

# The Berean

*A Christadelphian Magazine devoted to the exposition and defense of the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints; and opposed to the dogmas of the Papal and Protestant Churches!*

**The entrance of Thy Word giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple.--Psa. 119:130**

*Please send ecclesial communications to:*  
Bro. Jim Phillips, 592 PR. 3004, Lampasas, TX. USA  
Assisted by bro. Fred Higham  
Email: [jkphil2222@yahoo.com](mailto:jkphil2222@yahoo.com)

*In this issue:* The plan of salvation for mankind is God’s plan

Ecclesial News .....	482
Editorial.....	483
Behind Christ Crucified are God’s Claims by Robert Roberts..	486
The Judgement Demonstrates God’s Plan by Robert Roberts...	493
The Crucifixion by Robert Roberts.....	513
Power & Beauty of God’s Arrangements by Charles Smith.....	519
The Melbourne Synopsis by Robert Roberts.....	521
Brisbane Baptism Questions concerning Satan.....	531
Signs	536
Hints for Bible Markers from the Psalms by Beryl Snyder.....	540

**“...they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.”**

**CHRIST IS COMING SOON AND WILL REIGN ON EARTH**

**FLORIDA GATHERING..... October 18-20, Lord Willing.  
A Study of the Trees of the Bible. Gathering will be held in High  
Springs, Fla. Contact bro. Mike Jasionowski, at  
[mjasionowski@gmail.com](mailto:mjasionowski@gmail.com)**

**PHILIPPINES BIBLE GATHERING October 31 - November  
3, 2019 Theme: "Studies on the Parables of Christ"  
JumPal-Banga Ecclesia Aklan, Philippines contact bro.  
Will Manares [wmanares@cdimin.org](mailto:wmanares@cdimin.org)**

**LAMPASAS WINTER GATHERING... December 27-29 2019.  
Topic is still being determined. Contact bro. Nathan Phillips  
[nathanphillips24@yahoo.com](mailto:nathanphillips24@yahoo.com)**

**BOSTON FEBRUARY YOUNG PEOPLE'S GATHERING  
February 15-16, 2020 Contact James Sommerville**

## **African and Philippines Report**

Hello brothers and sisters,

I come to you all in the one hope of Israel. It's been a while since I sent out an update on what is happening in Ecclesias in Africa and the Philippines.

### **Kalibo, Aklan Province.**

Please keep our brother Willer, his family and the Ecclesia in the valley in your prayers as they are now in the middle of some heavy downpours of rains. Their drinking water in the town of Kalibo is contaminated and classes where the sisters attend have been suspended. We ask everyone to remember them in your prayers today.

In the meantime, our brother has been busy with webpages for the Bereans in the Philippines. He links quite a few of the pioneer writings as well as our statement of Faith and beliefs. Here is the link if any would like to check it out today! <https://sites.google.com/site/bereansph/>

We are in the process of getting him to do one for Malawi and Kenya in their respective languages and also linking with Bro. Lenny Naglieri to see how we can join his webpage and books he has on his website with give our brothers and sisters worldwide access to valuable spiritual materials. Lenny's website is [www.christadelphian.com](http://www.christadelphian.com).

### **Malawi.**

This weekend our Bro. Victor Magwira has paid a visit to some interested candidates in the neighboring country of Mozambique. The brethren there have been in contact with interested candidates, both

former CBM (Central) members as well as family members. These trips are sometimes self-funded and their budget is at times bare bones. Any support to these efforts would be appreciated.

### **Kenya.**

Our brothers and sisters there are generally well, and they continue to hold fast to the truth sometimes under very trying circumstances.

The Ecclesia at Kabusasi will be holding its first Bible School later this month, Aug.14 - 18. THE theme of the Bible School is based the passage in Heb.12:28. We pray that our brothers and sisters in Kabusasi will receive the full support of the Ecclesias in the region as well as others through attendance, prayer and remembrance.

Brothers and sisters we hope and pray that all in Yahweh's vineyard is doing well, despite the many trials we face. Praying for one another as we await the coming of our Lord Jesus.

Love in Christ our Master,  
Bob Bent.

## **Editorial**

In clauses three, four, and five, God's plan of salvation from sin is set forth quite clearly. Clause four showed the nature of the original man in his novitiate, or at his creation. Clause five defined the problem man created for himself when he sinned. And clause three explained how the Christ resolved the problem man had created.

Clause VI clarifies the point, that the entire plan is God's plan to sustain His righteousness, while not compromising with sin in any way. Under these conditions, God provided man a pathway from death rescuing those who desired to be rescued, and would recognize that God alone is righteous.

Clause VI also begins to define for us, the end result of that plan, what is, that the world would be populated with sinless immortals.

**VI.--That God, in His kindness, conceived a plan of restoration which, without setting aside His just and necessary law of sin and death, should ultimately rescue the race from destruction, and people the earth with sinless immortals** (Rev. 21:4; John 3:16; 2 Tim. 1:10; 1 John 2:25; 2 Tim. 1:1; Titus 1:2; Rom. 3:26; John 1:29).

The Scriptural explanation of how God was exhibited as righteous is naturally under attack, in those same quarters whose teaching ultimates in “substitution.” If Jesus is in any way a substitute for us, that is, if he is doing something for us, that he did not need to do for himself; then the kindness and righteousness of God in conceiving this plan comes directly under attack. How could the righteousness of God be demonstrated in requiring Jesus to die the death he died, if such a death was not necessary for his own salvation? While such an act might be loving and benevolent on the part of Jesus, wouldn’t God be demonstrated as wrong in requiring such an act from Jesus?

“Substitution” is such a watch word, and so obviously contrary to the thought of the foundational Christadelphians, that it is well documented in the early magazines. Bro. Thomas made this point quite clear:

“Then preach the word, &c., and exhort with all long-suffering and teaching. This is the purifying agency. Ignore brother this and brother that in said teaching; for personalities do not help the argument. Declare what you as a body believe to be the apostles’ doctrines. Invite fellowship upon this basis alone. If upon that declaration, any take the bread and wine, not being offered by you, they do so upon their own responsibility, not on yours. If they help themselves to the elements, they endorse your declaration of doctrine, and eat condemnation to themselves. For myself, I am not in fellowship with the dogma that Jesus Christ did not come in the flesh, or that he died as a substitute to appease the fury and wrath of God. The love of God is manifest in all that He has done for man. ‘When all wish to do what is right,’ the right surely is within their grasp. I trust you will be able to see it from what is now before you. And may the truth preside over all your deliberations, for Christ Jesus is the truth, and dwells with those with whom the truth is. Where this is I desire to be.”

Because of the clarity in the above, and many more foundational teachings, some who teach substitution, simply claim they do not. This is a part of the “deception” discussed later in this issue of *The Berean*. As quoted later in this issue, a fellow points out that we should say what we mean, and mean what we say. This is very true. And if some teach that Jesus offered himself as a sin offering for us, but was not in need of the sin offering for himself, then that is the doctrine of substitution, and directly opposed to the apostolic teaching which clearly stated:

Heb 8:3 For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.

The teaching that Jesus was not himself in need of the sacrifice which he offered for us, confounds the divine teaching pertaining to God's kindness in setting forth and requiring this plan.

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

Acts 2:23 Him, being delivered **by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God**, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:

Rom. 8:32 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?

John 10:18 No man taketh it from me, but 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.**

God's involvement as both the creator and operator in His plan for our salvation cannot be overstated. It is the failure in Christendom to understand the kindness of God in forming this plan, which causes them in their imaginations to make Him into a vindictive, exacting God, rather than the loving God of the Bible. And instead of the exhibition God's righteousness, the sacrifice of Christ becomes the equivalent of some Pagan process, by which angry gods are thought to be pacified.

God warns us of the dangers of Paganism, and it is easy to see how false views pertaining to the sacrifice led to such views. God criticized them:

Rom. 1:25 Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

Isn't this what is done, when ideas are set forth which make it impossible to see God as righteous and just in requiring the death of Jesus for sin? In such a scenario, what Jesus did would have been loving and caring, while what God did was vindictive. And in so teaching, the "created" is elevated above the "Creator."

When learning of her great honor in bringing our Lord into the world, Mary set before us the clear and unmistakable teaching of the Bible:

Luke 1:46-47 And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, And my spirit hath rejoiced in **God my Saviour.**

# BEHIND CHRIST CRUCIFIED ARE GOD'S CLAIMS

By Robert Roberts

We meet here this morning on a foundation that cannot be taken away. It is a great thing to have a foundation in an age like this, when men are building on all kinds of floating and flimsy structures which are certain to drift on Time's ceaseless stream away into the ocean of oblivion. Many are building on the mortal life of present experience, with no care or pretense for anything beyond. We know where that will lead: they die and are forgotten. Others build on human philosophy of a future state. That must end in the same way if the philosophy should happen to ignore Jesus Christ, which almost all philosophy does. Others accept the dreams of an Emmanuel Swedenborg, the hallucinations of a Madame Blavatsky, the speculations of a Herbert Spencer, the optimistic agnosticisms of a Tennyson, the scientific guesses of a Darwin, the cosmic vagaries of a La Place, or, failing all else, the traditions of hereditary piety or the dogmatism of Papal pretensions.

Wherein do we differ from all these? We build on the foundation of Moses and the prophets. To this foundation we adhere with all the indomitable tenacity that is born of reason. It is not the choice of taste or the bias of sentiment that leads us to prefer the Scriptures above every form or phase of human thought. We are compelled by the force of truth, generated by facts, discerned as all facts are discerned over the world-wide, and through all the ages of which we have record. Let us take the small illustration before us. Here we have in our hands a letter written by the apostle Paul, as every canon of criticism and reasonable principles of evidence compels us to recognise. In this letter Paul urges Timothy, the young man to whom he was writing, to "*continue in the things which he had learned and had been assured of.*" Why? He answers:

*"Knowing of whom thou hast learnt them."*

Who were those of whom he had learnt them? The apostles:

*"Of me among many witnesses."*

How was that a reason for holding on to the things learnt? Because the things so learnt were not matters of opinion or report, but matters of fact and knowledge at first hand.

*"We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ but were eye-witnesses of his majesty!"*

*“Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?”*

*“Last of all, he was seen of me also.”*

*“That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.”*

Well, that was a good reason why Timothy should continue in the things he had learnt; but Paul adds another reason:

*“And (knowing) that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures.”*

How was this a reason for holding fast?

*“Which are able to make thee wise unto salvation.”*

Why have they this character? Why are they able to do this great thing?

*“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for reproof, instruction, etc.”*

Here we stop to consider what is meant by inspiration of God, not as to how it acts, but as to what it is when it acts. We do not need to consider long when we realise that the mind of man is one thing, and the mind of God quite another. As God himself says,

*“My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways My ways.”*

Inspiration of God is therefore a putting into a man’s mind what is not there of man’s own power or gift, as defined in the express words of Peter.

*“Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.”*

It must have been so, for how otherwise could man know the things of God? Paul states a self-evident truth when he says: *“The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God,”* and these things man could not be trusted to define. The Spirit of God had to find the words as well, as Paul adds *“which things we speak not in words that man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth.”* Hence it is that the extraordinary phenomenon is presented to us by Peter of inspired men not understanding the words written by themselves under Spirit impulse:

*“The prophets searched and enquired diligently . . . searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when **it testified** beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.”*

It was the Spirit that **“testified beforehand.”** How could the prophets *“testify beforehand,”* as natural men? Prophecy is no gift of human nature.

This view, so clearly enunciated by Peter and Paul, is constantly sanctioned by Christ, as we should expect in view of his saying concerning the apostles:

*“He that heareth you heareth me.”*

He told the Pharisees to “search the Scriptures.” Why?

*“They are they that testify of me.”*

If the Scriptures of Moses and the prophets testify of Christ, they must have been given by inspiration of God, for how could men not inspired of God testify of events to happen hundreds of years after their own time? Again Jesus said-

*“Moses wrote of me.”*

The same question arises: how could Moses have done this if he had not been inspired? Moses, like the rest of men, knew nothing of futurity by human power. Again Jesus said to those who imagined he had come to make an entirely new start and to override Moses and the prophets:

*“Think not that I am come to destroy Moses and the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.”*

How could Jesus have spoken of “fulfilling” Moses and the prophets if they had not been the inspired Word of God? Again he plainly says,

*“The Scriptures cannot be broken,”* and again,

*“The Scriptures must be fulfilled.”*

The conversation after his resurrection with his disciples on the road to Emmaus affords perhaps the most interesting of all illustrations of the estimate in which Jesus held the scriptures of the Old Testament. He found fault with them for not believing “*all that the prophets had spoken.*”

*“And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.”*

Having afterwards made himself known to the eleven, and referred to the circumstances of his death, he said:

*“These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses and in the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning me.”*

In standing, then, upon the Scriptures, we stand upon that which is authenticated to us by Christ and the apostles as the Word of God, and are able to enter into the idea expressed by Paul in his parting words at Miletus:

*“I commend you to God and to the Word of His grace which is able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among all them that are sanctified.”*

Now, are we not safe in building on such a foundation? How can we be safe in building on any other? If God have spoken by Moses and the prophets and by His Son, then, in listening to any other, we are rejecting God and turning to man, unless those to whom we turn speak in harmony with the Scriptures. That is another thing. Peter says:

*“If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God;”* and God says-

*“If any man speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in him.”*

The world around us is all astray on both points. They do not speak as the oracles of God, and worse, they freely indulge in thoughts and speeches that are in direct opposition to the law and testimony. We must be on our guard against being drawn into their folly. It is for us to hold fast to what is taught in the Scriptures, however strongly the current of human thought may run against it.

Now, Paul says,

*“I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified.”*

Here is one of those things in which the thoughts of man and the thoughts of God are at variance. *“To the Jews a stumbling block: to the Greeks foolishness;”* to all men an unattractive conception. Who finds pleasure in the thoughts that centre in *“Jesus Christ and him crucified”*? Look around among friends and neighbours, are they not repelled, one and all, amiable and cultured as they may be, by this subject which Paul said was the only subject he would know among the Corinthians? The news of the day, music, art, science, books, men’s doings, -these are all in good relish; but Jesus Christ and him crucified? Well, it is to them monomaniacal rubbish. How is this? Do they say there was no Jesus Christ or that he was not crucified? Not they. There would be some consistency in their aversion if this were the position they took. They have simply no taste for the subject: they are not at home in it. Worse, it is nauseous to them. How is this? Paul gives us the reason in a certain form when he says:

*“The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned.”*

This is true in its extreme form among the absolutely unenlightened; but it is true in degree all through the different shades that divide darkness from

light. We are all barbarians at the bottom; and in proportion as we are under the power of natural bias (which is the bias of ignorance and mere instinct) we disrelish the things of the Spirit of God. This disrelish is no part of true enlightenment. It gives way entirely before the appreciation created by the knowledge of God. *“Jesus Christ, and him crucified,”* instead of being a barren formula or a repellent theme becomes the symbol of light and hope and the foundation of comfort and joy.

Jesus Christ is Jesus Anointed, Jesus Messiah, Jesus King, Jesus the coming head and shepherd of the human race, whose revelation will bring the supply of all the political and social and individual conditions that are requisite to transform the earth from a scene of dull and dreary misery into an active, joyful, beautiful world of light and joy for all. This is the Gospel of the Kingdom, the constant contemplation of enlightened hope; rooted and founded in God’s own purpose and promise—apart from which, there is nothing in prospect but endless vanity and darkness.

But Paul’s theme—Paul’s standing subject among the Corinthians, was not only Jesus Christ but *“him crucified.”* This is another phase. This has to do with the insides of things. This touches those aspects of the truth that are totally uncongenial to the natural mind, but full of delight to those in whom the natural mind has been revolutionised by the knowledge revealed by the Spirit of God. Many can think of the Kingdom with pleasure that have no heart for the things involved in the cross. The Kingdom, as the most ravishing poetical idyll ever exhibited to human thought, naturally appeals to the human love of beauty and rest and well-being, irrespective of its co-relations. Mere poets and idealists are not saints. Sentimentality is not godliness. The Kingdom is but a flower whose root is God and is only for those who take the root with the plant.

*“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.”*

Jesus calls this *“the first and the great commandment.”* There must be compliance here before there can be possession of the delights and glory of the Kingdom.

What has the cross to do with this? We see when we ask—why was Christ crucified? Some say, because the Jews hated him. This is only part of the answer. This is the human side of the event. There is a divine side. This is exhibited in Acts 4:27:

*“Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together to do whatsoever Thy hand and Thy counsel determined to be done.”*

The crucifixion of Jesus was divinely pre-ordained, with what object?

*“By him, to reconcile all things to himself. . . in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unproveable in his sight if ye continue in the faith grounded and settled and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel” (Col. 1:20, 23).*

But what had the crucifixion of his body to death to do with this result? There are several apostolic definitions that explain this. Putting these three together, we get the answer-

*“Condemned sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3) “to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God” (3:25); “that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin” (6:6).*

God required that our sinful and condemned nature should be federally put to death in one who had done no sin, through whom, after resurrection, we could come, in baptismal identification with his death, for forgiveness and friendship with God, *“if we continue in the faith grounded and settled.”* It was our very nature that was put to death in him. It was righteously so done because of his physical participation in the results of Edenic transgression. His resurrection was in righteousness also; for *“he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.”* Forgiveness on this basis is by grace (favour) and not of debt; for the death of Christ is not the payment of our debt but the declaration of God’s righteousness, on our recognition and submission to which, He is pleased to pass by our sins, of His own kindness and forbearance.

It is evident, then, that behind Christ crucified, is God and His claims on us. He claims our love; He claims our obedience. Both are the claims of the highest reason, for when reason opens to the origin of all things in God, we feel the utmost rousing of admiration at the perfect wisdom and goodness which they show to exist innately in Him. And when we realise that *“It is He that made us, and not we ourselves,”* and that we are merely so much of His stuff in a certain form by His permission, the idea of disobedience seems madness. To *“delight in the law of God after the inward man”* becomes the elementary act of reason. Any other state is aberration, due to ignorance. Its visitation by death is both reasonable and beautiful, for how could we imagine rebellion tolerated in a permanent state of things? And how could we imagine the misery of sin to be allowed to be endless?

The death of Christ is the assertion of all these beautiful truths, and the laying of the foundation-stone of salvation in righteousness. But it has a powerful and urgent application now to all those who are baptised into his

death and in the enjoyment of the forgiveness predicated upon that submission. Paul supposes the question:

*“Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?”*

His answer is energetic.

*“God forbid. How shall we that have died to sin (in taking part baptismally in the very death that Christ died) live any longer therein?” “Our old man (our old nature) was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.”*

So that there was a dramatic lesson in it. Every time we look at Christ crucified, we see a reason why we should not be guided by the mere instincts of the body we now possess, for that body was put to death on the cross that we might be told that rational life is not to be found by obeying the impulses that are native to that body. Those impulses are the law of life in the world, they are not the law of the sons of God. They are not a safe law. Followed by themselves, they lead to every hideousness and ruin. Regulated by law (that is, by God’s commands), they are beautiful, as fire is, under control. But the world loves not the law. Naturally, we revolt at it.

Rom. 8:7 *“The carnal mind is enmity against God; it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.”*

But when the power of the Spirit enters our minds, by the Word of the Spirit understood and believed, the darkness of the carnal mind gives way before the light, and we *“put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.”*

The restraints and self-denials and disciplines implied in this process may be irksome to flesh and blood; but there is another side. Even in systems of human wisdom, the value of “training” (whether physical or mental) is recognised; but what training can compare in results to that which hews us into the divine image while yet in the flesh; confers peace in a world of unrest and trouble; gilds the future with the glory of infinite hope; and at last confers the priceless gift of an incorruptible nature in which God will be our open vision and His whole universe our sphere of joyful life for ever?

# The Judgement Seat of Christ Demonstrates God Plan to be Recognized as Righteous by Those who Love Him

AN EXAMINATION of the Bible will show that Christendom is astray on nothing more than on the subject of judgment to come. The common idea of “judgment to come,” is that at a certain time popularly known as the “last day,” God will bring every human being to individual account—that heaven will be emptied, and hell emptied, of their countless myriads of souls, which will be reunited to their former bodies (resurrected to receive them) and added to earth’s living population and brought to judgment.

There is no exception to this rule in orthodox minds. It does not seem to strike them as a strange thing that there should be a judgment day for anyone, if every case is settled at the occurrence of death. Neither does it appear to them any difficulty that the manifestly irresponsible classes of mankind should be brought to judgment. “Heathens,” pagans, barbarians of the lowest type, human brutes of all sorts, idiots, infants—everyone—absolutely every human soul that has ever had a being, in what condition so-ever it may have existed—according to current theology, will be resuscitated, and brought to account.

That there are difficulties—great and insuperable—in the way of such an idea, can be attested by the agonising efforts of many a thoughtful mind. That the idea itself is thoroughly unscriptural we propose now to show.

We have quoted statements that declare the non-resurrection of those who, being unenlightened, are non-responsible. Further evidence is found in David’s description of the position occupied by the class in question (Psalm 49:6–20):—

“They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches, none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him (for the redemption of their soul is precious, and it ceaseth for ever); that he should still live for ever, and not see corruption. For he seeth that wise men die, likewise the fool and the brutish person perish, and leave their wealth to others. Their inward thought is, that their houses shall continue for ever, and their dwelling places to all generations ... nevertheless man being in honour abideth not: he is like the beasts that perish. This their way is their folly; yet their posterity approve their sayings. LIKE SHEEP THEY ARE LAID IN THE GRAVE; death shall feed on them; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning. (You that

fear my name ... shall tread down the wicked, for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet—Mal. 4:3). And their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling. But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for he shall receive me. Be not thou afraid when one is made rich, when the glory of his house is increased; for when he dieth he shall carry nothing away—his glory shall not descend after him. Though while he lived, he blessed his soul: and men will praise thee when thou doest well to thyself, he shall go to the generation of his fathers; **THEY SHALL NEVER SEE LIGHT.** Man that is in honour and understandeth not, **IS LIKE THE BEASTS THAT PERISH.**”

This is reasonable. It would be unreasonable to bring the brutish of mankind to individual account. Judgment has its basis in responsibility, and responsibility is a question of circumstances and capacity. Human beings in a state of barbarism may have the latent capacity to be responsible; but this does not make them responsible for the simple reason that the capacity is latent. The actual condition of mind which gives the ground of responsibility does not exist. This is the case with children. They possess reason and moral capacity in the germ, but because these qualities are not developed, by universal law they are held not responsible in human matters. Is God less just than man?

Human responsibility to the Deity primarily arises from human capacity to discern good and evil, and power to act upon discernment. Beasts are not accountable either to man or God, because they are destitute of the power to discriminate or choose. They act under the power of blind impulse. Idiots are in the same category of irresponsible agents in the degree of their incapacity, and many men not considered idiots are little better as regards their power of acting from rational choice.

The nature and extent of human amenability to a future account can only be apprehended in view of the relations subsisting between God and man, as disclosed in the history presented to us in the Scriptures. Apart from this, all is speculation, theory, and uncertainty. Philosophy is at fault, because it disregards the record. Accept the record, and all is simple and intelligible. **The progenitor of the race was made amenable to consequences placed within the jurisdiction of his will in a certain matter. Disobedience occurred and the law came into force: Adam and all his posterity came under the power of the law of sin and death, which was destined in their generations to sweep them away like the grass of the earth. Had God intended no further dealings with the race, responsibility would have ended here.** The grave-penalty would have closed the account; and human life, if indeed it had continued on the face of the earth in the absence of divine interposition, would have been the unredeemed tale of

sorrow, which it is in the experience of all who are “without God and without hope in the world,” unburdened, it may be, with the responsibilities but unalleviated by the hopes and affections with which the day-spring from on high hath visited us, and lightened this place of darkness.

**But, in His great mercy, Yahweh conceived intentions of benevolence which He is working out in His own wise way.** He did not—in haste and blunder, as our short-sighted philosophers insist His goodness ought to have prompted Him to do—at once and summarily, and without condition, relieve the sentenced culprit. This would have been to violate those deep-laid principles of law which guide all the Deity’s operations, “in nature” and in “grace,” and preserve the conditions of harmony throughout the universe. It would have been to perform a work not of mercy, but of destruction, confusion, and anarchy. The method of benevolence conceived in the divine mind was intended to work beneficence toward man conformably with the law that had constituted him a death-stricken sinner, a law which involves “glory to God in the highest” as well as “goodwill toward men.”

This intention necessitated those successive dispensations of His will which the world has witnessed in times past, and which have rescued both human existence and human responsibility from the bottomless profound to which the law of Eden consigned them. The enunciation of His purpose in promise and prediction, and the declaration of His law in precept and statute, reopened relations between God and man, and revived the moral responsibility which otherwise would have perished. It is, however, a divine principle that this result is limited to those who come within the actual sphere of operations.

Rom. 4:15 “Where no law is, there is no transgression.”

John 9:41 “If ye were blind (that is, ignorant), ye should have no sin.”

Acts 17:30 “The times of this ignorance God winked at”.

Psa. 49:20 “Man that is in honour and understandeth not, IS LIKE THE BEASTS THAT PERISH.”

John 3:19 “This is the (ground of) condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light.”

Hence, in the absence of light—that is, when men are in a state of ignorance—they are not amenable to condemnation; God “winks at” their doings (Acts 17:30), just as He winks at the actions of the brutes of the

field. Barbarous nations are in this condition. They are without light and without law, and Paul's declaration on the subject is in harmony with the general principles enunciated in the Scriptures quoted:—"As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law" (Rom. 2:12). If from him to whom much is given, much is required (Luke 12:48), it follows that from him to whom nothing is given, nothing shall be required, and from him to whom little is given, little is required in all the area over which the judgment operates.

This principle of absolute equity in the matter of responsibility is exemplified in the words of Jesus:—"If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin" (John 15:22). "That servant which knew his lord's will and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes" (Luke 12:47). "He that REJECTETH me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (John 12:48).

The operation of these principles is illustrated in the history of human experience. From Adam to Noah, there was but a little light. The promise of a seed, by the side of the woman, to crush out the serpent principle of disobedience and its results, was almost the only star that shone in the darkness of that time. Prophetic glimpses of the coming interference in its ultimate shape, such as those vouchsafed to Enoch (Jude 14), and the precepts of Noah, the preacher of righteousness, through whom the Anointing Spirit promulgated the divine principles to those who were disobedient (I Peter 3:18-20), added a little to the light of these times, but, apparently, not more than was sufficient to confer a title of resurrection on those who laid hold on it by faith. So far as we have any information, few became responsible to a resurrection to condemnation in pre-Noachic times. Human wickedness, culminating in universal corruption, was visited with the almost total destruction of the species by a flood, which may be regarded as having been a winding-up of all judicial questions arising out of the preceding period, so far as condemnation is concerned, and, therefore, as precluding from resurrection to judgment those who were the subjects of it.

On this point, however, positive ground cannot be taken. Since resurrection unto life will take place in several cases belonging to that dispensation, it is not improbable that resurrection to condemnation may also take place among those who were obnoxiously related to that which gave the others their title, including the class specified in Enoch's prophecy—"the ungodly," who were guilty of "ungodly deeds" and "hard speeches" against Jehovah, and who must, therefore, have possessed the

amount of knowledge necessary to constitute a basis of responsibility. This must remain an open question, not because the principle upon which judgment will be administered is obscure, but because we have not a sufficient amount of information as to the facts of the time in question to enable us accurately to apply the principle.

The principle itself, that responsibility Godward, is only created by contact with divine law in a tangible and authorised form, holds good in every form of human relation to the Almighty. Noah's immediate family were within the pale of the divine cognition, and responsibility in reference to another life may arise out of that; but their descendants wandered far out of the way of righteousness and understanding, sinking below moral responsibility, degenerating to the level of the beast, and establishing those "times of ignorance" throughout the world which we have Paul's authority for saying were "winked at."

**In the call of Abraham, the member of an idolatrous family, but who possessed the latent disposition to be faithful, God arrested the tendency to repeat the universal corruption of antediluvian times.** The germ of a more direct responsibility was planted among men by his election, and by the bestowal of promises upon him which had ultimate reference to the whole of the race. Abraham individually, while constituted a man of privilege, was also constituted a man of responsibility. Abram, the idolater, was his own—his own to live, like the insect of the moment—his own to die and disappear like the vapour. Abraham, the called of God, was no longer his own, but bought with the price of God's promise. He entered upon a higher relation of being. He was exalted to a higher destiny, and had imposed upon him Godward obligations, unknown to his former condition. Success or failure in the ordering of his life, was of much greater moment than before. Faith and obedience would constitute him the heir of the world, and the subject of resurrection to immortality: unbelief would make him obnoxious to a severer and farther-reaching displeasure than fell upon Adam.

In this respect, the children of Abraham by faith, that is, those who walk in the steps of the faith which Abraham had being yet uncircumcised (Rom. 4:12), who, being Christ's, are Abraham's seed (Gal. 3:29) through believing the gospel, and being baptised into Christ, are like their father. By nature children of wrath, even as others, they were in the days of their ignorance "without God and without hope in the world" (Eph. 2:12), "strangers from the covenants of promise" (ibid), "alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them" (Eph. 4:18), living without law, and destined, as the result of that condition, to perish without law in Adam; inheriting death without resurrection—death without remedy;

having neither the privileges nor the responsibilities of a divine relationship.

When called from darkness to light, by the preaching of the gospel, whether they submit to that gospel or refuse submission, they are “not their own.” They neither live nor die to themselves as formerly. They have passed into a special relationship to Deity, in which their lives, good or evil, come under divine supervision, and form the basis of a future accountability, unknown in their state of darkness, at which God winked.

The law of faith established by the promises made to Abraham, constituted a centre, around which responsibilities of this description developed themselves. All who acquired Abraham’s faith came under Abraham’s responsibilities. Doubtless, many entered this position in the course of the Mosaic ages. The law was added because of transgression (Gal. 3:19), and the purpose of its addition is indicated in its being styled a schoolmaster. Its mission was to teach the first lessons of Jehovah’s supremacy and holiness. It was not designed as a system through which men might acquire deliverance from Adamic bondage. Its purpose was purely preliminary and provisional, having reference to that result in its ultimate bearings, but not intended directly to develop it.

Paul’s comment on it is as follows: “If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law” (Gal. 3:21). It was impossible life could come by a law which required moral infallibility on the part of human nature. For this reason, the law, though “holy, and just, and good” (Rom. 7:12), was “weak through the flesh,” and though “ordained to life,” Paul found it (from this cause) “to be unto death” (verse 10). The consequence was, that “all the world stood guilty before God”; and in that moral relation to the Deity, they were precluded from boasting, that is to say, precluded from attaining to eternal life on a principle which would have left it open to them to think, and to say, that their life was their own by right as against the Deity. Prospectively considered, this was a mighty triumph of divine wisdom; for had immortal existence been attainable by self-acquired title, room would have been left for the admission of an element in the relations of God and man which would have disturbed the perfect harmony that will exist where God is absolutely supreme, both in law and benevolence, and man is in the position of a love-saved brand from the burning.

**The law of righteousness by faith is the principle on which men are saved—that is, saving righteousness is recognised or imputed by God where He is honoured by faith being exercised in what He has promised.** This law came into operation with Abraham. Actually, it had its origin in Eden, for we read of Abel that by faith (the substance of things hoped for),

he offered an acceptable sacrifice (Heb. 11:4). The prediction of the woman's serpent-destroying seed formed a pivot on which faith could work even then, and doubtless was the subject-matter of the faith which saved Abel, Enoch, and Noah; but the full and official initiation of the law of faith, as the rule of salvation, occurred in the history of Abraham. This law was the basis of resurrectional responsibility.

The Mosaic law was national. Its rewards and penalties were confined to the conditions of mortal life. It took no cognisance of, and made no provision for, life beyond the natural term of human existence. In its ceremonial forms and observances, it symbolised the truth in relation to Christ and his mission, but in its proximate bearing upon the nation, it subserved no spiritual purpose beyond the continual enforcement of the schoolmaster lesson of Jehovah's supremacy and greatness. In this, however, it established the greatest of first principles, and laid a foundation on which the Abrahamic law of faith could have its perfect work.

Out of the law, as a national code, it does not appear any resurrectional responsibility arose. Yet, concurrently with its jurisdiction, it is evident that a dispensation of God's mind, having reference to resurrection, was in force. Undoubtedly this was subordinate, and occupied the place of an undercurrent; but, its existence is unquestionable, else how are "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets," to appear in the Kingdom of God? **If it be recognised that God's purpose from the beginning had reference to the mission of the Christ as "The Resurrection and the Life," there will be no difficulty in apprehending this conclusion.** Obscurely it may be, but really it must be, that resurrectional responsibility was contemplated in all Jehovah did through His servants, from righteous Abel to faithful Paul. Jesus has shown us that the very designation assumed by the Deity in converse with Moses at the bush, though apparently used for the simple purpose of historical identification, expresses the doctrine of resurrection in relation at any rate to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. God called Himself the God of men that were dead; therefore, reasoned Jesus—and that convincingly, for the Sadducees were put to silence—He intends to raise them from the dead.

If so great a conclusion can warrantably be deduced from so apparently slim a foundation, what may we not legitimately infer from the promise of a country to them they never possessed, and the assurance of the universal blessing of mankind in connection with them, which has never yet been realised! What but the conclusion affirmed by Paul that they "died in faith, not having received the promises," and, therefore, that they must rise from the dead to realise them? With this general argument in view, it is easy to recognise resurrectional responsibility in many expressions which a forced method of explanation alone can apply to the judgment of the present

limited experience (Psalm 37, whole of the chapter: 49:14; 58:10; 62:12; Prov. 11:18–31; Ecclesiastes 3:17; 5:8; 11:9; 12:14; Isaiah 3:10; 26:19–21; 35:4; 66:4, 5, 14; Malachi 3:16–18; 4:1–3, etc.).

Jewish responsibility was greater than that of the cast-off descendants of the rejected groundling of Eden, because their relation to Deity was special, direct, and privileged. The responsibility originating in natural constitution, was supplemented by the obligations imposed by divine election, and arising out of the national contract entered into at Sinai, to be obedient to all that the Deity required (Ex. 24:3, 7). This is recognised in the words of Jehovah by Amos, “You only have I known of all the families of the earth; THEREFORE I will punish you for all your iniquities” (Amos 3:2). The national sufferings of the Jews, in dispersion and privation, are evidently (both on the face of the testimony, and on a consideration of the moral bearing of the case) a full discharge of the responsibility arising from national election.

A responsibility lying in degree between that of the Jews and the outlying Gentiles, attached itself to those nations that were in contact with the Jewish people. This is evident on many pages of the prophets. Take, for instance, the words addressed to the king of Tyre:—

“Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; ... thou wast upon the holy mountain of God. Thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the ‘stones of fire’ ... Because that Tyrus hath said against Jerusalem, Aha, she is broken that was the gates of the people; she is turned unto me; I shall be replenished now she is laid waste. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I am against thee, O Tyrus, and will cause many nations to come up against thee, as the sea causeth his waves to come up” (Ezek. 28:13–14; 26:2–3).

Take, also, similar words addressed to Ammon, Moab, Edom, and Philistia:—

TO AMMON: “Because thou hast said, AHA, against my sanctuary when it was profaned, and against the land of Israel when it was desolate, and against the house of Judah when they went into captivity, Behold therefore, I will deliver thee to the men of the east for a possession,” etc. (Ezek. 25:3–4).

TO MOAB: “Because that Moab and Seir do say, Behold, the house of Judah is like unto all the heathen, therefore, ... I will execute judgments upon Moab” (Ezek. 25:8–11).

TO EDM: “Because that Edom hath dealt against the house of Judah by taking vengeance, and hath greatly offended and revenged

himself upon them, therefore, thus said the Lord God, I will stretch out mine hand upon Edom,” etc. (Ezek. 25:12–13).

TO PHILISTIA: “Because the Philistines have dealt by revenge, and have taken vengeance with a despiteful heart, to destroy it for the old hatred, THEREFORE thus saith the Lord God, I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines,” etc. (Ezek. 25:15–16).

In these cases, it does not appear that God intends to mete out individual judgment by resurrection from the dead. It requires a high state of privilege before such can with justice be done. The majority of mankind, particularly in the rude and barbarous times that required the schoolmaster lessons of the Mosaic law, were in circumstances of pure misfortune. Born under condemnation in Adam, and left to the poor resources of the natural mind, which in all its history has never originated anything noble apart from the ideas set in motion by “revelation,” they were as unable to elevate themselves above the level on which they stood as any tribe of animals. How just and merciful it was then, of the Deity to “wink at” “the times of this ignorance” (Acts 17:30), which alienated from the life of God (Eph. 4:18), and allow flesh, under such circumstances, to pass away like the flower of the field, that the place thereof might know it no more (Psa. 103:15, 16).

On the supposition that every human being is an immortal soul, such a line of action would, of course, be excluded, and the circumstances of the early “dispensations” would be altogether inexplicable. An immortal soul, in the times of antiquity, would be worth as much as one now; and if it be wise and kind to save immortal souls now, there would seem a strange absence of wisdom and beneficence in the arrangement, which in these early ages, put salvation beyond their reach, and made their doom to hell-fire inevitable by the lack of those means of knowledge which are in our day accessible.

If, to get out of this difficulty, it be suggested that man, in such a plight, will in mercy be permitted to enter heaven, we are instantly compelled to question the value of our own privileges, nay, to doubt and deny the wisdom of the gospel, which, on such a theory, is not only necessary to salvation but a positive hindrance to it; since by its responsibilities, it imperils a salvation which, in its absence, would be certain. We should also be compelled to deny the testimony of Scripture, that man having no understanding is like the beasts that perish, and that life and immortality have been brought to light by Christ through the Gospel.

But we are not now dealing with the monster fiction of Christendom. We leave the immortality of the soul out of the account, and deal with **the**

question of judgment in the light of the fact that mankind is perishing under the law of sin and death, and, in Adam, has no more to do with a future state than the decaying vegetation which, year by year, chokes the forests, and passes away with the winter. The endeavour is to realise, in the light of reason and Scripture testimony, the varying shades of responsibility created by the dealings of the Almighty with a race already exiled from life and favour under the law of Eden.

We have seen that resurrectional responsibility was limited to those who were related to the word of the God of Israel. The promises and precepts conferred privilege and imposed responsibility having reference to resurrection. They formed a basis for that awakening from the dust to everlasting life, and shame and everlasting contempt, foretold to Daniel, and implied in many parts of the writings of Job, David, and Solomon. The extent to which they operate, it is neither possible nor important for us to determine. The law of resurrectional responsibility operates much more vividly upon our own times, and it is the relation of this law to ourselves that we are more especially concerned to elucidate.

It was left for him who proclaimed himself the “Resurrection and the Life” to define clearly the relation of judgment to the great scheme of which he was the pivot and the means. He appears before us as the solution of the great difficulty which must have haunted the minds of the faithful men of ancient times, in reference to the declaration that “God shall judge the righteous and the wicked” (Eccles. 3:17). He exhibits in himself the method by which the arbitration of the unapproachable and immeasurable Deity is to be brought to bear upon mortal and finite man. The “Word made flesh” proclaims himself the instrument and vehicle of divine judgment. He tells us that “the Father hath committed ALL JUDGMENT unto the Son” (John 5:22), and that as no man can come to the Father but by him, so no one will be judged by the Father but in the light of the word which operates through him (John 12:48).

It is highly important that this fact should be distinctly recognised, because it is part of the truth concerning Jesus, which forms a prominent feature in the proclamation of the gospel. This is evident from these testimonies: 1st, that in which Paul comprehends the doctrine of eternal (aionian) judgment among first principles (Heb. 6:1, 5); 2nd, the declaration of Peter: “He commanded us to PREACH UNTO THE PEOPLE and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be THE JUDGE OF QUICK AND DEAD” (Acts 10:42); 3rd, the statement of Paul that there is a “day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my (Paul’s) gospel” (Rom. 2:16). These general evidences are strengthened by the following testimonies, which we submit in detail on account of the importance of clear and Scriptural views on the subject:—

“He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day” (John 12:48).

“As many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law” (Rom. 2:12).

“Every man’s work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is” (I Cor. 3:13).

“The Father who, without respect of persons, judgeth according to every man’s work” (I Pet. 1:17).

“The day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds ... in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ” (Rom. 2:5, 6, 16).

“We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ ... Every one of us shall give account of himself to God” (Rom. 14:10, 12).

“Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts” (I Cor. 4:5).

“We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that everyone may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad” (II Cor. 5:10).

“The Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom” (II Tim. 4:1).

“It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this (that is when the death-state ends in resurrection) the judgment” (Heb. 9:27).

“Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead” (I Pet. 4:5).

“That we may have boldness in the day of judgment” (I John 4:17).

“The time of the dead that they should be judged” (Rev. 11:18).

The proposition that judgment is one of the prerogatives and functions of the Messiah, thus stands upon a very broad Scriptural foundation, not

merely as a fact, but as a constituent of the truth as it is in Jesus. The bearing of the fact is apparent in connection with the mission of the Messiah, as related to our particular dispensation. This is briefly defined by Paul to be to “purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” (Titus 2:14), and by James, “to take out of the Gentiles a people for His name.” The mode of accomplishing this work is the preaching of the Gospel. An invitation has gone out to the ends of the earth, for people of any “kindred, nation, people, or tongue” to become servants of the Messiah, and heirs of the kingdom which God has promised to them that love Him.

Over the whole period of the times of the Gentiles the number of these who respond to His call is considerable; but all who are thus called are not chosen (Matt. 22:14), because many who accept the word preached are not influenced by it to “present their bodies living sacrifices, holy and acceptable.” As in the case of the Israelites under Moses, “the word preached does not profit them, not being mixed with faith” in all who hear it (Heb. 4:2). The soil being bad, the seed produces no result of any consequence. The net of the kingdom (Matt. 13:47) submerged (by preaching) in the ocean of “peoples and multitudes, and nations, and tongues,” encloses bad fish as well as good. The propagation of the gospel results not only in rejectors, but in servants, and not only faithful servants, but unfaithful also.

Not only so, but there are different degrees of merit among those who are faithful. Some sow bountifully, others sparingly. Some bring forth fruit thirty-fold, and some a hundred-fold. No man can assess the degrees. None of the servants can say, “This shall be accepted much, and that little, and the other not at all.” In this matter, they are commanded to “judge not” (Matt. 7:1), and indeed they cannot do it; though, if censoriously inclined, they may attempt it, and sin. There are secrets unknown (good and evil), which require to be known most accurately, before a just judgment can be given. “Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart” (I Sam., 16:7).

Here, then, is a great community, living and dead, every member related to the rest by the closest of ties, and yet each sustaining a problematical relation to the finality upon which they have set their hearts—the attainment of immortality, and the inheriting of God’s kingdom; each having a right to the promised blessing, so far as the judgment of the rest is concerned, and yet each so situated with reference to God, that unfaithfulness will bring his damnation, though all his comrades approve.

When and by what means is this endless variety of causes to be adjusted? When and how is there to be a settlement of the account still open between

the Deity and His servants? which to a man is simply inextricable, and impossible if extricated? Has God made any provision by which this superhuman task shall be accomplished?—this balancing of good and evil in the infinite diversity of millions of “quick and dead”?—this determination of the minute shades of merit and demerit, attaching to the responsible dead and living of a hundred generations?—this rewarding, in just ratio, of unknown and forgotten deeds of constancy and mercy?—this exposure and retribution of evil thoughts, hidden malice, hard speeches, and deeds of darkness? Has He arranged for such a scrutiny of the affairs of His people, as shall result in the separation of the evil from the good, the reward of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked among them?

The answer sometimes given to this question is true in the fact upon which it is built, but wrong in the construction of the fact. It is said that “the Lord knoweth them that are His,” and that, therefore, there is no necessity for a judgment; that “He discerneth the thoughts and intents of the heart,” and “needeth not that any should tell Him what is in man.” This is true, and marks the difference between the “judgment seat of Christ” and a human judicature which makes inquisition for the purpose of ascertaining the facts. But when this truth is made the means of displacing the necessity for the revealed purpose of judging the quick and the dead, it is applied with an illogical and pernicious result. It is illogical, because it by no means follows that the Deity’s omniscient perceptions are not to have official expression, especially when, as in this case, those perceptions affect the standing of those who are the subjects of them, and determine in the expression of them, their destiny.

In all transactions between man and the Deity, there is an invariable accommodation on the part of the latter to the necessities and finite apprehensions of the former. Why did Jehovah allow a faithless generation of Israelites to escape from Egypt under Moses, and go through the miraculous experiences of the desert, and finally pronounce condemnation on them, instead of acting on His knowledge, and summarily destroying them in a night, like the Assyrians, without warning or explanation? Because He was anxious to bring down to human apprehension the methods of His moral procedure, which He could only do by acting on human modes and processes. Why did He allow Korah, Dathan, and Abiram to lurk in the camp for a season, and trouble the congregation by attempting a rebellion against Moses and Aaron, instead of acting upon His omniscience, and weeding them out at the beginning of the journey, and so save the nation from turbulence? Because such a mode of procedure, instead of illustrating and justifying the ways of God to man, would have wrapped them in mystery, and clothed them with the appearance of caprice and injustice.

Why did He so long forbear with the Jews in their obstinacy, foreknowing their ultimate rejection of all His messengers and His own Son? Why did Jesus, who discerned “spirits,” tolerate Judas till he convicted himself by betraying his master? Why did the Spirit suffer Ananias and Sapphira to come into the presence of the apostles, and go through the formality of hearing their own condemnation, before their mendacity was punished by death? In fact, why do things happen at all as they do? Why did not the Deity frame the terrestrial economy of things on such a basis that obedience and not disobedience should have been the law? The whole history of divine procedure, in relation to human affairs, shows that divine omniscience is never allowed for a moment to forestall or displace the natural order of events, but rather sets up and enforces the law by which everything has its full and logical course, before the culminating consequence is reached.

To say that because God knows the righteous from the wicked, He will not bring them to the formality of a judgment, is to reason against every operation of the Deity on record. It is true the Deity knows; but is it not necessary that the righteous and the wicked themselves should know? **How shall the righteous know themselves approved, and the wicked condemned, and the Deity be justified in the eyes of both, without the declaration of what He knows?**

The conclusion is also pernicious, because it evolves the rejection of one of the doctrines which are defined as the first principles of the doctrines of the Christ. We have quoted testimony sufficient to show that the doctrine of the judgment of the living and dead by Christ is part and parcel of the gospel-proclamation about Him. We further submit, on the strength of considerations already passed in review, that logically viewed, it is a natural and necessary part of the glad tidings. It is one of the finest sources of relief which the truth affords, the knowledge that the disputes, misunderstandings, and wrongs of the present maladministration of things, are destined, in the purpose of God, to come before an infallible tribunal, at which every man shall have praise or condemnation, according to the nature of the disclosure.

**It is gladdening to know that there lies between this corrupt state of things and the perfection of the kingdom of God, an ordeal which will prevent the entrance of “anything that defileth,” which, as fire, will try every man’s work, and thin down, by a process of purification, the crowd of those who do no more than say “Lord, Lord!”** It is comforting to know that wrongful suffering will then be avenged, that secret faithfulness will then be openly acknowledged, that unappreciated worth will be recognised, and that evil doing, unpunished, unsuspected, and unknown, will be held up for

execration, in the face of so august an assembly as that of the Elohim, presided over by the Lion of the tribe of Judah. This is part of the glad tidings concerning Jesus Christ.

In these remarks, we assume that the object and effect of the judgment is to mete out to every man who is summoned to it, according to his deeds, **WHETHER GOOD OR BAD**. This is apparent from the testimony quoted to prove that judgment will be executed by the Son of Man at his coming. We append further and more specific evidence on this point:—

“Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord ... And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: **DEPART FROM ME**, ye that work iniquity” (Matt. 7:22–23).

“Every idle (evil) word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment” (Matt. 12:36).

“The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works” (Matt. 16:27).

“Every one of us shall give account of himself to God” (Rom. 14:12).

“Whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner, but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire” (Matt. 3:12).

“Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be” (Rev. 22:12).

“The work of a man shall He render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways” (Job 34:11).

“Doth not He that pondereth the heart consider it? and He that keepeth thy soul, doth not He know it? and shall not He render to every man according to his works?” (Prov. 24:12—See also Psa. 62:12).

“I the Lord search the heart; I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings” (Jer. 17:10).

Another important evidence of the conclusion to which these testimonies lead us, is to be found in the parables of Christ, in many of which he

illustrates the relation between himself and his servants in connection with his departure from the earth. In all of these, he presents the fact that at his return he will “take account” of them, and deal with them according to their individual deserts. Thus, in the parable of the nobleman

(Luke 19:15), “It came to pass that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, he commanded these servants to be called unto him to whom he had given the money, **THAT HE MIGHT KNOW HOW MUCH EVERY MAN HAD GAINED BY TRADING.**”

Those servants are given as three in number, and, doubtless, represent the several classes of which the bulk of Christ’s professing servants are composed. The first gives a satisfactory account of himself, having increased five talents to ten, and receives jurisdiction over ten cities. The second has made two talents into four, and entitles himself to meritorious recognition, and the allotment of four cities. The third, who, though less privileged, might have stood equally well, had he turned his single talent into two, justifies his indolence on the plea that he dreaded a service where more was expected than was given in the first instance. This man, who stands for the unfaithful, is rejected. The decree is, “Take the talent from him, and give it unto him that hath ten talents.... Cast ye the **UNPROFITABLE SERVANT** into outer darkness” (Matt. 25:28–30). Here the unprofitable servant figures in the judgment of the king’s household, at his return, as well as the approved.

In Matt. 22:1–14, we have another parable in which the same feature is introduced. A certain king issues invitations to his son’s marriage, but the parties invited make various excuses for not coming. The king then orders a general invitation to all and sundry whom his servants may find on the highways, and his servants execute the orders, and “gather as many as they found, bad and good.” The king then comes in to see the guests, and “saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment,” whom he ordered to be “bound hand and foot, and taken away.”

This shows that the judgment to be carried out by Jesus at the time of reckoning has the practical effect of “severing the wicked from amongst the just.” To the same purport is the parable of which the latter italicised words are an explanation. “The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind: which, when it was full, they drew to the shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away” (Matt. 13:47, 48). Also the following: “The Son of Man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore ... lest coming suddenly, he find you sleeping” (Mark 13:34, 36).

Further, “Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return ... Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching ... But, and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to beat the men-servants and maidens, and to eat and to drink and to be drunken, the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers” (Luke 12:35–37, 45, 46). The parable of the ten virgins enforces the same fact, viz., the unworthy portion of his servants will be publicly and officially rejected at the time the others are acknowledged.

This is in harmony with the reason of the thing, as well as with the numerous testimonies already cited from the apostolic writings. Many are called, but only few out of the many are “chosen.” When should the choice take place, but at the time represented in these parables, viz., “When the lord of those servants cometh” to develop the state of things with reference to which the choice is to be made? (Matt. 25:19). The present is not a time for dividing the wicked from the righteous. Both go to the grave, and “rest together in the dust,” and their merits and demerits would sleep for ever with them in the silence of the tomb, were it not for the awaking voice that calls the just and unjust, at the appointed time, from the oblivion of hades, to give an account before the “judgment-seat of Christ.” Now is not the time for Jesus to execute judgment. He is a priest over his own house. The great question of account is left over till he returns. “He shall judge the quick and the dead AT HIS APPEARING AND HIS KINGDOM.” He shall open the dread book of God’s remembrance, wherein are indelibly recorded the thoughts and transactions of those who shall come to judgment, and the dead shall be judged out of those things that are written in the book.

Shall the wicked be absent at such a moment? The suggestion is precluded by the testimony and by the sense of the thing. A mockery of a judgment-seat it would be if its operations were confined to the allotment of rewards to the accepted. To judge, in the executive sense, is to enforce the division of good from evil. This is the function of Jesus in relation to His servants at His coming. True, says the suggester, but it will only be the living wicked that he will reject; the dead wicked will sleep on to another period. Is it so, then, that the accident of death a day before the advent will shut off a wicked man from the jurisdiction of the Judge of the quick and dead? Is it so that Jesus will only judge the living and not the dead at his appearing? Is it so that he is not “lord both of the dead and living?” (Rom. 14:9). The answer is self-evident; life or death makes no difference in our relationship to the judgment-seat. The Son of Man has power to call from the dead at his will, and, therefore, virtually, the dead are as much

amenable to his judicature as those who may happen to be in the flesh when he is revealed.

The constituted servants of Christ—by belief of the gospel and baptism—are candidates for the kingdom to be manifested at the appearing of Christ, which is to exist thereafter a thousand years; and it is meet that they should be arraigned in his presence to have it decided, as between them and him, when the time comes to enter the kingdom, which of all the number are worthy of the honour sought. This, it is declared, in the testimonies quoted, he will do. To do otherwise—to leave over the underserving of them for adjudication at a subsequent period, would both violate the fitness of things, and contravene the express declarations which we have quoted on the subject. Jesus has declared that he will confess or deny men in the presence of the angels at his coming, according to the position taken by them in his absence (Luke 9:26; Matt. 10:32, 33). Does not this necessitate their presence on the occasion? Where would be the shame of a denial if the one denied were not there to witness his own disgrace? Some will be “ashamed before him at his coming” (I John 2:28). Daniel says that at that time “Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.” This agrees with Paul’s statement that “indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,” shall be the lot of every soul of man that is contentious and disobedient to the truth, “in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus” (Rom. 2:8, 9, 16); and with his exhortation in another place, to “judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness” (I Cor. 4:5).

With the general conclusion before us, that the judgment-seat is the appointed tribunal for determining the great question of individual desert, in relation to the dispensation of God’s favour in Christ, we come to the minor but involved question of the nature and position of the dead, during the interval elapsing between their emergence from the death-state and their adjudication by the judge.

The object of that adjudication is defined by Paul in the following words: “We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive in body according to that we have done, WHETHER GOOD OR BAD” (II Cor. 5:10). What shall those “receive in body,” who have in the sense of those words, “done good”? and what, those who have “done bad”? Paul, in another place, answers these questions. He says God “will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing (he will render) ETERNAL LIFE. But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish ... in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ” (Rom. 2:6–9, 16). The same fact he announces in

more specific terms to the Galatians (6:7, 8), “Be not deceived; for God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap LIFE EVERLASTING.”

Paul does not mention the judgment in this testimony; but it is evident that it relates to the judgment, since life everlasting is not “reaped” in the present state of existence, and “corruption” befalls all alike, without reference to the “sowing.” It is evident that the results of the present life are to be dispensed at the judgment-seat. Paul, indeed, expressly declares it in the words already quoted, “that we may receive,” etc. This is reasonable, and befitting of the Deity, who is “a God of order” to the utmost exactitude in all things.

If this be so, does it not follow that prior to the judgment-seat, both classes of those subject to judgment, occupy the neutral position they hold in the present life, commingling indiscriminately, awaiting the tribunal, none knowing who is who? Is it not evident that the judgment-seat forms the great natural boundary line between probation and exaltation: the great crisis for determining the standing of the many who have been “called”; the time for that disclosure of divine secrets, which results in the severing of the wicked from among the just, and the rejection and the condemnation of the one, and the acceptance and glorification of the other? If so, it follows that up to the appearance of the dead before Christ to give an account, these questions are undecided, so far as their effect in relation to them is concerned. They are, of course, known to the divine mind, as we have already had occasion to consider, but not declared or enforced. Christ, as the judge of the quick and dead, is entrusted with that very office.

What is the conclusion from these Scriptural premises? There is only one: that the dead assembled for judgment are men and women in the flesh recovered from the grave, reproduced, and made to “STAND AGAIN” (anastasis) in the presence of their Lord and Judge, to have it determined whether they are worthy of receiving the “hidden manna” of eternal life, for which they are all candidates, or deserving of reconsignment to corruption and death, under the special solemn circumstance of rejection by him who is “altogether lovely.” Thus, those who are alive when the Lord comes, and those who emerge from the grave at that period, will be on a footing of perfect equality. They will all be gathered together into the one Great Presence, for the one great dread purpose of inquisition. Not until they hear the spoken words of the King will they know how it is to fare with them. All depends upon the “account.” This can only be accurately estimated by the Judge. A righteous man will tremble and underrate his position; on the other hand, “the wicked” may venture with coolness and effrontery before that august tribunal, to recount with

complacency and confidence the list of their claims to the Messiah's consideration:—"Have we not prophesied [preached] in thy name, and in thy name done many wonderful works?"

It is evident from three things—from the reason of the thing, from Christ's parables, and Paul's and Peter's statements—that the judgment will be no dumb show, no wholesale indiscriminate division of classes, but will be an individual reckoning. "Everyone of us shall give account of himself to God" (Rom. 14:12). It might naturally be fancied that persons before the judgment-seat would simply be paralyzed and rendered powerless to utter their minds; but it must be remembered that the power is then and there present that touched Daniel, and made him stand on his feet, when he was felled to the earth by the terrors of angelic presence; and, doubtless, this power will be put forth to enable all calmly, clearly, and with deliberation to manifest themselves as they are. Enswathed by the human spirit "mesmerically" applied, this result can now be partially achieved; how much more when the power of the Highest sustains, will those who are acted upon by it, feel isolated from all perturbing influences, and be enabled to concentrate their minds upon the solemn task they have to perform.

The idea that the righteous dead will spring into being in a state of incorruption, and that the living faithful will be instantaneously transformed, in their scattered places throughout the earth, and changed into the spiritual nature before appearing in the presence of Christ (though apparently countenanced by testimonies which are superficially construed by those who read them) is an error of a serious complexion, since it practically sets aside the New Testament doctrine of the judgment (itself a first principle), and tends to destroy the sense of responsibility and circumspection induced by a recognition of the fact that we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, that we may receive in body according to that we have done, whether good or bad.

To profess a belief in the judgment while holding this view, is only to retain a form of words out of deference to New Testament phraseology while having lost that which is represented by the words. If the dead are to awake to incorruptibility or death, according to their deserts, Jesus is robbed of his honour as judge, and the judgment-seat is robbed of its utility and its terror. If the living are to be subject to immortalization, say in their own houses, before Christ pronounces them blessed, is the judgment-seat not a mere empty form? If (worse than all) the wicked are not to be there to hear and receive their doom, it is no judgment at all, but a mere muster of the chosen; no terror at all, but a ceremony divested of every element of anxiety, since to have a part in it, according to this theory, is to be safe beyond miscarriage; no rendering to every man according to his deeds,

whether good or bad; but a mere bestowal of gifts and honours upon the King's assorted friends.

## THE CRUCIFIXION

By Robert Roberts

This was Christ's great act of obedience; but why was such an act of obedience necessary? Nothing has more staggered thoughtful minds than this question; and yet nothing is simpler when the Scriptural elements of the case are all placed together. It is a theological habit to represent the death of Christ as an act on his part to appease the wrath of the Father towards sinners. The Scriptures, on the contrary, always speak of it as an expression of God's *love* towards fallen humanity. We read:—

“God SO LOVED the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16).

Again, John, in his First Epistle 4:9 and 14, says:—

“*In this was manifested the love of God toward us*, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him, ... and we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son *to be the Saviour of the world.*”

Paul expresses the same sentiment in Romans 5:8:—

“*God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.*”

And again in II Corinthians 5:19:—

“*God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.*”

But the question presses: How was God's love manifested *in the death of Christ*? Could not divine love have been manifested without so tragic an event? Evidently not; for on the very eve of crucifixion, Christ prayed to the Father in these agonising terms—“*If it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.*” The cup did not pass; therefore, it was not possible. He drank it deep, pouring out his soul unto death. Why was the death of Christ indispensable? What did it accomplish? A consideration of the testimony will guide us to an answer which the discarding of the doctrine of natural immortality prepares us to understand. First let us consider the following New Testament allusions to the object of the crucifixion:—

“Christ *died for our sins* according to the Scriptures” (I Cor. 15:3).

“He was wounded *for our transgressions*; he was bruised *for our iniquities*; and with his stripes we are healed” (Isa. 53:5).

“He *put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself” (Heb. 9:26).

“Christ our passover is sacrificed *for us*” (I Cor. 5:7).

“God spared not His own Son, but delivered him up *for us all*” (Rom. 8:32).

“While we were yet sinners, Christ *died for us*” (Rom. 5:8).

“We have redemption *through his blood*, even the forgiveness of sins” (Col. 1:14).

“Having *made peace* through the blood of his cross, to reconcile all things” (verse 20).

“You He *hath* reconciled in the body of his flesh through death” (verse 22).

“His own self *bare our sins* in his own body on the tree” (I Pet. 2:24).

“The Son of Man came to give his life *a ransom for many*” (Mark 10:45).

“The man Christ Jesus, who gave himself *a ransom for all*” (I Tim. 2:5, 6).

“Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us *that he might redeem us from all iniquity*” (Titus 2:13, 14).

“Our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself *for our sins*, that he might deliver us from this present evil world” (Gal. 1:3, 4).

“This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the *remission of sins*” (Matt. 26:28).

“Thou wast slain, and *hast redeemed us to God* by thy blood” (Rev. 5:9).

These statements affirm a connection between the death of Christ and the restoration of sinful man to divine favour and life. There may not, at first, appear to be a logical connection between the two things; but a consideration of all the facts of the case will reveal the deepest philosophy in the whole arrangement—using the term philosophy in its true sense, in the conviction that absolute wisdom characterises everything with which the mind of Deity has to do—the principles involved in the death of Christ are simple and easily understood. It is the going astray of Christendom from these first principles that has thrown obscurity over the sufferings of the Man of Sorrows. It is of the first importance to get rid of this obscurity. It is not the mere fact of Christ’s transfixion on the cross by the Romans, that constitutes the saving and enlightening truth of the matter; it is *the principles involved in the tragedy* that constitute the truth to be known.

These principles have been divinely revealed. The first is, that “the wages of sin is death” (Rom. 6:23). Paul says, “By one man sin entered into the world, and *death by sin*” (Rom. 5:12). What this means, we have seen, Adam disobeyed a command given to him, and, *in consequence of*

*disobedience*, WAS CONDEMNED TO RETURN TO THE GROUND FROM WHENCE HE CAME. Hence, “sin,” which has become an obscure and unintelligible term, is simply disobedience. It is, in fact, so styled by Paul in the very chapter in which he describes Adam’s act as “sin.” He says, “By one man’s *disobedience* many were made sinners” (Rom. 5:19). If it is used in any secondary sense (such as when Paul speaks of “sin that dwelleth in me”) that secondary sense is covered by, or included in, the major sense of disobedience. Sin being disobedience or transgression (agreeable with John’s definition, “Sin is the transgression of the law”—I John 3:4), we are enabled to understand the relation of death to it.

This death is not a “state of the soul,” or “peril of eternal damnation in the flames of hell”; both of which are unknown to Scripture, either in word or idea, being pagan corruptions of the truth. The death resulting from Adam’s transgression is a *dissolution of being in the grave*. Hence Paul puts resurrection by Christ in antithesis to death by Adam. “For since by man came death, by man came also *the resurrection of the dead*.” This being the nature of death, we are enabled to understand the law which makes it the result of sin. Sin being the transgression or disobedience of the divine law, the perpetrator of it is out of joint with the law of well-being, whether as regards himself, others, or God. He cannot have joy of himself, he cannot yield happiness to others, and he cannot yield pleasure to his Creator. Misery is the result of such a state; and it is one of the beneficent ordinances of God that perpetual existence shall be impossible under such circumstances—that death (extinction of being) shall follow in the train of moral pestilence, and wipe its evil results from the face of creation. He will not allow the evil to become permanent. So far from decreeing or countenancing an eternal hell, where sinners shall writhe and devils triumph to all eternity, His law, with jealous and inexorable power, follows close on the heels of sin, and suppresses the very germ of rebellion and misery.

This is the first principle to be apprehended before the crucifixion can be understood. Adam, the father of the race, disobeying in face of the declared penalty of death, brought upon himself the threatened sentence, and his posterity are involved in the same condemnation, for the simple reason that they are but propagations of his own being in all its qualities and relations, and also because they are themselves, every one of them, sinners by actual transgression, and, therefore, on their own account, subject to death.

Now here is the problem to be solved, and which has been solved in the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus: how is condemned human nature to be emancipated from the law of sin and death, in harmony with the righteousness that has brought that law into force? If humanity were left

to itself, it would inevitably perish; because it is not only incapable of a perfect righteousness, but it cannot set aside the condemnation in which it already exists. God's plan in Christ has given us a scheme by which human salvation is achieved without the violation of any of His laws, which are necessary to the maintenance of His supremacy in the universe. Christ meets all the necessities of the case. The first necessity was that the law, both Edenic and Mosaic, should be upheld. The law required the death of the transgressing nature, viz., human nature. He had this nature, and he died:—

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, *he also himself likewise took part of the same* ... He took not on him the nature of angels, but *he took on him the seed of Abraham*” (Heb. 2:14, 16).

“God sent His own Son *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3).

But it was also necessary that such a sufferer should be sinless, because sin would have prevented resurrection to life immortal. This necessity for sinlessness in “the Lamb of God” was constantly prefigured under the law by the spotlessness of the beasts offered in sacrifice. Christ as the great antitype fulfilled this condition: “He was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners.” He could triumphantly ask his persecutors, “Which of you convinceth me of sin?” (John 8:46). If Christ had been a son of Adam merely, he would have been a sinner, and, therefore, unfit for sacrificial purposes. On the other hand, if he had been clothed with angelic or immaculate nature, he would have been equally disqualified, inasmuch as it was necessary that the sinning nature should suffer in him. The combination of condemned human nature with personal sinlessness was effected through divine power begetting a son from Mary's substance. A “Lamb of God,” was thus produced, guileless from his paternity, and yet inheriting the human sin-nature of his mother.

It is not possible that “The blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins” (Heb. 10:4), for the reason that appears in view of all these facts. The law would admit of no substitute, but exacted the very nature obnoxious to its penalty. Christ, then, “being found in fashion as a man,” and yet being sinless, was a perfect sacrifice; because being the representative of human nature he could meet all the claims of God's law upon that nature, and yet triumph over its operation by a resurrection to immortal life. The Lamb being provided, the sacrifice followed. The “Messiah was cut off.” “He was wounded *for our transgressions*; he was bruised for our iniquities: ... the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.”

God dealt with him representatively. There is a great difference between a *representative* and a *substitute*. A representative is not disconnected from those represented. On the contrary, those represented go through with him all that he goes through. But in the case of a substitute, it is otherwise. He does his part *instead of* those for whom he is the substitute, and these are dissociated from the transgression.

Christ suffering as the representative of his people, is one with them, and they are one with him. In what he went through they went through. Hence, Paul says believers were crucified with Christ, and baptised into his death. This death he declares to have been “the declaration of the righteousness of God,” which God required as the basis of the work of reconciliation and forgiveness (Rom. 3:24–26).

Christ having died, God raised him from the dead to a glorious existence, even to equality with Himself. This was the essential point of the scheme, as appears from 1st Corinthians 15:17, 20: “*If Christ be not raised YOUR FAITH IS VAIN, ye are yet in your sins. But now is Christ risen from the dead*”; and being raised, he constitutes the “one name given under heaven whereby men may be saved” (Acts 4:12). If Christ had been a personal transgressor, the law of sin would have kept him in the grave, and the scheme of salvation would have miscarried at its vital point. The way of salvation could not have been opened through him; a dead Saviour would have been no ark of refuge—no life-giver to the mortal sons of men.

But Christ, after suffering the natural penalty of disobedience in human nature, having been raised from the dead to live for evermore, he is “the Saviour of all such as come to him.” He has life for bestowal by his own right. “This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; *and this life IS IN HIS SON. He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life*” (I John 5:11, 12). Life is deposited in him for our acceptance, on condition of allying ourselves to him, yea, on condition of our entry into him, and becoming part of him; for Paul says of those who are in Christ, “We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones,” and the aggregate of such are designated “*the Bride, the Lamb’s wife,*” —“His body, the church.”

Divine wisdom, which is foolishness with men, has provided a means whereby we get the benefit of the result achieved in Christ. Baptism in water is the ceremony by which believing men and women are united to Christ, and constituted heirs of the life everlasting which he possesses in his own right. This will be demonstrated more particularly in a later lecture. Meanwhile, we quote Paul’s words: “As many of you as have been *baptised into Christ* have put on Christ” (Gal. 3:27). Entering into Christ, we are made *one* with him, and become heirs to the privileges of the

position which he has established in himself, after the analogy of the woman who, at her betrothal, obtains a prospective title to that which belongs to the man to whom she is betrothed. *In the first Adam*, we inherit death without the possibility of retrieving our misfortune, so long as we remain connected with him. *In the last Adam* (who, however, it must always be borne in mind, ascended to the last Adam position from the first Adam state), we obtain a title to eternal life. Hence the words of the apostle Paul: "As in Adam all die; even so in Christ shall all be made alive," that is, the "all" of whom he is speaking, viz., believers of the truth, as may be seen by the context (I Cor. 15:22, 23), and only those who are found worthy at the judgment-seat. He is speaking here of being made alive immortally, not of mere resuscitation of mortal life to judgment, of which many will be the subjects who have never been Christians, but who are among the responsible unjust by reason of their privileges.

By nature we are in Adam. By the gospel and baptism we pass "into Christ." This is God's appointment; and we cannot be saved except by compliance with His appointments.

Natural virtue will avail nothing, because, *in itself*, it is related only to the present, and establishes no right in respect of future existence. Those who are trusting to it, are building their house upon a foundation of sand. There is only one name given under heaven whereby men can be saved; and if we refuse to put on that name, and thus reject Christ, "who is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (I Corinthians 1:30), there remains nothing for us but the utter worthlessness of our own mortality, which without redemption will perish for ever under the just condemnation of Him who hath already passed the decree in prospect: "Whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away *even that he hath.*"

O reader, "refuse not Him that speaketh." Turn not thine ear from the invitation which calls thee to drink of the fountain of the water of life freely. Gladly accept it; humbly comply with its requirements; and thou shalt, in due time, be delivered from the bondage of mortal flesh which lies heavy upon thee, and be promoted to the glorious liberty of the children of God!

# The Power and Beauty of God's Arrangements

Bro. CHARLES SMITH, Edinburgh,

“It is the universal doctrine of the apostasy, that sin was laid on Christ merely by representation, or according to another way of expressing it, in substitution for us. Now Christ was the substance of all the representation contained in sacrifices under the law. What was taken away then only in form, in a sign (which Paul shows was not taken away at all), was taken away really and truly as an accomplished fact, in the body of our Lord. Sin was condemned in its own flesh. Some object to this. Yet it is conceded that Christ was a Jew, to redeem them that were under the curse of the law.

Now was not Jesus really and truly, and as matter of accomplished fact cursed by the law, while at the same time guiltless by his own act? If it was necessary for him to be as, a fact, brought under the curse of the law, that he might deliver them who were under the curse, why should it be said that it was unnecessary he should be brought under the Adamic curse in order that he might be a deliverer for those under that curse, both Jew and Gentile?

The truth is very plain: if the body of Jesus was not under condemnation we are still in our sins, then has sin never been condemned in the flesh. Oh, that men could see the power and beauty of God's arrangements, so that He can be just and the justifier of him who believeth unto Jesus. God is just—adheres to the most strict justice in all His operations. If it had not been so, He could have saved man without the death of His Son at all. The animal sacrifices under the law could have borne sin away by representation, and his holy child Jesus might have been translated in a moment to Holy Spirit nature.

One of the silliest things I have seen, is the question ‘Was Jesus born of two human parents?’ Was anybody so born? Man is born of one parent, having been begotten by another. Jesus was no exception. He was begotten by the Father and born of Mary, and therefore, on the principle that that which is born out of the flesh is flesh, he was flesh, which cannot inherit God's kingdom without being redeemed from corruption.

But the character of Jesus was the reflection of the begetter. Every child takes after both parents, some more after one than another. Jesus had the flesh of his mother, which was unclean; but he had the mind of his Father, which was altogether pure. How could an uncondemned human nature be

made under a law whose every jot and tittle were enactments regarding its uncleanness, &c.! But some have no understanding though their words be many. God's way of putting away sin has not entered into their apprehensions."

### **The Substance of the Matter (added to the above by bro. Roberts)**

That the Father is the Redeemer of man. No second person redeems us from Him; but He redeems us from sin. He does it on a principle that

- (1) excludes the glorying of the flesh, and
- (2) preserves a harmony between His work in condemnation and His work in salvation.

Illustration of the first point.—He manifests Himself by the Spirit in the nature condemned. The result was a Son in whom He was well pleased, holy, harmless and undefiled. God was in him for the work of reconciliation. Apart from the Father, Christ was and could do nothing. He was the Word made flesh, and the Word was God. The result of his work is therefore of God and not of man, that the praise might be to the glory of His grace. Had he been merely a man as Adam the first was, the glory would have been to man; but the last Adam was the Lord from heaven—God manifest in the flesh.

Illustration of the second point.—Man condemned in Adam must bear the condemnation, for God in His ways is without variableness or the shadow of a turning. But, if man is left to bear the condemnation himself, it destroys him, because his own transgressions stand in the way of escape. Therefore God provides him one who can bear it and be rescued from it after it is inflicted. This required one in the nature of the transgressor, for in God's ways, sentence upon man cannot be borne by angel or beast, but by him only on whom it lies.

Jesus was such an one, for he partook of the very flesh and blood of Adam's condemned race through Mary. Yet the sufferer, though in the nature of the transgressor, had to be personally sinless, otherwise God could not raise him. Hence it was necessary that God Himself should manifest Himself in the seed of Abraham, thus producing a sinless character in the condemned nature of the first man. This was done by the miraculous conception of the Son of Mary, who "through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself to God."—(Heb. 9:14.) Raising His Holy One from the grave, he offered all men forgiveness by faith of what had been done in Him, and obedience to His commandments.

He who renounces this, renounces the truth, and repeats the history of first-century declension.

# THE MELBOURNE SYNOPSIS

By Robert Roberts

Note: The Melbourne Synopsis was produced during bro. Roberts' second voyage to Australia, in direct response to those agitating for a false view of the nature and sacrifice of Christ in Australia. These agitators ultimately became the "Shield" assemblies, being withdrawn from by those in fellowship with Birmingham, Temperance Hall in the early 1900s, within six years of bro. Roberts' voyage.

The Shield assemblies were later absorbed into the Central assemblies in 1957, when Central abandoned requiring clauses five through twelve, and allowed views which were in harmony with the Cooper-Carter Resolution. That resolution permitted those views bro. Roberts directly argued against here, to be acceptable within the Central assemblies.

We reproduce the synopsis in this issue, as six and seven are directly to the point before us in this issue: that the plan of redemption for man, is God's design, God's will, and God's plan.—J.P.

## THE NATURE OF MAN AND THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST

1. —*That death entered the World of mankind by Adam's disobedience.* "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin" (Rom. 5:12). "In (by or through) Adam all die" (1 Cor. 15:22). "Through the offence of one many are dead" (Rom. 5:15).
2. —*That death came by decree extraneously to the nature bestowed upon Adam in Eden, and was not inherent in him before sentence.* "God made man in his own image . . . a living soul (a body of life) . . . very good" (Gen. 1:27; 2:7; 1:31). "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife . . . unto dust shalt thou return" (Gen. 3:17, 19).
3. —*Since that time, death has been a bodily law.*—"The body is dead because of sin" (Rom. 8:10). "The law of sin in my members . . . the body of this death" (Rom. 7:23, 24). "This mortal . . . we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened" (1 Cor. 15:53; 2 Cor. 5:4). "Having *the sentence of death in ourselves*, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raiseth the dead" (2 Cor. 1:9).

4. —*The human body is therefore a body of death requiring redemption.*—“Waiting for the adoption, to wit the redemption of our body” (Rom. 8:23). “He shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His own glorious body”—(Phil. 3:21). “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” (Rom. 7:24). “This mortal (body) must put on immortality” (1 Cor. 15:53).
5. —*That the flesh resulting from the condemnation of human nature of death because of sin, has no good in itself, but requires to be illuminated from the outside.*—“In me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing” (Rom. 7:18). “Sin dwelleth in me” (Ib. 7:20). “The law of sin which is in my members” (Ib. 23). “Every good and perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights” (James 1:17). “Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts” (Matt. 15:19). “He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption” (Gal. 6:8). “Put off the old man which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts” (Eph. 4:22).
6. —*That God’s method for the return of sinful man to favour required and appointed the putting to death of man’s condemned and evil nature in a representative man of spotless character, whom he should provide, to declare and uphold the righteousness of God, as the first condition of restoration, that he might be just while justifying the unjust, who should believably approach through him in humility, confession, and reformation.*—“God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3). “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the devil” (Heb. 2:14), “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body to the tree” (1 Pet. 2:24). “Our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed” (Rom. 6:6). “He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:15). “Be of good cheer, I have overcome the World” (John. 16:33). “Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God, to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus” (Rom. 3:26).
7. —*That the death of Christ was by God’s own appointment, and not by human accident, though brought about by human instrumentality.* “He that spared not His own Son, but delivered him up for us all” (Rom. 8:32). “Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have

crucified and slain” (Acts 2:23). “Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together for to do *whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done*” (Acts 4:27). “No man taketh it—my life—from me, but 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. 10:18).

8. —*That the death of Christ was not a mere martyrdom, but an element in the process of reconciliation.*—“You that sometimes were alienated in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled *in the body of his flesh through death*”—(Col. 1:21). “When we were enemies, we were *reconciled to God by the death of His Son*” (Rom. 5:10). “He was wounded for our transgressions: He was bruised for our iniquity: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed” (Isaiah 53:5). “I lay down my life for my sheep” (John 10:15). “Having therefore boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, *by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say his flesh, let us draw near*” (Heb. 10:20).
9. —*That the shedding of his blood was essential for our salvation.* “Being justified *by his blood*, we shall be saved from wrath through him” (Rom. 5:9). “In whom we have redemption *through his blood*, even for the forgiveness of sins” (Col. 1:14). “Without shedding of blood there is no remission” (Heb. 9:22). “This is the new covenant in my blood, *shed for the remission of sins*” (Matt. 26:28). “The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29). “Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins *in his own blood*” (Rev. 1:5). “Have washed their robes and *made them white in the blood of the Lamb*” (Rev. 7:14).
10. —*That Christ was himself saved in the Redemption he wrought out for us.* “In the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to *save him from death*, and was heard in that he feared. Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered. And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him” (Heb. 5:7–9). “Joint heirs with Christ” (Rom. 8:17). “By his own blood he entered once unto the holy place, *having obtained eternal redemption*” (Heb. 9:12). “Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect, &c.” (Heb. 13:20).

11. —*That as the anti-typical High Priest, it was necessary that he should offer for himself as well as for those whom he represented*—“And by reason hereof, he ought as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins. And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he that said unto him, &c.” (Heb. 5:3). “Wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.” (Heb. 8:3). “Through the Eternal Spirit, he offered himself without spot unto God” (Heb. 9:14). “Who needeth not *daily*, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the people’s: for *THIS he did once* when he offered up himself” (Heb. 7:27). “It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens (that is, the symbols employed under the law), should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices), but *the heavenly things themselves* (that is, Christ who is the substance prefigured in the law), with better sacrifices than these” (that is, the sacrifice of Christ—Heb. 9:23).

\* \* \* \* \*

**Additional Note:** Compromises in the truth never resolve anything, and certainly the Cooper-Carter Resolution was no exception. Hostilities between the two points which existed before the 1957 reunion, continued well after the reunion. The truth concerning the nature and sacrifice of Christ was defended in the Logos Magazine, which was edited by bro. H. P. Mansfield, while the Shield Magazine continued its uncertain sound. But a new magazine, The Believer, edited by Graham Bacon was begun, which, according to its own editorial policy, was to be the militant arm of the Shield against the Logos Magazine and the teachings of “Andrewism.”

“Andrewism” is the doctrine that Jesus was born morally guilty of Adam’s sin. It impacts most every aspect of the atonement. The truth is that Jesus was physically defiled by Adam’s sin, not morally guilty of Adam’s sin. The defilement inherited from Adam was a misfortune, but not a crime. But this significant difference between the teachings of bro. Roberts, and the teachings of bro. Andrew, is conveniently ignored by those who deny that there was any defilement whatsoever, in the nature of Jesus—that is, by those who deny clause five of the BASF. And either out of ignorance, or out of deception, they blur the difference between the Truth and Andrewism, lumping both ideas together, and claiming that any defilement to Christ would disqualify him for the work he was sent to do. The exact opposite is true. As bro. Thomas taught, if there was no sin in the flesh of Jesus, then sin could not have been condemned there.

Andrewism was formed, curiously enough, when bro. J. J. Andrew accepted a false premise developed by those who deny that there was any defilement to Christ's nature by birth, such as is described in Clause five. These began to preach that sin is only a moral term, and they renounced the Scriptural teaching pertaining to physical sin. This directly contradicted the teaching of bro. John Thomas, who was quite clear on the subject.

Bro Thomas wrote:

The word sin is used in two senses; first, to represent that combination of principles within us, which in excitation is manifested in passion, evil affections of the mind, diseases, death and corruption. They are called sin because their manifestation was permitted as the consequence of transgression. And this is the second sense of the word; as it is written, 'sin is the transgression of law.' Transgression was the effect of *the unbridled inworking of humanity*; and when the transgression was complete, or 'finished,' that inworking and its result were BOTH styled *sin*.

And again:

"The word *sin* is used in two principal acceptations in the scripture. It signifies in the first place, "*the transgression of the law*;" and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature, which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh '*which has the power of death*;' and it is called *sin*, because the development, or fixation, of this *evil* in the flesh, was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled 'sinful flesh,' that is, '*flesh full of sin*;' so that *sin*, in the sacred style, came to stand for the substance called *man*. In human flesh 'dwells no good thing;' and all the evil a man does is the result of this principle dwelling in him."

So bro. Thomas is clear as can be. But once only one sense of the word "sin" is acknowledged, then the many statements of the Scriptures concerning Christ and his relationship to sin become unintelligible, as Christ was morally sinless. If sin can only be moral, why would Christ have to offer for himself, for sins? (Heb. 7:27.) And why would we see the Messiah lamenting his sins in the Psalms, and in Isaiah? So against all reason, (and his own previous teachings,) in order to harmonize his new conclusion with clear Scriptural teachings; bro. J. J. Andrew began to teach that "sin in the flesh" or "the body of sin" was moral guilt. That is the root of Andrewism. Andrewism then reasoned that one must be baptized to be freed from this moral guilt, or a man would not come out of the grave to judgment, regardless of responsibility to light.

Bro. H. P. Mansfield once correctly observed of his detractors who confused the errors of Andrewism and moral guilt, with the truth of physical defilement:

"It is a fact that some occupying positions of authority in the Ecclesias, do not know Andrewism when they see it, though they wax eloquent about the 'blasphemy' of certain statements that are in accordance with the Truth" H. P. Mansfield, Logos, July 1971, p. 382.

Following the death of bro. H. P. Mansfield, the attacks continued, some might even say they increased, as the new editor, Graeham Mansfield suffered withering attacks. One particular attack which came from a popular Central speaker, Jim Cowie, is of particular note. He wrote to the new editor:

"For some time now I have been watching with growing dismay the progression of thought in Logos towards promulgation of an interpretation of the Atonement which does not belong to the Central Fellowship; is not taught in Scripture or in the BASF; does not have its origins in the teaching of our Pioneer brethren and was not taught by Bro H.P. Mansfield. It is a teaching that has more in common with the "Old Paths" teachings of the first half of the 20th Century which developed as an over-reaction to the Clean-flesh errors of John Bell, A.E. Harvey and others. As in those days it seems that in an attempt to uphold the truth of the Atonement, perceived by some to be under threat, the balance has been lost, and unnecessary elements super-added to Yahweh's work of redemption in Christ.

"I refer to the belief, now openly proclaimed in Logos for February 2002, that "Human flesh is accounted by Deity as sin", and "human flesh is sin" (Christadelphian Studies). The natural consequence of this mistaken view is that "our flesh and blood need justification, reconciliation, atonement or sacrifice" (Bristol Horfield Statement). It is now clear that the "Partial Atonement" accusation made against brethren and ecclesias who hold firmly to the basis of fellowship in this country as expressed in the Unity Booklet has arisen because some hold the view that human nature requires sacrifice in order for atonement to be made for it. This element is apparently seen as quite a separate issue to the work of moral reconciliation."

Jim Cowie puts "Partial Atonement" in quotes, because he teaches Partial Atonement, or the doctrine that it was not necessary that Christ should offer himself as a blood shed sacrifice, for his own redemption, on account of his own relationship to sin.

Now the Central folks who still maintained the truth on the matter, explained publicly and in enough detail why Jim Cowie is wrong on so

many of his points, especially in regard to his statements concerning the teachings of Logos, and the pioneer brethren. And our intent in bringing this up was not to examine the details of Jim Cowie's teaching, so we leave that alone.

But on May 6<sup>th</sup> of this year (2019) Jim Cowie posted on line, a public lecture he delivered on fellowship. Compared to what has come from Central recently, it was really quite good. It was a throwback to the talks of bro. H. P. Mansfield who consistently laid out sound Scriptural arguments for why we must not fellowship error, but then, for no apparent Scriptural reason, continued to fellowship error, and excused those who did so.

But Jim Cowie made the following comment, which we consider a significant change in the positions of the Central Assemblies. He said:

“Now we have a look at the principle at Amos 2 verse 3. ‘Can two walk together except they be agreed?’ So what if two communities do not agree on some fundamental doctrines. Now we know, of course, that...(and I’ve got many friends in the Unamended Community by the way. And some that were past members of the Unamended Community, and this ecclesia itself was once Unamended.) And I take the view, brothers and sisters...(and I have friends in the Berean Community.) I take the view that at the judgement seat of Christ that there will be people from all fellowships who will go into the Kingdom. Because they happen to believe the truth. And that is the essential element, isn’t it? They happen to believe the truth, and that’s why I have friends in those communities. Because, we agree. Not only on the doctrine of the truth, but on the way the truth should be lived. So we are on the same page. But I don’t break bread with them. And I’ll give you the reasons why in a minute.” Uploaded May 6, 2019, starts at 46:55 minute mark.

Here is a clear statement that Central now considers the position that the Berean Christadelphians hold on the nature and sacrifice of Christ, to be a position astray on a fundamental doctrine, which they will not fellowship.

In this we see the true characteristics of error. At the first the errorist demanded tolerance from those who held the truth. “Oh it’s just an insignificant detail,” or “Oh, it’s just saying the same thing differently,” we were told. “These are sincere brethren, with slightly different thoughts. No one believes the things you claim,” they told us. This actually occurred in the years between 1904 and 1957.

Then, over time, as these arguments break down the firm foundations of the truth, such as is expressed in clauses 5 – 12 of the BASF, and the clarity

of the truth is replaced with the vagueness of the Cooper-Carter Addendum, the errorist is granted his place, and permission to teach his error. This occurred in 1957.

And now, a few years later, the errorist begins to eliminate those who believe the truth, with statements such as we saw above: “this teaching does not belong in Central...” or it is contrary “to the basis of fellowship in this country as expressed in the Unity Booklet.” (That is the booklet which contains the Cooper-Carter Addendum.)

In one sense, statements like this from this speaker gives us the same sort of relief from the battle with error, that the apostle John spoke of:

John 2:18-19 “Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would *no doubt* have continued with us: but *they went out*, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.”

Gone now, is the argument which we have had to deal with so often over the past 45 years, that there is no difference between the Central and Bereans. That this was always a deceptive claim is proved by the action of this modern Diotrephes class who go out from us, and now refuse to allow the truth as taught by John and the other faithful of old.

At the same time, we feel so sorry for those who are holding onto the truth in Central assemblies, like the editor of the Logos and his adherents, but who find themselves more and more silenced for fear of Diotrephes and his friends. These (or their families, should time go on) will ultimately be leavened by the leaven of the anti-Christ—that doctrine that Christ is not come in the flesh, that is, the defiled flesh described in Clause Five of the BASF. True, they bring this leavening upon themselves and their children, because they refuse the Lord’s teaching to separate from error. But that doesn’t make their plight any less sad.

\* \* \* \* \*

Another subject this talk on fellowship dealt with, was truthfulness. Jim Cowie emphasized the need for honesty in all discussions about the individual beliefs of the community, and laments that in brethren’s dealings with brethren in the past, they have not been altogether honest. We fully agree with him in as it applies to us today, and we agree with his understanding of our history.

He congratulates the Unamended Community for their admitting that they do not agree with the Central Community on things pertaining to the moral relationship of Jesus to sin. This has its direct effect on doctrines pertaining to the atonement, the nature of man, the sacrifice of Christ, and what is accomplished at baptism.

“And I commend their honesty. I really commend their honesty. Because that’s what we need. We need people to say what they really think. And honesty is something that is disappearing out of our world, and sadly out of our community.

“You know it says in 2 Corinthians chapter one, verse 19, ‘(Christ) was not yea and nay’...he didn’t say yea here, and then nay over here: but in him was yea. And of course in Matt. 5 and verse 37, he said, didn’t he, in his teaching, ‘let your yea be yea, and your nay be nay.’ If you don’t agree, well then say so. Psalm 25:21. ‘Let integrity and uprightness preserve me;’ said the Psalmist, ‘for I wait on thee.’ Proverbs 11:3 ‘The integrity of the upright shall guide them:’. What if you haven’t got it? Well the opposite applies. Proverbs 20 verse 7 ‘The just man walketh in his integrity:’ and it brings blessings: ‘his children are blessed after him.’ And Titus 2 verse 7, this is Bullinger’s translation, he says ‘In all things shewing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine shewing uncorruptness,’ (and the word in the Greek is a rather long word, ‘adiaphthoria;’ it means incorruptibility, soundness, integrity of mind.) And he goes on to add the word ‘honesty’ in that context. \

“And the basic point of this, of course, is that in our dealings one with another, we have to be up front and honest, and not play games. And unfortunately games have been played and the consequences are awful.”

My experience is that this speaker’s remarks are unusual, as the Unamended Community has always been crystal clear and quite honest about what they believe on these, and in fact, all points. The deception has been the product of the Central camp, trying to conceal or distort or the true Unamended teaching, hiding the true Unamended teaching from those sound brethren in Central who would object to that teaching, so that some sort of union could be achieved between Central and Unamended.

The problem for Central is this. The Unamended brethren know they do not agree with the pioneer teachings, and they make no effort to show that they do. After all, bro. J. J. Andrew and bro. Roberts separated from each other in their lifetimes. Within the Unamended community, there are brethren who hold the teachings of bro. Andrew, and there are also those who do not but who simply believe that the points of difference between

bro. Andrew and bro. Roberts are not first principle. So there is no pretense of agreement with the pioneer brethren required, on the part of the Unamended. The position of the Unamended is the same today, as it was in 1898. This is not true of either with the position on fellowship, or the alternative beliefs on the nature and sacrifice of Christ which we find in Central. So if some sort of union is to be achieved, it is Central which must change and conceal its new position.

As we saw in his letter to bro. Graeham Mansfield, Jim Cowie claimed agreement with the Pioneer brethren. To make such a suggestion, deception is absolutely required. Just to limit this discussion to something already discussed in this article: the two senses of the word “sin,” as explained by bro. Thomas, must be blurred, for Jim Cowie to establish his points on the Atonement, and the deception grows wildly from there. An example of the deception Central created on this point can be seen in the July, 2019 Berean, pages 400-402 where John Carter confuses “metonymy” with metaphor” to muddle the question of the two aspects of sin, and mislead the brethren.

Deception was directly involved from the start of the 1957 reunion between Central and Shield in Australia, which Jim Cowie so reverentially references. Consider that in 1952, the Bereans were told that the Central met on the BASF without reservation. This was the printed assurances from the Jersey City Conference. Then Central made the reunion with Shield based on the Cooper-Carter Addendum, a clear reservation to the BASF, betraying the agreement made only five years earlier.

So we fully agree that deception has been a major problem in Christadelphia, but this is not a new thing. The “post card” incident was necessary in the lifetime of bro. Roberts, to clarify the brethren’s position in 1885 on “partial inspiration.” The deceptive behavior on the part of so many brethren saying one thing, but meaning another, was such that no other way could separate one belief from the other, than to put down on paper what was clearly meant, and have those who could agree, say so. It is the reason the spirit counselled us to be “wise as serpents, but harmless as doves.”

The Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith is clear enough, that qualifications to it are unnecessary, and destructive. Qualifications such as the “Cooper Carter Resolution,” in Australia, or “the Final Statement,” in Britain, increase confusion, admitting views that were intended to be excluded. If clarification is desired, let that clarification be found in a thorough and exhaustive study of the writings of bre. Thomas, Roberts and Growcott.

# Brisbane Baptism Questions

## THE BIBLE DEVIL AND SATAN

### 1. What is Satan?

It simply means an **adversary**. Like the word *devil*, it is an untranslated word. It was originally Hebrew, and was adopted into the Greek and finally transferred to the English.

*We in fact read the scriptures intelligently if we read adversary wherever we find 'Satan'. When we do this we shall find it easy to avoid the popular misconception, which is nothing more than a pagan myth of an infernal fallen angel in opposition to God.*

#### **Can you have a good and bad Satan?**

Yes. The Angel of Yahweh who stood in the way of Balaam's ass is referred to as an adversary or Satan. Yahweh Himself is referred to as Satan or an adversary to Israel and caused David to number Israel. The saints in the ecclesia at Pergamos were said to dwell where, "Satan's seat (or throne) is," —Pergamos being the central Roman power in Asia. This power is referred to as "the devil" in Revelation 2:10, which "cast" some of the saints "into prison." "Sin in the flesh" as manifested in the authorities of the Roman State was the great adversary (or Satan) of the early believers. (Numbers 22:22; 1 Chronicles 21:1 compare 2 Samuel 24:1; Revelation 2:13)

#### **Can you have a good and bad devil?**

No. The devil or the personification of sin in the flesh is always set against God, whereas the word Satan can be good or bad depending on the scriptural context. Sin however, is the great Satan or adversary personified in scripture.

### 2. How then is man tempted?

"Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." (James 1:14-15). The Lord Jesus says, "For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, sexual immorality, theft, murder, adultery...all these evil things come from within, and they defile a person" (Mark 7:21-23). We are tempted both from within as a result of the defiled nature we bear, as well as from without.

#### **Was Jesus tempted?**

He was tempted in all points like unto us yet without sin. (Heb. 4:15)

**3. You have previously stated that sin was condemned in Christ who knew no sin and Jesus died that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil (Heb. 2:14). What is the devil?**

The Bible devil is a scriptural personification of 'sin in the flesh'. The devil is understood by its characteristics; it is that in the flesh, "which has the power of death," and is called sin because the fixing of this evil in the flesh was the result of man's original transgression. There is no such being as the personal, immortal devil of popular religious belief (Romans 8:3; Hebrews 2:14).

*As you have stated there is no such being as the personal, immortal devil of popular religious belief. The belief in such a being is due to Greek Mythology and the misunderstanding of certain figures and symbols in the Bible. The Bible devil is a scriptural personification of 'sin in the flesh.' The word 'devil' is the Greek noun diabolos which Bro.Thomas says, "is the name of that which 'crosses, or **causes to cross, or falls over**' therefore to slander or falsely accuse. Diabolos is therefore a very fit and proper word by which to designate **the law of sin and death, or Sin's Flesh.**" (Eureka Vol.1 pg. 249) and as a scriptural personification of sin, has slandered or falsely accused Yahweh's law from the beginning, whose stronghold is the flesh, as a result of man believing the serpent's lie. **Note bro. Thomas does not say the devil is transgression of God's law but rather what causes it, i.e. "Sin's Flesh," the physical "flesh and blood" nature of man.** The Bible devil is manifested in many ways, individually and in the aggregate, in political and religious opposition, but all have their origin in the disobedience of flesh and blood to Divine Law. The Bible presents the 'devil' or 'sin in the flesh' as the source of all our problems and all the evil man commits as a result of this principle dwelling in us. The devil presents itself in our inner thoughts, and in those who would tempt us to do evil. The devil in its largest manifestation exists in the present religious and political constitution of things upon the earth. **The Son of God was manifested expressly for the purpose of destroying the devil and his works, that is Sin in its two scriptural aspects, root and branch.** (Romans 7:17-25 & 8:1-3; Hebrews 9:26; Romans 6:23; James 1:14-15 & 4:7; John 13:27 & 6:70; Acts 5:3-9; Ephesians 2:2; 1 Timothy 5:14-15 & 1:20; Matthew 16:23; Mark 8:33; Luke 4:8; 1 Thessalonians 2:18; Revelation 2:12-13; 1 Peter 5:8; Revelation 2:10; Romans 16:20; Revelation 12:3 & 17, 17:9 & 12, 20:2; Hebrews 2:14; 1 John 3:8).*

**4. What opened the way that on the third day for God to righteously raise Jesus from the dead and exalt him as High Priest and mediator between God and man?**

Jesus under severe trial never sinned requiring forgiveness. It was this that opened the way for his resurrection. Had he been a sinner as all other men

and women, death would have held the power over him that it had over them. God raised him from the dead after he destroyed the devil or that which has the power of death which Paul says is “sin, the sting of death” (1 Corinthians 15:56) and being raised from the dead, “death hath no more dominion over him.” “He ever liveth to make intercession for us, and is able to save to the uttermost all those who come unto God by him.”

*That is very true, and in this way he has become the righteousness of God to all who would be saved by the belief and obedience of the truth. (1 Corinthians 15:4-23; Hebrews 7:26 & 4:15; John 8:46; Matthew 3:17; Acts 10:40-43; 1 John 3:5; Acts 2:24-27 & 4:10-12 & 27).*

## **5. What is a mediator? Does he mediate for everyone?**

A mediator is one who goes between. There is one mediator between God and man the man Christ Jesus. He is the mediator of the new covenant and is a priest over his own household only. He does not intercede for the world or for those who though they may claim to be God’s servants, have abandoned themselves to disobedience.

*The scriptures tell us that Christ makes intercession for his erring brethren if they confess and forsake their sins. (1 Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 8:1-6 & 12:24; Luke 24:51; Ephesians 1:20; Acts 5:31, 15:4 & 13:39; Hebrews 4:14-15; John 17:9; Hebrews 10:26; 1 John 2:1; Proverbs 28:13).*

*On the question of whether God hears the prayers of the unbaptised, refer to Appendix I ‘Does God hear the prayers of the unbaptised?’, We should note that even Cornelius (a devout man, who feared God with all his household and prayed continually) who clearly was a proselyte to the Jewish religion and therefore understood “the Hope of Israel” and desired to approach God in an acceptable way, still had to be guided in the way of truth with respect to the Atonement that he and his household might understand the gospel in full and then be baptized.*

## **THE PRINCIPLE OF OBEDIENCE AS THE BASIS OF OUR ACCEPTANCE**

*We know the Lord sent forth his apostles to proclaim salvation through him as the only name given under heaven whereby men may be saved. You have said that the way to obtain this salvation is to believe the Gospel the apostles preached and to take on the name and service of Christ by being baptized. Christ gave the command to be baptized, and we may not ignore the commandments of Christ and be blameless. The Apostle John recorded this of Jesus: “Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” (John 3:5) Jesus explains here that baptism is not an option. A man cannot enter the*

kingdom of God unless he is born of water, in his baptism, and of the spirit, after his resurrection to life.

**What do we have to do then if we are to be found worthy at Christ's return?**

We must continue patiently in the observance of all things the Lord has commanded. (Romans 2:7; Matthew 28:20)

*We must recognize that while faith turns a sinner into a saint, obedience only will secure a saint's acceptance at the judgment seat of Christ. Disobedient saints will be rejected more decisively than the unjustified sinner. **The rule of life must be obedience to the commandments of Christ.** (Bro. Roberts' Bible Reading Companion)*

**After the obedience of baptism, what other commandments has Christ delivered for our observance?**

He has commanded us to assemble ourselves together every first day of the week to break bread and drink wine in remembrance of him. (Luke 22:17-20; 1 Corinthians 11:23-25; Acts 20:7; Hebrews 10:25)

*The bread and wine are the ritual symbols of the death of Christ. We partake of them and thereby identify ourselves with what God accomplished by the Lord Jesus' sacrificial death, in the declaration of God's righteousness by the condemnation of sin in the flesh. By our participation we show forth that we truly appreciate God's love in the giving of His Son and desire to be transformed into the image of him who loved us and gave himself for us; that by His grace, through faith, hope to receive God's gift of forgiveness through Jesus Christ our redeemer.*

**1. The doctrine of the churches denies the principle of obedience as the basis of our acceptance with God in Christ by its preaching of humanism and human rights. What are some of the other commandments of Christ we must obey to be accepted at the judgment seat?**

We must "love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our soul and with our entire mind," and "love our neighbour as ourselves." We are therefore, to love our enemies, to bless those who curse us, do good to those who hate us, and pray for those who badly use us. We are to be ready to do every good work, to give to those who ask, to relieve the afflicted i.e. to follow after whatsoever things are true, honest, pure, just, lovely and of good report. (Matthew 22:37; Luke 6:27-28; Matthew 5:44 & 42; Philippians 4:8)

**What are some things we are not to do?**

We are commanded not to return evil for evil, not to avenge ourselves but rather give place to wrath and suffer ourselves to be defrauded. We are not to labour to be rich or to love the world. We are not to grudge, complain, criticize, speak evil of or condemn our brethren and sisters. We are not to give way to anger, wrath, bitterness or evil speaking. We are not to talk spitefully or speak of others' sins until we have spoken to them ourselves first. We are not to be guilty of adultery, fornication, uncleanness, drunkenness, covetousness, wrath, strife, sedition, hatred, rivalry, boasting, vainglory, envy, jesting or foolish talking (Romans 12:17-20; 1 Timothy 6:8; 1 Peter 3:9; James 4:11; Matthew 7:1; Ephesians 4:31; Matthew 18:15; James 5:19-20; Ephesians 5:3-4).

**2. Will belief in the Gospel save us if we are disobedient to Christ's commands?**

No. Our belief of the Gospel and baptism will only be to our condemnation if we live in disobedience to the commandments of Christ. Only those who do his commandments will at last be among the blessed. Christ said, "Ye are my friends if you do whatsoever I have commanded you." (Revelation 22:14; Matthew 7:26; 2 Peter 2:21; John 15:14 & 14:15).

**Will you try to be obedient?**

Yes.

**3. Is there forgiveness for those who having submitted to the Gospel, may fail in rendering a perfect obedience to the commandments of Christ?**

Yes. If there were not, no flesh could be saved. Forgiveness is conditional upon our confessing and forsaking our sins and our ability to forgive others. However, forgiveness is only granted at the intercession of Christ. If we are unforgiving, or if he refuses to intercede, there is no hope for us. (Psalm 130:3-4; 1 John 1:7-9 & 2:1; Hebrews 7:25; Romans 8:34; Matthew 6:15; John 17:9).

*The true religion of God is a system of **Faith and Practice**. Bro. Thomas asks "...where is obedience to the gospel of the kingdom in the name of Jesus? Whoever thinks of obeying this? And yet He comes to take vengeance on all who obey it not (2 Thess. 1:8). I cannot too earnestly commend the words of Samuel to the attention of the reader in this place. 'Hath the Lord,' saith he, 'as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry' (1 Sam. 15:22, 23). A great principle is set forth in these words. It is that which can alone place men in harmony with the religion of God. Without it a man may in deed know the truth, but he must **believe and do** if he would inherit the kingdom which has been preparing from the foundation of the*

world...All the Most High requires of men is just to believe what He has done, what He teaches, and what He promises; to obey the law of faith; to take care of the poor of His flock; and to keep themselves unspotted from the world. This is pure and undefiled religion (James 1:27). But, alas! Where is it to be found?" (Elpis Israel Chapter 5 "The way to the tree of life" pg. 167-168).

## Signs

### Antisemitism on the Rise in the US

Antisemitism in the United States is again a front and center topic for discussion among world leaders. In early August, Israel, with the blessing of President Trump, refused the entry into Israel of two prominent anti-Semites in the US Congress. They are two Congresswomen, Rashid Tlaib of Michigan, and Ilhan Omar of Minnesota, both of the Moslem religion. We have written before about these women who are both Socialists, and Anti-Semites, and who appear to have an unusual popularity among Democratic political leaders.

The two women had previously sponsored a bill, commonly referred to as BDS, which stands for Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions against Israel. The concept behind the bill is the identical concept used to topple the South African government. The bill failed to pass, but the women have remained vocal supporters of all things anti-Semite. Israel has a policy that anyone involved in the BDS movement will be denied entry to Israel. President Benjamin Netanyahu stated concerning their visit:

“...that the Congresswomen’s itinerary revealed that they planned a visit whose sole objective is to strengthen the boycott against us and deny Israel’s legitimacy.”

Congresswoman Tlaib has a 90+ year old grandmother living in the West Bank who she wished to visit. Israel reversed its policy and said that if she agreed not to argue for BDS while in Israel, that she could visit Israel and her grandmother. She at first agreed, but then reversed her decision, and said that she would refuse to go to Israel. She said:

“Silencing me & treating me like a criminal is not what she [her grandmother—J.P.] wants for me. It would kill a piece of me. I have decided that visiting my grandmother under these oppressive conditions stands against everything I believe in—fighting against racism, oppression & injustice.”

“When I won, it gave the Palestinian people hope that someone will finally speak the truth about the inhumane conditions. I can’t allow

the State of Israel to take away that light by humiliating me & use my love for my city to bow down to their oppressive & racist policies.”

The reason for this visit by the two women was to have meetings with Palestinian leaders concerning various issues with serious consequences for Israel. Their trip was sponsored by Miftah, long recognized as an anti-Semitic group in Palestine. They had rejected an earlier visit with a Democratic Congressional group because it was going to “Israel.” Even in their written request, the request from the two women was not to visit “Israel,” but to visit “Palestine.” This is a part of the demands of Miftah, who is among the strongest supporters of the BDS movement, that the name of the nation be changed to Palestine. The following description of Miftah is from Fox News:

“Netanyahu cited Miftah as he alleged the lawmakers had ulterior, anti-Israel motives in their planned Israel trip.

“For instance, a 2006 Miftah report dealing with the Second Intifada – a wave of Palestinian violence in the early 2000s – discussed a 2002 Jerusalem suicide bombing under a section titled ‘Fighting Back.’ It described the attack, where Wafa Idrees blew herself up with a bomb that killed an Israeli and injured more than 100 others, as ‘the beginning of a string of Palestinian women dedicated to sacrificing their lives for the cause.’

“More recently, Miftah’s founder, Hanan Ashrawi, a member of the Palestinian Liberation Organization’s executive committee, spoke against referring to Palestinian attackers as terrorists in a 2017 interview.

“They are seen by the people as resistance and you cannot somehow adopt the language of either the international community or the occupier by describing anybody who resists as a terrorist,” she told Germany’s DW.com, describing “this whole labeling thing” as “unfair and unjust.”

So it is clear that Miftah is an anti-Israel group-. In spite of all this, the Democratically led Congress is now threatening actions against the Israeli Ambassador to the United States, as well as the United States Ambassador to Israel. Fox News reported:

“House Democrats are reportedly considering retaliatory moves against two top American and Israeli diplomats in response to Israel’s decision to block Minnesota Rep. Ilhan Omar and Michigan Rep. Rashida Tlaib from entering the country.

“Senior Democratic members of Congress are considering legislative action against Ron Dermer, Israel’s ambassador to Washington, and

David Friedman, the U.S. ambassador to Israel, according to McClatchy.

“According to one report, the Democrats are discussing a possible vote on a statement of no confidence in Dermer, as well as the opening up of an inspector general investigation into Friedman.”

The reason this concerns us is not the fact that there are a few virulent anti-Semitic congressional folks. That would hardly be a new development in American Politics. It is the fact that, unlike the recent past, their political party, the Democratic Party, is so completely and thoroughly behind these women, that it is refusing to condemn their hatred. They are even defending it.

This strong support coming from the Democratic Party for a couple of its true anti-Semites gives pause to what the future may hold for Israel. We know from the Bible prophesies that Tarshish will be badly defeated upon the mountains of Israel, following their fleet being destroyed by the “East Wind.” We know from God’s promise that he will not bring judgments upon nations while they are blessing Israel, but He will bring curses upon the nations that curse Israel. And we know that no matter how popular a president or political party is today, all that can change overnight, escorting in the other party in the process. The following is from the Washing Post:

“Israel’s decision to prevent their entry for that trip immediately drew widespread criticism from Democratic lawmakers and American Jewish organizations, including the staunchly pro-Israel lobby AIPAC, with some critics saying it set a new, unfortunate precedent for U.S.-Israel relations.

“On Friday, after Israel announced Tlaib was welcome to visit her grandmother but before she declined, AIPAC shared a tweet saying, ‘We commend the Israeli government for permitting Congresswoman Tlaib to visit her grandmother.’ Israel’s Interior Minister Aryeh Deri, who approved an overnight request from Tlaib on Friday to visit based on humanitarian grounds, called Tlaib’s decision not to visit a provocation.

“‘Last night, she sent me a letter asking to allow her to visit her 90-year-old grandmother ‘because this could be my last chance to meet her,’ Deri said. ‘I approved it for humanitarian reason, but it turns out that it was a provocation to embarrass Israel. Her hatred for Israel overcomes her love for her grandmother.’”

AIPAC, a Jewish group that is very loyal to Israel (and there are many Jewish groups who are not loyal to Israel, such as “J Street,” and “The Jewish Anti-defamation League;”) was critical of Israel’s action because they understand the point I just made. Even if President Trump is currently too popular and too successful to be upset in the upcoming 2020 election, it doesn’t take long for the tables to turn. And the AIPAC leaders know that it may not be too long before the nation of Israel is depending upon Democratic leaders for their defense. This is the reason that Israel has been very neutral in all American elections, even though they had so much on the line in certain elections.

The root policy behind BDS is the identical policy that was used to successfully take down the South African government. This was a point made by Congresswoman Tlaib as she argued for her “right” to go to Israel to argue against Israel’s existence. The man who started the BDS movement, Omar Barghouti has consistently argued for a one state solution, creating a situation where Israel would cease to exist. Consistent with the goals of the BDS movement, Barghouti refers to Israel as an Apartheid state. “Apartheid” means segregated based on race. As such he has argued for Israel to be classified as such by the United Nations.

Curiously, around 70% of the American Jews vote with the Democratic Party, which means they are voting for their own destruction. This is a behaviour not unlike the Jews of old, who departed from the worship of the true God, to follow idols which guaranteed their destruction. Their support of the anti-God positions of socialism, and their ignoring of the threats of anti-Semitism coming from their own party, is simply another step in guaranteeing their prophesied destruction at the hands of true socialists and anti-Semites led by Russia.

We know that the efforts of Miftah and similar anti-Israeli groups will fail. There is, after all, no practical or strategic reason why Israel came into existence, exists. It exists only because God placed it there, in harmony with His prophesies. It will continue to exist as a nation until the European Confederacy, led by Russia descends victoriously upon the mountains of Israel.

These actions by Americans political leaders, and specifically the Jewish Americans explain why God will bring the terrible judgements that are coming upon Tarshish first, and Israel second; in the near future.

## Hints for Bible Markers

### The Psalms

#### Psalm 10: 4

*“The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God: God is not in all his thoughts.”*

The wicked, through pride in his own abilities will not seek God. They strive for what they deem to be important. Time has not changed things, therefore what Job declares is applicable to our day. “Wherefore do the wicked live, become old, yea, are mighty in power? Their seed is established in their sight with them, and their offspring before their eyes. Their houses are safe from fear, neither is the rod of God upon them....They send forth their little ones like a flock, and their children dance. They take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ. They spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to the grave.” (Job 21: 7-9, 11-13). Both rich and poor are far away from God. The world is a wilderness full of thorns seeking to choke the life out of the righteous. It will not always be so, but for now this is the desolate state of society which prevails.

The Archbishop of York, Temple William, the second most powerful bishop of the Church of England, wrote many books, one titled *Plato and Christianity*. It stemmed from three lectures he had given. In 1931 while addressing the undergraduates of Oxford University he advised them to forget God during the greater part of the day or they would be unable to do the work they had to do in life. Here is a man the world holds in high esteem. How can anyone seeking to please our Heavenly Father, seeking to get knowledge and understanding of the way of life, choose to find information in books written, now and historically, by peoples professing Christianity. As amply shown by our brother Thomas, a Christian’s basis of understanding is flawed and as declared in the Scriptures he *“will not seek after God: God is not in all his thoughts.”* A Christian tries to teach the way of the Lord after putting “the stumblingblock of his **iniquity** before his face.” (Ezekiel 14:3).

Therein lies the key of a righteous man, the Lord our God is always in his thoughts. Though it appears we are cut off from our Heavenly Father, appearances can be deceiving. If we look to the Scriptures we can find many examples, both historically and presently, that God's Word is true and Yahweh is still actively controlling events to realize His plan. These providentially provided signs are one of the many ways provided for us to keep the Deity in our thoughts. Constant earnest prayer is another of the ways afforded us in this day of wickedness.

Continued next month should the Lord will

bro. Beryl Snyder