

# The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 100

## March 1988

In this Issue : -

Page 1 Editorial	Brother and Sister Linggood
Page 2 Sacrifice	A Christadelphian
Page 8 God's Will Be Done	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 10 Jesus My Substitute	Brother A. L. Wilson
Page 12 Letter from	Mr H. Taylor

---

### Editorial

Dear Brethren and Sisters and Reader friends, Warm Greetings in Our Saviours Name.

We thank all who have corresponded with us during the past month.

Our Sister May Lockett is a little better, has been discharged from the Nursing Home and back in her own home again. Not being able to write herself would wish to thank those who have written to her or visited her and she sends her love to all brethren and sisters.

Owing to increasing age we are finding the monthly production of the Circular Letter somewhat arduous and so propose as from now to issue it every two months (God willing). The next issue will be for April/May, hoping this decision will be acceptable to all.

We have heard that our Brother Albert Woodhouse has recently suffered a Stroke but is recovering satisfactorily, I'm sure we all wish him a full recovery.

In this month's issue we have an article on 'Sacrifice' by a Christadelphian now deceased, as will be seen he shared largely our view on this important subject. Also an exhortation by Bro. Leo Dreifuss; the first instalment of "Jesus my Substitute" by Andrew Wilson. A letter by interested friends to their Christadelphian friends.

With our sincere Love to all, yours in the Masters Service.

Harvey and Evelyn Linggood.

---

O God, Thou art my God alone,  
Early to Thee my soul shall cry,  
A pilgrim in a land unknown,  
A thirsty land, whose springs are dry.

Better than life itself Thy love,  
Dearer than all beside to me.  
For whom have I in heaven above,  
Or what on earth, compared to Thee ?

Yet through this rough and thorny maze  
I follow hard on Thee, my God;  
Thine hand, unseen, upholds my ways,  
I safely tread where Thou hast trod.

Praise with my heart, my mind, my voice,  
For all Thy mercy I will give;  
My soul shall still in God rejoice,  
My tongue shall bless Thee while I live.

\* \* \* \* \*

The greatest wealth is contentment with a little.

# Sacrifice

**PREFACE.** The article reproduced herewith was written some years ago by a Christadelphian who recognised the unscriptural nature of the Physical Condemnation theory as defined in the Statement of Faith and who sought to assist the brotherhood to a better understanding of the loving purpose of God in the Sacrifice of Jesus.

Although the writer falls short on some important points, his work is a tremendous advance on what is generally regarded as acceptable, and we are in thorough agreement as far as he goes.

We asked for permission to reprint it over the author's name, but unfortunately, like many other brethren who can see either partly or wholly eye to eye with us, he prefers for the sake of peace to retire into anonymity rather than face anew the scorn and resentment meted out to those who have the courage to cry aloud and spare not. Nevertheless, we send it forth in the hope that it may serve as a steppingstone to the Truth to some earnest seeker, and that the unnamed author may see at the great day some fruit to his labour.

He powerfully exposes the teaching that Jesus' death was in any sense on his own account, but he fails when almost within arm's length of it, to reach the goal and recognise on whose account, primarily. His death was necessary. The very conspicuous absence of the Letter to the Romans, in particular the 5th. chapter, in his exposition, is the explanation of his failure. This chapter conclusively proves the importance of the Federal principle to an understanding of the Atonement: the one federal head, Adam, brought condemnation; the other federal head, Christ, brought justification.

The main objections to "Adamic condemnation" are :-

1. The word "Adamic" is not found in the Bible.
2. It is said to be unjust.
3. It is sins, not sin that we are freed from.

All these objections are answered in the 5th of Romans alone, apart from in the general teaching of the whole Bible. That condemnation passed upon all men as a result of man's disobedience is plainly stated, and it cannot be denied that Adam was that one - man, so that No. 1 is a very weak objection. The second needs a little more explanation because of the prevalent false theory of substitution. It is evident from Deut. 24, 16, that no man will have to suffer for another man's sin, but it is quite as evident from I Peter 5,18, that Jesus, the Just, died for the unjust, in that He willingly gave Himself as a ransom, Matthew 20, 25.

In regard to No. 3, we believe with the writer, that sins are included, but it is the first sin that alienated Adam's offspring, and which occasioned the need for a redeeming sacrifice. The Redemptive work of Christ covers THE SIN and sins, from Eden to the end of the 1,000 years. To the best of our knowledge this preface and the appendix was written by our late brother F.J.Pearce. In the original booklet portions are in heavy black type.

## "Sacrifice."

A complete understanding of the word sacrifice is of paramount importance if we would desire to comprehend the truth concerning the death of Jesus Christ. Webster's definition of the word is: "Destruction or loss incurred for the purpose of obliging someone; to destroy or give up something else; to devote with loss." We are all more or less familiar with the many examples of such sacrifice in our everyday life, but the highest point of supreme sacrifice is displayed for our notice in the death of our Saviour. For we read in I Cor. 5, 7, that Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us. Keeping in mind the true meaning of the word, we can the more clearly understand and embrace the Love of God, a Love that must be of superlative degree when God Himself commends it to our notice. Listen to the reason for

such commendation: “Scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet peradventure for a good man, some would even dare to die, but God commendeth His love to us, in that whilst we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Romans 5, 7, 8). How such a love must appeal to us, when it rises so high above all the best of human love that we see in such like things as the love and personal sacrifice of a mother for her offspring, etc.

The love of God being rightly placed and received, we can then clearly understand and appreciate such a statement as this: That God so “loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life. (John 3, 16).

Herein do we see the necessity of Christ’s death for the benefit of the world. And why necessity? Because of our transgressions. Having transgressed God’s law, we are accounted as sinners in His sight,<sup>\*(see note 1.)</sup> for sin is the transgression of the law (I John 3, 4) and without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin. (Heb. 9, 22). To the Israelites, the Prophet said that your iniquities have separated between you and your God. (Isaiah 59, 2). So we see that the chosen people of God had become in a separated, and therefore alienated, condition, because of their iniquities. In this condition they stood greatly in need of reconciliation, if they would partake of the favour of God. Much more we, who are of the wild olive tree, do stand greatly in need of some means of reconciliation. For we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God (Rom. 5, 23). But we have also been granted repentance unto life (Acts 11, 18). With much rejoicing we can say that we who were sometime alienated and enemies in our minds by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled (Col. 1, 21).

*\* Note 1. Because of our transgressions. Our transgressions are certainly included, but the primary purpose is our release from Sin’s bondage, unto which Adam sold the whole race. There are two distinct stages of remission of sins. First by redemption, second forgiveness when related to Christ, I John 2, 2. We must be the subjects of the first before we can obtain the second. Having transgressed God’s law, we are accounted as sinners. If we transgress God’s laws, we are sinners. We can only be accounted sinners on the Federal Principle; “In whom all sinned”, Rom. 5,12. The unenlightened, although sinners in one sense, are not accountable, not being under law. The passage from Isaiah is against the writer rather than in his support, since it is said to the Jews, who were a covenanted people.*

The grandeur and simplicity of the truth now clearly teaches us that it is not our liability to sin, but our sins that are an offence to God; not our natural weakness in regard to temptation, but our yielding to temptation, that incurs the wrath and displeasure of the Creator. Jesus Christ was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin (Hebrews 4, 15). A reconciliation was therefore not required between the Father and the Son. But it is we who have been reconciled to God by His Son (II Cor. 5, 17). For God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them (II Cor. 5, 19).<sup>.\*see note 2.)</sup> What then became of our trespasses? In like manner as the sins of the people under the Mosaic Law were imputed to the animal chosen for sacrifice, so our transgressions were imputed to Him. Thus we read that He was made sin (a sin offering) for us; (He) who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him (II Cor. 5, 21). God’s own arrangement. His righteousness imputed to us. Our trespasses imputed to the slain Lamb. For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God (I Peter 3, 18). Seeing then that He was without sin, neither was guile found in His mouth (I Peter 2, 2); that He was the beloved Son of God (Mark 1, 11); that He was always obedient to His heavenly Father (Phil. 2, 8). He could be chosen as the Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world (John 1, 29), and truly He was the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13, 8). His death on the cross was an act of obedience to His Father (Phil. 2, 8). How such Scriptural language justify Him from the accusations so often made against Him by present-day professors of the truth, that His death was needful to free Himself from some condemnation resting upon Him. Such language, as sin nature, Adamic condemnation, inherited sin, and such like are not to be found in the Scriptures. They are merely terms invented by man, which becloud and therefore obscure the grand but simple truth concerning the Sacrifice of Christ. If a man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God. How plain would then become the statement that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (I Cor. 13, 5).

\* **Note 2.** *II Cor. 5, 19.* The words “not imputing their trespasses” proves they were not sinners in the direct sense. The righteousness of Christ which is imputed to us is proof that we had none of our own and that it is the gift of God. In the same way, trespasses that are imputed or not imputed are not our own but those under which we are required by scripture to regard ourselves for the purposes of reconciliation; by Grace not works.

Where shall we then look for some corroborative evidence regarding this plain statement of the Apostle Paul? To the serpent was said that the seed of the woman should bruise his head (Gen. 3, 15). How this was accomplished is revealed to us in Hebrews ch. 2 v. 14; Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood He (Christ) also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death. He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is (Sin personified as) the devil. How clearly the death of Christ is prefigured in the case of the lamb slain for the children of Israel, in Egypt, that the Angel of Death might Passover.

To the Corinthians Paul says: “For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us” (I Cor. 5, 7). All the shadow offerings under the Law of Moses (and let it be noted that the animals chosen for sacrifice must be without blemish) pointed forward to Christ, the substance. For the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin, but pointed forward to one who could (Hebrews 10, 4). What harmony we then see in Peter’s statement that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things... from your vain conversation... but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot (I Peter 2, 18). Such language as this should make comprehensible the announcement to Daniel, that after three-score and two weeks, shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself (Daniel 9, 26). The objector has said that the words “not for Himself”, are not to be found in some original manuscript. But which of the cavillers have resurrected from musty obscurity the manuscripts that tell us plainly and unmistakably that He was cut off for Himself? If such a statement could be found, irrevocable logic would say to us that he was not cut off for us.

What saith the Prophet? He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, all we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned everyone to his own way, and the lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. For He was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgressions of my people was He stricken. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him. He hath put Him to grief; when His soul shall make an offering for sin He shall see His seed. He shall see the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied; by His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities... because He has poured out His soul unto death... and He bear the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors. (Isaiah chapter 53).

What an abundance of proof is here placed before us. Surely sufficient to demonstrate to us that the statement to Daniel must stand, that the Messiah was not cut off for Himself. The prophecy was fulfilled. In due time Christ died for the ungodly (Rom. 5, 6). He was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin (I John 5, 5). Let those who seek to add to the prophecy by Isaiah chapter 53, and by so doing stultify the truth of that prophecy, ask themselves the question that Philip asked of the Eunuch, when he found him reading the same prophecy: Understandest thou what thou readest? (Acts 8, 30).

Beginning with the birth of Christ, we find the Angel telling Mary to call the child’s name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins. (Matthew 1, 21). How was this done? Only by shedding His blood for the remission of their sins. And the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin (I John 1, 7). And He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world (I John 2, 2). Seeing then that Christ has loved us and given Himself for us ( Eph. 5,2).

We must also love one another, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it (Eph. 5, 25). We must be considerate to our brethren. Destroy not him (thy brother) with thy meat, for whom Christ died (Rom. 8, 14). How pertinent are the words of our elder brother himself: Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends, and ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you (John 15, 13, 14).

Again He said: I am the Good Shepherd. The Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep (John 10, 11). We the sheep have gone astray, <sup>\*(see note 3.)</sup> we have each walked after our own lusts, but the grace of God was abundant towards us, for He spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all (Rom. 8, 52). Seeing then that He died unto sin once (Rom. 6, 10), we can rejoice in that we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all (Hebrews 10, 10).

\* **Note 3.** *“We the sheep have gone astray”. This again applied to Jews under Law and not to those who are not His Sheep.*

A certain well-known writer has said that it is a law of God that sin-stricken nature is unclean; a thus saith the Lord, is not appended for such a bold statement. But for support he says that it is typified by leprosy, in which case there was a legal uncleanness in addition to the physical condition and for cleansing there had to be an offering made. Now mark the words in addition. By reference to the narrative, we find that a leprous person was legally unclean and required an offering to be made because of his physical condition and not in addition to it. In like manner a woman under the law was deemed to be physically unclean when she had given birth to a child; the law commanded an offering to be made. <sup>\*(see note 4.)</sup> When the requirements of the law had been satisfied, she was said to be clean, but the nature had undergone no change. It was not a sin to be leprous or to give birth to a child. It would have been a sin not to have offered for physical uncleanness, as thereby would have been disobedience of the law. And here we have the root of the whole matter: disobedience to any God-given commandment is sin, for sin is the transgression of the law. Atonement will have to be made, if we are to escape the penalty attaching to the breach of law.

\* **Note 4.** *The uncleanness following childbirth and certain diseases were physical uncleanness and according to law. These ordinances, like circumcision, first-born etc., were to keep constantly before the mind God\* s prerogative as the Redeemer. The lesson to be learned, from Eden and right through the law, was the plan of redemption without which there is no hope, and those who see no need of, or reject, the federal principle lack the real appreciation of God’s loving plan.*

Although we know that obedience is better than sacrifice, yet God, foreknowing that all mankind would become sinners except one, permitted that one to be offered to bear the sins of many (Heb. 9, 28). God so loved us that He sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins (I John 4, 10). And now we being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him (Rom. 5, 9). For we must confess that at one time we walked according to the course of this world, having the same spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience, among whom also we had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh, and were by nature (or by reason of such things) the children of wrath even as others (Eph. 2, 2, 5). But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, gave His own Son, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people (Heb. 2, 17). But if, as unscripturally stated by many teachers, the wrath of God be upon us because of our possession of what they falsely term sin nature, then truly Christ would have stood in need of reconciliation Himself. If that could only be accomplished by means of His own death, then it would have been a case of Satan casting out Satan, which Christ Himself considered to be impossible (Mark 5, 25). “Physician, heal thyself,” could justifiably have been said of Him. How differently the Psalmist views the matter when he says: “None can by any means redeem his brother nor give to God a ransom for him” (Psalm 49, 7). Here lies the distinction between Jesus Christ and us. He was not in need of redemption, therefore He could offer Himself as the ransom price for us. How understandable then are His words that the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many (Matthew 20, 28). Himself not being in need of redemption. He was indeed rich, yet, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich (II Cor. 8, 9). It is not possible for one who is held to ransom to pay the ransom price for another who is likewise held to ransom. He must himself be free. <sup>\*(see note 5.)</sup> But Christ gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time (I Tim. 2, 6). For God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked should turn from his wickedness and live (Ezekiel 33, 11). God has not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us (I Thess. 5, 9, 10).



\* **Note 5.** *He must himself be free. The writer here arrives with complete accuracy at one great truth concerning Jesus which Christadelphians dare not face. The late Edward Turney taught the same truth, which in his day was falsely labelled the free-life theory.*

The words “for us” are synonymous with the words “for our sins”. The Apostle Paul greets the Galatians thus: Grace and peace be unto you from our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins ( Gal. 1, 34). Again he addressed them by saying: The life which I now live in the flesh. I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me (Gal. 2, 20). For what reason did He give Himself for the Apostle Paul? He himself tells us that: Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the chief (I Tim. 1, 15). How clear and concise is the reason for Christ’s death thus set out for us. If the mission of His death was for the redemption of so-called sin-nature, how could the Apostle style himself the chief?

There is surely no gradations to sin-nature. But our transgressions can be multiplied. Our offences are many. Yet there is deliverance from them, because Christ was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification (Romans 4, 25). And when He had by Himself purged our sins. He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High (Hebrews 1, 3).

Again we read that after He had offered one Sacrifice for Sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God (Hebrews 10, 12). God being in heaven this is the place that the Apostle Paul styles the most holy place, where Christ hath entered to appear in the presence of God for us (Hebrews 9, 24). It was by His own blood that he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us (Hebrews 9, 12). There is no gainsaying the fact that the redemption here mentioned, through His shed blood was for us. Were it for Himself, we are still in need of redemption, and would also be a flat contradiction of the truthful axiom that any that is already forfeited, cannot purchase redemption for another that is likewise forfeited, What saith the great apostle; In whom (Christ) we have redemption, through His Blood, even the forgiveness of sins (Col. 1, 14). This statement to the Colossians covers the whole groundwork of redemption in as condensed a manner as possible. He tells us who hath received the redemption, what it consists of and also the price paid for it. Let us acknowledge His death to be a sacrificial death on our account, then only, can we measure the great love of Christ. For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead, and that he died for. all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves but unto Him which died for them (II Corinthians 5, verses 14 and 15).\*(see note 6.)

\* **Note 6.** *II Cor. 5, 14-15. How were all dead? It must be obvious that this death (the same as in Rom. 5, 12) is not literal death and therefore it can only apply in the legal or federal sense. It is not the result of acts done in ignorance but of the sentence passing unto all men who come to a knowledge of the purpose of God. All who sin wilfully afterwards will be held responsible to the wages, the second death. The scriptures demand a recognition of the federal principle by the use of such terms as Bought and Sold. Alienated and Reconciled, Bondage and Freedom. In the Flesh and In Spirit, etc.*

And why should we not live unto ourselves? Because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow in His steps, who did no sin neither was guile found in His mouth (I Peter 2, 21, 22). Forasmuch then as Christ has suffered for us (I Peter 4, 1). Let us consecrate our lives unto Him that loved us and washed from our sins in His own blood (Rev. 1,5). Let us be constantly and fervently looking for the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave Him-self for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity (Titus 2, 15).

If we have believed the truth regarding His sacrificial death, and doubtless this is indeed necessary, that we might truly “be baptised into His death, we can then be amongst those who will welcome Him by saying: For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood, out of every kindred and tongue and nation (Rev. 5, 9). Which of you convinceth Me of sin? asked Jesus Christ of His hearers (John 8,46). Had He asked that question in our day, how many would there have been ready to convince Him that He was the possessor of a nature for which a sin offering must be made. How applicable to these accusers would seem the words of Caiaphas. Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people that the whole nation perish not. (John 11, 50). Jesus Christ

gave eloquent testimony to His apostles for the reason of His death. At the Passover supper He said unto them: Drink ye all of it, for this is My blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins (Matthew 26, 28). One of the apostles present at the Passover supper would surely understand what Christ meant, for in making an allusion to the Crucifixion says: Who His own self bear our sins in His own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins should live in righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed (I Peter 2, 24). One fundamental fact is evident to our eyes, that whatever Christ died for, we have been baptised for, should have been removed from us, baptism is symbolical of His death, death is a putting off, a parting with something. On emerging from the waters of baptism our past sins are put off. We are estimated as having been crucified with Christ. The people under the law had become in an accursed condition because of their disobedience. Seeing then that all unrighteousness is sin (I John 5, 17) it required one who was righteous to be a sin offering to remove that curse. The Apostle Paul tells the Galatians that this was accomplished for Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us (Gal. 3, 13). In Deuteronomy chapters 21, 22, and 23 we read that anyone committing a sin worthy of death, was accursed of God, if he be put to death and hung upon a tree, his body was not to remain all night on the tree, because he was accursed of God. Our sins being accounted to Him, He was accursed for us. Let those who would suggest that He was accursed merely because He hung upon a tree, or because he possessed a nature like unto us, take heed to the words of an inspired apostle: "Wherefore I give you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed" (I Cor. 12, 5). We know that our Saviour possessed a nature like unto us, but that is not in God's sight a heinous offence or a cause of alienation, or a sin. Let the Apostle James explain: Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed, then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin when is finished bringeth forth death (James 1, 14, 15). A clear and sufficient indication of the reason for the death of Christ is displayed to our notice in the animal sacrifices offered up under the Law of Moses, because they were the types or shadows of that greater sacrifice of Christ. When an Israelite had sinned, and brought a sacrificial animal to be offered as an atonement for his sin, he placed his hand upon the head of the animal to be slain. This action on the part of the one confessing his sin was of great significance as it signified the transference of the transgression of that person to the animal about to be slain. God had appointed and approved this action, and the great significance attached to it being that the sin of the Israelite was imputed to the animal. This proves to us that sins can be borne by another, by having them transferred from the sinner to the victim. After sins were transferred, blood was shed, the life was taken, because of the sins, shewing that death was the penalty or punishment due for the sins of the confessor. To suffer the punishment due to sin, the Bible teaches us, is to bear sin. The testimony: "But every one that eateth it shall bear his iniquity. That soul shall be cut off." The analogy to Christ is hereby perceptible: "By His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities". (Isaiah 55. 11). This was fulfilled at His death, for He bear our sins in His own body on the tree (I Peter 2, 24). The enactments of the law show to us that the penalty for sin was executed upon the sacrificial animal instead of the sinner himself. The sinner by the ceremony, in effect said: I have committed a sin worthy of death; I acknowledge my guilt before God, and I avail myself of the means he has graciously appointed for obtaining the forgiveness of my sin by bringing this animal and yielding it up to death, that I may escape the infliction of the death penalty to which I am justly liable, because of my sin, and that it may be visited upon this animal. All these things were acceptable to God for the time then present, although they were but shadows of the substance to follow. In Heb. 10 the Apostle says: For the law having a shadow of good things to come and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offer year by year make the comers thereunto perfect, for then would they not have ceased to be offered? Because the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins every year, for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices which can never take away sins. But this man (Christ) after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever sat down on the right hand of God. He taketh away the first to establish the second. So we see that the offerings under the law were figurative and prophetic of Christ and His great atoning work. In the Mosaic and Christian systems, the unsinning victim is regarded as the sin-bearer.

It is in this light that we must regard the death of Christ; He was without sin, pure, holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners, yet the death that He suffered was the penalty due to us, for our many offences that God laid upon Him. Seeing that the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin,

Christ takes the place of animals as the anti-type to put away sin; and so we read that He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. Let the honest and truth-seeking reader consider the following passages, which tell us plainly what happened to the person who had to bear his own iniquity or his own sin: Leviticus 5, 1, 17; 7, 18; 17, 16; 19, 8; 20, 17; 20, 20; 22, 9; Numbers 9, 15; 18, 22. These few passages from amongst many others will serve to illustrate and explain how Jesus Christ did bear our sins, only, by suffering the penalty due to them - Heb. 9, 28; Isaiah 53, 12; I Peter 2, 24; and not as is affirmed by some, because He had the same nature or physical constitution as His brethren,

Were the physical nature we possess beheld as unclean or condemned, in God's sight, then truly Christ in common with His brethren would stand condemned also. The word condemnation implies a need for reconciliation or atonement. But in vain do we search the Scriptures for any testimony that will show to us that the word "condemned" as censured, pronounced to be wrong, guilty, worthless, or adjudged or sentenced to punishment. Would any God-fearing person attribute any of the foregoing definitions to Christ except it be on our account, for our sins, our iniquities, our transgressions, our disobedience, that we might receive the atonement, that we might be saved. Christ Jesus our Redeemer is the one we look to as our Saviour. His death was our passover. His death was purely a sacrifice for us.

**APPENDIX.** As noted in preface, the foregoing article is, as far as it goes, an excellent presentation of one phase of the truth concerning the atonement; the main failure is due to neglect of the teaching of Romans chapter 5. It may assist to an understanding of the Federal principle to explain that it is a legal principle analogous to the present laws of naturalisation. By enlightenment we find ourselves citizens of Adam's domain, by faith and obedience we can become citizens of Christ's domain. We were sold under Sin by Adam; we are bought into Righteousness by Christ; servants of sin or servants of righteousness. One is the Old Man, the other is the New Man. The one is the Body of Sin, the other is the Body of Christ, or again, the Body of Death (Adamic body) and the Body of Life (Christ body), and we can pass out of the one into the other by means of the Law of redemption which Christ effected by His shed blood.

Through One man THE Sin entered into the world (in Whom all sinned) and through the ONE sin, THE Death. (Romans 5, 12).

The DEATH reigned from Adam, over those who had not sinned as Adam (v. 14)

By the Fall of the ONE (Adam) many died, so by God's favour the Gift by One Man, Jesus Christ (v. 15).

ONE (Adam) having sinned, THE sentence was from ONE to condemnation... the gracious gift from many offences by ONE (Christ) to righteousness (v. 16).

By the fall of the ONE, THE death reigned, so by the righteousness of One, The Life reigned (v. 17).

Through One Offence, Sentence came on all men to condemnation, so also through ONE Righteous ACT, sentence came on all men unto justification of Life (v. 18).

Through the disobedience of ONE man, many were CONSTITUTED sinners, so through the obedience of One, the many will be CONSTITUTED righteous (v. 19).

The Law (Mosaic) entered that THE OFFENCE (of Eden, not offences) might abound, but where THE Sin abounded, grace did much more abound (v. 20).

As The Sin reigned by The Death, so Grace reigned through Righteousness for Eternal Life through Jesus Christ (v. 21).



If the 5th Chapter of Romans were given unbiased study, no reasonable person would object to “Adamic condemnation”, nor reject the just federal principle which God has put into operation by scripturally concluding all under (THE) Sin. To make light of The Sin of the World, which Jesus, as the Lamb of God came to take away by the Sacrifice of Himself, denotes a failure to perceive any meaning whatsoever in a large part of the Bible.

We conclude this copy with a loving and sincere entreaty to all who read it, to make their calling and election sure by a proper appreciation and acceptance of the Love of God towards a perishing world, manifested in the Sacrifice of our Saviour.

For God so loved the world, that he gave His only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.  
John. 3,16.

---

## **God’s Will Be Done.    Numbers Ch. 22 And 25**

All that is written in the scriptures is for our learning. We learn from history recorded in the pages of the Bible what to do and what not to do. Today I want to consider two instances of what the Word of God tells us not to do. There is the case of Balaam. He was determined to go on that disastrous mission, trying to curse Israel. He knew from the outset that it was not God’s will that he should go with the messengers of Balak. God told him so twice. But his trouble was greed for fame. And in his determination he kept on waiting to see if God would change His mind. But God does not change His mind at the will of rebellious man. What did he say (Num. xxiii. 19) “God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?” Balaam eventually went, but what a disastrous undertaking! First he nearly lost his life when the angel of the Lord withstood him, and the apparently stubborn ass saved him. Then when he eventually got to his destination, he was forced to bless the children of Israel whom Balak wanted to be cursed. So apart from having nearly lost his life he failed in his object of worldly fame and wealth.

Viewing that journey it was a great waste of time and effort, and altogether avoidable had he submitted to God’s will in the first place.

The second case is that of the Jews that were left in the land of Israel after that Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon carried most of the people into captivity in the time of Jeremiah.

They were afraid of the Babylonian army and wanted to flee to Egypt. They thought they would be safe there. So they asked Jeremiah to pray for them, and inquire for God’s mind. They wanted up to a point, to do God’s will. But deep down in their heart so it seems to me, they wished that God’s will was for them to go into Egypt. Again we know the outcome. The prophet told them distinctly that they should stay where they were; in the land of Judah. But in their determination and self will they went into Egypt against divine warning, and far from being at peace there, the war caught up with them in the end. Like Balaam’s journey, it was futile, and for the same reason: against the will of God.

Now applying these lessons, especially the last, to us, do we not sometimes badly want something and pray to God that our wish may be granted? I don’t mean necessarily money or some material possession, but that something should happen in our lives, such as getting a job which we badly desire, or getting a promotion, or passing some examination. Do we always add in our prayers something such as “if it be Thy will”? I suspect that many of us do, but deep down in our hearts we feel like those Jews who were bent on fleeing into Egypt, and wish that God’s will matches ours. But not always so. God sees beyond our present circumstances and knows what is, and what is not good for us. If our desire is not fulfilled, if we have faith, we may come to see a few years later how good it turned out to be that our

prayer was not answered. Our position resembles that of a child asking his parents for something not good for him.

There comes to mind the case of a youngster in his early mid-teens seeing his mates smoke. He wanted to be like them, or perhaps just to show off, and ask his father for permission to smoke. Father refuses because he knows that it is unhealthy. The youngster keeps on pestering, just as Balaam kept on asking God. If the father has a strong will power, his 'No' is final. But unfortunately many fathers give in. The youngster starts to smoke, only to discover years after when chest trouble sets in, that dad knew best after all. Human fathers have not always the will power to persist. Human fathers can even be wrong in their judgment. But our Heavenly Father never misjudges. And where our desires are against His will we shall all be forced eventually to tow the line. One of our tests of faith might well be something we pray for not being granted. We won't be alone in this respect. Paul had that problem. He mentioned a thorn in his flesh. What it was is not revealed. Suffice it to say he accepted God's will without wavering. After all this, like all scripture is written for our learning. So the Bible tells us not only what and what not to do, but how to accept and to live with unanswered prayer. Let us endeavour to walk in this faith to the end of our probation, realising that God knows best what is good for us. And if we prove worthy of the resurrection the reasons for our unanswered prayers will come into the open.

G.L. Dreifus

---

The two articles to which this is a reply were in print nearly 80 years ago. The author of this article and others mentioned therein are asleep and waiting the call to come forth from the grave. Today the Christadelphian body still regard Jesus as a representative and not a substitute.

A reprint of this article was published by the Nazarene Fellowship in 1945. Very few copies still exist, this fact has prompted us to repeat it in the present form of monthly articles in the Nazarene C.L. The author wrote this article in the early 1900's :-

## **Jesus My Substitute.**

We have been handed articles by two Christadelphians, condemning the idea that Jesus died as the sinner's substitute; one is a booklet by C.C.Walker, Editor of the "Christadelphian", and the other in "Glad Tidings", by the Editor, Wm. Grant of Edinburgh. Both arguments are easily refuted by an accurate exposition of the appropriate Scripture, and as we are satisfied that both writers are thoroughly sincere, we offer our comments upon their theories in a spirit of love and with the hope that some will be delivered from what we believe to be a false representation of the Sacrifice of Christ.

There is a twofold aspect of Justification, the careful discrimination of which is indispensable to an accurate solution of this subject. Indeed, we do not hesitate to say that an indiscriminate mixing of these two aspects has been the direct cause of most of the confusion in what has been written on the subject. Now let us give a clear explanation of what we wish to be understood by this twofold aspect of Justification. Man is legally justified when he is baptised into the sacrificial death of Christ; but he will not be morally justified at the tribunal of Christ unless his actions shall have conformed to the will of God. We are legally justified when, by baptism, we are engrafted into the True Vine; but we shall, not be morally justified when the roll is called, unless we abide in Him (John xv.) It is only at our baptism we enrol in the race for immortality; but we shall not be 'crowned' unless we run "so as to obtain". It would be impossible to exhibit this important distinction more lucidly than has been done by J.J.Andrews, of London. After defining the term "Justification", he says :- "It is typical and antitypical, and it has a legal and a moral aspect. The legal is represented by the expression 'made righteous' (Rom. v. 19), and the moral aspect by the statement that by works a man is justified, and not by faith alone. Neither legal nor moral Justification can exist without blood-shedding; the legal must precede the moral, and both legal and moral must precede the bestowal of eternal life."

We consider this the maximum of thought in the minimum of words. If the student would carefully keep the distinction clearly before his mind, we are persuaded he has secured the key to an accurate understanding of the Epistles to Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews.

Now a recognition of the full force of the law of sin and death, and the precise scope of the law of the spirit of life in Christ is requisite to our pursuit of the question of Substitution. The combined force of these two laws shows that the condemnation we inherit from Adam (Romans chapters iv.,v.,vi.,vii., and viii. ) is a barrier to probation, a barrier to our acceptance with God, and a barrier to eternal life; and that the blood of the everlasting covenant is absolutely necessary to remove this threefold barrier. We maintain, then, that God has procured for us this legal Justification on His own glorious principle of substitution. C.C.Walker says:- "If Christ were a substitute we ought not to die, and Christ ought not to have risen."

This is a compound proposition and must be examined separately. "If Christ were a substitute we ought not to die." We take this as an ungrateful utterance, and will prove that the Word of God demands that it should be directly inverted, viz. if Christ be not a substitute" we ought not to have lived." If Adam had been executed without mercy on the day he sinned, we had had no existence; but God in His mercy provided for Adam a substitute, typified in the animal slain (Gen. iii. 15; Job xxxiii. 24; Rev. xiii. 8). The benefit Adam's descendants derive from this is, that it secures for them natural existence; but inasmuch as all do not become individually related, in the appointed way, to God's covering for sin, natural existence is their empyrean. This demonstrates that it is due to the very mercy of God that we are here at all. In regard to C.C.Walker's difficulty: "Why do believers die?" we answer, "Why do those who are alive and remain escape the dark valley?" Simply that their King has come. Those of previous ages are allowed to fall asleep, simply because their king has not come; and that is the purpose of God that His faithful shall all be glorified together (Dan. xii. 13; Rom. viii. 17; Heb. xi. 39-40). This confirms the Scripture that whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. If C.C.Walker say that believers yet die the death unto sin, we remind him that God is not the God of the 'dead' (Matthew xii. 32). There is therefore now "no condemnation" to those in Christ, for the law of the spirit of life made them "free" from the law of Sin and death (Rom. viii. 1). "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." If C.C.Walker say his own death contributes to his cleansing from sin, we remind him that he becomes a thief and a robber, by climbing up another way (John x. 1), and robbing Christ of His redemptive work (John xiv. 6).

Again, if he say by his own good works, we remind him that by the works of the law shall "no flesh be justified" (Rom. lii. 20). This brings all the world guilty before God (Rom. iii. 19). Can C.C.Walker dispense with a substitute?

Let us now take the next proposition. He says: "If Christ were a substitute, he ought not to have risen." If a carcase of corruption be the price of Man's redemption, then, truly, Christ could not have risen; for the moment He rose He would cease to substitute us. But a carcase of corruption is not our price, otherwise no human soul is yet redeemed, for Christ saw no corruption (Psalm xvi. 10; Acts ii. 31 ;xiii. 34-37). Messrs Walker and Grant spurn substitution, and claim it to be "representation." Does this lend them aid? Let us make a test. If a carcase of corruption be the price of man's redemption, then the moment Christ rises He ceases to represent Messrs. Walker and Grant, consequently they must fill in "the remainder." You see this weapon cuts equally well both ways; because if the substitute goes, the representative is doomed to follow. Further if Christ did not pay our debt "instead" of us as our substitute, but only "for" us as our representative, then you must first furnish your representative with the means, otherwise you defraud the law. What have you then, in this case with which to furnish your representative? Absolutely nothing; your all is confiscated (Romans v.). You cannot dig, to beg you are ashamed. Hence you leave nothing with which to cover your sin but "the shirt of death."

But there is an undercurrent here which prevents Christadelphians from straight sailing. The writer knows their whereabouts, from the fact that twenty years ago he himself was a member of the Christadelphian body. Instead of beginning with the loss of life in Adam, they confuse themselves over the effect as regards the flesh of Jesus. They hold that as Jesus was born of a woman. He was under condemnation to death on His own account, requiring to be executed in order to be cleansed from His

own “physical sin”! See their “Slain Lamb.” “The Blood of Christ” and all their works on the subject. It was due to this very doctrine the writer left their body. But does the Law allow anyone, who is already under its condemnation to effect his own release, to say nothing of others wriggling through without payment? If the life of Jesus were claimed by the Law, this would represent God as swindling. We must not forget that God is just, as well as the justifier; but if you represent God as effecting the redemption of man by yielding up “to sin” what already “belonged to sin,” then indeed, you represent yourselves as having been redeemed by fraud.

The only explanation then, as to how Jesus could be our substitute and triumph over the grave is in the fact that the lost treasure is “Life,” and that nothing short of a free, unforfeited life can purchase life back. God solved this by becoming the Father of Jesus, and the English law recognises the phenomenon of quickening to be the acquisition of a life by which the foetus might live independent of its bearer. This was the Spirit germ of the “second man,” irrespective of the lust of the flesh. Directly, “Son of Power.” Now the Master once asked; “What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and forfeit his life? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?” Was there ever a man who possessed the whole world and forfeited his life? By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men “in whom” all sinned. Could this man (Adam) have redeemed himself? If you say “Yes”, we ask proof; if you say “No”, then your contention against our substitute is eternally closed. Thus we see God alone comes to our rescue. He declares: “Deliver them from the pit, I have found a ransom” a corresponding price, equivalent, or substitute (Job. xxxiii. 24). Now what does God declare this ransom to be? “The Life of the flesh is in the blood thereof, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls”. (Lev. xvii. 11). Christ confirms this: “I lay down my life for the sheep” (John x. 11). But what is Sacrifice? It is of the utmost importance we should have a clear conception of this. If you Sacrifice something, you must relinquish possession of it eternally. If at any time you receive it back, it ceases that moment to be a Sacrifice, and becomes a mere loan. Did Jesus receive back that identical life He sacrificed? On the authority of Scripture we say He did not. “The redemption of their lives is precious, and it ceaseth for ever” (Psalm xlix. 8 ). Christ laid down the life of His flesh, and that has eternally gone for our price. The life He received afterwards from the Father was immortal life. Profoundest problem! Most glorious solution: “O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave where is thy victory? His life was His own; and before receiving the higher life He relinquished for ever the life of His flesh for our redemption.

How clearly He shows this by His metaphor of the grain of wheat; “The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified;” but to have been glorified there and then. He alone would have inherited the Kingdom. Indeed I say unto thee, “Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit” (John xii. 24).

To be continued.

---

### **A letter to Christadelphian friends -**

“Praise be to the only True and Wise God”

Dear Dennis and Andree, Thank you both for your letters received safely which I thought contained some very good points such as Personal study of the Bible, taking the place of meetings, and magazines, personal contact etc. Listening to addresses is hard when one knows that what in some cases isn’t true, is propagated and believed in by the ignorant or those that lack understanding of Truth, many take it unto themselves to preach. And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written. How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel in peace, and bring glad tidings of good things. Rom 10.15. But wilt thou know o vain man that faith without works is dead? James 2.20.

Why then the trouble, unhappiness, strong words, suspicion, and the like, does it spring from . . . truth? Doth a fountain send forth at the same place, sweet water and bitter? James 3.11. Unhappiness,

suspicion, bitter envying, and strife. This wisdom descendeth not from above but is earthly, sensual, devilish, for where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work.

Let us get down to facts. It was considered by Christadelphians 'those sitting in high places', that the devil was not a supernatural being, but was the principle of lawlessness in man's nature, and from an address given by a 'prominent elder' on 27.9.87 death only would bring about deliverance from this lawlessness, so that man can only destroy him that has/had the power of death, by his own death. Now I am sure that we both understand that it is sin that has the power of death; for instance homosexuality has the power of death and those suffering from aids should be told that, for homosexuality has the power to bring about death, because the Law has said, If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them. Lev. 20.13. What the homosexual is saying, it is not his fault, it is the principle of lawlessness in his nature. Now if there is a principle of lawlessness in man's nature, then the 'Lord God' must have put it there in which case 'God' directly, or indirectly is responsible for The 'Lord Jesus Christ' was tempted in ail points like as we are, yet without sin, wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things 'pertaining to God'.

Do you think then that there was a principle of lawlessness in his nature? What was wrong with Joseph's nature when he resisted Potiphar's wife, hast thou considered 'God's' servant Job, perfect and upright and one that feared 'God' and eschewed evil (that is to avoid, abstain from; shun). Have you considered Zacharias and his wife Elisabeth, that they were both righteous before 'God' walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the 'Lord' blameless, did they have a principle of lawlessness in their nature, whereby they could not help but sin?

The 'Lord Jesus Christ' did not have to conquer sin because he knew no sin, he had to conquer the temptation, he did this in the wilderness, after his being baptised, he went forty days, in those he did eat nothing, and when they were ended he afterwards hungered. It is written that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of 'God'.

Get thee behind me, Satan for it is written, thou shall worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve. It is said 'thou shalt not tempt the 'Lord thy God'. One cannot conquer sin after it has been committed. Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? He that committeth sin is of the devil; 1 John 3.8 Whosoever is born of 'God' doth not commit sin; 1 John 3.9. 'Jesus' said to Nicodemus, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God'.

Trouble, unhappiness, suspicion, bitter envying and strife. Let all bitterness and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you with all malice. Ephesians 4.31

The rulers of this earth have every opportunity to beat their swords into ploughshares, now, while it is called today, the Jews had the chance to accept the teaching and gospel of the 'Lord Jesus Christ'. How then do we interpret Hebrews 2.14? First we must give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard (what is written) lest at any time .we should let them slip. Heb. 2.1.

What is man that thou art mindful of him? Whether it be Dr. T, RR, BG, JS, or HT. But we see 'Jesus' who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of 'God' should taste death for every man. In bringing many sons unto glory (ye must be born of the Spirit), to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. (Therefore, I take pleasure in infirmities 2 Cor. 12.10). For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified (to free from sin), are all one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.

For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven; the same is my brother, sister and mother. Matthew 12.50 'God' intends to set up a kingdom on this earth, and his 'Son' died that we might know the way into the kingdom. Mortify, put to death, not the flesh, but fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness which is idolatry. It will bring about your death so put it to death. The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness,



faith, meekness, temperance (ye must be born of the Spirit). Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our 'Lord Jesus Christ'. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. 2 Peter 1.5 to 9.

Charity or the principle of lawlessness, where does it lie in the air, mind, brain, heart, arm, or leg? For 'Christ' is not entered into the holy places made with hands, for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world, but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin.

I beseech you therefore brethren, by the mercies of 'God', that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice holy, acceptable unto 'God', which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good; and acceptable, and perfect will of 'God'. Rom. 12. 1 to 2 I am still looking into the doctrine of the Nazarenes, they already seem to me to be much nearer to truth than the Christadelphians, so we must press on to the mark of the high calling.

Our love to you both. and may the 'Good Lord' bless the pure in heart, and those who hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled (for we are unprofitable servants).

Yours affectionately,                      Horace and Rosemary.

=====