

FLESH, SIN AND SACRIFICE

-BIBLE TEACHING CONFIRMED

When we come to fix our attention on the Sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, all recognise that it is “a trustworthy saying, worthy of all acceptance” that “Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners” (*1Tim 1:15*). But the salvation of sinners is not accomplished in a moment; several stages are required. A sinner firstly becomes a hearer of the word preached, then a believer (*Rom 10:14-17*). The believer, having learned what the Lord would have him do, then acts upon those things, being baptised into the Name of Yahweh – that is, the Name shared by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And being obedient believers, their sins are forgiven them; righteousness becomes imputed to them, as they become the seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise (*Rom 4, Gal 3*).

But in their state of mortality, believers are *heirs* only, not yet having received the promises. They see that day afar off (*cp Heb 11:13*) through faith, the day when the judgments and precepts of the Almighty shall be known by all upon the earth, and when glory, honour and immortality shall be granted to those who find favour in His sight. This is the final phase of redemption, deliverance from the body of death (*Rom 7:24*), and the partaking of Divine Nature (*2Pet 1:4*). To become immortal, the body of our humiliation being transformed to become as the glorified, spirit-charged body of the Master (*Phil 3:21*). So it is that in the Divine Scheme of redemption, there are essentially two states of blessedness for obedient believers; the forgiveness of sins now; and the transformation of their mortal frame into glorious immortality in the future.

PRINCIPLES OF ATONEMENT

Whilst the fact that sins might be remitted in Christ is readily accepted amongst us, the issue frequently surfaces, as to how the principles of Atonement are brought to bear upon the mortal flesh of humankind. Clearly it does have a bearing, for the Hope of the faithful, made possible by that sacrifice involves a physical change to become immortal. But upon what basis? The question is sometimes raised as to whether or not the ‘flesh and blood’ of which the children are all partakers, itself requires a cleansing by sacrifice - and particularly whether or not if so, if the Master who “also himself likewise took part in the same flesh and blood, also had a personal need of cleansing, despite being without transgression. There are many doctrinal threads bound together in the Sacrifice of Christ, but as this issue appears to be surfacing once again in some quarters, it appears appropriate to examine this particular thread more particularly, and this we shall endeavour to do.

By utilising the Mosaic “schoolmaster” (*Gal 3:25*), the Spirit brings us to the principles of the Atoning work of our High Priest thus:

“such a high priest became us . . . who needeth not daily (lit. “day after day”), 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 7:26,27*).

Here then, is a clear precedent established in the shadowy ordinance of the Law (*Heb 10:1*), a pattern of “good things to come” in Christ Jesus. A matter of principle is estab-

lished, whereby in order to atone for others, a High Priest was required to offer for himself first (*see Lev 16:6,11*). But the Law being but a shadow, and “not the very image of those things”, there was a difference. Unlike the priests who served after the order of Levi, our High Priest required not to offer day after day - but once only. And in Him, there was no need for two separate offerings, for he achieved both results in his *one* offering. As Bro Roberts expressed it:

“... Christ did ‘once’ in his death what the high priests under the law did daily, viz, offered “first for his own sins and then for the people’s” ... *he offered first for himself; he was the first delivered* ... But his offering for himself was also the offering for his people. The two aspects of the double typical offering were combined in one act. He had not twice to offer for himself ...” (*The Christadelphian 1875, p 139*)

And again:

“Paul’s statement (*Heb 7:27*) is that Jesus did ONCE what the typical high priest did daily. What was that? ‘Offered first for his own sins and then for the people’s’. *It follows that there must be a sense in which Jesus offered for himself also, a sense which is apparent when it is recognized that he was under adamic condemnation, inhering in his flesh* (*The Christadelphian, 1873, p 405*).

FOR HIMSELF – THAT IT MIGHT BE FOR US

The High Priest’s entry into the Holy of Holies on that day was to make atonement for the people (*Lev 16:30*), that by his appearance in the Divine presence as their representative (*Cp Heb 9:24*), they might be reconciled to Yahweh. But the priest was one of those people himself – he was part of the congregation, and in order to accomplish anything for them, he had to be sanctified first. There was then, a personal need to be met; the Priest himself, as a sinner, required forgiveness before he could atone for others – for how could a guilty man bring reconciliation between Yahweh and his people? Accordingly the Law, whilst being a shadow of greater things, also met the circumstantial requirements of the people who lived under it.

But the Levitical priest required personal sacrifice because he was himself a sinner in need of forgiveness – what then of our High Priest? He “knew no sin” (*2Cor 5:21*), rather yielding total obedience to the righteous requirements of his Father – why should there be a need for him to offer “first for himself”? The plain answer of Scripture is that the Master inherited the “flesh and blood” of mankind which is under condemnation because of sin, and he required deliverance from such. How could he deliver others without delivering himself first? The facts testify to the case, he is immortal; we are not. He saved himself as the Firstfruits, and will yet save his brethren out of the grave at his coming. He required to be sanctified first, in order that he could sanctify others; even as he himself testified: **“for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the Truth”** (*Jno 17:19*).

Though he were without transgression, the Master possessed as a “law” of his being, the root cause of sin; styled by the Apostle “sin in the flesh”, or “the diabolos” (*Rom 8:3, Heb 2:14*). And to fulfil the Father’s purpose as we shall see, it was necessary for him to over-

come the carnal lusts of the flesh by bringing them to the grave in victory, that he might therefore be raised, no longer subject to the wiles of the flesh (*cp Rom 6:10, 1Pet 4:1*).

The Testimony of the Spirit, is that in order for him appear in the Presence of Deity as the antitypical Aaron, the shedding of his own blood was firstly required, and his own redemption secured:

“Christ, being come and high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building, neither by the blood of goats and calves, but *by his own blood* he entered in once into the Holy Place, **having obtained eternal redemption**” (*Heb 9:12 note: ‘for us’ is not in the Greek here, and is therefore omitted in some translations*).

Bro Roberts explained the matter thus:

“The priests, in their official capacity were types of the great high priest between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; and *there must therefore be a counterpart, in his case, to their official offering for themselves*. This is not difficult to find in the view of the fact that the Lord partook of our unclean and condemned nature, which had as much to be redeemed in his case by death and resurrection, as in the case of his brethren, for whom he died” (*The Christadelphian, 1875*).

The Master then, though blameless in every respect, in partaking of the same “flesh and blood” of those he came to save, partook of the condition of that nature, and the condemnation, which fell upon it. He, as the “firstborn” required redemption himself, in order that he could redeem others. This is a vital aspect of things which we ought never lose sight of; that the Master himself had a deep involvement in his own offering, aside from the fact that it was he who was sacrificed. In order to fulfil the Father’s purpose in redeeming sinners, he redeemed himself first; only then could he be a Saviour to redeem others from their sin-stricken nature.

A WRONG UNDERSTANDING SET FORTH

There are those who deny this aspect of the Atonement, claiming that Sacrifice is required for transgressions only, and that therefore Christ had no personal requirement for such. Accordingly, in the editorial for *The Christadelphian* of December 1993, we read the following:

“If his baptism had shown that he bore some kind of personal responsibility for his nature, then we would expect to find his sacrifice also having a bearing upon the same issue. But as he bore no moral accountability for his mortality, **he did not have to make an offering for the nature he received at birth. He had to condemn sin** and prove that he was master over his nature as no-one before or since has been. **He did this by being obedient to his Father throughout his life**, and declared that sin could not control him by remaining obedient even unto death”.

Again, an editor of *The New Bible Student* for March/April 1995 claims, in discussion of

Heb 9:12:

“None of this, however means that he personally needed a blood sacrifice”

And again, in connection with Hebrews Chapter 13, verses 20-21:

“Whatever the true meaning of the passage *it does not teach that the Lord needed to be cleansed physically by his own blood to rise from the dead*” (p 190).

The same writer goes on to say:

“Clearly *there are those who believe that the Lord’s shed blood was necessary for our nature (and his) as well as for our actual sins.* They have a conviction that this was the teaching of our pioneer brethren. We have argued throughout this series that *this view is a misconception ...*”.

A DOCTRINAL SHIFT

In these words, we detect a distinct shift in thinking from that of earlier Christadelphians, and from the plain teaching of Scripture, considered above. The Master “did not have to make an offering” for his nature, as he bore no moral accountability for it, so it is claimed. He did not “personally need a blood sacrifice”. To suggest that the Pioneers believed this is “a misconception.” But if this be true, what then do the following words of Bro Roberts signify?

“So he died for us; *but did he not die for himself also?* How otherwise could he have been made free from that sin which God laid upon him in sending him forth in the likeness of sinful flesh? Paul says that ‘he that is dead is freed from sin,’ and that ‘in that Christ died, he died unto sin once,’ being raised from the dead, death hath no more dominion over him (Rom 6:7,9,10). *Is it not clear from this that the death of Christ was necessary to purify his own nature from the sin-power of death that was hereditarily in him in the days of his flesh?*” (The Christadelphian, 1873, p 465-466).

And again, in speaking of the principles of the Law:

“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, it had its first effect.*” (The Law of Moses, p 178,179).

The Pioneers were wholly consistent with what they taught concerning this vital subject. Not only did they demonstrate how the Master’s own redemption laid the foundation for the salvation of others, but Bro Roberts specifically repudiated the wrong doctrine with which we are being presented today.

Although the words we cited to illustrate this error were penned by editors of UK based magazines, the theory has mostly emanated from certain individuals, and ecclesias in Australia. Initially it was designated as the “*Saved By His Life*” theory after a book produced by a prominent brother of that title, which appears to be the standard text for many who adopt this position. Now however, following the distribution of a certain booklet in refutation of the theory, it has become more commonly referred to as “*The Theory of Partial Atonement*”, so called because the basis of the concept is that only transgressions, not the “law of sin” which causes those transgressions, requires sacrificial cleansing—thus there is a *partial*, not full atonement (this labelling is somewhat inaccurate however, in that either the Sacrifice of Christ is efficacious or not. There is no such thing as being *partially* atoned for; the error we are encountering denies vital aspects of the Atonement, and therefore renders the whole ineffective, not simply one aspect).

THE LAW OF SIN AND DEATH

A fundamental flaw of this theory, is that it does not take into account the fact that death is the Divine condemnation of Sin. Following the transgression in Eden, the pronouncement came: “in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return” (*Gen 3:19*). This is a simple truth, and simply expressed. As the Apostle describes, “the wages of sin is death” (*Rom 6:23*). Death is Divine method of dealing with sin. It represents a condemnation of the evil performed, of the One performing that evil, and it is the means whereby the sinner might be removed from the Creator’s sight, being caused to exist no more.

Once Adam and Eve became dying sinners, their seed, being derived from of the physical substance of their bodies, were born dying sinners also. As the Apostle again declared: “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned” (*Rom 5:12*). Death passed “upon” (or “into” as the Greek signifies) all men, proving it to be a physical, *hereditary* condition derived in the first instance from Adam, and passed down through the ages to all who proceeded from his bowels—a condition of death, commonly described as ‘mortality’.

But why is this? Why is it that the descendants of Adam inherit death through his sin? The simple answer of Scripture, is that all his descendents also share the innate disposition of the flesh to do evil, styled by the Apostle “the law of sin”, or “sin that dwelleth in me” (*Rom 7:17*), the *diabolos*, which is condemned to destruction (*Heb 2:14*). Not only is it the case that through physical descent from Adam “all die” (*1Cor 15:22*), but also from him they possess a ‘law’ of their being which drives them to disobedience: “by the offence of one, judgement came upon all men to condemnation . . . by one man’s disobedience *many were made sinners . . .*” (*Rom 5:19*). That is, because of Adam’s transgression, all men are born into a constitution, or order of things dominated by sin and it’s effects, and they themselves, with Paul have Sin “dwelling” within them, as a “law” of their being, compelling them to transgress.

These two principles are collectively described as “the law of **sin** and **death**” (*Rom 8:2*), Sin coming first, as the root of the mischief. “The law of sin”, was something acquired by man through his own volition in Eden as witnessed by the Mosaic record, and death is

the Divine condemnation, which falls upon man's sinful flesh. The very flesh of all mankind is condemned to the grave because of sin: "by the offence of one judgement came upon all men to condemnation" (*Rom 5:18*).

The interrelation of the two elements of "the law of sin and death" are described many times in Scripture, for they stand related as cause and effect; "the law of **sin**" induces us to transgress, rendering us worthy of **death**:

"When we were in the flesh, *the motions of sins*, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit *unto death*" (*Rom 7:5*)

"*Sin*, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it *slew me*" (*Rom 7:11*)

"*Sin, that is might appear Sin, working death in me* by that which was good" (*Rom 7:13*)

"Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of *sin unto death*, or of obedience unto righteousness?" (*Rom 6:16*).

Sin then, is plainly that which has the power of death, with brings its' possessors into the grave. It is therefore the *diabolos*, spoken of by Paul as warranting destruction by the offering up of Christ, who shared the "flesh and blood" of his brethren: "forasmuch then 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 (*diabolos*)" (*Heb 2:14*). Even when no personal transgressions are committed, as in the Master's case, even then the *diabolos*, or "law of sin" is still condemned to destruction through death; indeed it is the possession of this which makes the flesh of man to stand condemned in the eyes of it's Creator.

This is a fact not recognised by proponents of the "Saved by his Life" theory. Being unable to recognise the word 'Sin' in anything but a moral failing which requires forgiveness, they cannot accept how that Sin exists as an inherent 'law' within the "flesh", styled apostolically, "sin in the flesh" (*Rom 8:3*). They find it needful to employ terms as "sin-prone nature" and "nature prone to sin" to describe the condition of the flesh. But this misses the point – "the flesh" is not merely prone to committing acts of transgression, it has "sin in" it, as a "law," which carries with it the condemnation of death. As Bro Thomas expressed it, it is Sin that makes the flesh mortal:

"'Sinful flesh,' or flesh full of sin, **a physical quality or principle which makes the flesh mortal**; and called 'sin' because this property of flesh became it's law as the consequence of transgression" (*The Christadelphian, 1873*).

FURTHER DENIAL OF SCRIPTURE

The central aspect of the theory we are being presented with, whatever name we wish to

use for it, essentially denies this point, that the “flesh” of mankind has a “law of sin” residing within it, which, even in the Master’s case, required to be condemned by a sacrificial death, in order that a resurrection to Immortal life might be obtained. It states that human nature itself does not require sacrifice, or atonement, only transgressions. And as the Master committed no sin, thus it is deduced, he therefore had no personal requirement for Sacrifice. Accordingly, in the book *Saved by his Life*, we read:

“The Lord Jesus Christ ***did not have to sacrifice for his sin-prone nature.*** But he could not have made the sacrifice with out it. You see, ***you cannot sacrifice for human nature because to sacrifice for anything is to try and save it.*** You cannot save this ‘body of sin’. It is unredeemable. You can only do one thing with it, and that is to destroy it” (see p 66-77).

“To say that he needed to sacrifice for his sin-prone nature is to confuse the *moral* with the *physical*” (p 25)

“Jesus did not benefit because he sacrificed *for* his body of sin—he did not make atonement *for* his sin-prone nature. Jesus benefited because he was *obedient* to his Father’s will, as plainly stated by the apostle . . .” (p 25).

A further expression of this same teaching is found in a statement recently published jointly by the Enfield and Cumberland ecclesias:

“we need forgiveness for the sins we commit: this was the primary purpose for which Christ died. “Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures” (1Cor 15:3). ***Our flesh and blood nature, however, does not need “justification,” “reconciliation to God,” to be “atoned for,” or “sacrificed for.”*** Our relationship to God is moral: sin, not our flesh and blood nature, alienates” (Clause 7)

And again in the same statement:

“Jesus represented those he came to save. He was not a substitute, for he was himself redeemed from mortality as a result of the offering he made on behalf of others. ***His flesh and blood nature did not need to be atoned for, or a sacrifice made for IT,*** it was required to be sacrificed, for in it resided the lusts that lead to sin” (Clause 5).

The notion is here presented in clear terms. Our “flesh and blood nature . . . does not need . . . to be atoned for”. The Lord’s own “flesh and blood nature did not need to be atoned for, or a sacrifice made for it”, even though it was required to be sacrificed for us. The whole issue pivots around whether or not human nature itself is in need of sacrifice, or more accurately, whether or not “the law of sin” residing in it requires to be condemned by death. Modern theorists say not. And in this, they make a significant departure from the Truth as understood by Christadelphians since the days of their inception, and more significantly from Bible Truth.

Consider the following words of Bro Roberts:

“Paul says that as it was necessary that these pattern-things in the Mosaic system should be purged with blood, so it was necessary that the things signified should be purged; but with a better sacrifice, that is the sacrifice of Christ (Heb 9:23). The Christ of your (*Turney’s*) theory needed no ‘purging;’ therefore does it not follow that *he is not the Christ of Paul*, who required purging from the law of sin and death, by his own sacrifice?” (*The Christadelphian 1873, p 468*).

The doctrine which states that the Master’s “own “flesh and blood nature did not need to be atoned for, or a sacrifice made for it”, presents a Christ, so Bro Robert Roberts correctly deduced, which is not the Christ of Paul, whose own ‘purging’ was the means by which he could be a High Priest to save others.

THE CONDEMNATION OF SIN IN THE FLESH

Death is the Divine condemnation and judgement upon sin. It passed into all of Adam’s progeny, ensuring that the Sin within their members could not exist perpetually, for in the death-state the entire being becomes extinct, including the evil desires of the heart, and all the natural laws governing it’s life. In death, the “motions of sins” within the flesh cannot be experienced, for they cease to exist at the last breath. As it is written, “he that is dead is freed from Sin” (*Rom 6:7*). Death then, is the condemnation and destruction of that styled “sin in the flesh”, or *‘diabolos’*. That is why babies sometimes die, even tragically within the womb, when they can have done neither good nor evil (*Rom 9:11*). Though they have done no sin, and therefore are not personally accountable for evil performed, nevertheless, they blamelessly bear “the law of sin and death” within the very fabric of their being - sin, or *the diabolos*, which carries with it the condemnation of death.

When we turn to consider the way of redemption in Christ then, we find that an essential principle to be involved, was the condemnation of Sin (*Rom 8:3*) in death, in order that the Father be shown to be Righteous (*Rom 3:25*) in requiring it’s destruction (*Heb 2:14*). Death is the condemnation of sin—and forgiveness is not effected by the setting aside of that principle, but by submission to, and the endorsement of the righteousness of it. And this is what we find in the Sacrifice of Christ, as Bro Roberts showed:

“The crucifixion of Christ as a ‘declaration of the righteousness of God’ and a ‘condemnation of sin in the flesh’, exhibited to the world the righteous treatment of sin. It was as though it was proclaimed to all the world, when the body was nailed to the cross: “this is how condemned human nature should be treated according to the righteousness of God; it is fit only for destruction . . . such a declaration of the righteousness of God could only be made in the very nature concerned; a body under the dominion of death because of sin. It would not have been a declaration of the righteousness of God to have crucified an angel or a new man made fresh from the ground” (*R Roberts, The Blood of Christ*).

Forgiveness then, is extended by the Father’s mercy to those who identify themselves with that declaration made in the Son’s crucifixion. Bro Roberts summarised the situation very succinctly thus, in speaking of how Christ destroyed the hold which sin had

over all mankind:

“He did not destroy the hold it had obtained on sinners in general; for the vast mass of them continue under it’s bondage from generation to generation, and will be held by it in eternal bonds, and the (comparative) few whom Christ will save are yet unreleased. He was sent to be a beginning or release for all who should incorporate themselves with him. ***The release began with himself.*** He destroyed that hold which the devil had obtained in himself through extraction from Adam, and through submission to the curse of the law in the mode of his death. He was of the same nature as ourselves as regards flesh and blood; and therefore death-stricken, for that is the quality of flesh and blood . . .

The Testimony is that he destroyed the devil *through death*. Sin can do no more when a man is dead. Therefore, in dying on the cross, Christ yielded to the devil all he could take; and God then raised him for his righteousness sake, so that in Christ, the devil was destroyed in the only way possible in harmony with God’s appointments. He was not destroyed out of Christ. He was destroyed *in him*. We have to get into Christ to get the benefit. In him, we obtain the deliverance accomplished *in him*. . . .

Death is a physical law in our members, implanted there through sin ages ago, and handed down from generation to generation. Consequently, partaking our physical nature, he partook of this, and his own deliverance (as “Christ the firstfruits”) was as necessary as that of his brethren. ***In fact, if Christ had not first been saved from death (Heb 5:7) - if he had not first obtained eternal redemption (Heb 9:12) - there would have been no hope for us, for we attain salvation only through what he has accomplished in himself,*** of which we become heirs by union with him. He overcomes, and we share his victory by uniting with him, if he at the judgement seat permits. This we do in baptism, in which we are made *partakers of his death*, as well as his resurrection” (*The Christadelphian, Aug 1 1879*).

CERTAIN DANGERS HIGHLIGHTED

When discussing such matters, there is a very real danger that brethren can begin to speak of the Lord Jesus Christ in terms, which separate him from the work he came to accomplish. To some extent, the debate is centring on the issue of whether or not the Master required to offer for himself—whereas that is not the aspect of things emphasised by Scripture. “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world **to save sinners . . .**” (*1Tim 1:15*). That is the emphasis consistently placed upon the Atoning work of Christ by the Spirit—what he came to accomplish for others. The problem with this error being increasingly taught in the UK, as well as abroad, is that brethren become drawn away from the fundamental purpose of the Father in his son when seeking to combat it, to attempt to analyse Christ as an individual personage, separate from what he came to do. That is certainly a danger to be aware of, yet at the same time emphasis on the end achieved (i.e. the redemption of sinners to the glorification of the Father) ought not discourage us from understanding *how* our redemption is effected, namely through the condemnation of Sin, in the Sacrifice of Christ.

SAVED BY HIS LIFE

Denying the need for Christ to “condemn” (*Rom 8:3*), and “destroy” (*Heb 2:14*) the “law of sin” in himself through his Sacrificial death, thereby cleansing himself from the “uncleanness” (*Rom 6:19*) thereof, the protagonists for the theory under consideration are compelled to find some other means whereby Sin could be condemned in Christ. The Scriptures strongly emphasise the manner in which he rendered perfect obedience to his Father in all things, and so, for some, his obedience in life becomes the means of sin’s condemnation, and therefore salvation—hence the title of the book, “Saved by His Life”.

Accordingly, we read statements like:

“The Lord acknowledged his Father’s righteousness in **condemning sin as a way of life** by refusing to **practice**” (*18 point statement on aspects of the Atonement, 14/10/90*).

And again, as we read earlier:

“**He had to condemn sin** and prove that he was master over his nature as no-one before or since has been. **He did this by being obedient to his Father throughout his life**, and declared that sin could not control him by remaining obedient even unto death” (*The Christadelphian, Dec 1993*)

It is, of course, perfectly true that “we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (*Heb 4:15*). But the Scriptures do not state that it was his obedience in life that condemned sin. Rather, they emphasise the Master’s death in this regard: “**through death** he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the *diabolos*” (*Heb 2:14*). Indeed, Bro Roberts encountered the same notion—and refuted it:

“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*) . . . *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” (*The Law of Moses*).

The fact is inescapable, the “Saved by His Life” theory is a major departure from the Truth believed and taught by our earlier brethren. The expression “Saved by His Life” is itself a wresting of Scripture from its proper context, of the Apostle speaking of the Life of the Master which followed his death:

“God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be **saved by his life.**” (Rom 5:10).

Here is a passage of tremendous beauty and truth. Notice, we are “justified by his blood”, his poured out blood, expressive of the expiration of his life upon the accursed tree. There, in the offering up of Jesus, we see sin condemned. Christ brought it to the grave—to destruction, having exercised Mastery over it at all times throughout his life of obedience. He has taken sin out of the way, that he might be our High Priest appearing in the Father’s presence ‘for us’ (Heb 9:24). And having been so reconciled by the death of the Son, how much more can we have hope of salvation from death by his resurrection? “If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept” (1Cor 15:20). Bearing our sinful nature, in order that he might redeem it from Sin that ordinarily reigned supreme there, the Master redeemed himself as the firstfruits, and thanks are to the Father, in so doing, the foundation has been laid for our salvation also, at his appearing.

Chris Maddocks

*NOTE: Since the production, and initial distribution of this article, we have been directly challenged by one of the “Saved by his Life” advocates on the matter. However, when we presented to him the issue of whether or not the sanctification of the Altar typified that of Christ, he refused all further discussion. Yet our Master is very clear: “for their sakes **I sanctify myself that they also might be sanctified through the truth**” (Jno 17:18). The flawed nature of the theory under consideration is that it just cannot accommodate the Types of the Law—and the refusal to even discuss that aspect of things is surely proof of this.*