

THE
ATONEMENT
THE
DECLARATION
OF GOD'S
RIGHTEOUSNESS

To “condemn sin in the flesh” (Rom 8 : 3)...
Some would explain it as meaning the moral
condemnation of sin by Christ *during his life*.
This cannot be the meaning

Robert Roberts

PREFACE

The Divine scheme of reconciliation, or in other words our salvation in Christ, is dependent in the first instance, on a correct understanding of the means God has set out in His Word for us. This is evident on the declaration of the Apostle John who exhorts us to

“ believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.

Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God:”

1. John. 4: 2.

We are exhorted to be as vigilant today as in the first century. Brother Thomas in teaching the truth on the things concerning the Name of Jesus Christ wrote extensively on the subject. Brother Roberts valiantly contended to preserve the truth of these doctrines as demonstrated in ‘The Slain Lamb’ (1873), ‘The Blood Of Christ’ (1895) and ‘The Law of Moses’ (1898).

We have produced this short compilation of some of their writings, emphasizing certain doctrinal principles. Our hope and prayer to God is that it does justice to the authors original intentions and gives encouragement to brethren and sisters to stand fast in the Faith.

M. A. Pilbeam.

THE STATEMENT OF FAITH

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

IX.-That it was this mission that necessitated the miraculous begetting of Christ of a human mother, enabling him to bear our condemnation, and, at the same time, to be a sinless bearer thereof, and, therefore, one who could rise after suffering the death required by the righteousness of God.

X.-That being so begotten of God, and inhabited and used by God through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, Jesus was Emanuel, God with us, God manifest in the flesh – yet was, during his natural life, of like nature with mortal man, being made of a woman, of the house and lineage of David, and therefore a sufferer, in the days of his flesh, from all the effects that came by Adam's transgression, including the death that passed upon all men, which he shared by partaking of their physical nature

XI.-That the message he delivered from God to his kinsmen the Jews, was a call to repentance from every evil work, the assertion of his divine sonship and Jewish kingship; and the proclamation of the glad tidings that God would restore their kingdom through him, and accomplish all things written in the prophets

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

COATS OF SKINS INSTEAD OF FIG LEAVES

Elpis Israel, Page 161 (14th Edition).

Adam and Eve....had no idea of *religion*; for hitherto they had needed none. It yet remained to be revealed as *the divinely appointed means of healing the breach which sin had made between God and men.*

Man having been made subject to evil, and consigned to the bondage of a perishing state, the Lord God repudiated their fig-leaf invention, and “*appointed coats of skins*” for their covering. In this testimony there is much expressed in few words. To appoint coats of skins implies a command for the sacrifice of animals whose skins were converted to this purpose. It also implies that Adam was the priest on the occasion, who presented himself before the Lord with the mediatorial blood. When the sacrifice was accepted, the offence was *provisionally* remitted; for the scripture saith,

that it is not possible for the blood of animals to take away sins.

Heb 10 : 4.

It was impossible, because if the death of a transgressor would have sufficed, then, Adam and Eve might have been put to death at once, and raised to life again. But this was not according to the divine wisdom.

The great principle to be compassed was –

the condemnation of sin in sinful flesh, innocent of actual transgression.

Sin was to be condemned in sinful flesh.

This required the death of a man;

for the animals had not sinned: so that, if the whole animal world, save man, had been made an offering for sin, *sin would still have been uncondemned in his nature.*

Besides the necessity of a human sacrifice,
God deemed it equally necessary that the victim should be **free from personal transgressions**; and that when he had suffered,

he should rise from the dead

so as to be “*a living sacrifice*”.

This principle necessitated the manifestation of one, who should be born of a woman, but not of the *will* of man. Such a one would be the Seed of the Woman, made of her substance, with Him for his Father who by His overshadowing spirit should cause her to conceive.

He would be Son of God by origination; and Son of Mary by descent,
or

birth of sinful flesh.

Now, it is not to be supposed that Adam and Eve did not understand this: God doubtless explained it to them; for they had none to teach them but Him ; and without His instruction, they would not have known what they should believe. It was from them that Abel derived the knowledge which was the foundation of his faith, to which God testified in the acceptance of the firstling of his flock and the fat thereof.

Adam and his wife had faith, or God would not have accepted the sacrifices with whose skins they were clothed; for it was as true then as it is now, that

“without faith it is impossible to please God”.

Faith, then, in the Seed of the Woman, first as a sacrifice for sin, wounded to death by his enemies ; and afterwards the destroyer of the sin-power; in connection with the sacrifice of animals as representative of the bruising of his heel – was the ground of their acceptance with the Lord God. It was

the Way of life.

John Thomas.

The Sacrificial Blood.

The Law Of Moses Pages 170-179 (4th Edition 1939).

In the Mosaic service ...the sacrificial blood was applied to everything ... Aaron and his sons included (see Lev. 8: 14-15 ; 23-24). An atonement had to be made by the shedding and the sprinkling of blood for and upon them all (Lev. 16: 33). As Paul remarks, “almost all things by the law are purged with blood” (Heb. 9: 22). Now all these things were declared to be

“patterns of things in the heavens ”

which it is admitted on all hands converge upon and

have their substance in Christ.

There must, therefore, be a sense in which Christ (the antitypical Aaron, the antitypical altar, the antitypical mercy-seat, the antitypical everything), must not only have been sanctified by the action of the antitypical oil of the Holy Spirit,

but purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice.

This conclusion is supposed to be weakened by the statement of Lev. 16:16, that the atonement for the holy place, altar, etc., was to be made “because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins”. That is, it is argued from this, that the holy things would have had no uncleanness in themselves apart from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. This must be granted, but it must also be recognised that because the children of Israel were sinful and polluted, the holy things were reckoned as having contracted defilement in having been fabricated by them and through remaining in their midst. This cannot be denied on a full survey of the testimony. They were ceremonially unclean, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and had to be cleansed by the holy oil and the sacrificial blood before they were acceptable in the Mosaic service.

Now, this is part of the Mosaic figure. There must be an antitype to it. What was it ? The holy things, we know, in brief, are

Christ. He must, therefore, have been the subject of a personal cleansing in the process by which he opened the way of sanctification for his people.

If the typical holy things contracted **defilement** from connection with a sinful congregation, were not the antitypical (Christ) holy things **in a similar state, through derivation on his mother's side from a sinful race** ? If not, how came they to need purging with his own “better sacrifice” ? (Heb. 9: 23).

Great difficulty is experienced by various classes of thinkers in receiving this view. Needless so, it should seem. There is first the express declaration that the matter stands so; “it was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these (Mosaic sacrifices) ; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these” (Heb. 9 : 23). “It was of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer” (8 : 3). “By reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins” (5: 3). **“By his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption”** (*for us*, is an addition inconsistent with the middle voice of the verb employed, which imports a thing done by one to one's own self) (9 : 12).

There was next the necessity that it should be so. The word “necessity”, it will be perceived, occurs frequently in the course of Paul's argument. The necessity arises from the position in which men stood as regards the law of sin and death, and the position which the Lord stood as their redeemer from this position.

The position of men

The position of men was that they were **under condemnation to die because of sin, and that not their own sin, in the first instance**, but ancestral sin at the beginning. The forgiveness of personal offences is the prominent feature of the apostolic proclamation, because personal offences are the greater barrier. Nevertheless, **men are mortal because of sin, quite independently of their own transgressions.** Their redemption from this position is a work of mercy and forgiveness,

(*Children are born sinners or unclean, because they are born of the flesh; and “that which is born of the flesh is flesh” or sin. This is a misfortune not a crime [page 129] This sinful nature we inherit. It is our misfortune not our crime. [page 77] John Thomas, Elpis Israel 14th Edition.)*

yet a work to be effected in harmony with the righteousness of God, that He might be just while justifying those believing in the Redeemer. It is so declared (Rom. 3: 26).

It was not to be done by setting aside the law of sin and death, but by righteously nullifying it in one who should obtain this redemption in his own right, and who should be authorised to offer to other men a partnership in his right, subject to required conditions (of their conformity to which, he should be appointed sole judge).

How to effect this blending and poising of apparently opposing principles and differing requirements – mercy and justice; forgiveness and righteousness; goodness and severity – would have been impossible for human wisdom. It has not been impossible with God, to whom all things are possible. We see the perfect adjustment of all the apparently incompatible elements of the problem in His work in Christ, “who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption” (1 Cor. 1 : 30).

We have only to receive the simple facts testified in the case to reach, the end of all difficulty. With immortal soulism and eternal torments, the solution is impossible. With the doctrine of human mortality, it is otherwise.

We see Jesus born of a woman, and therefore a partaker of the identical nature condemned to death in Eden.

We see him a member of imperfect human society, subject to toil and weakness, dishonour and sorrow, poverty and hatred, and all the other evils that have resulted from the advent of sin upon the earth. We see him *down in the evil* which he was sent to cure : not outside of it, not untouched by it, but in it, to put it away.

**He was saved from death (Heb. 5: 7), but not until he died.
He obtained redemption (Heb. 9: 12), but not until his own blood
was shed.**

That statement that he did these things “for us” has blinded many to the fact that he did them “for himself ” first-without which, he could not have done them for us, for it was by doing them for himself that he did them for us. He did them for us only as we may become part of him, in merging our individualities in him by taking part in his death, and putting on his name and sharing his life afterwards. He is, as it were, a new centre of healthy life, in which we must become incorporate before we can be saved.

The antitype of the cleansing of the holy things with blood is manifest when we look at Christ as he now is, and contrast him with what he was. He was a mortal man: he is now immortal. He was a sorrowful man; he is now “full of joy with thy (the Father's) countenance”. He was an Adamic body of death, corruptible and unclean: he is now a spiritual body, incorruptible, pure, and holy. What lies between the one state and the other ? His own death and resurrection. Therefore, by these, he has been purified, and *no one else* has been so purified as yet. Any one else delivered will be delivered by him, as the result of what he did in himself.

If there was one injunction of the law more strenuous than another, it was that contact with death in any form, however remote or indirect, was defiling. Even to touch a bone made a man unclean or to be touched by a man unclean from such a cause had the same effect. We have the perfect antitype in the Lord born of a death-bound woman, and therefore made subject to death: it was “that he, by the grace of God, might taste death for every man” ; but he was the first to taste, in the process of redemption from it. He was a “body prepared” for the work : prepared as to its power to evolve sinlessness of character, but prepared also as to subjection to that death which it was designed to abolish (2 Tim. 1 : 10). In him were combined the antitypical “holy things” requiring atonement, “because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins.” The reverence for Christ commands respect which leads some men to

consider him immaculate in all senses and in no need to offer for himself, but it is not “according to knowledge”. It is not consistent with the **Divine objects** in God “sending forth his son in the likeness of sinful flesh”.

All these objects blend together, but they are separable.

One of them was to “**condemn sin in the flesh**”, as Paul says (Rom. 8:3).

The stumblings that have taken place over this expression are doubtless due to that other truth, that Christ did no sin, and in this sense was the “Lamb of God without spot”. But the stumblings do not get rid of the expression as affirming a truth.

Some would explain it as meaning the moral condemnation of sin by Christ *during his life*. This cannot be the meaning

in view of the statement with which it is conjoined that what was done was “what the law could not do”. The law condemned sin so thoroughly in the moral sense that it is called “the ministration of condemnation”. Then some have suggested that it means the flesh of the sacrificial animals. This is precluded by the intimation that Christ was sent “**in the likeness of sinful flesh**” for the accomplishment of the work in question -

THE CONDEMNATION OF SIN IN THE FLESH.

This is, in fact, the reliable clue to the meaning. That he was sent “in the likeness of sinful flesh” for the accomplishment of the work shows that it was a work to be done in him. Some try to get away from this conclusion (and this is the popular habit) by seizing on the word “likeness” and contending that this means not the same, but only like. This contention is precluded by the use of the same term as to his manhood: “he was made in the likeness of men”. He was really a man, in being in the likeness of men: and he was really sinful flesh, in being in “the likeness of sinful flesh”. Paul, in Heb. 2: 14-17, declares the likeness to have been in the sense of sameness: “Forasmuch as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, it became him likewise to take part

of the same”.

The statement remains in its undiminished force that “God sent his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for (as an offering for) sin condemned sin in the flesh”. It is, in fact, a complete and coherent statement of what was accomplished in the death of Christ, and a perfect explanation of the reason why he first came in the flesh, and of the reason why John the apostle insisted so strenuously on the maintenance of the doctrine that he had so come in the flesh. Possessing sinful flesh was no sin to him, who kept it under perfect control, and “did always those things that pleased the Father”. At the same time, **being the sinful flesh derived from the condemned transgressors of Eden, it admitted of sin being publicly condemned in him, without any collision with the claims of his personal righteousness, which were to be met by an immediate and glorious resurrection.**

There was a purpose in it, which is variously stated. These various statements conjointly admit us to what may be called

God's objects in the case

-apart from which, there can be no understanding of the matter. With those objects in view, it is not only intelligible but admirable. But those objects cannot be discerned or appreciated apart from *God Himself*. The subject begins there. That is why the subject remains dim, so long after other parts of the truth are understood. We cannot understand God, yet we can have some idea of the relation between Creator and created. We may know that the rights are all on the side of the Creator, and that the reasonable attitude of the created is that of absolute submission, and that any departure from this attitude is treason, and that death is just in the case of treason. We may also find it easy to recognise that though He is kind, and ready to forgive, He cannot grant forgiveness apart from such an *amende honourable* as will preserve intact the mutual relations of Creator and created. This, in simple language, is the explanation of the entrance of death by sin, and the granting of life by forgiveness for Christ's sake, after “setting him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood” (Rom. 3: 25). We are “justified by his blood” if we believe-(see Rom 5 : 9 ; Acts 13: 38-39).

There is no difference between the shedding of the blood of Christ, and the condemnation of sin in the flesh.

For this blood-shedding is what is otherwise expressed as “the pouring out of his soul unto death”.

AND WHAT IS DEATH BUT THE CONDEMNATION OF SIN ?

Christ did not sin, but he inherited the condemnation of sin in deriving his nature from a daughter of Adam, the condemned: and **he was considered as having the sins of his people laid upon him, in so far as the sins of his people were to be forgiven for the sake of what should be done in him.** “He shall bear the sin of many.” “God hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all.” “He was wounded for our transgressions.” “He was made sin for us, who knew no sin.” “Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.”

For this view of blood-shedding we are indebted to the explanation vouchsafed in the law, as to the requirement of blood in sacrifice. This explanation is as follows: “The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul” (Lev. 17 : 11). **The pouring out of the blood was therefore the pouring out of the life-therefore the infliction of death : and therefore an illustration of what was due to sin, and an acknowledgement on the part of the offerer that it was so.** But being the blood of an animal which had nothing do with sin, it was only a typical illustration or declaration of God’s righteousness in the case. It was not a condemnation of sin in its own flesh, but a mere shadow which God was pleased to establish in Israel's midst, in educational preparation for the actual condemnation which was to be carried out in His own Son, in whom “sent forth in the likeness of sinful flesh” for (or because of *) sin, He “condemned sin in the flesh”.

This sacrificial condemnation of sin in the eyes of all the world (for by record and report, all the world has seen Jesus on the cross), is otherwise said “to declare the righteousness of God for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance God” (Rom. 3: 25).

* (Third Edition 1924)

These terms are as lucid as profound. They constitute an inspired definition of the object in the case.

No view can be right that cannot be brought within the terms of that definition.

It is, in fact, the final easement of all difficulty where the mind is able to rise to the Divine point of view involved in the statement.

The crucifixion was a Divine declaration and enforcement of what is due to sin, and as it was God's righteous appointment that this should be due to sin, the infliction of it was a declaration of God's righteousness.

If we limit our view to the individual “man Christ Jesus,” and look at him in the light of what is due to individual character as between man and man according to the “justice” of common parlance, we may have a difficulty in seeing how the righteousness of God was declared in the scourging and death of a righteous man. But this is not looking at the subject in the light in which it is prophetically and apostolically exhibited. It is not looking at it in the character that belongs to it. Jesus did not come into the world as an individual, but as a representative, though an individual. In this sense, he came “not for himself”, but for others, though he was included in the coming. And it was to carry out Divine objects towards all. As he said, “I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me”. He speaks of the work which the Father had given him to do.

This work was to establish salvation by forgiveness, but forgiveness on conditions, and these conditions involved the declaration of the Father's righteousness in the public condemnation of sin in its own flesh in the person of a guiltless possessor of that flesh. Paul declares it was so, and controversy really ends with his words.

It only remains that we realise how completely the fact is in harmony with the statement. We cannot see this unless we recognise that Jesus

was a wearer of Adam's condemned nature, and the bearer of the sins of the people-not that Christ might be punished for others, but that God's righteousness might be declared for others to recognise, that they might be forgiven. The gospel provides an opportunity of close identification with what was done: "Buried with him by baptism into death" "Crucified with Christ". In this posture, they receive the remission of sins "through the forbearance of God" (Rom. 3: 25).

GOD'S FORBEARANCE

This is the other great fact of the case - God's forbearance, His kindness, His readiness to pardon *when His claims are conceded*. This excludes the popular view of vicarious suffering. If Christ paid our debts, there would be no forgiveness, but exaction, and thus would be blotted out the crowning glory of the apostolic proclamation. God is kind and will forgive, but God is great and will be exalted: and in the matter of life eternal, He has provided His own method both of exalting Himself and humbling us ; and in the presence of it, there is nothing left for us but to bow in reverence-before the crucified but resurrected son of His love.

We may appear to have wandered far away from the sacrificial blood sprinkled on the sanctuary and the altar, and the laver, and on Aaron "to make an atonement for them". Not really have we done so. The operation was a type of God's work in Christ, and it helps us to understand that work rightly, and especially in that one aspect of it which the doctrine of human immortality has made it so difficult for moderns to receive, viz., that **Christ himself was included in the sacrificial work which he did "for us"**. "For himself that it might be for us", for how otherwise could we have obtained redemption if it had not first come into his possession, for us to become joint heirs of ?

The necessity for Christ coming personally into the operation first, comes out very clearly - perhaps more clearly than anywhere - in the study of Paul's statement concerning Israel :

"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law".

The method of this work is before us without any fog. First Paul says he was *made under the law* to redeem them that were under the law

(Gal. 4 : 4). He was *himself born under the law*, that he might work the work that was to be done for others in that position. Not only so, but in bearing the curse of the law away, it had to *act on himself*. This will be seen if we ask how he took the law away ; he did it by bearing it: “Being made a curse for us”. How ? Instead of us ? No: by himself coming under it. This is Paul’s teaching. “As it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” It might seem in Moses that the clause about the cursedness of hanging on a tree means mere human infamy: but we must suspend our impressions in the presence of the Spirit of God in Paul. Mere human infamy is not the curse that Christ has redeemed us from, but the curse of God, as evident from his statement in the immediate context : “As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse, for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them” (Gal. 3: 10).

Christ was cursed by the law in the mode of his death.

He could not be cursed in any other way, for he was not a transgressor of the law. But in this way, he was cursed. And it is probable that this clause was inserted in the law for this very purpose-that Christ might innocently die under the curse of the law, and so take it away : for the law can do nothing more than kill. When he died he was no longer under the law, which was made for mortal men, and had dominion over a man only as long as he lived (Rom. 7 : 1). **When he rose, he was free from the curse of the law - redeemed by his death.** It is by union with him as a resurrected free man that we obtain this redemption wrought in him. This is what Paul says: “Ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead”. He was born under the law and redeemed from the law, that we might be redeemed by sharing his redemption. This view of the matter enables us to understand Paul’s allusion to what the death of Christ accomplished in relation to the law : that he “abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of the commandments contained in ordinances” (Eph. 2 : 15) ; “blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross” (Col. 2 : 14). But the result was achieved *in himself*.

This is the whole principle : redemption achieved in Christ for us to have, on condition of faith and obedience. It is not only that Israel are saved from the law of Moses on this principle, but it is the principle upon which we are saved from the law of sin and death, whose operation we inherit in deriving our nature from Adam.

Christ partook of this nature to deliver it from death, as Paul teaches in Heb. 2: 14, and other places: “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil”.

Understanding by the devil, the hereditary death-power that has reigned among men by Adam through sin, we may understand how Christ, who took part in the death-inheriting nature, destroyed the power of death by dying and rising. We then understand how “He put away sin by the sacrifice of himself”. We may also understand how “our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed” (Rom. 6: 6), and how he “died unto sin once”, but now liveth unto God, to die no more (verses 9-10).

All of which enables us to understand why the typical holy things were purified with sacrificial blood, and why the high priest, in his typical and official capacity had to be touched with blood as well as anointed with the holy oil before entering upon his work. When we say, as some in their reverence for Christ prefer to say, that the death of Christ was not for himself but only for us, they destroy all these typical analogies, and in truth, if their view could prevail, they would make it impossible that it could be for us at all: for it only operates “for us” when we unite ourselves with him in whom, as the firstborn, it had its first effect

Robert Roberts.

The Blood Of Christ

Page 15. Old Edition, page 12. 1998 Edition.

Sin condemned in its own flesh

He was born that he might die, as the first necessity in the case; for thus was the righteousness of God to be declared, and **sin condemned in its own flesh** as the foundation of all the goodness to come afterwards.

It may be asked,

could not such a result have been achieved by the sacrificial immolation of any sinner?

So far as the mere condemnation of sin was concerned, no doubt the lesson could have been thus enforced;

but as in all the works of God, there were more objects than one.

Not only had sin to be condemned, but resurrection had to come in harmony with the law that made death the wages of sin; and this resurrection was not merely to be a restoration of life, but the providing of an Administrator of the glorious results to be achieved-the raising up of one who should be a mediator between God and man, the dispenser of the forgiveness and the salvation of God through him and the judge also of who should be fit to receive these great gifts.

All these aims required that the sacrificial victim should be a perfectly righteous man as well as the possessor of the nature to be sacrificially condemned- who should do no sin himself, while “made sin” and treated as sin for us; who should be just and holy, obedient in all things

while yet “numbered with the transgressors, and making his grave with the wicked”.

Robert Roberts

The Christadelphian 1894

Page 232.

Sin conquered morally by obedience

It is a first principle of the truth that Jesus, at his first appearing among men, was of the identical flesh of all men –the flesh derived from the condemned transgressors in Eden. His mission required that it should be so,

both

That he should conquer sin morally by obedience

...

and that he might nullify its hereditary condemnation

by offering it up in sacrifice

on cavalry as required.

Those who teach otherwise unwittingly make void the sacrifice of Christ.

They intend to honour Christ perhaps: but it is only as Peter honoured him saying, “Lord, this shall not be unto thee,” which evoked the Lord’s prompt rebuke: “Get thee behind me, satan.”

Robert Roberts

Note:-

Bro Roberts speaks of *conquering* sin morally and the *condemnation* of sin in the flesh through death as *two* distinct aspects of what was accomplished in Christ.

The Christadelphian 1873

Page 364.

God sent His own Son in the likeness of sin's flesh,

which he declares was the same as ours. Compare Rom. 8 : 3, with Heb. 2 : 14-17. And he says, too, in Heb. 7 : 27. "He offered for his own sins and the people's, when he once offered up himself" But what is to be understood by his "own sins?" The sins committed by others and borne in his own body on the cross, as testified in 1 Pet. 2 : 24, saying "who his own self bare our sins in his own body to the tree," upon which "he became a curse for us." In the Mosaic and Christian systems, the *unsinning victim* is regarded as the sinner, in the sense of being the *sin-bearer*

Personally, Jesus was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" if he had not been so, he would not have been fit for the *sin-bearer of the world*;

the purpose of God being –

the condemnation of sin in the nature that transgressed in Eden, in the person of one who had himself committed no sin.

John Thomas

The Christadelphian 1894

Page 67

Christ bearing sins on or to the tree (1 Pet. 2 : 24) is a figure of speech. Literally, sins are acts of disobedience and cannot be carried anywhere. But because the ground of their forgiveness was Christ's submission to the death of the cross, that death is figuratively considered as a bearing of them to or on that accursed instrument of torture and execution. In this obvious sense, we can understand God laying on him sins past present and future of all His people.

Robert Roberts

The Christadelphian 1873

Page 485.

The destruction of the devil

How does Jesus through his death destroy the devil ? ...

The devil Paul refers to in Hebrews, is “that having the power of death,” which we have seen is sin.

The question therefore, is

How does Jesus, through his own death, destroy sin?

Answer

By making his life-blood an offering for sin, which offering is perfected by his resurrection; as it is written “he was delivered for our offences and raised for our justification.”

John Thomas

Note:-

His offering was perfected by his resurrection.

RECOMMENDED FURTHER READING ON THIS SUBJECT :-

Elpis Israel (14th Edition) Pages	John Thomas 66 -110, 121-142, 161-167.
Eureka volume 1 Chapter One	John Thomas Section <i>I</i> : 3. All of Section <i>II</i> Section <i>V</i> : 7.
Chapter Two	Section <i>I</i> : 3. Section <i>II</i> : 4. Section <i>III</i> :4.
Catechesis	John Thomas
The Slain Lamb	Robert Roberts
The Blood Of Christ	Robert Roberts
The Evil One	Robert Roberts
The Law Of Moses (4th Edition) Pages	Robert Roberts 165-188, 236-268.
The Christadelphian 1873 Pages	314-331, 358-365, 385-409, 434-470.
1889 Pages	17-20.
1894 Pages	23-24, 232, 240-242, 343-357.
1899 Pages	175-176.
1913 Pages	259-261
Bible Teaching Concerning Sin And Sacrifice The Devil Of The Bible	Wm. Smallwood Bexleyheath Ecclesia