

PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

On perceiving for the first time the simple and satisfying understanding of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ which is possible when the false doctrines of Sinful Flesh and Original Sin have been renounced, many people express astonishment that such explanations have only recently come to light.

Were it even so it would be no reflection upon the intrinsic value of the truths Involved; but the fact is that they have been steadily and patiently advocated by a despised minority during almost the whole history of Christianity, but for the preservation of their own prestige and vested interests, those who should be teachers lead the people astray. In the 4th century, Pelagius questioned the assertion that Sin was a fixed principle of human flesh, and was branded as an heretic. The apostate dogma is defined in the 9th of the Thirty-nine Articles almost exactly as it is held by Christadelphians.

The matter reproduced here was in print nearly 40 years ago, and though the author, A.L.Wilson, and those to whom he replies, C.C.Walker, Wm. Grant and R.J.Campbell are all asleep and the works in question no longer commonly available, it is self-explanatory and the truth shines forth with the same glory and simplicity as in apostolic days.

Because they cannot overthrow it, to-day the leaders of Christadelphians, editors, recorders and speakers, conspire to keep the people in ignorance of the true issue and while the unthinking majority are scared off their food by the charge of heresy and the labels Clean Flesh and Free Life, yet of those who can discern between their right hand and their left there are added to the Church daily such as should be saved.

1945

Jesus my Substitute

We have been handed articles by two Christadelphians, condemning the idea that Jesus died as the sinner's substitute; one in a booklet by C.C.Walker, Editor of the "The Christadelphian," and the other in "Glad Tidings," by the Editor, Wm. Grant of Edinburgh.

Both arguments are easily refuted by an accurate exposition of the appropriate Scripture, and as we are satisfied that both writers are thoroughly sincere, we offer our comments upon their theories in a spirit of love and with the hope that some will be delivered from what we believe to be a false representation of the Sacrifice of Christ.

There is a twofold aspect of Justification, the careful discrimination of which is indispensable to an accurate solution of this subject. Indeed, we do not hesitate to say that an indiscriminate mixing of these two aspects has been the direct cause of most of the confusion in what has been written on the subject. Now let us give a clear explanation of what we wish to be understood by this twofold aspect of Justification. Man is legally justified when he is baptised into the sacrificial death of Christ; but he will not be morally justified at the tribunal of Christ unless his actions shall have conformed to the will of God. We are legally justified when, by baptism, we are engrafted into the True Vine; but we shall not be morally justified when the roll is called, unless we abide in Him (John 15). It is only at our baptism we enrol in the race for immortality; but we shall not be "crowned" unless we run "so as to obtain." It would be impossible to exhibit this important distinction more lucidly than has been done by J.J.Andrew, of London. After defining the term "Justification," he says;

“It is typical and antitypical, and it has a legal and a moral aspect. The legal is represented by the expression ‘made righteous’ (Romans 5:19), and the moral aspect by the statement that by works a man is justified, and not by faith alone. Neither legal nor moral Justification can exist without blood-shedding; the legal must precede the moral, and both legal and moral must precede the bestowal of eternal life.”

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

Now a recognition of the full force of the law of sin and death, and the precise scope of the law of the spirit of life in Christ is requisite to our pursuit of the question of Substitution. The combined force of these two laws shows that the condemnation we inherit from Adam (Romans 4,5, 6,7,& 8) is a barrier to probation, a barrier to our acceptance with God, and a barrier to eternal life; and that the blood of the everlasting covenant is absolutely necessary to remove this threefold barrier. We maintain, then, that God has procured for us this legal Justification on His own glorious principle of substitution. C.C.Walker says;

“If Christ were a substitute we ought not to die, and Christ ought not to have risen.”

This is a compound proposition, and must be examined separately. “If Christ were a substitute we ought not to die.” We take this as an ungrateful utterance, and will prove that the Word of God demands that it should be directly inverted, viz., if Christ be not a substitute we ought not to have lived. If Adam had been executed without mercy on the day he sinned, we had had no existence; but God in His mercy provided for Adam a substitute, typified in the animal slain (Genesis 3:15; Job 33:24; Revelation 13:8). The benefit Adam’s descendants derive from this is, that it secures for them natural existence; but inasmuch as all do not become individually related, in the appointed way, to God’s covering for sin, natural existence is their empyrean. This demonstrates that it is due to the very mercy of God that we are here at all. In regard to C.C. Walker’s difficulty,

“Why do believer’s die?”

We answer, “Why do those who are alive and remain escape the dark valley?” Simply because their King has come. Those of previous ages are allowed to fall asleep, then, simply because their King has not come; and that it is the purpose of God that His faithful shall all be glorified together (Daniel 12:13; Romans 8:17; Hebrews 11:39, 40). This confirms the Scripture that whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord’s. If C.C.Walker says that believers yet die the death unto sin, we remind him that God is not the God of the “dead” (Matthew 22:32). There is therefore now “no condemnation” to those in Christ, for the law of the spirit of life made them “free” from the law of sin and death (Romans 8:1). If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. If C.C.Walker says his own death contributes to his cleansing from sin, we remind him that he becomes a thief and a robber, by climbing up another way (John 10:1), and robbing Christ of His redemptive work (John 14:6). Again, if he says, by his own good works, we remind him that by the works of the law shall “no flesh be justified” (Romans 3:20). This brings all the world guilty before God (Romans 3:19). Can C.C. Walker dispense with a substitute?

Let us now take the next proposition. He says,

“If Christ were a substitute, He ought not to have risen.”

If a carcase of corruption be the price of man’s redemption, then, truly, Christ could not have risen; for the moment He rose He would cease to substitute us. But a carcase of corruption is not our price, otherwise no human soul is yet redeemed, for Christ saw no corruption (Psalms 16:10; Acts 2:31; 13:34,36,37).

Messrs Walker and Grant spurn substitution, and claim it to be “representation.” Does this lend them aid? Let us make a test. If a carcass of corruption be the price of man’s redemption, then the moment Christ rises He equally ceases to represent Messrs Walker and Grant, consequently they must fill in “the remainder.” You see this weapon cuts equally well both ways; because if the substitute goes, the representative is doomed to follow.

Further, if Christ did not pay our debt instead of us as our substitute, but only for us as our representative, then you must first furnish your representative with the means, otherwise you defraud the law. What have you, then, in this case with which to furnish your representative? Absolutely nothing; your all is confiscated (Romans 5). You cannot dig. To beg you are ashamed. Hence you leave nothing with which to cover your sin but “the shirt of death.”

But there is an undercurrent here which prevents Christadelphians from straight sailing. The writer knows their whereabouts, from the fact that twenty years ago he himself was a member of the Christadelphian body. Instead of beginning with the loss of life in Adam, they confuse themselves over the effect as regards the flesh of Jesus. They hold that, as Jesus was born of a woman, He was under condemnation to death on His own account, requiring to be executed in order to be cleansed from His own “physical sin”! See their “Slain Lamb,” “The Blood Of Christ,” and all their works on the subject. It was due to this very doctrine the writer left their body. But does the law allow anyone, who is already under its condemnation, to effect his own release, to say nothing of others wriggling through without payment? If the life of Jesus were claimed by the law, this would represent God as swindling. We must not forget that God is just, as well as the Justifier; but if you represent God as effecting the redemption of man by yielding up “to sin” what already belonged to sin, then indeed, you represent yourselves as having been redeemed by fraud.

The only explanation then, as to how Jesus could be our substitute and triumph over the grave is in fact that the lost treasure is “Life,” and that nothing short of a free, unforfeited life can purchase life back. God solved this by becoming the Father of Jesus, and the English law recognizes the phenomenon of quickening to be the acquisition of a life by which a foetus might live independent of its bearer. This was the Spirit germ of the “second Adam,” irrespective of the lust of the flesh. Directly, “Son of Power.”

Now the Master once asked; “What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and forfeit his life? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?” Was there ever a man who possessed the whole world and forfeited his life? By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men in whom all sinned. Could this man, Adam, have redeemed himself? If you say “Yes,” we ask proof; if you say “No,” then your contention against our substitute is eternally closed. Thus we see God alone comes to our rescue. He declares; “Deliver them from the pit, I have found a ransom” - corresponding price, equivalent, or substitute (Job 33:24). Now what does God declare this ransom to be? “The life of the flesh is in the blood thereof, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls” (Leviticus 17:11). Christ confirms this; “I lay down my life for the sheep” (John 10:11). But what is Sacrifice? It is of the utmost importance we should have a clear conception of this. If you sacrifice something, you must relinquish possession of it eternally. If at any time you receive it back, it ceases that moment to be a sacrifice, and becomes a mere loan. Did Christ receive back that identical life He sacrificed? On the authority of Scripture we say He did not. “The redemption of their lives is precious, and it ceaseth for ever” (Psalm 49:8). Christ laid down the ψυχη (psuche) life of His flesh, and that has eternally gone for our price. The life He afterwards received from the Father was immortal ζωη (zoe) life. Profoundest problem! Most glorious solution! “O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?” His life was His own; and before receiving the higher life He relinquished for ever the life of His flesh for our redemption. How clearly He shows this by His metaphor of the grain of wheat: “The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified;” but to have been glorified there and then, He alone would have inherited the Kingdom. “Indeed I say unto thee, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit” (John 12:24). This use of life in the

abstract is objected to from the fact that life in the abstract is all one. We freely grant this, and that God is the fountain. But we also recognize the fact that God has been pleased to distribute Life in portions. Hence we read of the “bundle,” and of those, His enemies whom He will “sling out” (1 Samuel 25:29).

Then C.C.Walker asks; “Could God be said to forgive sin, if He exact the utmost penalty?” We answer; truly not. But we think we shall be able to prove that God is not the exactor. Even Wm. Grant is in advance of C.C.Walker on this score. He says; “It is not God who requires to be reconciled, but men.” We cherish this, coming from the other side. No; God is not the exactor, but ever the supplier of man’s needs. If He should mark iniquity, who should stand? God so loved the world the He gave... (John 3:16). God was in Christ reconciling the world, not imputing or exacting. God commendeth His love toward us... What manner of love He hath bestowed upon us...”

? “The life of the flesh is in the blood thereof, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls” (Leviticus 17:11). Christ confirms this; “I lay down my life for the sheep” (John 10:11). But what is Sacrifice? It is of the utmost importance we should have a clear conception of this. If you sacrifice something, you must relinquish possession of it eternally. If at any time you receive it back, it ceases that moment to be a sacrifice, and becomes a mere loan. Did Christ receive back that identical life He sacrificed? On the authority of Scripture we say He did not. “The redemption of their lives is precious, and it ceaseth for ever” (Psalm 49:8). Christ laid down the ψυχη (psuche) life of His flesh, and that has eternally gone for our price. The life He afterwards received from the Father was immortal ζωη (zoe) life. Profoundest problem! Most glorious solution!

Then Messrs Walker and Grant ask; “Does Justice substitute the innocent for the guilty?” We reply, not for an evil purpose, but in the case of redemption, by Divine mercy it does. “For scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die, but God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” “The Just for the unjust.” Justice could not substitute the “guilty” for the guilty. Hence the weakness of the argument. Next, in spite of C.C.Walker’s attempt to refute substitution, on page 32 he says; “The command of the Father was, that Jesus should lay down His life by crucifixion as an exhibition for all time of what was due from God to man of sin.”

We say this is substitution to the hilt, and we regret the orthodox wrath of God with a vengeance. We think we have shown that God is not the party who nurses wrath to keep it warm, not the party who is due man anything. The party due man is “the lord on the other side,” of whom Dr Thomas speaks. When man became the servant of the Diabolos, he ceased to be the servant of God, consequently God was due man nothing. Seeing man left God, and preferred Diabolos for his master, he must expect the wages of the Devil. Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto righteousness?

Well then, in C.C.Walker’s own terms;

“If Christ endured what was due to man for sin, what shall we term the principle involved?”

The only escape Christadelphians have from substitution here is that they say Christ was under condemnation to death on His own account. Does this reply benefit their case? Let us see. If we grant that Jesus had to be executed to pay His own debt, then we leave absolutely no balance with which to pay the debt of Messrs Walker and Grant. What is the result? A complete dilemma. They are either false witnesses regarding Christ’s debt, or they are themselves defrauders of the law by wriggling through without payment.

C.C.Walker seems cognizant of this, and attempts to escape the second horn. But he resorts to an ambiguous middle term. He says truly, when the substitute dies, the survivor escapes the penalty and lives; but he says;

“It is not so with Jesus,”

and to support this denial with the semblance of Scripture, he says;

“we have yet to do with the death of Jesus, so much so, that an apostle has said, I am crucified with Christ, buried with him in baptism.”

But one little question will expose the fallacy. Does every believer require, as Christ required, to undergo literal crucifixion? Now you see the blunder. C.C.Walker uses two totally distinct things as if they were identical and of equal legal value, viz., Christ’s literal crucifixion, with Paul’s symbol of it, thus clearly confounding the literal with the figurative. What a destructive argument it is, then, to deny substitution by trying to make it appear that we require to go through identically what Christ went through, when, on examination, we find that the symbol is all that is required at our hands! The very fact that the symbol is all that is required of the believer is of itself a sufficient proof of substitution. If Christ did not die the death I was due, then my baptism into that sacrificial death is a pure absurdity. But seeing that it is imperative I should be baptised into that death, then Christ is my substitute. Indeed, it is on this principle alone that animal sacrifice can be explained. From Eden to Gethsemane the sinner died symbolically in the death of the animal slain. Hence baptism into the sacrificial death of Christ has been indispensable from Gethsemane to the Kingdom of God. God has made an individual recognition of this fact, an indispensable preliminary to our acceptance with Him. But after this stage is reached it is incompatible with God’s justice to allow any to become partakers of the Divine nature who shall wilfully persist in sin; such shall, at the tribunal of Christ, have merited the second death. They were mercifully allowed to pass the first death in symbol, but for those who shall have merited the second death, there remaineth no more sacrifice or substitute for sin, but a fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries. This is the death Jesus did not die instead of any one (Hebrews 10).

Is it matter for surprise, then, that, as the dreadful hour approached, the lowly, sinless Jesus should sweat as it were great drops of blood, and pray; “O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me”? Let us follow Him into the garden of Gethsemane where He was betrayed by one of His disciples, then denied by another, and forsaken by all. Now He is accused as a rebel and false prophet by the Jews, evil-entreated by the soldiers, hurried from the Chief Priest to Pilate, thence to Herod, from him back to Pilate again. Now He is blindfolded, buffeted, scourged, crowned with thorns, spit upon. Now He carries His own Cross through the city to Calvary. Now He is crucified naked. Is He not now in the condition of Adam after rebellion, and before being clothed with the coats of skin? But for the joy set before Him He endures the Cross and despises the shame. Now God forsakes Him, Now He groans -”It is finished”! Now He bows His head and becomes silent in death. Now He is borne to the rich man’s grave in the olive garden at the foot of Mount Olivet, where the dread silence of death is unbroken for three days! He is God’s Son; He sinned not. Why was all this? This is matter about which we ought rather to weep and pray than quarrel and denounce.

“Jesus my Substitute.” Thank God.

We are now confronted with a carefully selected list of passages, by both editors, where “for” means “on account of,” and not “instead of.” Thus, as they think, disposing of substitution. Now it is a simple matter to give instances where our English preposition “for” does not mean “in place of,” from the fact that it has to do work for several Greek terms. Indeed, it does work for “*γάρ*,” which is clearly a connective. But does this fact dispose of substitution? Let us see. How came it about that Jesus had to die “on account of” our sins? Why could not Messrs Walker and Grant die “on account of” their own sins, seeing they reject a substitute? But if they could not, with redeeming effect, die

“on account of” their own sins, have they strengthened their argument? The very reverse. Substitution is indisputably proved, only in a different form of words.

Now 1 Timothy 2:6 says; “He, having given Himself “*αντιλυτρον*,” an equivalent, a corresponding price, a substitute, on behalf of all.” Can Messrs Walker or Grant deny this? They cannot.

Well, Matthew 20:28; “The Son of Man came, not to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom “*αντι*,” in place of many.” Can they deny this? Listen. C.C.Walker says

“*αντι*” (Matthew 20 28) may, indeed, mean “in place of.”

Why then, does he reject substitution? Then he goes on;

“But it may also mean “on account of,” and is so used in Matthew 17:27. A piece of money, that take, and give unto them for thee and me.”

Now we shall show that C.C.Walker could not possibly have selected a stronger Scripture against his contention. Jesus knew what He was saying, and employed the term “*αντι*” appropriately here, when we ascertain that the payment of this money was a ransom “*αντι*” in the place of their souls. If C.C.Walker will turn to Exodus 30:11-16 he will be furnished with painful confirmation of this. But there is something more in Matthew 17:27 that has not yet dawned on Christadelphians. The Master asked; “What thinkest thou, Simon? Of whom do the kings of the earth take tribute? Of their children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto Him; Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free.” What a powerful refutation of the Christadelphian doctrine; that “Jesus was under condemnation to death on His own account.” “Then are the children free.”! Glorious news! How conclusively Jesus demonstrates here that He, as God’s Son, might justly have claimed exemption from the payment of this ransom for His life. How Peter cherished this may be gathered from his subsequent reference; “Knowing that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold (Jesus’s words; “That give unto them for thee and me”), but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot (Jesus’s words; “Then are the children free”).

We submit, then, that this very Scripture, from which Mr Walker seeks support to refute substitution, proves substitution in a most remarkable manner. When the premises are false, the best logician is the least safe guide.

Now the Greek preposition “*αντι*,” when uncompounded, means “in place of.” Example (Matthew 5:8), an eye (*αντι*) in place of an eye, and a tooth (*αντι*) in place of a tooth. If the reader will examine the following list after the above example, he will be satisfied of the truth of this; - Matthew 17:27; 20:28; Mark 8:37; 10:45; Luke 11:11; Romans 12:17; 1 Thessalonians 5:15; 1 Timothy 6:20; Hebrews 12:16; James 4:15; 1 Peter 1:19; 3:9. Indeed, when the term “*αντι*” is compounded, it still retains strong substitutionary force, except, however, when it means “before” [then it is a Latin prefix, and not the Greek preposition *αντι*], but when it means “against,” “opposition,” “contending,” it does; antichrist, antithesis, antidote, etc. Now as an example, let us take Paul’s application of antichrist (2 Thessalonians 2:4); “Who opposeth, and lifts himself above all that is called God, so that he as God sitteth in the temple (or place) of God, showing himself that he is God.” The reader may apply the following - Matthew 5:39; Luke 21:15; Acts 6:10; 7:51; 18:6; Romans 9:19; 13:2; 1 Timothy 2:6; 6:20; 2 Timothy 2:25; 3:8; Hebrews 12:4; James 4:7; 5:6.

Regarding Wm. Grant’s article, while we confess there is much in it with which we agree, yet there is much in it we would pronounce an indiscriminate confusion of the twofold aspects of Justification. Let us once more clearly state our premises. We hold that it is the major purpose of God ultimately to glorify His own Name in all the earth; towards this purpose He is graciously inviting man to become partakers of the “Divine nature,” on condition of probationary faithfulness; that before man, who is already under the law of sin, can enter upon this probation, it is imperative

that he should be redeemed and initiated into the family of God. Now we hope this is clear. To confuse, then, our subsequent probation as contributing anything towards this previous redemption God has made, is to betray gross ignorance of the matter in dispute; to detract from Christ as the price, and to reduce God's merciful purchase to a mockery. Thus we see that Justification at baptism is quite distinct from Justification when "crossing the bar." With the above distinction, then, let us, as before God, examine Wm. Grant's article.

First. He compliments R.J.Campbell on his renunciation of substitution. We wonder why he should halt at the last half-yard toward R.J.C.; because he has distinctly told the writer, before witnesses, that he does not now believe that Christ in the days of His flesh was under condemnation to death on His own account, and positively styled such a doctrine "a theological error."

The writer asked; "Unto what, then, were you baptised?"

Mr Grant; "Not into a condemned, but into a risen, glorified Christ."

The writer pointed out that it was the death of Christ into which we are requested to be baptised, and that if Christ were under condemnation, the whole affair was a mystery.

Mr Grant then attempted a slur about "free life."

The writer replied; "If Christ had not a free life you are yet doomed."

Well, then, let us compare notes, seeing he has admitted that Jesus was free from condemnation, and sinned not, yet was slain. What conclusion is deductible from these premises? Any babe in logic could ascertain that, if you deny substitution, then the slaying of Jesus was absolutely unnecessary. Consequently, the cold, relentless logic of his own premises leaves him no other alternative than R.J.C's "Missionary murder."

But in spite of his compliment to R.J.C., he does not leave the very paragraph till he accuses R.J.C. of denying that Jesus, by dying unto sin, did "for us, what we could not do for ourselves."

Is it possible to have substitution more clearly defined? Should R.J.C. ever cast his eyes across the paper what will he think of such confusion?

The next proposition to which we take exception also betrays an indiscriminate confusion of the two-fold aspects of Justification. Wm. grant says;

"R.J.C. may pooh-pooh at the doctrine of the putting away of sin, but the death of Jesus had much to do with the putting away of sin."

If he had had a clear conception of the legal Justification and Redemption procured for us at our induction into Christ, and presented to us as the free, unmerited gift of God, his reply to R.J.C. would have been that the death of Jesus had everything to do with the putting away of sin; that when we arrive at this stage all required of us is to keep sin away, or resist the Devil, and he will flee from us. Then his subsequent remark to R.J.C., "Where is boasting, then?" would have been truly appropriate. But to confuse our subsequent duty as contributing anything toward the putting away of our own sin at the commencement is to represent God as providing only part of the initial redemption, leaving man to clear off the remainder afterwards by instalments. This would directly rob Christ, and represent the purchase God has made as incomplete.

The paper shows that Wm. Grant is not a pioneer, but that he is yet in the stage of depending too much on the propositions of his former teachers, who were no more inspired than he, and as capable of blundering. As an instance of this he says;

“It was once said, and that truly, that a just law can never be satisfied with the death of an innocent man when the guilty goes free.”

As the rules of the syllogism forbid the use of four terms, we must discriminate between the two aspects which underlie this proposition, and render it absolutely free from ambiguity. We thoroughly agree with him that a just law can never be satisfied with the death of the innocent, when the guilty goes free, if accomplished for a wicked purpose; but seeing the case in hand is wholly a question of Redemption, we must not confuse the two ideas, but test the truth of the proposition by facts regarding Redemption.

Now Jesus was either guilty or not guilty. If not guilty, then the boasted truth of the proposition is rendered absolutely false. If guilty, will Mr Grant point out to us where the satisfaction of this just law, for the liberation of the enslaved, obtains? Seeing he rejects the death of the “innocent One” is he prepared to say this just law would be satisfied with the death of the “guilty,” when the guilty goes free? This would be confusion worse confounded, and reverting to his “theological error of a condemned Christ,” and representing God’s purchase as a fraudulent transaction, by swindling the redemption of man from the condemnation of this just law, by delivering up one already under condemnation. Will Wm. Grant say his own death renders the necessary satisfaction? This robs Christ, and makes a mockery of God’s purchase. How, then, according to him, is this just law to be magnified, and made honourable, seeing he rejects the death of the innocent One? Will he say that God has revoked this just law? Jesus prayed; “If it be possible let this cup pass from me.” Did this cup pass? Will he have the audacity to say Jesus was not innocent? What, then, becomes of the boasted truth of his writer’s proposition? Will he improve the Scripture; “The just for the unjust”? “The unsearchable riches of Christ,” etc.? Mr Grant’s confusion of man doing his part cannot be admitted here. It is wholly a question of this just law being magnified before man can be permitted to do his part. Man’s subsequent faithful probation will secure for him approval at the tribunal of Christ, and is, therefore, quite a distinct thing from his justification at the commencement of the race. How then, is he to be justified at the commencement of the race, till this just law has been magnified by the death of the innocent One, whom he repudiates? It seems quite an innocent thing to quote “former teachers,” but it is altogether a different thing to be held responsible for the consequences.

As another instance of clinging too much to former teachers, he says;

“A writer put it in this way, ‘It is not a mere substitutionary case,’ etc.”

Now we would point out that his former teachers were thoroughly logical in their denial of substitution, because they conscientiously believed the strong delusion that Jesus was under condemnation to death on His own account; but seeing Mr Grant has renounced that delusion as “a theological error,” he has abandoned all reason to uphold their conclusion from premises as contrary as light is from darkness. If he would, for truths sake, launch out alone regardless of man, and take another cruise over traversed waters, we assure him he would discover that “physical sin” and the “condemned Christ” are concealed rocks against which the Christadelphian ship has foundered.

Next, Mr Grant goes on reiterating with R.J.C. that Jesus “did not do it all.” Here, again, we must discriminate. If this refer to our duty after redemption, we say, “True;” but if it refer to the purchase God made of us, by Christ, as contributing anything thereto, then we say it is false; because it is by grace through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the free, unmerited gift of God. Where is boasting then? Where Mr Grant’s “part”?

Finally, he says;

“Every follower of Christ has his part to do; but he must first be put into a right relation before God.”

This is the best statement he has made, and yet he is no nearer a solution of the problem as to whether our being put into this right relation is on the principle of substitution. We thoroughly agree

that every follower of Christ has his part to do; we thoroughly agree that he must first be put into this right relation before God; but we deny that the believer's subsequent part contributes anything towards the provision which entitles us to this right relation. Herein lies the pith of the whole dispute, and thus his confusion still remains. He has spent all his energy in telling us that a certain writer put it in this way, that it is "not a mere substitutionary case." But alas, he has not proved the truth of his writer's proposition. Can it be that he has actually lost sight of the question he has raised, viz., the principle upon which God has procured for us this right relation, and that the proposition he seeks to maintain is his certain writer's denial of substitution? Wm. Grant's paper, like Balaam's parable, while setting out to curse, has, when cleared from confusion, altogether blessed substitution. Let us prove this. He says; "God offers the reconciliation, and provides the means." If, then, Mr Grant could not provide the means, what is the principle involved? But what of all this when he denies the innocence? We picture him confronting Christ at His return, and accusing Him to His teeth that He was "not innocent." As Dr Thomas says; "God has bought us with a price from that other Lord."

If, then, you say this very price was "due," you prostitute the law of purchase and charge God with fraud. The law of Redemption will accept nothing short of an exact equivalent. If He gave what was already due, there could be no release for others, the law would justly claim and retain its own. The Redeeming price must, therefore, absolutely belong to another. The confiscated article then being "life," God so loved the world, that He gave His own Son, who again gave the life of His flesh for that of man, the exact ἀντιλυτρον, equivalent of the confiscated article (Matthew 20:28; 1 Timothy 2:6). That price has eternally gone (Psalm 49:8; Job 33:24). Christ had it to spare (John 12:24). And God rewarded Him with a superior or more glorious existence- "He asked life of Thee, Thou gavest it Him, length of days that for ever more He should live" (Psalm 21:4; Hebrews 1:9; 7:16-24). We have compared the proposition of Wm. Grant's "certain writer," condemning substitution, and have found that God did not revoke the just law, contrary to His own attributes (Hebrews 6:18). We have also found that the believer could neither undergo the execution in order to redeem himself, nor yet that he dies under condemnation, otherwise contradicting Paul (Romans 8:1); robbing Christ (John 14:6) and reducing God's purchase to a mockery. What, then, is the solution? We could not define it in more appropriate terms than from his own pen to R.J.C.

"That Jesus, by dying unto sin, did for us what we could not do for ourselves." Jesus says; "Out of thine own mouth shall thou be judged."

We claim, then to have shown that God has graciously provided for us this right relation before Him, on His own glorious principle of substitution. Jesus, the innocent, endured the literal execution due to Adam's sin, and for our recognition of this fact, God has prohibited any from entering the law of the spirit of life in Christ, until they undergo "the execution due to the law of sin and death;" but, thank God, only in symbol (Romans 6). It is then, as Dr Thomas says, "A gracious, merciful and loving Father who first purchased us from the law of sin and death, at the expense of His beloved Son, and put us on probation for immortality" (Romans 2:6,7). This is the exact antithesis of the theory popularly represented as - "Jesus purchasing man from a wrathful, malignant and offended God, and a flaming, endless hell"! When, therefore, a believer has been duly baptised into the "Sacrificial Death of Christ," he is freely presented by God with the only available covering for sin. Those who spurn this free, unmerited gift have no place at the wedding (Matthew 22:11) All, therefore, requested of us now is to keep this garment clean till the wedding day. So shall we walk with Him in white.

Andrew Wilson
(1908)