “sanctified through the offering of Christ once for all.” “He bore our sins in His own body to the tree.”

C.C.Walker: Dear Lord, you utterly surprise me. Do you actually disdain my perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3? You might have popped it in once, at least, in the many references you give. And you also, Peter, have given the show away and caused me to italicize so that it could be that Jesus bore our literal sins in His body which was sinful (Romans 8:3).

Peter: What authority have you, friend Walker, to tamper with and attempt to improve what I have written? If Jesus bore our sins in His body will you, or any other soul in Birmingham, refute substitution? Then you instantly juggle and construe our sins to mean His own supposed sinful flesh. All this jargon abominates and blasphemes the Divine definition and function of a sin-bearer, one who bears the penalty in place of another, with His stripes we are healed. Could our own stripes have healed us? No more than His own stripes could have healed Himself, if He was under your double curse! If therefore He was bruised for our iniquities, what is the logical deduction - pure and positive ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) man.

Never under heaven did God curse man or beast on account of his or its nature, but He did command that a murderer, or an ox that gored a man, shall be put to death. Your pagan assumption

renders Christ blasphemously unfit for the purpose for which the Gracious God brought Him into existence.

Life

Jesus: “The Son of man came, not to be served, but to serve and to give his life a ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) many.”

C.C.Walker: “Dear Lord, be careful here, lest you let the cat out of the bag. You know that *anti lutron* means a ransom, instead of, just as redeem means to buy back (Dr. Thomas). You also know that you, our Condemned Representative, are utterly powerless to accomplish this, even for yourself. You know that our only deliverance from our sinful flesh is by perfect obedience and crucifixion, and we must go through all that you, our Condemned Representative, go through.” (Christendom Astray, page 114).

Death

Jesus: “The Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep.”

C.C.Walker: Yes, the Good Shepherd gave His life for the sheep but I have failed hitherto to convince Him that it was for Himself also. He must have adopted the Clean Flesh Heresy.

The very Scriptures you quote demonstrate how Jesus could and did substitute us in death and triumph over death and sheol. First: He was God’s own Son (Romans 8:3). Second: He fulfilled His Father’s conditions for the Divine nature, beyond the natural (Hebrews 1:9, John 12:24). Before glorification, therefore, He stood in a position whereby He could deliver up the life of His flesh in the blood thereof (Leviticus 17:11) a ransom for man, which Adam by sin forfeited (*zemeothe*). Jesus handed over His life in exchange (*en antallagma*) (Matthew 16:26).

This Jesus accomplished on the Divine Federal Principle. The second Adam stood in the place of the first. This Divine truth is reiterated seven times in Romans 5 alone - see also 1 Corinthians 15 and John 12:24, and Ephesians 1:4 etc. Your assumption of a condemned Representative requiring to square up his own debt, shatters all hope and plunges one into the blackness of oblivion!

Truly thou wast slain and hast redeemed (*egorasas*), bought us back to God by thy blood.

In Him was life unclaimed by Law. Jesus confirms, “As the Father hath life in Himself, so also hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself.” Now contrast the following; “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves.” Again, “I am the light of the world, and the life was the light of man.” Your assumption of this one under condemnation blows the candle out.

Now, they sang a new song in presence of the Throne - and note particularly that no soul could learn that song except those who were redeemed (*egorasmnoi*) – bought back. Still you pronounce this a profane commercial transaction! The apostle continues, “they were redeemed (*egorasthesan*).” I challenge Birmingham to refute Divine commercial transaction here. The very elements of these Greeks spell, “Bought out of the market” (*agora*).

Confusion of Tongues

“And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower which the children of men builded... and the Lord said, Go to, let us go down and confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech.”

History repeats itself. With our Christadelphian friends it is ever a case of “I say,” “Thou sayest,” “He sayeth” - all of them as the theory demands can paint Jesus as pure as the driven snow. In their next paragraph all of them can paint Him as black as the Earl of Pandemonium. We have found Him of whom Moses, the prophets, and the apostles did write; the Alpha, Middle Wall, and Omega of His Father’s own purpose - not white today and black tomorrow - but One who was the same yesterday, is today and will be forever.

Just listen to the late **J.J.Andrew’s**, “I Say!”

“A change must, therefore have taken place in Adam’s physical constitution as the result of this decree... How the change was effected is not revealed, nor is it necessary to know.”

I ask, must we therefore swallow wholesale this unrevealed assumption without even a pinch of salt? No one ever countered more completely the above stupid unrevealed assumption as was done by the late **Robert Roberts**:

“He Sayeth:” “Our friend (David Handley) imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no proof of this whatever, the presumption and evidence are entirely the opposite direction. There was a change in Adam’s relation to his Maker, but not in the nature of his physical organisation.”

I pronounce this declaration of Divine Truth in the first rank in latter day Theology, which deserves to be framed in Gold.

Let us now hear friend **Strickler**:

“He Sayeth:” “That Jesus, having the common sinful nature with those for whom He died...etc.” Again “He Sayeth:” “Christ’s offering was, therefore, for Himself as well as for the people, not for His sins. Christ, as we are, was in need of eternal redemption, and from the mortal flesh and blood condition... and from the possession and dominion of sin.”

I ask, did not Jesus belong to God? If so, He could not at the same time be under the dominion and in the possession of sin - also, this would make God and sin joint proprietors of Jesus. No soul can belong to God and to the devil at one and the same time. Jesus blankly denounces that notion. You cannot serve two Masters.

Will you please furnish me with a greater confusion of tongues in any other denomination under the sun? Jesus says, “Come unto me, all ye that labour, and I will give you rest, my yoke is easy...” etc.

Christadelphian:

“Dear Lord, You are as heavy laden as we, and require a rest more so than we. If you bear our literal sins in your own body which is already obnoxious to the curse, such a load will land you in Sheol.”

It is imperative we commence with the first principles of the faith, even milk, not butcher meat (Romans 8.3), until our faculties become habitually exercised for the discrimination and separation of God’s Son from the sons of sin, otherwise you involve the Son of God. Your absurd fatal adjective of sinful flesh is no where to be found in God’s book. As well say, “John Black, the butcher, his beef must necessarily be black also.” Again when believers are made the righteousness of God in him, you are wide, wide awake not to conclude in righteous flesh. Why then, like a pagan, bungle and deface

Romans 8:3 to conjure up sinful flesh to establish your pet assumption of Christ's "very nature being obnoxious to the curse"?

You handle that text in the trickery of men by cunning craftiness, in systematic deception. There is but one plea left you, viz., ignorance. This calls forth pity and even in that case you should have left it alone. "Where there is no law, there is no transgression," says the apostle. This rules sin out of court. If Christ was born in debt, requiring His blood poured out before He could obtain release from His supposed sinful flesh, why was He sent at all? When the completion of the time arrived "God sent forth His own Son." To an unsophisticated soul that fact alone settles the question but you ever confound the quality of flesh with ownership. Why did God send forth His own Son? Hear the apostle's adverbial of purpose: "That He might redeem (buy off - *ese agorase*) those under Law."

The apostle has another adverbial of purpose, viz., that those bought off ones might receive something, viz., the sonship. But you denounce this "a profane commercial transaction." I cannot help that, but there it stands in the pure irrefutable Greek thought: *ex* - out of, *agora* - market place. Will you or any other sole refute this? God accomplished what the Law could not do, since it was the "ministration of death," and was added "that the offence might abound." By no means the creed absurdity that "no mere man was able to keep the Law" - a scandal on a Just God. How then did God condemn sin and liberate man? By the sacrifice of His own Son in flesh - it was Jesus in flesh, not sin in flesh that was sacrificed. Peter clenches this point beyond refutation; "He was put to death in flesh (*sarki*), but was made alive in spirit (*pneumati*) (1 Peter 3:18). God, by the sacrifice of the life blood of His own Son paid the price "Lord Sin" demanded from Adam - otherwise we had never drawn the breath of life. This was the true light which lighteth every man coming into the world. Your pagan assumption of Christ in debt on account of His flesh would blow the candle out.

There are two possessors mentioned in Romans 8:3, viz., God and the Devil. The Government of each is irrevocable. Adam sold himself to King Sin whose wages is execution (Matthew 16:26, Romans 6:23).

Now, God loved Adam, His dear destitute boy. Could this love of itself reinstate Adam in his Father's home? If so, then you blot heaven by the sacrifice of Dear Jesus on Calvary. On the other hand, if the Government of king Sin could prove your charge of the double curse, Edenic and Mosaic, against Jesus, do you imagine you improve matters? Contemptible Theology! This would reap oblivion.

Now, there was a certain rich man who had a steward (editor) who was accused to him of wasting his goods (Romans 8:3) and having called him, said to him, What is this I hear of thee? Render an account of thine editorship, for thou cannot be an editor any longer. And the editor said within himself, What shall I do, for the Master taketh the editorship from me? I cannot dig, and I am ashamed to beg. I know what I will do, that when I am deprived of the editorship that they may receive me into their homes. So the editor curtailed the debt of each, and the Master applauded the unjust editor for his perfectly good rendering of Romans 8:3 and for his skill in commercial transaction.

You conclude your pamphlet with the most appropriate question you ever asked in your life, viz.:

Men and Brethren, What Shall We Do?

I reply, confound not the legal with the physical and thou shalt behold the Lamb of God, instead of a Condemned Representative. This will relieve you of conjuring up words and phrases to the tune of sinful flesh. Imaging Jesus a Constitutional Sinner. But this appellation was found too glaring when it had to give place to your theoretical distinction between Christ's physical constitution and His moral relation to His Father, thus dividing Christ into two sections, or apparent personalities. This

enables you to sit astride the fence and advocate either side as your assumption demands. The very God of heaven forbids you and your brethren to split up His Holy One after such a fashion! This acrobatic leap from the concrete physical constitution to the abstract moral relation eclipses the Old Lady's Immaculate Conception. It paralyses the law of contradiction and exhibits the most contemptible logic under heaven. Divine truth, like the water of life, winds its silver streak between these bleak mountains of delusion and death.

God's message is as silent as the grave regarding an abstract Christ. Did Jesus sacrifice His moral relation for us? This had nullified His power over the grave! Well, then, if you curse His physical constitution, will it improve your case? Would not a cursed sacrifice pollute the table of the Lord? (Malachi 1:12-14, Hebrews 10:12-14, 26-29). Did Jesus actually say, "This is my cursed body which is given for myself"? Are you not ashamed of your pamphlet?

Your association of a condemned representative, together with your theoretical distinction, enables you to conjure up two Christs, like the Siamese twins, one of whom you paint black, the other white; then as your assumption demands, you pluck your twins asunder and pop in Darkie into the nominative case of some of the most contemptible orations under heaven, like that of Herod who was afterwards eaten of worms.

Your theoretical distinction can scatter the rules, moods and figures of syllogism to the four winds of heaven and inflate our vocabulary to explosion!

Conclusion

Dear friend Walker, cannot you perceive what you and your brethren should do? With the apostle, I reply, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins," instead of forcing into the mouth of Peter that "He bare our literal sins in His body to the tree" and instantly construe our sins to mean His own supposed sinful flesh - a pitiable exposition of the function of a sin-bearer. Read Isaiah 53, "He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him and with His stripes we are healed." Could we have been healed by our own stripes? Does not the prophet gloriously fill in Peter's ellipses? Just imagine the Priest, on the Day of Atonement 'pumping' the sins of the people into the victim! Cannot you perceive that by your denunciation of the God-provided ransom the God of heaven pronounces the case against you and your brethren? You denounce ransom "a profane commercial transaction," to uphold a pagan delusion of sinful flesh which would, if true, undoubtedly have involved Jesus since there is but one kind of flesh of men.

You also restrict the purpose served by the Divine begettal of Jesus to the arming Jesus with superhuman power to conquer this supposed demon in His flesh, and skilled yourselves to dodge his 'Black Majesty' by your pretence of going through all that Christ went through. ("Christendom Astray," page 114).

God declares "Ye have profaned it, in that ye say, the table of the Lord is polluted, and His fruit thereof, even His meat thereof is contemptible." Could anything more contemptible than sinful flesh be placed on the table of the Lord! "And ye have snuffed at it, saith the Lord of hosts. And ye brought the torn, the lame, and the sick. Thus ye and your brethren brought an offering. Shall I accept this at your hand, saith the Lord? Cursed be the deceiver who hath in his flock a male and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing (obnoxious to the curse - "Christendom Astray," page 113). For I am a great King, saith the Lord of hosts and my name is dreadful among the heathen."

Cannot you and your brethren now perceive what the Lord requires at your hands in this Divine denunciation of sinful flesh sacrifices offered unto Him? Hear the conclusion of the Lord's reproof of you and your brethren: instead of permitting the continuance of your sin-claimed Representative whose very nature you declare was obnoxious to the curse, He purposes to sweep from off the face of

the earth your fatal delusion when from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, “my name shall be great among the Gentiles and in every place shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering.”

Could the gracious God have used language more explicit? Do you and your brethren approach God through this pure offering, this ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) man, the Gift of God alone? If this one were holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners, do you justify yourselves by your crafty “theoretical distinction” in splitting up the Beloved of God to extract His moral relation and damn His physical constitution? Can you and your brethren, in spite of this Divine rebuke, satisfy yourselves that such is the pure offering which the Most High purposes to establish throughout the earth in the very near future?

We have analysed the assumption of Adam’s constitution being death proof and the evidence, as Dr. Thomas declared, points the opposite way. Let the qualified objector examine the statement *esti soma psuchikon*. Again, *ek ges choikos* (1 Corinthians 15:44-47). The baptized believer is therefore in the same relation to God legally, morally and physically as Adam was prior to rebellion. “If the Son shall make you free (*eleutheroras*) then shall you be free indeed.”

It is wholly a question of Law, ownership, relation and character, while the physical constitution remains the same. Every creation of God is good (1 Timothy 4:4). Nothing is unclean of itself (Romans 14:14). Even where there is no Law, there is no transgression, no sin. This annihilates the sinful flesh assumption and clears Jesus at the Bar. Again, “If I had not done the works amongst them which no other man did, they had not had sin.”

The Master challenged His enemies, “Which of you convicteth me of sin?”

C.C.Walker: Dear Lord, we are not aware that you ever sinned, but you are sinful flesh, rendering your very nature obnoxious to the curse.

The apostle exhorts us to look to the Leader and Perfecter of the faith, Jesus, who, instead of (*anti*) choosing the Joy set before Him (see John 12:24), He first endured the Cross, despising the shame and has sat down at the right hand of God. The joy set before Him was not His own glorification, though the hour had come that He should be glorified - the joy set before Him was the “bringing of many sons to glory.” Instead of selfishly accepting His glorification and remaining alone, He chose rather to go through the jaws of execution, pay the ransom that the other Lord (as Dr. Thomas declared) demanded for man.

Dear friend Walker, I ask you in deepest sympathy, whether a Representative under the same condemnation could possibly have had any choice in the above case? The crucifixion of the Beloved of God is the greatest tragedy that ever transpired on earth. If this was to wipe off His own debt, then you blot the very Throne of God.

Jesus says, “The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified.” Indeed, I assure thee, except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit.

Does the soul breathe who could improve or render more explicit that other statement of His, “The Son of man came, not to be served but to serve and give His life a ransom in place of (*anti lutron*) many” (Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:45, 1 Timothy 2:6, John 12:24).

If redemption means to buy back (see Dr. Thomas’s definition) and *anti lutron* means a ransom in place of, then a Representative as much under the curse as those He came to save, must be a black fraud and I am positive that no soul of yours would permit me to buy back from you by handing you back your own coin!

I repeat, the joy set before Christ was not His own glorification but His bringing many sons to glory. He knew His own glorification was in safe hands, viz., “Thou wilt not leave my soul in sheol, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption.”

“It is more blessed to give than to receive.”
“Today, if you will hear His voice, harden not your hearts.”

Your sincere friends, Andrew and Lena Wilson.

First published Circa 1935