

The Sacrifice of Christ

By EDWARD TURNEY

Foreword

If envy and malice had not been hard at work to misrepresent my mode of procedure, there had been no occasion for this explanation as to the origin of my lecture in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham. It is in consequence of the extraordinary behaviour of Mr Roberts and his repeated mis-statements, that I feel it incumbent upon me to inform the brethren why I went to Birmingham on such an errand. Some days before the 22nd of August, I received letters from Brethren in Birmingham desiring me to go there and give some explanation of this "New idea" concerning Christ.

I was informed that many were anxious to hear me. Mr Roberts, it was stated, was doing his best to suppress my writings on this subject which I also knew to be true. There is a time however, for everything. But, Mr Roberts, it would appear not being able to "discern this time," and perhaps forgetting that the Holy Office of the Inquisition is now closed his attempted revival of literary proscription answered my purpose not amiss, urging forward that very publicity and freedom which seemed to bring on him "wailing and gnashing of teeth."

The invitation to which I have referred was not of my seeking: in fact it was quite unexpected, and when it did come I had very little idea whom I should meet. After accepting the pressing request of the Birmingham brethren, Dr. Hayes and Brother Farmer agreed to accompany me.

About seven in the evening more than twenty brethren and sisters had assembled at 71 Belgrave Road. I then proceeded to sketch out my subject. This occupied about an hour and a half. Before starting I gave permission to the reporters present to take down the whole of my remarks if they thought well, and to have them published in the "Christadelphian."

At this there were significant shrugs of the shoulders, and some smiles, which I interpreted to mean that the Editor of that periodical would bravely bar the door against "the wolf" which mild zoological individual the good editor soon afterwards discovered to be my humble self, against whom he stoutly refused to open the Athenaeum doors at the request of his brethren, although they offered to pay for the use of it. I have proof of this in writing.

After I had got through the sketch many questions were asked, and at the end of nearly four hours hard work in a small closely packed room, one of the brethren rose to express the thanks of the meeting at the free, fair and ready manner in which at their request, I had come forward. This was supplemented in a few days by a long and very sensible letter from another brother who was present, from which I venture to give the following extract:-

"I have already expressed thanks for your kindness in attending Birmingham purposely to express your theory; and I think it only proper gratefully to acknowledge the Christlike courtesy and sincerity; the frankness and fairness with which you met your querists. I attended the meeting to gain instruction, and I returned home wiser than I left."

This meeting broke up a little before midnight, and in a few days afterwards I received several letters from brethren present stating that the meeting as a whole were convinced that what I had taught was true and scriptural.

Here then, is the origin of my lecture in the Temperance Hall. An urgent request was made for me to deliver a lecture to as many of the Birmingham brethren as could be got together on the subject of "The Sacrifice of Christ." I was distinctly informed in writing that I must consider the meeting entirely in my hands. This being so, I requested Dr. Hayes to take the chair, and he consented.

I was also informed in writing that it was chiefly that portion of the Birmingham meeting who had come to hear me on the 22nd that would pay for the Hall. But while communication was on its way to Nottingham, there was another flying to Birmingham from Brother Farmer saying; "Take the Temperance Hall for Brother Turney's lecture, I will pay all expenses."

But the reader will very likely ask why this lecture was not delivered in the Athenaeum Rooms, seeing that brethren alone were allowed to be present? This is the answer. Mr Roberts holds the Athenaeum Rooms in his own name, though he does not, of course pay all the rent himself. A number of brethren wished him to grant them the use of the room, and were so anxious that, as before stated they preferred to pay for the use of it. What was the reply of this good and valiant man, this mighty warrior who is ever ready to let in a foe in order to display his prowess in putting him to flight? Oh, this was quite another matter! "No! Never! Not while I hold the place shall the wolf enter here." Certainly this argument was effective so far as the Athenaeum was concerned, but, happily the prescriptive spirit of our modern inquisitor could not operate beyond the precincts of that habitation, the rent of which he did not pay.

Sensible people may perhaps wonder why he is even the Lord of the ascendant. The reader will now know the reason why I found myself in the Temperance Hall.

Up to the moment of going on the platform I was told in writing that the meeting was mine; and that the man who courageously bolted the Athenaeum doors against me was doing his utmost to "neutralize" the effect of the lecture. He had for nights been declaiming against me, and against my doctrine. And although he knew perfectly well that he and his friends had not taken the Temperance Hall and would not have to pay for it, he had the singular audacity to request that the brethren would grant him the privilege of putting all the questions to me on Thursday night assuming that questions would be allowed. Yes, says he there was an overwhelming majority for this. No doubt. But did this overwhelming majority hire the Hall, and pay for it? Did this "overwhelming majority" invite me to deliver the lecture? And was it not my would-be interrogator that had refused me a door of utterance? Will any sensible person not see that under these circumstances it was not exactly strange that at my lecture I deliberately ignored the authority of the man who kept out the "wolf." What else should he expect, except a severe rebuke for his incivility, if I condescended to notice him at all?

During the lecture I was occasionally compelled to administer a reproof. The whole assembly conducted itself in a most exemplary manner for the whole two hours and a half, but the Editor disgraced himself about a dozen times by attempted interruptions. Now in conclusion of this explanation what does Mr Roberts say of the meeting of the 22nd August

and the lecture on the 28th? He says that I ran away from him at Nottingham. He insinuated distinctly that I knew he would be absent from Birmingham on the 22nd, and therefore I took the opportunity of holding a hole and corner meeting, as one of his partisans styled it, and that the Lecture of the 28th was an underhand affair. Is it worth while for me to put myself to the trouble of saying that these statements are entirely untrue? They are only put forth to make a show of courage; but it is doubtful from the evidence soon to be before the reader whether they are not after all, but the empty boasts of faint-hearted conceit.

"The Sacrifice of Christ"

The Chairman, Dr.S.G.Hayes, in opening the meeting said:

Dear Brethren and Sisters, allow me before the lecture is commenced to make a few observations respecting it.

Our brother Mr. E.Turney, is here this evening, by invitation to deliver a lecture on a topic of absorbing interest to all Christadelphians, a topic, the importance of which it is impossible to overrate in view of that passage in John where it says:- "This is life eternal (5) to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." John 17:3. We can only know God and we can only know His Son as God has been pleased to reveal Himself and His Son in the Scriptures of truth. And it is of course of the first importance that we should know what that record is: for if we are under a misapprehension concerning God or concerning His Son, how can we attain to life everlasting? The lecture which will be delivered to-night is for the purpose of laying before you in detail, as far as time will permit, what our Brother Turney believes conscientiously to be the truth concerning this most important matter; I beg you to hear him patiently and attentively throughout. I must request that you will in no way interrupt the discourse, either by manifestations of approval or dissent. Some of the details put before you will be those on which we are all agreed; on the other hand some points will be raised about which we do not see at present eye to eye. We hope the day may arrive when we shall all see eye to eye concerning all matters of mutual interest; but I am hopeful with regard to those who may entertain doubts on the subject that the lecture tonight will cause such doubts to be removed. And with regard to those who are wavering on the points at issue, I have hope that they will decide on what our Brother Turney and those who believe on this subject with him believe to be the truth.

I would suggest the question whether we have not ourselves perhaps fallen into the same error which we have not been slow to condemn in others, namely, that of allowing our-selves, in some measure at least, to be carried by those supposed to know better than ourselves; but, however much, or however long we may have studied the truth, still I think we must all admit the possibility at least of our having been mistaken on one or perhaps more points. It has been said that an open mind is the best mark of a philosopher and truly it will be wise on our part not to be hasty in condemning neither to be hasty in receiving what may appear at first sight to contradict that which we may have believed perhaps for a very long time, but to carefully weigh and consider the arguments adduced and decide accordingly.

Since Brother Turney first published the views which he now holds concerning the nature of Christ, a great deal of pressure has been put upon him from various quarters.

As you are aware, he has recently been very seriously ill, and in consequence of that illness he has been recommended by his medical adviser to abstain altogether for several months from public speaking or public controversy; but, under the circumstances, he has not been able to avail himself of this advice, on account of the pressure I have mentioned. If he had consulted his own ease and convenience he might very well have objected to meet here tonight and have put off the meeting to a more convenient season, when he would have been more able by renewed health to speak on this matter. But here he is tonight agreeably to your invitation. I beg your best attention to what will be advanced, and I think our brother will be able to satisfy you concerning this matter, perhaps not tonight but at all events he will put you into such a position that you will be able to examine the matter for yourselves. I do not think I need detain you longer with any further observations of mine, but I will now call upon our Brother to commence his lecture.

The Lecture

Mr Turney:-

Brethren, as the chairman has said, I am here tonight in response to several invitations in writing, and the object of my visit is to set before you in as plain a manner as I possibly can, the “New Light” which I have received from conversation with our Brother Handley of Maldon.* (see appendix A)

Having many matters to discourse upon I beg you will hear me patiently, and as I do not feel endowed at present with any spare physical strength, at the end of the first hour I may find it necessary to crave your forbearance by sitting down to rest myself for five minutes. I do not know that I shall have to ask for the privilege, but if I have, I think you will not refuse to grant it to me, as I am anxious to go through the whole of my programme.

I have had, brethren, upon this subject many deep and painful feelings. From my first understanding of it, it seemed to me a matter about which we ought rather to pray and to weep than quarrel and denounce, and I feel like that tonight

I take it that I am only partly understood, and in some cases not understood at all; but when upon my feet having as a rule the faculty of making myself understood, I do not despair tonight - however dim my writings might be - of reaching your understandings. Whether I convince you or not of what I do mean, time alone will tell.

Now brethren, there has been a vast amount of what may be fairly styled party feeling thrown out in connection with this matter. Unfortunately so. For my part I have refrained from bringing to the front those who have sympathized with me in this controversy; but if I were to read you all the letters which I have received - not merely letters of sympathy but letters with eyes in them, and can see straight to the end. I think there would be about as many as would cover an ordinary dining table. The last letter I have received I beg to read before proceeding with my lecture. It is from Brother Wm. Ellis, of Liverpool, a well known, highly respected, and long tried Brother in what we believe to be the faith. Brother Ellis had been for several days at Nottingham, and he came like others armed to the teeth ready to destroy this new heresy; but I will say this, brethren, that he came forward in a most Christian temper, spirit, and disposition, he came in the manner advised by James 1:19, to be “swift to

hear, slow to speak, and above all, slow to wrath.” Now the best way to get at the understanding of another is at least to hear him out. I now proceed to read Brother Ellis’s letter:-

86 Crown Street, Liverpool.
August 26th, 1873.

Dear Brother Farmer,

I am happy to say I reached home safely last night shortly after ten, and found all well. Before I had got seated Sister E. asked me: “Well have you converted them, or have they converted you?” I said they have converted me. I was wrong upon the nature of Christ. I never did before see that, because God was His Father He was free from the Adamic or divine curse against transgression. I now frankly and thankfully confess to yourself, brethren Handley and Turney that my understanding of that point aright is due to my visit to you and the conversations with you from Saturday to Monday evening. With kindest Love to you all and many thanks for all your kindness towards me.

I am yours in haste,

William Ellis.

I do hope Brethren, that many more will yet feel as Brother Ellis now feels upon this subject, and I trust when they do that they will have his frankness and courage to give expression to their minds. I will begin my lecture, brethren, by asking you to read with me Romans 5.

(Having finished the chapter, the lecturer remarked):-

The first point I wish to speak upon in that chapter is that mentioned by Paul in the 6th verse; viz. “For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.” Now, brethren we ought to know what the apostle would have us understand by that clause, “When we were yet without strength.” As to the expression “in due time,” I think we are all probably agreed that it refers to the end or nearly the end of the “seventy weeks” spoken of by the Prophet Daniel. But what can be signified by the phrase “without strength”? That is the question now for decision. My answer is with Paul thus - that we lost all our strength by the Adamic transgression. “In whom all sinned.” By one man’s disobedience sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men “in whom (Adam) all sinned.” The Greek word means “in whom.” To express it as Milton does in his 3rd Book of “Paradise Lost” at the 290th line, “His crime makes guilty all his sons.” And in his Eleventh Book, line 317, he says, “In me all posterity stands cursed.” That is our position; we are prospectively dead men. Now, then, I shall take this position - that if Christ came into the world in this position, He cannot help us.

It may be said, and probably will be said that it was the Father who provided the help. That is perfectly scriptural. But, I would have you to observe that He did not provide that help “apart” from His Son, but “in” His Son. And you will see this in a pointed manner by referring to Psalm 89:19,20, which reads thus:- “Then Thou speakest in vision to Thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help on one that is mighty. I have exalted one chosen out of the people.” We shall agree, I think, that this refers to this Messiah. Now to have brought Christ

into the world under the Adamic curse would have been to deprive Him of “all help” instead of to have “laid help upon Him.”

Our being brought into the world in that state deprived us of all help, and if He had been so brought in He would likewise have been utterly helpless... or as Paul says:- “Without strength.” The very fact that His death helps or saves us, is proof that He did not come into the world like us. viz:- “without strength.” But there is something more. This help I take to be presented to us in a two-fold way, and I would speak of the first part of it as natural help, and the next as supernatural help. But the supernatural, would have been of no value without the natural help.

You will enquire what I mean by natural help. I mean this; assuming for the moment that the second man, the last Adam, the Christ, came into the world as free as the first Adam, not under condemnation to death caused by the first man’s transgression, that is what I mean by “natural help.” There was a life as free as Adam’s was when he sprang from the ground a living soul. Now, that life was the price or ransom that had to be paid for those who had lost theirs by Adam’s transgression. I can see help in a natural way there.

By supernatural help I mean this, that had the Almighty not raised Jesus from the dead He would have been there now. Supernatural help was necessary to bring Him again to the surface, to bestow upon Him eternal life, and to empower Him to impart that life to those who shall be found worthy at the Judgment seat. Now, that in brief is what I mean by the two phrases, natural and supernatural help.

Let me proceed now to give a diagram. There can be no objection to this, because Christadelphians have long since employed charts and employed them, especially to explain God’s manifestation, that is, to understand the purpose of redemption in Christ Jesus. I employ mine therefore, not very elaborate but I think lucid, in order to set forth my present view of God’s scheme of redemption in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Imagine that mark (drawing a small perpendicular line on the blackboard) to represent Adam when God made him fresh from the dust. I will now pass over the interval of time long or short for there must have been an interval before the Almighty energized Adam with the breath of life. I first ask you to consider what was this Adam? What was his physical structure and composition? The testimony is that he was made “a living soul.” And by the aid of Paul we understand that to be “a natural body” a man of living flesh and blood. 1 Corinthians 15:44-49.

Now the question here to consider is this. Was Adam in any sense a sinner: Was there any sin at all in him? I say there was none. Adam was not then a Sinner. But I would have you to understand, brethren, that though there was no sin in him, there was in this Adam all the propensities, all the impulses to sin, as Mr Roberts has truly said in a certain place to which I shall refer by and by: for if this had not been the case, there never could have been sin. Now what I want to impress upon you is that these impulses, or propensities are not sin, the impulses to sin are one thing and sin is another. One is cause, the other effect. James says, and I think an Apostle may be accepted as an authority on this subject, that when lust, or desire hath conceived - and that implies a time - it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished brings forth death. James 1:14,15.

Now I maintain that there is nothing in man with which the Almighty has endowed him, that is sinful of itself; but by the too great exercise of certain endowments or faculties, he oversteps the divine boundary line, and then we have what is called sin, but not till then. If desires were sin then God would be the author of sin, for man can only be what his Creator made him. I may here use a familiar illustration. If you place a prisoner within four walls, and you tell him those four walls are his place of abode, he must not go beyond the threshold; he can pass round and round as much as he pleases, and he can even place himself just on a level with the threshold, but unless he crosses the line there is no transgression. However brethren, let me make an explanation lest I should be misunderstood. There is a sense in which desire or lust is sin when nothing actually is done. Christ said whoso looketh on a woman, etc., Matthew 5:28, he is guilty. Lust or propensity is sin when a man purposes to commit a forbidden act, but by some circumstance beyond his control he cannot accomplish it, then he is just as much a sinner as if he had done it: he only lacked the opportunity. Now I return to this man who was not at first a sinner, neither by nature nor by action, but who had desires. I draw a horizontal line, at right angles with the perpendicular one, which represents the period of probation. Adam is now on probation for immortality. But this other perpendicular line upon the horizontal one I would have you to understand that the Almighty gave Adam a law, and that at the time signified by this next mark he broke that law.

Now in all the interval from the time he was made only of the dust until he broke the law, he was not a sinner, but as soon as he broke the law, then "Sin entered into the world."

Now let me finish his career and mark the downright line which represents the period at which he dropped into the grave.

I want you now to consider this question. Could anything which this man might do in the way of righteousness, in the way of true piety, in the way of perfect godliness, after the passing of this sentence of death on account of his transgression, revoke the sentence pronounced?

My answer is emphatically no. And as a proof of his utter helplessness and dependence upon the mercy of God, there was at once set forth a scheme of redemption or means of paying the debt incurred by sin. The sentence could no more be revoked by Adam's subsequent obedience, piety and repentance of themselves than the subsequent obedience piety and penitence of a man having committed a crime worthy of death as Adam had, and lying in gaol, could revoke the just sentence of death passed upon him by a human Judge. Therefore, for the sake of a better illustration, I would lengthen this upright line representing the point at which Adam broke the law, and I would draw an oblique line to the end of the horizontal one representing Adam's probation, and what I wish you to understand by this line is this, that the man was now, after transgression, under the sentence of death, however long he might live and however good might be his subsequent acts.

I will assume, if you like, that he lived after a perfect Christian manner, even as perfect as the Lord Jesus Himself, and I would ask this question, Could that perfect that subsequent life have brought him from the grave? I am utterly unable to see how it could: because there was this old debt first to be discharged.

His life had been forfeited, or lost, and though the subsequent, excellent probation might be worthy of something in the future, that something could not be realized until the obstacle, the old debt, that is the loss of life, had it been cleared out of the way Adam's probation

consisted of two phases, first he was on probation for eternal life without redemption; second, he was on probation after sin under redemption. I hope this is clear.

Now this other downright line shall represent the “Second Adam,” our Lord Jesus Christ. I will draw the horizontal line of probation, but I will put no mark upon that line, for this reason, that probation was perfect; there was no breach of law committed.

But suppose this Second Adam had come into the world in the condition the first was in after transgression, that is to say, under the penalty of death for the breach of law by the first Adam, where would have been His life? If it be true that by one man’s offence death hath passed upon all men, Jesus included as Mr Roberts will have it, then death would have passed upon Him also, and His natural life would have been lost. I use the word “lost” because it has been said it is not correct to use the word “forfeit.” But I think it must be granted that with respect to the first Adam it is correct, however incorrect in regard to his posterity, because he did commit an act of treason against High Heaven, and forfeited his life thereby.

But I still hold that I used the word “forfeit” correctly with regard to his sons also, for I find it used in the English classics in the same sense in which I used it. Those who are acquainted with Shakespeare will probably recollect this passage. In the play called “Measure for Measure” we have certain dramatic personae Angelo and Izabella.

Angelo says: “Your brother is a forfeit of the law and you but waste your words.” Izabella replies: “Alas! Alas! Why all the souls that were, were forfeit once.”

And so I hold they were forfeited once by that one act, and if Jesus had been born under the curse of the old law, His life would necessarily have been lost also and however perfect His probation might be, I affirm that the former debt must first be paid by the shedding of blood for Him before He could help us. His own blood could no more redeem Him, in such a case, than our blood could redeem us. But I maintain this, that by the Almighty endowing Him with “Free life” He began by that means to lay help upon one mighty to save, and perfected that help by the addition of supernatural help, that is - eternal, life.

Now brethren, there were two things required of the last Adam; one was that He should run His probation after a perfect manner; the other that He should lay down His life for us.

I am utterly unable to see how He could lay down a life He did not possess. If His is lost or forfeited as ours is at birth He did not really possess it free, and as His natural life was the price to be paid He had in that case absolutely nothing to pay with.

But if He begins, as I represent Him, when He comes to the end of His career He is in a position to do what God commanded Him. He said: “Therefore doth My Father love me; because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.” John 10:17,18.

Now why did He lay it down? As “a ransom for all.” Matthew 20:28. No man who is in pledge can redeem or buy back another. I therefore say that it was imperative Jesus should have been free.

Well having got to the end of His probationary career to the foot of the Cross, what do we observe? Two things are now to be done; one that He should lay down His life “a ransom for all.” The other, that He should lay it down in such a manner as would meet the case of the Jews who had broken the Mosaic Law.

If Jesus had been a Gentile there had been no necessity that I can see for Him to lay down His life upon a Cross. But as Paul teaches it was needful for Him to be obedient unto the death of the Cross, to redeem the Jews from the curse of the Law; and this act was quite voluntary on His part. He was not a mere passive instrument in this matter. He was determined to do His Father’s will. He loved righteousness. Hebrews 1:9, and hated iniquity.

We find Him then nailed upon the Cross to redeem the Jews, and He sinks into the grave, and after three days He rises again.

I think we shall all agree that He did not rise immortal, but that He entered the perfect state very soon after, perhaps on the same day. He first took His natural state again* (see Appendix B)

Now cannot you see that this being so, that if He were sinful flesh when He went down into the grave, He must have been sinful flesh when He rose again? But neither you nor I should like to affirm such thing

He rose from the dead as we all believe, and entered into eternal life, and He then may be said to have obtained eternal redemption. There will be some redeemed, or brought back who have denied the Lord that bought them; these will not attain to eternal redemption, but will return unto the dust.

Eternal redemption is based on approval at the Judgment seat of Christ. Now redemption as I understand it, is the old debt incurred by Adam paid for us by Christ.

We “now” enter upon probation, and we are required to give all diligence to make our calling and election sure. We are required to run so as to obtain. 2 Peter 1:10. This I hope we shall all be able to do.

Now I wish to call your attention at this point, to a few lines in an otherwise admirable little work entitled “Jesus Christ and Him Crucified” by J.J.Andrew of London.

I shall just read what I wish to draw your attention to. The reason I do this is because it is still sought by the author to support this view, otherwise I should not have done it. Page 77, line 1, 1st edition: -

“Being a Jew by birth, He was under the law. Galatians 4:4, and therefore it was necessary that He should comply with the injunctions of that law. This He did in every particular except one; consequently He became obnoxious to the curse of that law. For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point is guilty of all, and cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them, Galatians 3:13. Among the things written in the book of the law it is said: “He that is hanged is accursed of God” (see also page 115, 1996 edition of “The Real Christ”). This was the one item of

the law which was infringed by Jesus, and therefore He became obnoxious to its curse."

Now brethren, listen to this, it was necessary that such should be the case in order to obey the will of God.

I cannot understand that I am first told He complied with every particular except one; that there was one point in which He was guilty and therefore guilty of all; that He infringed the law, that means to break it, and that it was necessary to do this (namely to be "guilty" of the whole) in order to "obey" the will of God.

In plain language it means this, that it was necessary to "break" the law in order to "keep" it, to "disobey" God in order to "obey" Him. Shall I tell you that whosoever offends in one point is guilty of all? James 2:10.

A dishonourer of God does not obey Him. But what says Paul in his epistle to the Philippians 2:8 He says that Christ was "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

So that this death on the cross was not an infringement of the law but an act of obedience to the law. However, brethren, passing over these contradictions, I would point out that it was needful for Jesus to come under the curse of God, but not to infringe the law. Oh no. Let me explain. I have used this familiar illustration before and it may serve tonight; supposing we are now in the dog days, and here are two persons each in possession of a dog. The bye-laws of this town say that whosoever lets his dog at large at this time will be fined £5. Now if A lets his dog run loose, and thereby breaks the law, and the penalty comes upon him justly. B keeps his dog chained up, and thereby honours the law. Now just suppose B says to A, "I am sorry for you my friend, you have broken the law, you are in a calamity." "Yes" replies A, "and I have not the wherewith to pay the fine." "Never mind," says the other, "I will pay it for you. I will place myself under the penalty and you shall go out clear." Now in this case is B a breaker of the law? No, he is a fulfiller of the law; he takes the penalty of the breach upon himself. It was precisely so with Jesus; He bore the penalty of the law for those who had broken it. He having fulfilled it and made it honourable. Isaiah 42:21.

In this death He bore both the Edenic and Mosaic curses for those who were justly under them.

When debating with Mr Smith of Edinburgh. I urged this about the breach erroneously termed by Mr Andrews, of the law upon the Cross. He, Mr Smith, saw the position, and beat a retreat. He said; "I won't say He broke the law" but he did not see the corner he was driven into by that admission. I answered, "Then if it was not necessary for Jesus to break or infringe the Mosaic law in order to redeem them that were under the law neither was it necessary for Jesus to be made a sinner under the Edenic law, in order to redeem them that were accursed by its transgression in Adam."

And then I reversed the argument thus. "If it was necessary for Jesus to infringe the Edenic law to redeem transgressors then it was necessary to infringe the Mosaic Law in order to redeem the Jews." But dogmatism is blind.

This position brings to my recollection the story of a Chinaman who made a tub, and to put on the lid got inside, and consequently fastened himself in, and had to remain there until

someone came and let him out. I say, brethren, that to curse Jesus in His death as having infringed the law of Moses, and to curse Him in His birth as a sinner in Adam, is to make it doubly impossible for Him to rise from the dead, and for the Almighty to retain the title of Just.

We must not forget that God is just as well as the Justifier, Romans 3:26. But if He had liberated Jesus from death, first as a sinner in Adam, and lastly as being “guilty of offence” against the Law of Moses, there would be a manifest injustice thrown upon Him.

Allow me to demonstrate this by a simple figure on the board. Here are two parallel lines of equal length representing a tube. This dot represents a pea in a tube, put there of course, through the opening at one end, now I draw a line which blocks up the other end, the two ends signify the double sin first “in Adam” then against Moses’ law, both of which are justly punishable with death.

Now I want you to show me how to get the pea, which stands for Jesus, out of the tube, which tube represents death? This is clearly impossible unless the Almighty breaks two laws arbitrarily in favour of Jesus. To do this would not, I repeat, be just, but manifestly unjust, and as God is never unjust we may safely say He adopted no such plan.

To return to Christ as I now see Him. He had His natural life free because God was His Father; and having died for us He then held eternal life, earned by obedience, and holds it now having the keys of Hades and of death; Revelation 1:13, and those who are worthy will share it with Him. Such a Christ is a Redeemer indeed, and such a Christ I can understand.

Many times under the old view - and I think you will agree that I knew it, seeing I had been a student for fifteen years, and of late have had a good deal more leisure than many of you therefore, I think it is not presumption in me to say that I knew what the view was, when I regarded Jesus as having done no sin, as 1 Peter 2:22 says, having no guile in His mouth, I have walked about and wept tears of joy. He had been a character of the highest admiration to my mind; and so I rejoiced exceedingly before God. But all this was marred as soon as I turned round and saw Him coming into life with “sinful flesh” and therefore a sinner, as I used to think, and consequently cursed with death.

The logical part of my mind revolted from that picture in great distress and confusion, and I tried to pacify myself by saying “It is in the hands of God; it is alright.”

Brethren, I shall not be out of place in making this observation that our esteemed Brother, the chairman has told me since we have daily studied this matter together, that for 15 years he had not been able to understand what Dr. Thomas meant by “sin-in-the-flesh.” That is the fixation of sin in the flesh which he speaks of in “Elpis Israel,” page 126, that otherwise admirable work and to which we are all so much indebted, directly or indirectly; and I confess to you without reserve, neither have I been able to understand it.

But still I have many a time taught it. I have taken the 9th article of the book of common prayer and pulled it to pieces and said that Christ came in flesh full of sin; for said I to the people, what can sinful flesh mean, but flesh full of sin?

Well now, since my mind has been more especially directed to the study of this subject, I have arrived at this conviction that there is no such thing as flesh full of sin, and never was,

nor can be. I am perfectly aware that this emphatic statement will suggest to you some verse of Paul's which you imagine will disprove my assertion; but you know, brethren, that when we are arguing with orthodox believers, and tell them there is no such thing as an "immortal soul" they think the Bible glistens with it on almost every page; but on searching they cannot find it at all, so it is with this "sinful flesh."

In studying this question, I took up a concordance as the readiest means of getting at the texts, and I found that the adjective "sinful" occurs only some seven or eight times in the whole of the Scriptures.

We find it in connection with language of this kind, "Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity." Numbers 22:4; Isaiah 1:4; Amos 9:8. And I began to say to myself, "Does this mean that every particle of flesh of the men, women and children is full of sin from the top of their heads to the sole of their feet?"

That view of the case presents insuperable difficulties to me. For example, when a vessel is full you cannot put any more in. Before any more of the new can enter, some of the old must be poured out. Now if our flesh is "full of sin" how can righteousness find admission? For sin being in the flesh itself there is no possibility of driving it out, Proverbs 22:15, it would be an element of the man himself. This will not stand, said I, and I proceeded in this way. "O righteous nation." Genesis 20:4; Isaiah 26:2.

Then I asked myself this question, Is the flesh of a righteous nation different from the flesh of a sinful nation?

Does not sinful apply to "character" and not to "flesh"? And so I concluded; for we shall have a righteous nation in the age to come. I know that it may be objected that the sins of that nation will be blotted out, but if sin be in the flesh you cannot put it out unless you burn or otherwise destroy the flesh. And talk about resisting sin, James 4:7, or diabolos which is equivalent to sin, as we are told to do and he will flee from us, it is simply preposterous if fixed in our flesh, for wherever I went with my sinful flesh, there he would go; it would be an element of myself, in every particle of my flesh. But the Scriptures teach that we can put away sin, lay it down, and pass on.

We retain the propensities to sin, but the propensities are not sin. Please observe the importance of cause and effect.

Desire leads to sin, but desire is not sin, sin brings death, but death is not sin, death is an evil consequent upon sin. It is quite untrue to say we have sin "fixed in our flesh." We have plenty of it in our character, but it is a thing we can put away if we will, for we have many exhortations in the Scriptures to this end. Romans 6:12, 1 Corinthians 9:27. We are expected not to let sin reign in our mortal bodies. Now, if you do let sin reign, what are you to do?

If one King is stronger than another, and he makes war upon the other, and conquers, does he not depose the vanquished? That is what we have to do in this case. We can depose sin, put him out of "office" and bring in another King, Jesus, who must dwell in our hearts by faith. Ephesians 3:17.

I began to see that "sinful" was quite a wrong adjective wherewith to qualify the noun "flesh."

A certain portion of the audience will excuse me pointing out that adjectives qualify nouns; for example “white” paper qualifies or shows the colour of the noun “paper” and so forth, and you cannot find it in the Scriptures that “sinful” applies to the flesh.

If you want to know whether an adjective is suitable to qualify a noun, it is not a bad plan to bring in the opposite; all things have their opposites.

Now the opposite word to “sinful” is “righteous.”

What would be thought of us if we spoke of “righteous flesh”? We read of “Holy Flesh,” Haggai 2:12, Leviticus 22:10, Deuteronomy 7:6, Psalm 87:1, 89:20, Luke 1:35, but “Holy” means sanctified or something set apart; it does not refer to the quality of the flesh itself.

I say then that “sinful” is not a proper adjective to qualify the noun “flesh,” but it qualifies the noun “character.”

A sinful man is a man of bad character, not of bad flesh.

Sin is an act, 1 John 3:4, not a fixed principle. 1 Corinthians 6:18. It seems to me just as appropriate to speak of “long” noise, “green” music, “tall” tunes, etc., as to speak of “sinful” flesh.

But so ignorant was I upon this subject that I thought I should have no difficulty in finding this adjective used in connection with flesh, and betook myself to the concordance and also to the Scriptures, but the only place in which I could find the phrase “sinful flesh” was in Romans 8:3. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh.

That is the only place in which sinful flesh occurs and in that place it is no translation at all. The Greek words are “*en homoimati sarkos hamartias*” which in English is “in the likeness of flesh of sin.” But in good English we don’t say “the hat of John” but “John’s hat,” and so we must say for *sarkos hamartias*, “Sins flesh.” This is a scriptural phrase, and it sets forth a scriptural doctrine.

Let us look at it a little. You all know what is meant by the possessive case, it means “possession” or ownership, as John’s book, that is the book that belongs to John.

Change the name then, and put in the word “sin,” “sin’s” book. The book that belongs to sin.

Let us take another figure, a figure of flesh, the horse for instance, “sin’s horse.” The horse which belongs to sin, which is his property. Do you think now that sin’s horse is necessarily a horse that is made of “sinful flesh”? I think you will all see the absurdity of this conclusion. Well, let us again change the figure, “sin’s man” that is a man belonging to sin. Is the man’s flesh necessarily full of sin because he belongs to sin? Certainly not. Take yet one more figure; here are two sheep, they both belong to one shepherd, one strays away, the other remains in the care of the shepherd. The stray sheep wanders over a boundary line and

becomes the property of a person whom we will call “sin;” for sin is personified in the Scriptures as a “king reigning,” etc.

Now please observe, here is the other sheep still where they both were at first. Do you think the wool, do you think the skin, do you think the flesh of the stray sheep are at all changed? Do you believe that its wool, skin and flesh have become in any way different from those of the sheep which remain with their Master?

I cannot see any difference whatever. It is merely a question of possession. It may be thought that this is scarcely a proper illustration; perhaps it may be objected to as being too commercial or too carnal. Well it is carnal, inasmuch as it relates to flesh, for sheep are made of flesh. But I think it will serve my purpose, and it happens to be scriptural as you will find if you turn to Isaiah 53:6, “All we like sheep, have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Now when those sheep had gone astray, whose property were they? They had served sin, and they are “sin’s sheep.”

What I want you now to consider, brethren, is this. Was Israel at all changed in regard to their flesh? I cannot see that they were.

A very important and serious change had taken place, but that change was in their character and in their relation to God, but not in their flesh, and God proposed to redeem or buy them back to Himself. Now cannot you see that if Jesus was “sin’s flesh” then God is a swindler and a bungler. We must not forget that God is just as well as a justifier, but if He effected the redemption of man by yielding up to sin what already belonged to sin, then we are redeemed by fraud.

That is the logical outcome of this “Sinful flesh” theory. No change had taken place in the quality of their flesh, it was precisely the same as before they went astray.

I think perhaps that will be sufficient for the present about sin, flesh, and sinful flesh, the last expression please remember being nowhere found in Scripture.

I now wish to draw your attention to some testimony from two of our brethren, one dead and the other living.

The first I shall take up is contained in a letter to “The Rock” which is to be found in this month’s “Christadelphian” page 864.

It was drawn from the pen of our late highly esteemed Brother Dr. Thomas, in answer to a correspondent who signed himself “Testimony.” Testimony says that if the manifestation of Jesus was in “sinful flesh” then Jesus was a sinner.

Well, so say I - how could it be otherwise, for if every particle of the flesh is full of sin, how can a man be anything else? And when a vessel is full how can you get anything else in?

Then if the demon, sin, is in every particle of a man, and you do not exorcize it, I do not see how you can get any righteousness into him. But I proceed with the letter. Testimony desires to know if Dr. Thomas means to say this; -

“Christadelphians mean to say neither more nor less than Paul saith.” Now, with the deepest respect, indeed, respect which amounts well nigh to reverence for our departed Brother, I cannot see why he replied to “Testimony” in this fashion, that is by saying Christadelphians mean to say neither more nor less than Paul saith. Why did he not say he meant His flesh was full of sin? I can see no good reason why he would not say it was full of sin, because frequently in his writings he used that style, but, as I take it, perceiving the rocks ahead like a shrewd pilot in argument, and he was a shrewd one, he tried to steer clear of those rocks by putting his answer in this form. Dr. Thomas, this unsurpassed teacher of the truth then continues:-

“God sent His own Son in the likeness of “Sin’s flesh.” I think I have shown you, brethren, what a wonderfully different thing this is from “Sinful flesh.”

Let me return to the illustration. Here are two sheep, the one on the left belongs to “sin” and I am required say to produce a likeness of that sheep. How could I better respond than by pointing to the sheep on the right which did not go astray? That is how I understand the matter. A “likeness” of Sin’s flesh. Here is flesh “not belonging” to sin, there is flesh “belonging” to sin. The one is the precise likeness of the other, but it does not belong to the same master, though the “flesh” is just the same.

Now, then, the Dr. says God sent His own Son in the likeness of flesh of sin, or “Sin’s flesh” which he declares was the same as ours, and so do I, but I say our flesh was once under the sentence of death, but not flesh “full of sin.” There lies all the difference.

The Dr. next refers “Testimony” to Hebrews 7:27, thus: “He, Jesus, offered for His own Sins and the peoples when He once offered up Himself.”

Now I want you to notice this particularly. But what has to be understood by “His own sins”? Are we to understand sin in Jesus’ flesh, muscles and bones and all His physical system full of sin? Or are we to understand our sins put into his flesh as you would put a half-crown into a box?

Hear the Dr. - “What is to be understood by “His own sins?” The sins committed by others and borne in His own body on the cross as testified by Paul. 1 Peter 2:24, saying, “who His own self bore our sins in His own body to the tree,” upon which He became a curse for us.”

Now mark this, in the Mosaic and Christian systems the unsinching victim is regarded as the sinner, in the sense of being the sin “Bearer.” Personally, Jesus was Holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners, if He had not been so He would not have been fit for the “Sin bearer” of the world.

The purpose of God being the condemnation of sin in the nature that sinned in Eden, in the person of one who had himself committed no sin.

Paul says Jesus was “undefiled.” Can this be said even of a new born babe? Are we not all defiled as sinners in Adam?

Did not death then pass on every one of us? And if Jesus had been under that sentence would He not in like manner have been defiled? But the Scriptures declare He was “undefiled” and separate from sinners, and the Scriptures cannot be broken. John 10:35.

It is evident, therefore, that though He appeared in the flesh, that flesh was not defiled by the death sentence passed upon all Adam’s begotten sons. The reason is plain enough. Jesus was begotten of the Holy Spirit. Matthew 1:13. Luke 1:31-35. Now returning to the diagram for a moment, here is a line representing Adam when God made him. We have seen he was flesh and blood; we have asked if he was sinful, and the answer was no. Well, that was the nature that transgressed in Eden. Now then, the matter is perfectly plain; and I can justly claim this statement of the Doctor’s to be on my side.

I am sorry, however, that some confusion arises by finding statements from the Doctor’s pen on the other side.

The nature in Eden had no sin inhering in it. It was corruptible and relatively imperfect as compared with Angelic nature. There was no sin in the “nature” after it had transgressed. No, what was there then? There was mortality. What does that mean? Death. “Of man’s disobedience and the fruit of the forbidden tree, whose mortal taste brought death into our world, and all our woes, with loss of Eden till one greater man restored us and regain the blissful seat, sing heavenly muse.” * (See Appendix c)

There was mortality. There was man destined to die; but sin was not a fixed principle in the man’s flesh. However, inasmuch as I have said that Dr. Thomas has taught this, I cannot do better than refer you to the place. Elpis Israel, page 113, 3rd paragraph:-

“The word sin is used in two principle acceptations in scripture. It signifies in the first place. “The transgression of law.” 1 John 3:4. (Yes, brethren, and let me tell you that unless you use it in a “metonymic” way it signifies nothing else, unless you use it to signify the propensities. But mark what the Dr. further says) – “And in the next it represents that physical principle in the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh which has the power of death, and it is called “sin” because the development, or fixation of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression.”

There is a fixation of “sin” in the flesh. The Doctor pushes this matter beyond man; but he gives no proof, and when I have spoken in support of this theory I have given no proof. I have merely asserted it and it was not until I came to look for proof that I found there was absolutely none.

The Doctor says lower down,

“The nature of the lower animals is as full of this physical evil principle as the nature of man, though it cannot be styled “sin” with the same expressiveness, because it does not possess them as the result of their own transgression. The name however, does not alter the nature of the thing.”

I have heard the Doctor use the phrase “Confusion worse confounded” when criticizing other men’s writings, and if it were not for the respect in which I hold him, I should be inclined on that statement to say the same.

The Doctor has laid down that sin came into the flesh by transgression, and then he says it became a fixed principle.

He also says it is in the flesh of the lower animals. If so I want to know how it came there. Did it come into the animals in the same way as into man? Is a lion a sinful lion because he transgressed? If not, tell me how it is he is full of sin. But this would lead to absurdity, and I shall refrain from drawing some logical conclusions which I might justly draw.

I turn from that view and present to you another. The animals, we learn from Genesis sprang from the ground by Almighty power. They have all the same breath, all were of flesh, that is corruptible. You may call them "mortal" if you like, in a general or loose sense; but it is more strictly correct to style them "corruptible" because "mortal" means destined to die through breach of law* (see Appendix c). I do not know that the lions, giraffes, elephants, bears, and the serpent tribes have been guilty of moral transgression, and therefore I do not see how sin was established in their flesh. If it be said that sin was put into their flesh because of Adam's transgression I ask for proof. I have seen no proof, but I have seen this, that there was dissension instead of harmony and peace which before obtained; for whereas Adam before the fall was king of all these and they were under his control, afterwards the tiger's eye, and the lion's teeth may be said to have turned against him in rage. But if I mistake not, prophecy declares that this peaceful state is to be restored. Isaiah 11:6, unless we are to receive that passage altogether in a figurative sense?

The second sense in which the word "sin" is used by the Dr. is quite imaginary. It is what Webster calls the theological sense, that is to say, sin is supposed to mean the native depravity of the human heart. All this is supposition. I repeat that sin is an act, not a literal element existing in the flesh.

If the act is not repeated, then one can be said to have laid aside that sin. If a man kill unlawfully, the sin of killing does not affect the man's physical self. He bears the character of a murderer. So it was with Adam, his transgression did not change his flesh; it placed him under sentence of death, who, by his very nature was capable of but not destined to death until sin was committed.

And now brethren, be kind enough to give me your special attention. I have shown you that Dr. Thomas has distinctly affirmed the existence of sin in the flesh, as a fixed principle. I am now going to turn to a living author, and show you that he flatly contradicts the Doctor on that point. I refer you to an article in the "Ambassador" for March 1869, entitled, "The relation of Jesus to the law of sin and death" by the Editor; and if I mistake not it was written chiefly to rectify what was conceived to be an erroneous impression in the mind of our esteemed Brother David Handley previous to his immersion.

Now what I want you specially to notice is this, that the Doctor affirms positively and clearly the existence of sin in the flesh as a fixed principle, while the Brother with whom for the time being I am unhappily at discord upon this matter, affirms the direct contrary. Here are his own words. Page 58, left column: -

"The phrase sin in the flesh is metonymical." - *"The Slain Lamb,"* page 19.
(Pardon me for explaining the term "meta" means to change; "nomen," a name. It

is that figure of speech which puts one thing for another, and may be exemplified by the very familiar illustration, "the kettle boils," when we mean the water in the kettle). The Editor proceeds *"Sin in the flesh is metonymical, it is not the expression of a literal element or principle pervading physical organization. (Is not that plain enough?). Literally, sin is disobedience or an act of rebellion. The impulses that lead to this reside in the flesh and therefore came to be called by the name of the act to which they gave birth. In defining first principles we must be accurate in our conceptions."*

I respond to that most heartily. I wish I had been more accurate in my own ten years ago. But the writer proceeds:

"The impulses which lead to sin existed in Adam before transgression as much as they did afterwards: else disobedience would not have occurred." Further down, in a complete sentence, *"There is no such thing as essential evil or sin."*

Now I think that perfectly clear, and I rejoice to be able to agree with Mr Roberts, at least when he penned those lines, that there is no sin in the flesh. But it is said by those who hear him regularly, that only a week ago he held precisely the same language in public discourse. I think he had the advantage of me then, he seemed to see the matter then. I did not. I wish I had.

I next call your attention to another part of this article to show you that the flesh of Jesus is said to be sinful. I refer to the second paragraph:-

"If Jesus came in the flesh He was under condemnation, for the nature He inherited was condemned."

Mr Roberts gives no proof of this, it is merely round assertion. He instances the proposition as a conclusion, instead of showing the reason of its conclusion. That is what logicians call "reasoning in a circle."

If Jesus came in the flesh He was under condemnation. Will that hold water? Or is it like pouring water into a sieve which lets it through as fast as it is poured in? Let us make a test. Was Adam in the flesh before he sinned? He was. Was he then under condemnation because he came in the flesh? Oh, no, that is bad logic. Therefore if he came in the flesh and was not under condemnation how could Jesus be under condemnation because He came in the flesh?

Mr Robert's answer is the flesh he inherited was condemned nature. Mark what nature means. It does not mean "character," it means substance, body.

Now then, I shall show where he has palpably contradicted himself again on this matter. He says:-

"Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he transgressed. There is no evidence of this whatever, and the presumption and evidence are entirely the contrary way."

Then the Editor goes on to give the best of all reasons when he goes on to say:-

“There was a change in Adam’s relation to his Maker; but not in the nature of his organization. What are the facts? He was formed from the dust a living soul, or natural body. His mental constitution gave him moral relation to God. He was given a law to observe, that law he disobeyed, and sentence was passed that he, the disobedient living soul should return to mother earth (see Appendix D). What was the difference between his position before disobedience and his position after? Simply this. In the one case he was a living soul or natural body on probation for immortality, and in the other case he was a living soul under sentence of death. He was a living soul or natural body in both cases.”*

I perfectly agree with that, brethren, it is a well written piece, and it serves my purpose admirably. You must get Mr Roberts to reconcile that with “Flesh full of sin” and “Condemned nature.” I am only sorry however to find confusion in other parts, sorry to find him asserting the other side, as did Dr.Thomas, who also, as clearly as he, taught this view and proved it. There is much I had marked in the article for criticism, He says, page 84:-

“The blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin, and the suffering of angels could not avail.”

Now, here is a question of death and I do not understand the meaning of the clause “the suffering of angels.” I read nothing about it in Scriptures. I understand when we possess Angelic nature we shall be beyond all suffering, and tears shall be wiped away from all faces and there will be no more curse. “Death having passed on the race of Adam. He will not accept the death of Angels.” Does not Christ say that they that are equal to the Angels can do no more?

My understanding of Angelic nature is, that in it inheres the principle of “deathlessness” and therefore it is an evident contradiction, I had almost said an absurdity, to speak of “the death of angels.”

Let us examine some other passages in this article;-

“The sentence of death ran in the blood which He inherited from Adam through Mary. Jesus was therefore in the days of His flesh as much under its power as those He came to save. This conclusion follows from the testimony that He was a man. It would stand secure upon that foundation alone; but it is also reaffirmed in divers parts of the word.”

Now brethren, if Jesus were as much under the power of death as those He came to save, was He not, like them, a child of wrath? Can a child of wrath deliver another from death? If he can, then the Scriptures which saith no man can redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him (Psalm 49:7) is made false. On the other hand, if this Scripture be true then one man born under sentence of death could by no means redeem those under the same sentence. He could not give to God a ransom which is “life” because being under sentence to die his life is already lost.

Now let us take the next statement in hand: -

“The mere fact that Jesus was a man is alone a sufficient foundation for the assertion that He was under sentence of death.”

Nothing is easier than to demonstrate the incorrectness of this statement. Look at Adam, was he a man before he sinned? Of course he was. Was he under sentence of death before he sinned? Of course he was not. It is therefore false to teach that because Jesus was a man He was under sentence of death. Before this can be taught we should first have to prove that Jesus was a sinner. But that is nowhere found in Scripture; on the contrary there are the plainest statements possible to show that Jesus was not a sinner. What saith John? – “And we know that He was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin.” 1 John 3:5.

Now if there were no sin in Him, then He could not be under sentence of death; for death can only come by sin, as it is written, “By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin.” Mr. Roberts says; *“It is expressly affirmed in divers parts of the word, that Jesus was under the Adamic sentence of death.”* I should very much like to see one of these express affirmations. Where are they? Well, Mr. Roberts points us to 2 Corinthians 5:21.

It is testified that Jesus was made sin for us. How does Mr. Roberts explain this verse? Please pay attention :-

“As Jesus was not of sinful character, this could only apply to His physical nature, which drawn from the veins of Mary, was made sin.”

You have not forgotten, brethren, that in this very article Mr. Roberts has told us distinctly there is no such thing as sin pervading our physical organization; that there is no such thing as essential evil or sin; That sin is an act of disobedience; and that the physical, nature of Adam was not changed by transgression. Now he tells us that sin ran in the blood of Mary, and from her, in this way was Jesus made sin. There could not be a more palpable contradiction than this; a gross stultification of himself and therefore a complete proof that he does not understand the subject. He is quite ignorant as to the manner in which Jesus, who knew no sin was made sin for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.

I will now explain the matter. The word “sin” in this verse is in Greek *“hamartia.”* Now this word means both “sin” and “sin-offering.” The question which arises therefore is this. Does the word mean “sin” or does it mean “sin-offering” in this place? If it means sin and not sin-offering; then surely we should be able to produce proofs from other parts of the word that Jesus was made sin in this sense. But I am sure there is no proof. You have already heard the testimony of Paul and John. The first teaches us that Jesus was undefiled and separate from sinners; the second that “in him is no sin.” Dr. A. Clarke observes that he has noticed more than a hundred places in the Scriptures where the word *“hamartia”* stands for sin-offering, and he says that is its meaning in 2 Corinthians 5:21. He who knew no sin, was made a sin-offering for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.

This certainly commends itself to one’s Judgment. He was made a sin-offering that something might follow for our eternal benefit, viz: that we might be made the righteousness of God “in Him.” And now brethren, ask yourselves whether we could have been “in Him” unless He had been made a sin-offering for us? Ask yourselves whether we could have been made the righteousness of God “in Him” unless we had been baptized into “His death”? And how could we have been baptized into His death unless He first had been made a sin-offering for us? Now survey the interpretation given by Mr. Roberts, viz; That Jesus was made sinful

by nature: that He drew this sin from the blood of His mother, although he emphatically declares there is no such thing as “sin” in the nature. I would ask you, brethren, how we could be made the righteousness of God “in Jesus” because He was made “full of sin”? How could the circumstance of sin in Jesus’ blood clothe us with the righteousness of God? Such an interpretation of the text sounds to me very much like “darkening counsel by words without knowledge.” To present one sinner to clothe all other sinners with righteousness is what I cannot at all comprehend. It resembles to my mind a project for clothing all the ragged wretches in the world with suits of apparel made out of the filthy rags of one like themselves.

I suppose my inability to apprehend the wisdom and justice of this plan is to be found in the fact that I am not spiritual but carnal, and that I cannot see below the surface. Be it so. But those who have had the advantage of a longer “spiritual education”? and whose powers of vision are well nigh prophetic ought surely to employ a little eye-salve instead of a hurricane of abuse and misrepresentation.

I will explain the matter by reference to another passage to which I ask your special attention, as I presume some little light may shine out of this which has not perhaps been seen, at any rate by some of us. The passage I refer to is in Genesis 4:7:- “If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.”

That verse is usually understood this way, that when Cain sinned, sin lay at his door as a kind of debt, a kind of witness or evidence of his iniquity, and this Scripture is often cited in this sense. But when we look below the surface in this matter by aid of those who do know, we find that is not at all the sense of the original. The word is “*chattath*” and that means sin-offering.

The phrase is “*lappethach chattath rabbets*” meaning a sin-offering lieth at the door. Lightfoot, Clarke, Boothroyd, thus expound the text. “There is an animal suitable for a sin-offering crouching at the door of the fold. If thou doest not well, take and offer it.” That is the explanation, and I consider it a beautiful passage.

It shows that God has provided a means for covering sin. As Clarke says, “It is not that the Almighty has not provided a lamb; that the Almighty is not reconcile; it is not that there is no sin offering lying at the door.” No, there was one outside the gate. That was the proper place. It pleased the Lord, His Father, to bruise Him there, and by that death we may be reconciled to God, if we place ourselves in relation to Him, not without.

Now then, this “*chattath*” or sin-offering is translated in the Septuagint by the word “*hamartia*,” the word before us.

Our attention has been called to my discussion with Mr. Smith of Edinburgh. I had supposed him to be especially expert in the Law and in the Psalms, but I am very sorry to say that I did not find him so. His use of the types and shadows “slew him.”

To understand this phrase we will refer to the types. Here is a bullock, there is a ram, and yonder is a lamb. These are physically without blemish. How are they made sin? Just as the Doctor says “by laying the sin upon them.” They then became sin-bearers.

How was Christ, the spotless Lamb of God made sin? By the same means - by laying sin upon Him. A sinless victim was made sin “for us.”

I have a book here brethren, from which I should much like to read an extract; but the time is so far gone, and I must content myself by making a very limited quotation from it.

The article upon which I open is entitled, “The bullock for a sin-offering.”

The first offering brought by Moses was a bullock for a sin-offering or, in Hebrew, “the bullock, the sin.” The word “offering” is never found in Hebrew connected with sacrifice. It reads “The bullock the sin, the ram the sin, the lamb the sin,” and so forth.

How are these victims made sin? By sin being laid upon them, The Priest laid his hands “heavily” upon them (the word means “to lay heavily”), and so was understood to transfer his sins from himself on to them, and these animals bore away his sins into the plain.

I refer to the scape-goats. However, when the tenth day of the seventh month came around again, they must needs avail themselves of another animal for a scape-goat.

Therefore the law was but a shadow, a representative way of sin covering. It was very different when “God’s Lamb” came, one who could be tried with all the impulses to sin, but who did no sin, and in whose mouth no guile was found, one upon whom, as Isaiah graphically says, “our sins were laid.” They were put away by the death of Christ, to be brought against us no more for ever.

Now it has been objected to this way of putting the matter that my view, as it has been styled, lays our sins on Christ's back like a bundle of sticks or something of the kind. I cannot help that. The Spirit in the prophet Isaiah says they were “laid on Christ” or made to meet on Him. You know the testimony but it is as well to read it; “He was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from Him. He was despised and we esteemed Him not. Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions. He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He was numbered with the transgressors, and He bore the sin of many.”

The former part of this prophecy found its fulfilment in the miracles performed by Jesus. Matthew 8:16 says:-

“When the even was come, they brought unto Him many that were possessed with devils; and He cast out the spirits with His word and healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of by Isaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bore our sicknesses.”

My brethren, the Lord was pleased to impute, or transfer, or lay on this victim's head the sins of the whole world. As the poet most beautifully expresses it, “By faith I lay my hand on that dear head of thine. While like a penitent I stand and there confess my sin.”

Our friend has said that sin is not a literal principle, and I agree with that. Sin is not a thing you can transfer from one to another like change for a sovereign. Nor am I disposed to think that in blood itself there is any intrinsic value.

Take the blood of the Passover Lamb in Egypt. Its value was the value which had been put upon it. The blood of Christ also was the same as that of any other man, but the Almighty has appointed that blood to us upon His plan, or scheme of redemption, which rendered it "precious." 1 Peter 1:19.

Because our life is not worth a rush, it is lost in Adam. I see how the blood of Christ is precious, because His life was not so lost.

The precious blood of Christ as of a Lamb "without spot and without blemish." It is His blood in which is no sin, that cleanseth us from all sin, if we walk in the Light. 1 John 1:7.

Now, then, I come to another point. The pamphlet I hold in my hand is by Mr. Roberts, and is entitled, "A Review of Brother Turney's answers to the Sacrifice of Christ." In it he positively affirms that the types were "wholly unclean." This I wholly deny. Now then for proof. He says,

"Again Paul writes, 'The bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood suffered without the gate.' Hebrews 13:11.

Here is a parallel between the burnt bullock as a type, and the slain body of Jesus as the antitype. Now let us mark the facts connected with the bodies of those beasts in their significance with regard to the body of Jesus. Numbers 19; "Speak unto the children of Israel that they bring thee a red heifer without spot, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke. And he shall give her unto Eleazer the High Priest, that he may bring forth without the camp, and one shall slay her before his face. And one shall burn the heifer in his sight, her skin, her flesh, and her blood with her dung, shall he burn; and the Priest shall take cedar wood, and hyssop and scarlet and cast it into the midst of the burning of the heifer. Then the priest shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterwards he shall come into the camp, and the Priest shall be unclean until the evening. And he that burneth her shall be unclean until the evening. It is a purification for sin. He that gathereth the ashes of the heifer shall wash his clothes and be unclean until the evening."

Everyone who had to do with the bodies of those beasts burned without the camp, for purification of sin, contracted uncleanness by contact with the bodies.

Now the type being so wholly unclean what is the uncleanness of the antitype? The heifer was without spot, and had never been put under yoke pointing to the sinlessness of Christ, and of the fact that He was brought into the world for the service of God alone; but what counterpart had the uncleanness? The answer is found in the fact that Jesus was of the seed of Abraham, the flesh of David, the sin nature of the condemned Adam, for the condemnation of sin in the flesh. The condemnation rested upon him which was the uncleanness and this antitypical uncleanness of that one great offering could only be cleansed after the example of the type, by death, and burning, the burning being the change effected by the spirit on the risen body of the Lord after His death for sin.

The new theory contains no parallel to this uncleanness of the typical bodies burned without the camp.” - R.Roberts.

Now let me try to show whether it does or not. Here the types are said to be unclean. If it means after the sins were laid upon it, I say that is true, but if it means that the flesh of the types was wholly unclean, I deny it, because if any one had brought to the priest an unclean animal for offering, he would have been worthy of death. It was only when the sins had been laid upon the victim that they were reputed unclean, and those who touched them contracted uncleanness; he must then wash his clothes and remain apart from Jewish society until the evening.

“This uncleanness” writes Mr. Roberts, “could only be cleansed after the example of the type, by death and burning; the burning being the change effected by the Spirit on the risen body of the Lord after His death for sin.”

Where is the proof of this idea? Mr. Roberts gives none. What in the world does he mean by cleansing Jesus after the manner of the type? Will he show where and when the typical victim was cleansed? He says, “By burning”! Did burning the bullock “cleanse” the bullock? If cleansing be the same as “destroying” then perhaps the bullock was cleansed. But I should like Mr. Roberts to show us the bullock after it had thus been cleansed.

The truth is brethren he does not know what he is taking about. If Jesus must be cleansed after such a fashion, then he is not alive now but was reduced to ashes 18 centuries ago. I think we may call this “a burning” argument which utterly devours the position maintained by Mr. Roberts, and leaves him neither root nor branch, neither type nor antitype. How long will he wallow in the ashes? Further, having informed us that the type was “wholly unclean” in his very next line says, “The heifer was without spot, and this spotlessness pointed to the sinlessness of Christ.” Is not this another strange contradiction? If the heifer were “wholly unclean” as he has just stated, I want to know what was the nature of that uncleanness? The heifer was not a moral agent like man, and certainly therefore, was not morally unclean. Well, was the heifer physically unclean? Certainly not. It was without spot or blemish. The slightest disease, lameness, or deformity would have rendered it quite unfit for an offering. If therefore, the position of Mr. Roberts rests upon the types which are wholly unclean and on examination we find them to be wholly clean, where, I ask you, is his standing? When the premises are false, the best logician is the least safe guide. Let us now look at what Mr. Roberts says about the goats :-

“So with the two goats, Leviticus 16:15,26. The one that was burned without the camp “was unclean” necessitating ablution on the part of the man who carried out the body to be burnt, and the one that was allowed to escape alive into the wilderness, as the sin bearer of the people, imparted uncleanness to the man who let him go.”

All this, brethren, is put forward to prove the necessity for the physical nature of Jesus to be unclean. But one little question will reveal the mistake. Were these goats unclean when led up to the Priest? Now you see the blunder. If it had been made by a man of short spiritual education, by a man who could not see below the surface, there had been some excuse. As it is, I think there is none. The goats, brethren were perfectly clean, not wholly unclean.

Now I will show you in Mr. Roberts' own words how they came to be unclean: -

"The sins," he says, *"were ceremonially put upon the goats."* Precisely so. But before that ceremony they were free from sin.

"If this is so with the types, what are we to look for in the antitype?" He asks. I answer a harmonious counterpart. In other words the antitype must be a wholly clean thing before sins are laid upon Him.

This is exactly what "The Lamb of God" was. John 1:29.

To lay sins on a sinner would not avail to remove sin. They must be borne by one "Mighty to save." And that mightiness could only consist of absolute sinlessness.

All under sin are "without strength" and therefore, just the reverse of "mighty."

I now beg to read a little from the prophet Malachi, in which we shall see the awful consequences of the types being wholly unclean. Malachi 1:12,14:

"But ye have profaned it, in that ye say the table of the Lord is polluted, and the fruit thereof, even His meat, is contemptible, Ye said also, behold what a weariness it is, and ye have snuffed at it saith the Lord of hosts, and ye have brought that which was torn, and the lame and the sick. Thus ye have brought an offering. Should I accept this of your hands, saith the Lord? But cursed be the deceiver who hath in his flock a male, and voweth and sacrificeth to the Lord a corrupt thing."

If the type had been unclean, you see it would have brought down a heavy curse, and if Jesus had been unclean in the sense of sins being in His flesh He must have been quite out of harmony with the type. I would not dwell longer on that point.

I want to mention three passages, one in Hebrew - Daniel 9:26, another in the Greek copy of the Septuagint, and another in the Greek copy of the New Testament.

It was once said that if that passage in Daniel meant what the English translation said, it would settle this question.

I have been able to prove, and the chairman will bear me out, that that which is given in the margin is not intended as a translation at all. But we will read the text:-

"And after threescore and two weeks shall the Messiah be cut off, but not for himself."

The words which touch the matter in hand are "but not for himself."

I want you to notice that in the margin we have these words, "And shall have nothing" and please observe the reference is to John 14:30. That is a reference, not a translation.

Those who have a marginal Bible will observe that where another rendering is given there is no reference made to another text, but in Daniel 9:26 there is a reference to John 14:30. The words "*ewe ayin lo*" of this verse in Daniel, Dr. Clark renders:-

“But not for himself.” He agrees with Dean Prideaux in this translation. Others have altered the common rendering on the supposition that there was at one time another word in the original text meaning justice. So Houbigant translates the passage: “He shall have no justice.” Boothroyd considers the text elliptical and renders it; “Though he had no fault.” When Doctors disagree, disciples may go free. Still, we have great weight of learning on the side of the reading in our English version:- “But not for Himself.” It seems to me a most comprehensive statement of the Prophet. It covers the whole ground, excluding at once the idea of the Messiah being a sinner either by birth or by His own actions.

The next reading I would draw your attention to is the LXX:- “And condemnation is not in Him.” This reading is also very significant. It may, I think, fairly be taken to cover the whole case, that is to say, it may be taken to signify that the Christ was not under condemnation either as a birthright or as an actual sinner. Mr. Roberts says the book of Daniel is not in the LXX. I am sorry, brethren, to see he knows so little about the matter. Is he to be trusted as an authority? Instead of there being no book of Daniel, there are as it happens two books of Daniel in that copy of the Old Scriptures. I do not desire to be severe upon him, but if he pushes his interruptions and provocations too far, I shall be compelled to retort, and if I do, it will be in no measured terms. Brethren, the Scriptures saith “The fear of man brings a snare.” Proverbs 29:25. And I hold it to be a degradation for a man to be afraid of another in a free country.

The last text to be noticed is that John 14:30 – “The Ruler of this world cometh and in me he hath nothing.” This Ruler was undoubtedly Pontius Pilate, and we have Pilate’s own testimony that he found no fault in Him. His wife also believed Jesus to be “a Just man.” The other texts were long before trial of Jesus. Daniel’s, about 500 years before, and the LXX about 200 years. I think, brethren, we may gather from the three readings this grand conclusion, that though Messiah appeared in our nature, He was absolutely free from sin until our sins were laid upon Him.

As it is gone ten o’clock I shall come to a conclusion as soon as possible. What is worse in argument than putting into your opponent’s mouth things which he desires?

It has been said that my doctrine makes Christ commit sin. I simply deny this. In our part of the Globe they have been so hard put to as to say that the sin in the nature of Christ was washed out in the waters of Jordan.

Now we are told that the blood of Christ cleanseth us from sin in its application to our hearts by faith, but if water could wash away sin, there was a source in Eden from which sprang four rivers, Genesis 2:10, and how is it that Elohim did not command Adam to wash in them and be clean? 2 Kings 5:13. The enemy is in a very miserable case.

Why was Jesus baptized of John? The answer is “to fulfil all righteousness.” Matthew 3:15.

But what righteousness was fulfilled by this act? I would suppose two things. First that the baptism of Jesus was the means of putting on His efficient robes, for it was after this we find Him becoming the great miracle worker and Prophet. It was at His immersion that the Spirit was shed upon Him. Secondly, the baptism may have foreshadowed His death, burial and resurrection. And besides this it might be that as John came baptizing the sons of Israel, Jesus felt it needful to set an example of obedience to the new ordinance.

Mr. Macknight renders the passage: "For so it becometh us to establish every ordinance." John does not appear to have perceived the need of Jesus being immersed, and hence "He forbid Him," but being pressed, "He suffered Him."

The answer of the Master Himself is conclusive, "It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." To have neglected one item - all righteousness, had been fatal to all. Offend in one point, guilty of all.

It is preposterous to talk of washing away the taints of sin in Jordon if Jesus had even been tainted; but I have shown He was neither tainted, nor defiled. Then there is another foolish accusation which has been set up like a man of straw, which, when brought to the fire of the word perishes. The Gnostic theory has been imputed to us. I had brought a long extract to read to you, showing the belief of the Gnostics, but the time is too far gone. I may say, however, that the Gnostics did not believe that Jesus was flesh and blood but only an apparition that looked like flesh and blood. They believed that His body was bruised; but that He did not suffer. Others believed that Jesus was not Christ; but when the anointing Spirit came from the Eternal throne, then the Christ united Himself with Jesus, and many, many other absurd things. Have I taught these things? I have uniformly taught that the nature of Jesus was precisely like our own, necessarily so, because it was that flesh which had impulses to sin, but which, unlike us, did not lead Him into sin.

I ought also to say something about "The Immaculate Conception." And there are seven or eight other items I should like to go through.

The doctrine of the "Immaculate conception" is peculiar to Papists. "*Macula*" means a "spot," prefixed signifies not. It means therefore, "without spot." That is the very phrase the Apostle Peter uses concerning Christ and therefore, it is a proper form of words to describe Him. But the Papists, like Mr. Roberts, holding this sin-in-the-flesh doctrine, invented the idea that Mary was immaculate also, in order to get a spotless Son. But why set up the idea of the immaculate Mary? I imagine that it was to overcome this difficulty of the taint called "Sin-in-the-flesh."

But suppose there is no taint; what need for such an invention? Suppose that instead of Mary's flesh being "full of sin" we regard her as being simply under sentence of death on account of sin (which conclusion itself would also be absurd seeing she was in the Covenant of God), this would explain the matter. If she could have had a child of herself, that child would have been under sentence of death. But she could not. That she knew herself, "seeing I know not a man."

The first woman was indeed in the transgression. But Mary was Jehovah's redeemed handmaid, therefore her Son was free from the sentence passed on Adam. Her other children by Joseph were under sentence. The flesh of their brother Jesus was just like theirs, but it was not "Sin's flesh" but "God's flesh." We ought to praise God for this scheme, for sending "His Son" in our nature to be tried, to resist, and to give His life a ransom for all.

Mr. Roberts charges me with Papal delusion; grosser ignorance of my theory could not, brethren, be expressed in words.

I have renounced the Papal myth of “sin-in-the-flesh” by which Mr. Roberts is yet bewitched, hence his utter ignorance of the matter and bland contradiction of himself when dealing with the subject. But instead of trying to enlighten me, he at the first appearance of my 32 question wrote letters to Brother farmer in which he said, first I had renounced the truth, next had abjured the faith, next was on the verge of the territory of the Mother of Harlots and finally that I had never understood the truth. At this last statement I began to compare notes and to wonder how I had achieved the marvellous feat of “renouncing” and “Abjuring” that which I had never understood. And to this day I do not know how I have managed it. You see, brethren, that short of time as Mr. Roberts professes to be, he can find time to write such epistles as these. If he were to refrain from the unchristian practise and calmly study the matter for himself, I am positive he would like a great many more of us be ashamed of the great amount of matter he has published.

I would now speak briefly of Jesus under several aspects.

First as an Apostle. Paul describes Him as “the Great Apostle,” Hebrews 3:1, “of our profession,” and invites us to consider Him in this capacity. An Apostle is one sent, from a Greek word which means “to send.” When did Jesus become an Apostle? I believe it was when He was baptized, being about thirty years of age.

He then began to evangelize the house of Israel. The twelve were all sent of God, but we observe that Jesus was sent in a peculiar and prominent manner. He came literally from God. He was God’s only begotten Son - John 1:18; He was the great Apostle. Paul has been styled the great apostle; but not in Scripture. We have thought to do him honour by this title, but scripturally speaking, the Great Apostle is none other than Jesus Christ.

He is next to be viewed as a Prophet; the Prophet of Nazareth, the great Prophet like unto Moses - Acts 3:22. I cannot now speak to any length under this head. Those who wish to see an able treatise on this may read “Newton on the Prophecies.” Suffice it for the present to say that several original prophecies were delivered by Jesus.

Perhaps you will expect me to say something in the next place of Jesus as a Priest; but that would be going too far.

I must speak of Him as a “victim.” There has been some confusion on this subject, a jumbling together of these high offices, and I wish to arrange them in proper order, so that your minds may apprehend each division separately, and then be able afterwards to take a clear and full view of the whole.

When the career of Jesus closed as an Apostle, and a Prophet on earth He became “a victim” on whom was laid not only the sins of Israel, but the sins of the whole world. I John 2:2. He was the “Lamb of God” - John 1:29. It pleased the Lord to bruise Him. This was done by the command which His Father gave Him. “To lay down His life” - John 10. The Jews and Romans executed the blood deed as murderers. They killed the “Prince of Life” - Acts 3:15, without being able to prove any crime against Him.

The giving of that life, however, was voluntary on His part, inasmuch as He had power to summon twelve legions of angels. But how then must the Scriptures be fulfilled? - Matthew 26:53, 54. You will observe that as soon as the sins were transferred to the head of the bullock or the goat, death followed. It was so with Christ. The sentence being passed, the

sins of the world were laid upon Him and He bore them to the Cross: that is to say the chastisement due to the sons of Adam, the Jews made other attempts to assassinate Him but failed. His hour was not yet come - John 7:30.

We must distinguish between a Victim and an Offering! Killing is not sacrifice; there must be both killing and presenting, or offering, before you have a sacrifice. If killing were offering, then as many beasts as the butcher killed there would be just as many offerings. We shall get some light on this distinction by referring to Leviticus 9:15. "And he brought the people's offering, and took the goat which was for the sin offering for the people, and slew and offered it for sin as the first."

Here you notice the slaying is the one thing, and the offering is another and both these make a sacrifice. - Ephesians 5:25.

Now the type and antitype must agree. It will not do, therefore to repeat the blunders so frequently made by our opponents in this controversy, and speak of Jesus as a Priest while on earth, and to say that He offered Himself on the Cross. I say He did not offer Himself on the Cross - neither was the great Offering made there. You shall be fully furnished with proof of this. It will be admitted by all that none but a Priest can offer. Another may bring an offering to the Priest, i.e., may bring an animal to be offered; but the Priest alone is authorised to offer it. If, therefore, it should turn out in this argument that Jesus was not a Priest while on earth, if He could not be a Priest in the days of His flesh, I ask you to say what becomes of the conclusion based upon His offering for Himself and for the people upon the Cross?

To say that Jesus was then "a victim" is in effect to say that He was not at the same time a "priest."

But I shall now draw your attention to the testimony which speaks of the Messiah's Priesthood. There are not merely one or two texts so that we are not left to conjecture. The evidence on this point is abundant and decisive.

Jesus was constituted a Priest by a Divine oath, - "The word of the oath" in Psalm 110 saith, "Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec."

Now there was this peculiarity about the original Melchizedec, that nothing is specified touching the termination of His Priesthood; and therefore, so far as the record goes, he stands before us an undying Priest, "made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually." It seems certain, then, that this Melchizedec was not typical of the Priesthood of Aaron, inasmuch as it is really superior to it.

The greater does not foreshadow the less; but the less, the greater. Of the superiority of Melchizedec to Aaron Paul leaves us in no doubt. Now this advantage of Melchizedec over Aaron, arises in part from the longer period during which Melchizedec holds office. For the law says Paul "makes men High Priests which have infirmity but the word of the oath which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore." Hebrews 8:28. Here we have a strong contrast, infirmity, and evermore.

Again Paul writes: - "Who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment but after the power of an endless life." The greater excellence is seen in the phrase "endless life," whereas the house of Aaron must succumb to death. "And they," says the apostle, "truly

were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; but this man because he continueth ever hath an unchangeable Priesthood;" or as the margin reads, "Which passeth not from one to another."

This testimony establishes the fact that Christ was to be an immortal Priest.

In the present discussion no fact is of greater weight than this. It follows from this that Jesus was not, as Paul says, a Priest on earth. This is also further evident when we remember that there was not on earth more than one divinely recognized Priesthood in the days of Jesus, and He was not of this line.

"For He of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning Priesthood."

Paul further writes:- "For if He were on earth, He should not be a Priest, seeing that there are Priests that offer gifts according to the law. But now hath He obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much more also He is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established on better promises." Hebrews 8:4-6.

From this teaching the conclusion is easy and safe that Jesus did not enter upon His Priesthood before He ascended to heaven. This conclusion is confirmed by the following statement:- "But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater, and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building." Hebrews 9:2.

If Jesus did not, and could not be a Priest in the Temple at Jerusalem, into what Holy of Holies did He enter? The answer is this, "for Christ is not entered into Holy Places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Verse 24.

There is yet another question to ask on this subject, and it is one of some importance. Was Jesus an Advocate the moment He entered into the presence of God? I answer that question in the negative.

Why was He not an Advocate at the first? I answer because He had not yet presented His offering to God. What was that offering? Paul says: Himself. "He needed not to offer Himself often, as the High Priest entered into the holy place every year; but now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." You have not forgotten that sacrifice consists of two things, killing and offering- Jesus was killed on earth, He offered Himself in Heaven; then His sacrifice was complete.

Let me now draw your attention for a moment to Hebrews 7:27. Mr. Roberts has adduced this text to prove that Jesus offered for His own sins and the people's on the Cross.

I shall show you that our friend does not know what he is talking about, the verse reads:- "Who needeth not daily as the High Priests to offer up sacrifice, first for His own sins, and then for the peoples, for this He did once when He offered up Himself."

Now the question is this, when, and where did Jesus offer up Himself? What I said a few minutes ago shows clearly that Jesus offered Himself, not on the Cross, but in Heaven. He did not, like the High Priest offer Himself often, but once He appeared to put away sin-offering by the sacrifice of Himself. Do not forget that there had been no sacrifice until He had been offered, or presented to God.

The next question is this. Does this verse show that Jesus offered for Himself? I say certainly not. You will remember the amount of plain testimony and argument in the former part of my lecture in proof of this which cannot of course be recapitulated. On another occasion I pointed out that the two offerings, not slayings by the High Priest were necessarily distinct from each other, and could not possibly be blended into one. And I remarked that if Paul wished us to believe that Jesus, like Aaron, offered for His own sins and the peoples also, he would not, I think have said this He did once, but *these* He did once, these being totally separate offerings. Besides this I asked, what could He offer if, as Mr. Roberts contends the offering was the shedding of His life blood for the people, after He had offered it for Himself. This has not yet been answered.

The truth is, brethren, that Jesus offered Himself for the sins of the people, not for His own sins. "In Him is no sin" - 1 John 3:5.

Well, having offered Himself without spot to God for us, He then sat down at His Father's right hand, there to be our intercessor, there to present our petitions to the Throne of Grace, and there to wait till His foes shall be made His footstool. After that, He will descend upon earth again to be for the first time a King and a Priest, not a Priest for us, for we are to be Kings and Priests with Him, but King and Priest of all nations.

At this time, Ezekiel, Isaiah and others teach that Messiah the Prince will offer and prepare sin-offerings. But we may consider these offerings in a memorial sense, as pointing back to His own complete sacrifice for sins, just as the offerings under the Law not being able to remit sin, but directing the mind to an offering which had that power, so I judge the sin offerings of the age to come will cause the nations to look back, and to remember with gratitude the deliverance provided in the sacrifice of "The Lamb Of God." This was the principle object for keeping the Jewish Passover, to carry the hearts of the Israelites back to the time when God delivered their fathers out of the hand of Pharaoh.

The next thing brethren I must speak of is "God manifestation." I need not to explain this term, you all know how it is used among us. I am not quite sure however, that God manifestation is a proper expression, but let that pass.

It has been said that this new idea destroys the Scripture teaching of God manifest in the flesh. Nothing, I conceive, but ignorance of the new idea could lead anyone to make such a serious mistake. Why, brethren, the scheme is all of God. Without God there could be no Son of God.

To begin with then, we have a, literal manifestation of God in our Lord Jesus. Then I ask, who devised the plan of redemption but God? When this is understood, we have the most marvellous manifestation of God's love to death-stricken man.

Then, who educated Jesus? Was He not directly taught of God? Who raised Him from the dead? And who glorified Him? And placed Him at His own right hand? Brethren! It is all of God, of whom are all things.

What blind assertion to say, as Mr. Roberts says, this scheme ignores the relation of the Father to Jesus in the matter! This to my mind is another proof that Mr. Roberts does not understand the subject. He says he does understand it. He had told me tonight he knows all I can say on the subject before I begin. To say the least, I think any man cultivating this frame of mind is very far from being teachable; a disposition the Lord makes necessary to our entering the Kingdom of God. Some men like the honour of teaching others, but are not able to see any honour or advantage in being instructed themselves.

But, my brethren, Jesus was not a passive instrument. He was a willing and obedient agent, and co-operated with the Father, therefore a share of the glory is due to Him. Hence it is written;- “Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests unto God, even His Father; to Him be glory, and dominion for ever and ever, Amen.” - Revelation 1:5, 6. The language held by Mr. Roberts makes Jesus to far exceed other men in His power to avoid Sin, while it condemns all other men for doing what they had not the power to avoid!

Here are his own words :-

“When at the age of 30, the Holy Spirit descended upon Him in bodily form, and as it were, took possession of His being, the Father dwelt in Him, and His qualification was complete.”

Now, I wish to know by what power Jesus walked without sin up to thirty, seeing that Mr. Roberts, at this age makes the Father, “take possession of His being” and so account for His resisting all temptations? If the Father, at thirty took possession of His being in order to help Him not to yield to His fleshly impulses, we ought to be enlightened by Mr. Roberts as to the means of keeping these impulses in check without the aid of the Holy Spirit during fifteen or twenty years out of the previous thirty. And then we come to wonder why the same power which had kept the impulses in check so many years could not hold them at bay for three or four years longer? The truth is brethren, that this taking possession of His being at thirty is no more than theological fancy engendered in the brain of a man who does not understand the subject: it is a mere fume, or curl of mist floating between the mind of the writer and the object, distorting it to his eye, and imparting to it an imaginary shape and colour. But hear what Mr. Roberts further says: - *“Yet He was tempted because He possessed the impulses common to our nature. He possessed, however, the counter-balancing endowment of knowledge and superior power which enabled Him to do what no man ever has done, that is to pass through this state of existence without sin.”* “Ambassador,” March 1869, page 86.

If this theory be true then God is more unjust than most men. What Mr. Roberts says just amounts to this: Here is a heavy weight, you call this man to lift it, but find it too heavy for him. He is willing enough, but not strong enough and because he cannot raise the weight you condemn him. You then call that man, and order him to lift the weight, which he does forthwith, and because he has more strength than the other, you reward him and exalt him.

Brethren I ask you to say what sort of justice, what sort of love, what sort of mercy is this? I ask you to say whether such a proceeding is not a piece of injustice altogether unworthy even of His finite and fallible creatures? It is most obvious that, if you make Christ either stronger or weaker than His brethren, you destroy the Scriptures which saith that “He was tempted in all points like as we are.” Hebrews 4:15. Temptation is weak or strong just as we have power to bear it. 1 Corinthians 10:13.

If you give Christ an almost infinite strength you thereby blunt or destroy the temptation, in fact you make it no temptation at all. There is no suffering. But we read that Jesus “suffered being tempted.” Hebrews 2:18.

Let me quote once more from the wonderful article:-

“When therefore, we realize the fact that divine power directly wielded by the Holy Spirit, was the energy which incepted His being, we are enabled to see that the type and texture of His being, though developed from the flesh of Mary, was something far above what falls to the lot of the mere children of men, and we shall find that this is one of the secrets of His sinlessness.”

I must say this is a statement passing contradiction and absurdity, coming as it does from a man who is exerting all his power to prove that “Christ was as much under the law of sin and death as those He came to save,” and that His nature was quite as fallen, and depraved as any of the sons of Adam. With one breath he tells us that Jesus was absolutely the same as His brethren in this respect, then with the next he says, the type and texture of His being were far above what fell to the lot of the mere children of men.

By such conflicting statements as these we are reminded of Paul’s word when he says:-

“For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God and are become such as have need of milk and not strong meat.” Hebrews 5:12.

Let me now lay down this article and take up for a few moments the next item on my list, that is “Redemption.”

Now in this discussion my opponents have been shocked at what they call the commercial aspect of this new idea. A religious plan which we venture to illustrate by “the full payment of our debt” seems to one or two, in Birmingham more especially, to have something about it not to be tolerated.

I venture to call this “zeal but not according to knowledge.” Romans 10:2. The higher man’s spiritual education is the further he is removed from this evil world, and especially that most hideous of all wickedness that of professing to be Christ’s brethren, the quicker, I say will be his perception and recognition of any simile or figure of a scriptural kind. If this “buying” and “selling” be not scriptural but carnal and worldly, such a spiritually educated person will be able at once to show us that it is so. However brethren, let us not be frightened by shouts and denunciations, let us look and see whether Christ Himself did not refer to “commercial” transactions to teach better things:-

“The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field which, when a man hath found he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.” Matthew 13:44. “Again the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a merchant seeking goodly pearls; who, when he hath found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had and bought it.” Matthew 13:45, 46.

Then see how Christ teaches the forgiveness of sins; “Therefore is the Kingdom of Heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants, and when he had begun to reckon one was brought unto him which owed him ten thousand talents; but inasmuch as he had not wherewith to pay his Lord commanded him to be sold and payment to be made. The servant, therefore, fell down and worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me and I will pay thee all. Then the Lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him and forgave him the debt. But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow servants that owed him an hundred pence, and he laid hands on him and took him by the throat, saying. Pay me what thou owest, And his fellow servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, have patience with me and I will pay thee all. But he would not and went and cast him into prison till he should pay the debt, so when his fellow servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told their Lord all that was done. Then his Lord, after he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant. I forgave all that debt because thou desirest me. Should not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow servant, even as I had pity on thee? And his Lord was wrath, and delivered him to the tormentors till he should pay all that was due to him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.” Matthew 18:23-35.

I have put emphasis on all the commercial words in this beautiful piece.

The sublimest of all the doctrines of the Bible, namely, “Forgiveness of sins” is taught by Christ is a “business figure.” And see how fit and proper this figure is. “Redemption” and “Pardon” are the highest questions of “Bought” and “Sold.” We are “sold” under sin: Romans 7:14, we are now “bought” with a “price.” 1 Corinthians 6:20. To scorn this phraseology is to scorn Christ and His Apostles, or to affirm that they were “too commercial” and “too carnal.” I could imagine a self-complacent, self-righteous, Pharisaic individual falling into such a grievous error; but I cannot conceive how this should happen to one of “a prolonged spiritual training.”

But there is one grand trait that marks a truly spiritual man, that is “a cool spirit.” A man of understanding saith the Proverb is of “a cool spirit.” Proverbs 17:27.

A truly spiritual minded man does not make fierce anger a virtue, nor poverty arising from indiscretion and extravagance a passport to the Kingdom of God.

A man of deep spiritual training is temperate, 1 Corinthians 8:25, and sober, 1 Peter 1:13, in all things, and does not think more highly of himself than he ought to think. These, brethren are some of the features by which you may know a spiritual; from a carnal minded man.

If Jesus had to die in order to cleanse himself either from “sin” “defilement” or “condemnation” in Adam, is it not passing strange that there is not even one solitary passage of Scripture which says He did?

How is it that we are to take such an important fact for granted, and yet we find so many texts which tell us that it was for “us” He died?

If it was needful to repeat it so many times that Christ died for “our sins” how is it, if He were under sin Himself, that not a single text points it out?

One fact is quite as important as the other, and if one must be received without testimony, why is there any need of so much testimony to establish and confirm the other?

I will now show some passages which distinctly show that it was for “our sins” Jesus was offered up:-

“But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all, for the transgression of my people was He stricken. He bare the sin of many. For He bare their iniquities.” - Isaiah 53.

“Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself” - Daniel 9:26.

“The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world” - John 1:29.

“The thief cometh not but for to steal, and to kill and to destroy. I am come that they might have life. I am the Good Shepherd: the Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep. I lay down my life for the sheep.” - John 10:10-15.

“And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the High Priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself. but being High Priest that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only, but that also He should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad” - John 11:49-52.

“Who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification” - Romans 4:25

“For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. But God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him” - Romans 5:6,8,9.

“He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all. How shall He not with Him also freely give us all things” - Romans 8:32.

“But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walketh thou not charitably, destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died” - Romans 14:15.

“Purge out therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are un-leavened. For Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us” - 1 Corinthians 5:7.

“For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus Judge, and if one died for all then were all dead. And that He died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto them- selves, but unto Him who died for them and rose again” - 2 Corinthians 5:14,15.

“For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him” - 2 Corinthians 5:21.

“For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich” - 2 Corinthians 8:9.

“Who gave Himself for our sins that He might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God” - Galatians 1:4.

“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” - Galatians 2:20.

“Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us” - Galatians 3:13.

“God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons” - Galatians 4:4,5.

“Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free” - Galatians 5:1.

“In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace” - Ephesians 1:7.

“And walk in love as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering, and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.” Ephesians 5:1

“Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for us” - Ephesians 5:25.

“Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son” - Colossians 1:13,14.

“And you that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy, unblameable and unreprouvable in His sight” - Colossians 1:21,22.

“For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us” - 1 Thessalonians 5:9,10.

“Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners” - 1 Timothy 1:15.

“For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time” - 1 Timothy 2:5,6.

“Who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” - Titus 2:14.

“When He had by Himself purged our sins sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High” - Hebrews 1:3.

“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” - Hebrews 2:9.

“How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God. So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many” - Hebrews 9:14,48.

“By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” - Hebrews 10:10.

“Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood suffered without the gate” - Hebrews 13:12.

“For even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us. Leaving us an example that we should follow His steps. Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed.” - 1 Peter 2:21,24.

“For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God” - 1 Peter 3:18.

“Forasmuch then as Christ suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind” - 1 Peter 4:1.

“But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son cleanseth us from all sin” - 1 John 1:7.

“And ye know that He was manifested to take away our sins and in Him is no sin, hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us” - 1 John 3:5,16.

“And they sang a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred, people and tongue, and nation” - Revelation 5:9.

Now, brethren, having presented to you this array of texts, each emphatically pointing us to the love of God in giving His well-beloved Son to die for us where shall I turn to find one text which even fairly hints that He died to cleanse Himself?

The word of God is as silent as the tomb and it is only by some bad inference or other that even a shadow of support can be adduced.

Yea, Christ redeemed us by His blood. Adam lost his life and ours by sin. Christ died for all, which as the apostle points out, was because all were dead. The apostle said He judged thus of the effect of Adam's sin.

But Mr. Roberts seems to know better than Paul; he says:-

"As the children of Adam we inherit his condemnation, but we did not forfeit our lives in him. We have forfeited our lives since, by transgression."

Now, brethren, I should ask you to say whether this statement is not a flat contradiction of Paul's. And besides, I ask what was Adam's condemnation? Was it not death?

Do we not then inherit death through him? If not, what else? But whatever else, we are certainly thereby children of death? By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death hath passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned. No. No, says somebody of prolonged spiritual education! You cannot see beyond the surface, we did not lose our lives by the sin of our first parents; we have lost them by our own acts. Truly brethren, wisdom is justified of her children. Paul reminded the Ephesians with tears that they had been "purchased with the blood of Christ." Acts 20:28.

Peter called the attention of his brethren to the fact that they were redeemed with the precious blood of Jesus, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. 1 Peter 1:19. The value of His blood lay in the fact of its spotlessness, that is, of its being undefiled by the sin of Adam: in other words, of its not being under sentence of death. Has not this sentence, brethren, made us all sinners? Has not this sentence defiled the whole human race, in the sense of putting them under the sentence of death? Has not the sting of death been thrust into the heart of every son of Adam?

Whence then comes this mighty power to redeem, to ransom from the power of the grave? The answer is Christ was not under penalty, and could therefore, and did "give His life a ransom for all."

The blood itself was of no better and no worse quality than your blood and mine, for God hath made of one blood all nations of men. Acts 17:26. It was, brethren, the precious "life" wherein lay the exceeding, nay the "countless price."

Why is the death of God's saints precious in His sight? (Psalm 116:15). Because they have been redeemed by the blood of His Son from the curse. The death of the wicked is as nothing to Him; whole nations are counted as only the drop of a bucket. Isaiah 40:15.

Sufficient has been said, I think to make it clear in what way Jesus redeemed us; to show that life had been lost through sin; that Jesus gave His life for all. You have not forgotten, of course, that I pointed out that Jesus by perfect obedience earned immortality. Now having seen how Christ hath redeemed us, let us enquire whether Christ needed to be redeemed, and in what way?

I answer that Jesus did not need to be redeemed. The sense however, is that of being released or saved from death; of being brought up again from the pit. Here Jehovah appears as the Great Redeemer; the great Saviour, besides whom, strictly speaking there is none else.

The power of Jesus to take His life again lay in His right, but it was God alone, the fountain of all power, who could bring Jesus again from the dead. As God is just it was impossible that the bars of death should hold His Son who had kept all His Father's commandments.

It was not possible, says Peter, "that He should be holden of it." Acts 2:24. When about to enter the chamber of the "King of terrors" Jesus offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him who was able to save Him from death. Hebrews 5:7.

The sum, then, of what I have said is this; Christ redeemed us with the price of His own life. His Father redeemed or released Him without a price because in Him is no sin. 1 John 3:5.

Mr. Roberts would have us believe that this is a profoundly intricate subject requiring "a prolonged spiritual education" to comprehend it, and to give a show of truth to this assertion he quotes the prophet Isaiah:- "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, for as the Heavens are high above the earth..." Isaiah 55:8.

I ask whether this passage is to be taken to mean what Mr. Roberts wishes you to think it means, namely that you cannot understand redemption without "a prolonged education"?

Just read the preceding verse: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God for He will abundantly pardon. For my thoughts are not your thoughts..." and so forth. You see, the comparison is made between wicked man's thoughts and God's thoughts. The passage was never penned to tell you that redemption is so abstruse that you cannot see through it until you have had "a prolonged spiritual education."

Oh no, Redemption is a first principle. Redemption shows God's righteousness, which a man must put on first before he can hope for acceptance in the sight of God. Matthew 6:33. 1 Corinthians 2:2.

If, brethren, we must go through "a prolonged spiritual education" before this first step can be taken, I fear there is precious little chance for us. To the poor the Gospel is preached - Luke 11:5, Matthew 11:25, 21:16. The poor have less opportunities than others. But I will unmask this sort of talk. It does not require one to see very far below the surface; the plain meaning of it is this:- "I have had more spiritual education than you have had months." "This is a profound subject." "It is not to be expected that you should understand it." "Look to me." "Trust to my judgment."

Brethren, this is precisely the policy of the Clergy, it is nothing more than the strategy of the Papist. I tell you the plan of redemption is not subtle, it is plain; but it requires on our part a child-like teachable mind.

When I issued my "Thirty-two Questions" Mr. Roberts published some remarkable replies. Question 17 enquires "Was the life of Jesus His own?"

Now listen, brethren to Mr. Roberts reply:-

“If it be asked could He have given it for the sin of the world, if it had not been His own (in the earned sense) the answer is, He might have given it. But it would have been of no avail, because the law of sin would have condemned Him personally, and barred the way to His resurrection.”

No words of mine, except those in parenthesis, could better convey my meaning. I feel sure that unless the natural life of Jesus had been under no pledge, He could not justly have been raised again. But what is the import of these words: “In the earned sense”? I understand Mr. Roberts to mean that Jesus by perfect obedience earned life, and then laid it down. Now what life did He earn? Surely not His natural life; that He receive as every child does, from His Father. I understand that the life Jesus earned was eternal life. If therefore He laid down His life in the earned sense, then He laid down His eternal life. No, it was not the life “in the earned sense” that Jesus gave for the sins of the world; it was the life of His flesh (John 6:37) which His Father gave him in His mother’s womb and which, by obedience, He kept, having by the same obedience earned the higher life. When therefore He laid down the first freely, He still held the right to the other as his resurrection demonstrates.

It has also been directly concluded that as Joshua, the High Priest was clothed with “filthy garments,” Zechariah 3:3, Jesus the antitype, must necessarily be physically clothed with filthiness of Adam’s sin. We will now examine whether this High Priest was a type of Christ. But let us examine this “filthy garment” argument.

Remarkable things have been known in nature. Children have been known to be born with teeth, and so many other remarkable things; but never in the creation of God has it been known of one to be born with garments. So that whatever the “garments” may typify, they must mean something put on the Christ sometime, at least subsequent to birth. And I think it agrees with the prophet Isaiah “The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.” “The Christadelphian” affirms that physically, Jesus was as much involved in Adam’s transgression as they, for He inherited Adam’s nature from Mary’s blood, in which Adam’s life existed, “for the life of all flesh is in the blood thereof.”

I myself allow that Jesus inherited Adam’s nature from Mary’s blood. I allow that Adam’s life was in Mary’s blood, but the life of Jesus is the pith of the dispute. I have no dispute about flesh. The flesh of Adam, the flesh of Christ, and the flesh of Judas, was all the same flesh. There is one kind of flesh of man, 1 Corinthians 15:39, and doubtless the Christ appeared in this one kind. “And God hath made of one blood all nations.” Acts 17:26. I have no dispute, therefore, about flesh and blood, for whether Jews, Chinese, or Esquimaux, they are all one.

Nor do I deny that the life is in the blood. The life of Adam was undoubtedly in Mary’s blood, and if Adam had been the direct father of Jesus, as he was of Mary, then his life would have been the life of Jesus also.

The Almighty put the life into Adam’s blood when He breathed into him the breath of life. And afterwards he forfeited that life by sin, both for himself and for all whom he should beget. Now I hold that if Jesus derived His life through Adam that life also would have been under condemnation, to argue about flesh is to overrun the subject. The Creator did not begin by condemning Adam’s flesh, as flesh. The sentence was “Thou shalt surely die.” Genesis 2:17. That is, lose thy life. The body then perished as the effect of this just deprivation. See 1 Samuel 14:44 and 22:16, 1 Kings 2:37, 42, 46.* (see Appendix D).

“If Jesus was the seed of David,” says “The Christadelphian,” “according to the flesh, He stood in the days of His flesh in all the relations of David.” I say this will not stand, Jesse was David’s father and therefore Adam was. But the Almighty was the Father of Jesus, therefore Adam was not. If we say Adam’s life was in Jesus, this is in effect affirming that His paternity was from man. If we hold also that God was His Father, confusion sets in, for in that case He had two fathers.

Truly He was the son of David according to the flesh, but not according to the life. Thus constituted every whit suitable for a sin-offering unto redemption. “The last Adam” set out on a career of probation ending in Victory.

The Editor of “The Christadelphian” puts in as evidence against the doctrine propounded in my “32 Questions” a letter from the late Dr. Thomas which he no doubt thinks a heavy counter blow. This letter was familiar to me long before it appeared in the last “Christadelphian.”

The Doctor in the last line of it, as in other parts of his writings appears to employ the phrase “sinful flesh” at times merely as an equivalent for flesh and blood. At any rate, I, as a well known student and admirer of the Doctor’s works, undertake to prove that the Doctor has distinctly taught the theory set forth in my “32 Questions,” which is that Jesus did not derive His life from Mary, but directly from God. Consequently, that life could not be forfeited by Adam’s sin.

In “Eureka” volume 1, page 277, the Doctor says, :-

“His germination was irrespective of the lust of the flesh. In this particular the germination of Jesus was different from that of all other men. If Joseph had been His Father, He would have been born of blood, of the will of the flesh, and of man, instead of the Spirit. He would have been son of man only, and not Son of God.

Now I ask, would not this have been so if His life came from Mary? Certainly, for her life was Adams life. But hear the Doctor:-

“The name then in connection with the testimony of the prophets indicates a conversion of Spirit into flesh and blood, developed by the formative power of the Eternal, independently of, and apart from the will of man.

The spirit operated germinatively upon the contents of Mary’s womb. Here, as the spirit germ of the Second man, it remained the usual set time subject to the laws of the animal economy. Such was the page in preparation for the Sacrificial man. His germination was irrespective of the lust of the flesh.

Jesus Anointed is the Creator of this new Creation, and Himself also the first element of it that has been created without human intervention. Enoch, Moses and Elijah were glorified men before His creation, but they were not a direct creation of the Deity, for their paternity was human.

Jesus had no human father, but was created by the spirit as independently of the will of the flesh as Adam, the beginning of the animal creation of the deity was before him."

"Eureka" Volume 1, pages 276 and 406.

What can be plainer than this? But if we say the life of Jesus came from Mary we say in effect that it came from Adam; otherwise Jesus had two lives.

I feel sure the Doctor meant that the life of Jesus came direct from God, as Adam's did and by furnishing Jesus with this life he could, at the close of His career give His life a ransom for many.

I now proceed to quote from "Phanerosis" page 34.

"He was not begotten by the impulse of the flesh, nor of the will of man, so that being born of the human nature; He would be directly Son of woman, and only indirectly Son of man. But if He were not directly Son of man, He must have been directly Son of Power, as Adam was who had no human father."

Is it not evident from this that Jesus' life did not descend from Mary, but from God? In this way, as the Doctor elsewhere observes, the Jews might have known what was meant when Jesus said:- "I came down from heaven, and that He would go up where He was before." John 6:42,62.

Here the Doctor once more:-

"When we contemplate the Cherub before His sealing and anointing, we see only the son of Mary, the seed of the woman, and Son of God in the same sense that Adam was." Page 43.

Is it not from this beyond all doubt that Christ's life was direct from God and not through His mother from Adam?

If this only could be seen in its effects in the scheme of redemption my object is attained, and I would impress upon you, brethren that if the life of Jesus were imparted to Him through Mary, the issue must be that He is still among the dead.

I wish now to call your attention for a moment to a very solemn thing. I have called it, "The condemned loaf."

If Jesus Christ's body was, as Mr. Roberts declares, "a sinful body" then the loaf is emblematical of that body. When, therefore, we eat of that loaf, we are figuratively eating of a "sinful body." Brethren, is not this repulsive in the extreme?

Take this illustration. Suppose the Officers of the Board of Health had set his brand upon this loaf, had condemned it, had pronounced it unfit for food, would you eat it? And if you were to eat it, what must be expected to follow? Why, that you would, of course be made sick; that you would thereby become infected.

The body of Christ symbolized by the loaf was as the body of a lamb without blemish and without spot. That body was broken for sin, after sin had laid upon it. Are we, then eating of a body of sin, or are we eating of Christ, our spotless Passover, who was sacrificed for us? Brethren, let us purge out this old leaven, that we may be a new lump. 1 Corinthians 5:7,8.

In conclusion of this long lecture, I would speak a word of exhortation. There has been a great deal of talk among us as a body to this effect, that we cannot please God; “when we would do good evil is present with us...” and so on. And the usual place of shelter is the 7th chapter of Romans, one verse of which says: - “For in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.” I shall show you that we have been grossly mistaken on this point; our ideas have been quite subversive of Christian perseverance, and holiness of life.

In the first place, is not man with all his tastes just what the Creator made him? Has the creature man any more senses or faculties now than he had at first? Can you implant in him any additional faculty or sense? By no means. In his senses, as in his hair and stature, no alteration can be made. Now, brethren, what follows from this? It follows that if any of the senses or faculties of man are sin, then God is the author of sin. There is not in fact one inclination in all the human mind but what, when you come to consider, is good in itself. Romans 14:14. It is only when these inclinations are allowed to run on without restraint that sin occurs.

This may be seen in a moment by considering some of those passions which, un- guided, lead to the grossest crimes.

God commanded His new-made earth borns to multiply and replenish the earth. Genesis 1:28. But He also said, “Thou shalt not commit adultery.” Exodus 20:14. This last being no more than the same act unlawfully committed. God allows we eat our fill, but He also put in a law on gluttony and drunkenness, which is the undue indulgence of hunger and thirst. And so it is throughout the entire range of human appetites. To kill is good, but to slay unlawfully is murder.

I say then that the exercise of desires is not displeasing to God: that our flesh which He made is not an abomination in His sight: but like all other works of His hands is very good.

To teach otherwise implies a defect in the understanding. One great Divine of the Protestant church professed to feel his natural depravity so keenly that he said, even his very tears of repentance needed washing. Surely this was not that kind of repentance Paul says “needeth not to be repented of.” 2 Corinthians 7:10.

All this, brethren, I am persuaded is mistaken humility; it is too near akin to Popish penance to be pleasing in the eyes of the Divine being.

You will do well to make a fresh study of the 7th chapter of Romans. Instead of its language applying to Paul the Apostle as has been so commonly thought, I feel sure you will see that it has no such application, but that it refers to a Jew outside Christ, as Milton holds, to a person of unregenerated mind.

The key so to speak, to a right understanding of this chapter lies in the 1st line of the 5th verse, “For when we were in the flesh.” What means the Apostle here? Does he speak of the

flesh of the body? No, he speaks of the unbridled lusts. You see this by that other saying of his, "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Romans 8:8. Does this signify that so long as a man "is flesh and blood" he cannot please God? Certainly not. Paul explains himself. He says, "But ye are not in the flesh." The phrase "the flesh" therefore does not point to the body of the flesh but to the unlawful exercise of the desires of the flesh.

"If ye live after the flesh ye shall die." That is not because we are bodies of flesh, but if we follow after the desires of the flesh so far as to set aside the commandments of the Lord. We are all physically in the flesh, but that is not displeasing to God. But we who are in Christ are neither legally nor morally in the flesh, in the Apostle's use of the phrase.

A fleshly-minded man cannot please God, because such a man's hope is not set in God, and is without faith. But a man, though physically flesh including the appetites can please Him if he comes under the guidance of that faith "which works by love" and purifies the heart. Acts 15:9.

You will find brethren, that the fleshly-minded man of Romans 7 is not the Apostle Paul after he had yielded himself wholly to Christ. Paul simply uses the pronouns "I" and "me" as is common in illustration.

After describing most graphically the tossings and self-reproaches of this "I" and "me" of this unregenerated man under the law who by the law is convicted as a transgressor who, distracted and in despair as to deliverance therefrom, is led by Paul at the close of the chapter to a recognition of deliverance through Christ. He then continues; "There is therefore now no condemnation to them who 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." Here is the glorious release from "the flesh" to "the spirit" according as these phrases are used by Paul.

The conclusion therefore is brethren, that Paul did not decry the flesh; did not bemoan himself because he was just what God made him, but he rejoiced in the discovery of a motive power sufficiently strong and enduring to overcome the desires of the flesh and to reward him for keeping under the body and bringing it into subjection. What is it then that God has commanded us to do which we cannot do? Are we not exhorted to keep His commandments? If there be those that it is impossible to keep, then that command is a mockery and God a monster.

But what saith the word? "His commandments are not grievous." 1 John 5:3, and that He tempts no man above what he is able to bear and will with the temptation make a way of escape that ye may be able to bear it. Again, "take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for my yoke is easy and my burden is light." Matthew 11:29. Peter's reference to the law being a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear (Acts 15:10) is clearly indicative of the Scribes and Pharisees interpretation of the law. "Yea they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders but they themselves will not move them with their fingers." Matthew 23:4.

If no mere man is able in this life to keep the commandments of God, I would ask you to consult carefully the Book of Deuteronomy alone. I am sure it will exhibit this monster delusion in absolute nakedness. Truly Rome has corrupted all nations.

But let us rouse ourselves from such degrading thoughts to a cheerful perseverance; let us gird up the loins of our minds with truth and be vigilant, lest this enemy; this bad-flesh doctrine should get an advantage over us. 1 Peter 1:13.

Let us resist the devil, being assured that if we do he will flee from us, James 4:7.

And let us run the race that is set before us, not uncertainly but so as to obtain. 1 Corinthians 9:24 to end.

Paul was a man of like passions with ourselves and inspiration did not alter these passions. He said: - "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

If Paul did so brethren, cannot we? Let us say we will. By the grace of God we will.

To alter one in Moores beautiful lines:-

But then, celestial warrior, then
When all earth's shrines and thrones before our banner fall,
And the glad slave shall at those feet lay down his broken chain
The tyrant lord his crown, the priest his book, the conqueror his wreath,
And from the lips of truth one mighty breath
Shall, like a whirlwind, scatter in its breeze
The whole dark pile of human mockeries;
Then shall the reign of Christ begin on earth,
And, starting fresh as from a second birth,
Man, in the sunshine of the world's new spring,
Shall walk transparent, like some holy thing.

REMARKS

And now brethren, I have finished my lecture, but I will beg your attention for five minutes while I relate a few personal matters. Mr. Roberts has noised abroad that I have not courage to meet him in discussion. If that be true, all I can say is that he is the first man of whom I have felt afraid. But brethren, I am not naturally afraid of the faces of men especially of men who, I firmly believe cannot maintain the cause they have undertaken to defend.

To tell you the truth, I rather like a sharp encounter, it does me good; but I do not put much faith in such things as a means of settling questions of importance. This can only come after quiet and patient private investigation.

Now I will tell you in a few words the story of these challenges.

First of all Mr. Roberts attacked my 32 Questions in the "Christadelphian" for June 1873, suppressing the name of the author. Upon this Brother Farmer here present asked me if

I would see Mr. Roberts privately, provided he was willing. I said Yes, I should like to see him privately. Then Brother Farmer arranged with Brother Sulley to go at once to Birmingham with the object of bringing about this interview.

What message did Brother Sulley bring back? Listen:

Brother Sulley: "Will you see Brother Turney privately about this affair?"

Mr. Roberts: *"Oh, if Brother Turney had wished to see me, he would not have launched the 32 questions."*

Brother Sulley: *"But I know Brother Turney does wish to see you."*

Mr. Roberts: *"Then I don't know that I want to see him."*

And as a confirmation of this he said in a letter: *"I would rather not be hampered by personal influences."*

After this I said I was willing to meet him before one or two brethren on each side, with Dr. Hayes for chairman and Brother A. Andrew for reporter, the report to be used by either party as he thought well. This offer he absolutely refused. He said: - *"It would be submitting himself to an irritating situation."*

I dare say it would, and he spoke as he felt. But why should he be irritated, seeing, as he pretends, he has all truth on his side and I have all error on mine?

Men are not usually irritated at the prospect of an easy victory. But we know that some men who are loud and brave before a sick and weakly antagonist do feel irritated when they have to stand close to an opponent who likes to be close to them. They then prefer either more room or else some condition to place a great advantage on their side to start with. Anybody can fight a winning battle, but to pull against wind and tide requires coolness, not irritation, and steady nerve and tried courage. Well then, the truth is brethren, that I have been the party ready to meet Mr. Roberts on anything like fair terms, time and time. But he would not, for reasons best known to himself.

In place of what all other men would consider fair conditions, he proposed to ask me a lot of questions. He seems to have cross-examination on the brain, and to think himself born to ask questions. But if you are to get at what a man means, it will not be by asking him only such questions as you hope will make him contradict himself, but by letting him speak freely, listening attentively, not to catch him in his words, but to get at his ideas.

This presupposes that you regard him as honest and sincere in his motive; the other presupposes that he is not, and therefore must be caught and exposed.

Now then I put down a public challenge to discuss three or four nights before you all when I return. (I repeat it. Mr. Roberts did not accept it). I hope Mr. Roberts will be better informed on the scheme of redemption before I return, for instead of publicly debating the question it would be far more profitable to go round the country helping him to set it forth. But so long as he is hostile, it will be war to the last. I never give in when I feel sure I am in the right.

* * *

CHAIRMAN

At the close of the lecture the Chairman rose for the purpose of addressing a few words to the audience, but was prevented by Mr. Roberts who, shouting at the top of his voice, threw into confusion a meeting which up to that point, with the exception of some interruptions from the same quarter, had been marked by the most exemplary order and attention throughout the whole period of two hours and a half which was occupied by Brother Turney in the delivering of his address.

There were two or three points alluded to in the course of the lecture to which the Chairman was desirous of calling the particular attention of the audience. The first was the very significant fact that those who have written on this question “contradicted” themselves, as already shown by the extracts made from their published works; and no stronger proof could be adduced that the theory they seek to uphold is false.

It stands condemned by its own advocates. Another point of great importance in this controversy is the fact that the words “sinful flesh” on which so much stress has been laid, and which are so frequently on the lips of those who hold what may be called “The condemnation theory” of Christ, are not found in the Scriptures. It is true that the phrase “sinful flesh” occurs in the Authorized Version, but no such phrase was ever written by the Apostle Paul.

The form of sound words used by him was a likeness of “Sin’s flesh” predicating “property” or “possession” and not “quality.”

This is the rendering of the original, and it is certain no Greek scholar can call it in question. It is sound speech which cannot be condemned, and harmonizes perfectly with the entire record concerning the Anointed Saviour.

Let this particular form of words be studied, and it will be found that there is very much involved in it.

The confounding of “sin” with the impulses which lead to sin has introduced an element of confusion into this question which should be carefully avoided.

It is a figure of speech peculiar to the Apostle Paul; it shortens or abridges discourses, in fact, conveys the “maximum of thought in the minimum of words.” “*meta*,” to change, “*nomen*” a name. The important distinction between “sin” and “sin-offering” is still another point calling for attention which cannot be too strongly enforced, the right understanding of this at once removes a great difficulty.

There has unfortunately throughout this controversy been much misunderstanding, and in consequence much misrepresentation though it is not here intended to insinuate that it has been wilful.

But after the detailed explanation of his views which has been given tonight by our Brother Turney, there will be no longer any excuse for misrepresentation, for surely the matter has been made sufficiently plain for the comprehension of anyone of ordinary intelligence, and certainly of those who are supposed to be, not mere readers, but students of the Bible. It is much to be regretted that a spirit of animosity has been manifested, which, among those professing godliness, is especially reprehensible.

The one object to be kept in view is to ascertain the truth, and no rightly disposed person of independent mind, who has no party interest to serve, can possibly have any other.

Noisy declamations, hard speeches, and personalities, will not aid the search. They do but tend to show that the parties who indulge in them are in a measure conscious of the weakness of their cause. The points at issue can be decided only by an earnest investigation of the Scriptures of truth.

So then let us apply ourselves, in an humble, teachable, and child-like spirit, and there need be no fear of the result.

Appendix A.

The letter from David Handley published by R. Roberts some two years previous to the lecture: -

Dear Brother Roberts, I am surprised that any looking for redemption through Jesus, should ever suppose Him to be mere man. I do not think that any maintain that they can be saved unless redeemed. I am aware that saying and writing too much often mystifies that which the writer or speaker wishes to make plain; yet I venture to write a little on this subject, though some may think there has already been too much written.

I will endeavour to express my mind in a few words. First, what is the position of every son of Adam? by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; so that every son of Adam being under sentence of death, it was not possible for any to escape from it, unless redeemed. Now is Jesus Christ the Redeemer? We say Yes. What qualified Him for the great work? We shall see that to do this, He must be both Son of God, and Son of man. First, He must pay the debt, in order to release the Debtor. It was the mortal race that had fallen under the wrath of God, which ended in death. In order to meet the law, He must be the seed of the woman, for there could be no compromise. The law could not be set aside. It had no power to release the dead until a sacrifice had been offered in the flesh that sinned. Here we see the need of Jesus being in the likeness of sinful flesh. But He must be Son of God in order for there to be virtue in His death to redeem; His life must be independent of the Adamic race. Therefore though Son of David's daughter, and made of a woman, He was a New Creation, "The Lord from Heaven." Not dependent on Adam for His life, but received it direct from the Father, as John hath it. (John 5:26, 6:57).

Here I think we see the wisdom of God in Redemption; a body in our nature; a life independent of our race; the life of the flesh is given for the life of the world; here is what men of business call 20 shillings in the pound. But again I say, there could be no virtue in the giving up of His life if He was a mere man, or if He had derived His life in any way from the seed of Adam, for all who derived life from Adam, lost it; for in him all sinned. But Christ in our flesh could suffer the penalty and then redeem His brethren, for He had never forfeited His life by personal transgression, and His life being independent of the race, He could give it for a ransom. To me this appears clear, while no man could give to God a ransom for his brother, the Son of God, who was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, could, having the price of redemption in His own power. You will see from these few lines what I wish to convey to the brethren. If you think the matter worthy of insertion in the Christadelphian, use it; if not, refuse it. My house all join in love to thee, and to thy house, and the household of faith, farewell. D.Handley, Maldon.

Note: It is said that before he died the writer of the above letter renounced the views expressed in it and developed by Edward Turney. Whether this is so or not does not affect the issues involved.

Appendix B.

The lecturer here endorsed the belief held almost without exception by the brethren of his day, that Jesus rose mortal. It is fairly certain that before very long he perceived the incongruity of the idea and realized that as the first-begotten from the dead Jesus must have come from the tomb in incorruptible nature. Most Bible students today recognize that the words Jesus spoke to the woman in the garden do not justify the deduction made from them that Jesus was not to be touched because He was defiled by the grave.

Appendix C.

Mortal and Corruptible. The speaker appears to have been slightly ambiguous here. He asks what was in the nature after transgression and says there was mortality, meaning death. As in Appendix B it is evident that he had not yet completely shaken off Christadelphian confusion on the point. It is still a very general misconception that mortality and corruptibility are synonymous terms. Actually mortal means subject to death by law whereas corruptible means perishable by nature. The lecturer made this clear however in the first paragraph on the next page.

Appendix D.

The sentence upon Adam. In expressing agreement with R. Roberts statement commencing "There was a change in Adam's relation to his Maker..." Edward Turney appears to have endorsed the view that the sentence upon Adam was the return to dust. It is not perhaps surprising that at the time of the lecture he had not reached the point where he could distinguish between the death Adam incurred, which as the wages of sin was an inflicted or violent death, and natural death. The significance of sacrifice and blood shedding in connection with the remission of sin had not been fully appreciated even yet. When later, in "The Two Sons Of God" he wrote, "The return to the ground is not strictly speaking perhaps any part of the penalty," he had reached the grand truth towards which he had been groping, that if Adam had not been prospectively redeemed in Eden by a typical sacrifice

foreshadowing Calvary, he must have been put to death there and then and our human race would have perished with him. Thus it is that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of all men - because our very existence was purchased by Him at the price of His own life - specially of them that believe, because through faith in Him they are promised the gift of God - the Eternal Life.

Appendix E

Index of Scriptural texts cited in “The Sacrifice of Christ”

Page	Page	Page
GENESIS	9:26 23, 31	5:6-9 5, 32
1:28 39	AMOS	6:12 11
2:7, 10—17 ... 24, 36	9:8 11	7:5,14 31, 39
4:7 19	HAGGAI	8:3, 8, 32 12, 32, 39
20:4 11	2:12 12	10:2 30
EXODUS	ZECHERIAH	14:15 32, 38
20:14 39	3:3 36	1 ST CORINTHIANS
LEVITICUS	MALACHI	2:2 35
9:15 26	1:12—14 ... 22	5:7, 8 32, 38
16:15, 26 ... 22	MATTHEW	6:18-20 12, 31
22:10, 17 ... 12	1:13,18 14	8:25 31
NUMBERS	3:15 24	9:24-27 11, 40
19 21	5:19, 28... .. 6	10:13 29
22:4 11	6:24, 33... .. 35	15: 39, 44, 49.. 6, 36
DEUTERONOMY	8:16 20	2 ND CORINTHIANS
7:6 12	11:25,29 ... 35,40	5:14, 21... .. 18, 32
1 ST SAMUEL	13:44-46 ... 30	7:10 39
14:44 36	18:23-35 ... 31	8:9 32
22:16 36	20:28 8	GALATIANS
1 ST KINGS	21:16 35	1:4 32
2:16, 37, 42 ... 36	23:4 40	2:20 32
2ND KINGS	26:53,54... .. 26	3:13 32
5:13 24	LUKE	4:4, 5 8, 32
PSALMS	1:31-35 12, 14	5:1 32
49:7 17	11:5 35	EPHESIANS
87:1 12	JOHN	1:7 32
89:19, 20 ... 5, 12	1:18-19,29 ... 22,25,26,31	3:17 11
110 26	6:37,42,62 ... 36, 38	5:1 32
116:15 34	7:30 26	5:25 26, 33
PROVERBS	10, 10-15,35 ... 14,26,32	PHILLIPPIANS
17:27 31	11:48-52 ... 32	2:8 9
22:15 11	14:30 23	COLOSSIANS
29:25 23	17:3 3	1:13,14 33
ISAIAH	ACTS	1:21,22 33
I:4 11	2:24 35	1 ST THESSALONIANS
11:6 15	3:15-22 25, 26	5:9, 10 33
26:2 11	15: 9, 10 ... 39	1 ST TIMOTHY
40:15 34	17:26 34, 36	1:15 33
42:21 9	20:28 34	2:5, 6 33
53:6 12, 31	ROMANS	TITUS
55:8 35	3:26 10	2:14 33
DANIEL	4:25 32	HEBREWS

1:3-9 ... 8, 33
 2:9, 18 ... 29,33
 3:1 ... 25
 4:15 ... 29
 5:7-12 ... 30, 35
 7:27 ... 14, 27
 8:4-6, 28 ... 27
 9:2,14,24,48 ... 27, 33
 10:10 ... 33
 13:11, 12 ... 21, 33

JAMES

1:19 ... 4
 1:14,15 ... 6
 2:10 ... 9
 4:7 ... 11, 40

1 ST PETER

1:13,19 ... 20,31,34,40
 2:21,22-24 ... 10, 14, 33
 3:18 ... 33
 4:1 ... 33

2ND PETER

1:10 ... 8

1 ST JOHN

1:7 ... 20, 33
 2:2 ... 25
 3:4 ... 12, 14
 3:5 ... 18, 28, 35
 5:3 ... 40, 53

REVELATIONS

1:5,6, 13 ... 10, 29
 5:9 ... 33