

7139

## THE ATONEMENT

Speaker: Bro. John Martin

Study #3

Jesus Christ Our Representative

My beloved brethren and sisters in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Well, b&s, we have endeavoured to explain the Atonement as simply as possible, and I hope it has been made plain for you, if it hasn't, it's not the bible's fault, it's mine, and I apologize for that; it's not always easy to remember those principles as I said earlier. And the suggestion has already been made to me, by some brethren that the idea that we do it once a year in our ecclesias, is a good one. And it is a good one, it's just like a refresher course on those principles which are so readily forgotten.

Now this third talk, b&s, is a very important one, because it touches upon, what I believe, is the very core of the matter, that if we can grasp the principle that I want to set forth in this third talk, I believe that we have a foundation to solve all our problems, if it's thought through. I want to make it very plain at the beginning, where we're going. You see, earlier we said this, and this is mine own experience in this doctrine. I've always found that wherever you have a deviation from truth, it arises because of an emphasis one way or the other. Either, (and I want you to listen very carefully) either an emphasis or an over emphasis on what He did for us, and the over emphasis on for us, has blinded many as to what He did for Himself, in what He was doing for us. The other emphasis then, counter-balancing that, is then to over emphasize what He did for Himself, to such an extent, that it almost seems that He came into the world with His own individual problem apart from the one that He shared with His brethren. Now, I want to say that again; I want you to get that crystal clear. The problem arises when there is an over emphasis on either, what He did for us excluding Himself, or what He did for Himself in an individual sense apart from what He did for us. And in either of those extreme emphasis, b&s, what happens is that the Lord is separated from the work He came to do.

We might then ask the question at the beginning, what was the work He came to do? And there is a biblical answer for that, when the apostle Paul couldn't have put it plainer when he said this, 'this is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners'. That is the fundamental foundation fact, worthy of all acceptance, and He could never have saved sinners, b&s, if He didn't share their problem. Because if He'd never shared their problem, He never could have laid down the principles by which both He and they were extricated from death. It's as

simple as that, and if we are able at all times to keep a proper balance of this subject in our mind, we should never ever have to run to extremes one way or the other. And so we can say, that what He did for us, He was doing for Himself, and what He did for Himself, He was doing for us. We must forever keep Him like that, and you'll never find a problem in your mind, when you do that, because you will see that all the principles of God fit that concept. He came into the world, to save sinners, that's it! but He could never had done that, if He didn't share the problem they had, because they couldn't get themselves out of the situation, into which sin had gotten them. Now if that's not simple, I really don't know what is!

Now I want to show that this afternoon, not so much from the scriptures, but from the writings of some of our pioneers, and they've been selected especially, b&s, with this emphasis. I know there's a whole lot more writings, I know that for 80 or odd years there have been 'a battle of quotations' as one of the pioneers said. And it's not my purpose here today, to try and emphasize one aspect or another; I'm not emphasizing what He did for us nor am I emphasizing what He did for Himself, I'm emphasizing what He did for Himself and for us, that's what I want to get home to you. If we can get that home, b&s, then I believe, that we have a basis there for sorting out our problems, on this most wonderful doctrine.

So then, let's have a look at some of these writings. Now in Australia, (let me explain this, before I put this transparency on; I know nothing or very little about your problems, and that is true. I don't dabble in other people's problems for the simple reason, 1. I'm not curious and 2. I've got stacks of my own and I haven't got time for yours. These talks have been prepared for Australian conditions and have been prepared to clear matters in Australian minds, and they have been very successfully delivered there, b&s. So if there is any inflection here upon anything that's in brethren's minds here, it is purely coincidental. And I say that very, very sincerely. So then, the very transparency that I am now going to quote and show you, is a quotation from what we call the 'Unity Book'. Let me explain what that was. In 1958, we had a visit to our shores from our bro. John Carter, a wonderful man, an incredible man; and he in his untiring efforts there, achieved unity for us in 1958, as we were divided on this question of the Atonement. And as a result of his works, some years later, they put out the Unity Book, which was an epitome of his work in Australia, mainly supervised by himself, and I believe reading through that book, while, of course, all human productions have errors in them, they'll never get everything perfect, but by and large, I believe that in that book, we have the mature mind of bro. Carter, who, had the hindsight and the maturity of bro. Roberts and bro. Thomas before him, and bro. Walker of course, he had all those brethren who preceded him, his own maturity came out in that book, it was at the end of his life, and in that book, he made some profound comments, which I found personally to be exceedingly helpful, in my appreciation of the work of God in Christ for us. Now this comment, really encapsulates all that I'm trying to say, and on page 21 of our Unity Book, and I want to read this with you, b&s, and I've highlighted, of course, the important expressions, I want to read it with you, and you just follow it carefully. Remember what we're doing, we're keeping Christ together with His people.

He says, 'Another cause of difficulty arises out of the Lord's relationship to His own death. It is affirmed in scripture, that by His own blood He entered in once, into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption. And that, God brought from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, and that He was saved out of death'. (Now listen) 'He needed redemption, He needed salvation from death'; the confusion arises when we isolate Him from His work. He was there to be our Saviour, and but for our needs we may reverently say, He would not have been there'. That is an absolutely profound comment on the Atonement. He needed redemption, He needed salvation from death, the confusion arises when we separate Him from the work. He was there to be our Saviour, and but for our needs we may reverently say, He need not have been there.

Bro. Roberts under questioning once said this, concerning the work of the Lord Jesus Christ for Himself, he said, 'If there had never been a 'sin race', there never would have been a need for the Messiah'. So you see, it's as simple as that, that's why He came. He came, b&s, to share a problem, and in sharing it, He took it away for us as our representative. Now, if you can get hold of that point, believe me, we're going to bridge a lot of gaps, in the minds of people and in your own mind you can bridge a lot of difficulties in the Word, when we talk about the fact that He had to die, and yet, He also volunteered to die. And those ideas can be made compatible when we see Him in the light of One who was our Representative. And as I say, I know, I'm fully aware, that there are pages of pioneer writings that can be quoted one way or the other to emphasize one aspect or another aspect, please brethren and sisters, please understand me, I am neither here to emphasize one or the other, but I want to get Him in between where He belongs.

Now, my next comment is from bro. Roberts; we all, of course, have a profound regard for bro. Roberts, who forged this doctrine into its present form as we have it, through the fires of controversy; it was tried from both directions, both extremes came at him and he kept it in the middle magnificently. He was a wonderful expositor. Now this is what he had to say, now b&s, in this particular comment, it comes at the end of a whole section about the work of the Lord Jesus Christ for Himself. Bro. Roberts believed that and so do I; He could not have saved us, if He did not first save Himself, because in saving Himself, He was our representative and in saving Himself, He saved us. Whatever way you say it, you always come back in the middle; He couldn't have saved us, if He didn't first save Himself, and in saving Himself first, He was saving us; it was all involved in that. Now you look at this comment, and this comment comes after a long dissertation on the work of the Lord Jesus Christ for Himself. Now that was the emphasis of this section, and this is a paragraph in which bro. Roberts qualifies all that he meant by that. You look at the comment, 'The representative nature of the sacrifice of Christ', he says (and I'll read it with you, so we can all read it slowly together), 'If we limit our view of the man Christ Jesus, and look at Him in the light of what is due to the 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. (Now listen!) 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'. That is magnificent! Now b&s, bro. Roberts was not saying that Jesus did not have to die for Himself; he is not saying that. But what he is saying is that Jesus had to die for Himself (full stop!) In other words, he's saying, 'in dying for Himself, that's what He was doing for others, because He was representing their problem to God'. And whatever He did for Himself, He did for others, and He was included in that.

Do you see what bro. Roberts is doing? He is keeping our Lord locked into that situation; and on one occasion when he was again under scrutiny and questioned on this very subject, as to the benefits our Lord received, and as the involvement of the Lord in His own offering, and he kept being asked, 'What did Jesus receive as an individual?' he kept refusing to answer that question. He would not answer the question when people dealt with the Lord individually. He says, 'We cannot consider Him apart from His brethren' because that's the work He came to do. And when we separate Him and say, well, 'if He had stood alone what would have happened?' It's a hypothetical question and it is, of course, in those circumstances, not necessary to answer that. Now I hope I'm making myself plain.

Let's take bro. Carter again. On the same page in the Australian Unity Book, we read this, and I'd again like to read it with you. 'God purposed that by man came death, by man must come resurrection. He must be one who died but who's resurrection was assured; God set Him forth to declare His righteousness, that identifying ourselves with Him, we subscribe to the declaration of God's righteousness made by Him. (Now listen!) He did these things for Himself that it might be for us! (I'll make a comment on that in a moment). We are not entitled to say what He would have had to do, had He stood alone; that is purely hypothetical. Neither may we say that because God required His death, in the given circumstances, in becoming our Saviour, God would have required the same under different conditions, we do not know! (Now listen to this) On the one hand we must accept what is written concerning His benefit from His own work'. (We've got to accept that) 'While on the other hand, we keep clearly in mind, that the purpose of it all, is that we might be saved through Him', these added comments will, we hope, help to keep in right perspective, the revealed facts concerning sin, and the use of the Word by figure of personification, and metonymy'. Now, b&s, I want to comment upon a couple of those phrases; you see the phrase, 'He did these things for Himself that it might be for us', you see how that reads, it keeps the Lord identified with the work He came to do. That is not bro. Carter's expression! You will find that expression in the Law of Moses on page 177 in my edition anyway, exactly that expression. And when you see it there, you'll notice that it is in inverted commas, so it didn't originate with bro. Roberts either. I haven't been able to find where it originated, but you will find it quoted in the Teachings of the Master by bro. Sargent. So bro. Roberts quoted it from somebody, bro. Sargent used that quotation, and bro. Carter used that quotation. He did these things for Himself THAT it might be for us' (remember that, because it is an expression that keeps it all together).

And so bro. Carter says, 'That Jesus benefitted from His own work'. He saved Himself by His sacrifice; not a doubt about that! He says we must accept that; it's true, it's a biblical truth, but we've got to keep in mind, b&s, that He did that by laying down His life for others. And you can see very clearly and very simply what that is saying and what the bible is saying. 'So God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life', 'God is not willing that any should perish', the scriptures says, do you know, b&s, He came to do God's will. What is God's will? You know, the will of God is defined in the bible. Jesus said, 'This is the will of God, that of all that He hath given Me, I should lose nothing', and He came to do God's will. This is the will of God, that of all that He's given Me, I should lose nothing, and so He came then, to do that will, and God is not willing that any should perish. And so in coming to do that will, being involved in the problem of those that God wished to save, He had first to save Himself, because if He didn't save Himself, He couldn't save them, and that's the reason He came. You see the point? it is all tied up, isn't it? He was a true representative of the human race, He was a true representative of His heavenly Father, and His heavenly Father's will was, that of all that He hath given Him, He should lose nothing. Now, what happens then, is that we get this emphasis one way or another, which upsets that balance. I want now, b&s, to show you two extremes that do that; I have no pleasure in demonstrating errors, but if it can help you to see, how they got away from centre, well, then we can be on our guard at all times, to keep that matter at centre. And there are two extremes that do that, they're not all the same, but these two really epitomize those two extremes. And they are two false doctrines, two extremes that separate the Lord from His work for us. We've entitled them ANDREWISM and CLEAN FLESH, for the want of better words, not casting any personal dispersions upon any brethren in the question.

ANDREWISM is a doctrine so-called because it originated with bro. J.J. Andrew, who in the early 1870's, was a right hand man of bro. Roberts when he fought 'clean flesh', but 20 years later, had ran to an opposite extreme, which caused the great debate between the two of them.

CLEAN FLESH is a title of a doctrine which is the opposite extreme to Andrewism, and was promulgated in Britain by Edward Turney; you had brethren out here who promulgated that, and we've certainly had brethren in Australia, and still have, who promulgate 'clean flesh'. It is the main problem in my opinion in our country, the 'clean flesh' doctrine.

Now, do you see what they do? Andrewism separated the Lord Jesus Christ from His work, by including Him in the sacrifice, but He did it separately; He was included separately. He propounded the doctrine that Jesus needed to offer independently for His nature; whereas His brethren needed His sacrifice for their sins and their nature. He separated those two things. And so whilst he included the Lord in the sacrifice, he included Him in an independent way, and in that way he isolated Him from His work.

Now, on the other hand, the 'clean flesh' people, exclude the Lord entirely from His sacrifice; they say that sacrifice is only for sin, that there is no such thing as bias in

nature; Jesus had no personal sin, therefore He's not involved in His sacrifice. And so they 've taken Him right out of His offering, whereas they say that we are sinners in need of His sacrifice and it was entirely for us, with no involvement of His own, that He made that sacrifice, and that, b&s, is purely and simply nothing more or less than the church doctrine of 'substitution'.

So whether Andrew put Him in separately with a separate need, or whether the clean flesh people took Him out with no need, they both did that; they isolated Him from His work. Now let me show you what they taught, this is what the 'clean flesh' people teach, you will see, b&s, that we never taught this in our first two talks.

### CLEAN FLESH

1. They said that there was no change in the condition of Adam's nature as the result of sin. He didn't change, he was always very good.
2. They said therefore, there was no subsequent proneness to sin resulting from transgression of God's law in Eden; there's no such thing as native proneness to sin.
3. Therefore, a nature biased to sin, could not be transmitted to posterity.
4. Consequently, no man including Jesus, inherited such a sin pruned nature.
5. Because Jesus was born with a nature identical in condition with Adam's before sin, and on account of His perfect life, He was in no way related to the principles seen in His death.

That's clean flesh! Now I know there are variations of that, but I tested that one on one of the main protagonists of the 'clean flesh' doctrine in Australia; I put that to him and he said, '100% correct'. So that's what they believe in certain parts of our country. I say, 'it's 100% incorrect!' I don't believe that for a moment.

Andrewism taught this, and you know, b&s, there are not a lot of people in our country who know what the bottom line of Andrewism is. We know where it went to, in the end it went to the resurrectional responsibility question; I don't want to enter into that here, that's nothing to do with me, I'm dealing with the Atonement. I believe Andrew had an Atonement problem; he had an Atonement problem. And this is what he taught!

### ANDREWISM

1. He taught that as a result of transgression in Eden, there were two aspects of that sin which separates from God. Personal guilt or personal sin if you like to call it that and physical sin, or as he would put it, a hyphenated term, sin-in-the-flesh.

Now, I want to pause here, b&s, I want to pause, (now concentrate on what I'm saying and not on what's written on the transparency, please)! Because there is a biblical sense, in which we most assuredly believe that there is a problem in our physical

constitution, not many people see the subtle difference between Andrewism and our view. Let me explain it and that is this, the subtle difference was this, our belief is that when Adam sinned as a result of the passions being inflamed by the lie of the serpent, there was created an imbalance in that matter, and a bias to evil which became a fixed principle in mortality. So that we now find ourselves, not only subject to death, but by our personal experience we know the truth, that we are tragically and sadly biased to evil. We say however, that the bias itself is not actual sin but the cause of all actual sin. And so we see that there is a difference. We see, that sin understood physically is metonymical, it's by metonymy, it's the cause of all sin. Andrew did not see it like that; he saw it like this. That because that bias was created in the first instance by sin, they were equal. They were equal, to use his own words in 'The blood of the Covenant', they were of equal force. They are not equal; one is the cause of the other! But he said 'no', there is moral sin and there is physical and they are equal. B&S, that is the bottom line of his error, out of which sprang every one of his corollaries, from that basis. So he went on to teach,

2. All Adam's sons inherit his unclean, physical condition, (which we do), but because he saw them as equal with moral guilt, he says it's the cause of estrangement from God, irrespective of personal transgression.

Now there's a sense, a real sense in which we were strangers and pilgrims, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, until we form a relationship with God through the truth accepted in our baptism and walked in Jesus Christ our Lord. There's a truth in which we were strangers from those things, but Andrew put a personal note on that. He stressed the personal aspect of that, whereas Robert Roberts stressed a general aspect of that. There was the difference between the two views; 1. was personal and individual; 2. the other saw individuals caught up in a general condemnation. And there was a difference in the way they saw that. Because to Andrew they were equal, this physical and moral sin. He said,

3. That sacrifice was as necessary to take away sin in its physical and moral aspect; it was necessary for both because he saw them individually. They were individually considered and he saw them having equal force, and therefore sacrifice was as necessary for the physical as it was necessary for the moral, which lead to him saying that,

4. Christ being born of our nature possessed physical sin although He didn't have any moral sin, which required cleansing by sacrifice.

Now, I'm going to be careful about this, b&s, because I want you to understand, I believe, that Jesus Christ's nature needed cleansing. I certainly do; and I believe, that if He had not gone through the process of His offering, on our account, He never would have been raised from the dead, and His body never would have been changed from mortality to immortality, from biased to now being unbiased or biased in a different direction towards God. That would have never have happened if Jesus Christ had not made His sacrifice. But that's not how Andrew saw it. He saw that cleansing as

something a bit different, and it was all done in the death, because He was sacrificing for some principle in that body, apart from transgression, that needed a sacrifice equal to all the moral sins, that Jesus came to die for, and to lay down His life, that they might be forgiven. And so he said,

5. That Jesus needed to be justified from His sin nature, before He could do anything for anyone else.

And it was sort of a one-two situation, a divided situation, instead of seeing that the Lord had our nature, it was our problem which He shared, and if He didn't save Himself, He couldn't save us, and we couldn't be saved unless He did that; instead of seeing that, Andrew saw it as a one-two situation. First for Himself in the individual sense and then for His brethren. And so we find then, there's your two extremes, one excluded the Lord by saying, He's not in it; the other one said, yes, He's in it but for His nature independently as well as for moral sins. So He's in it but there's an independent sense that He's in it for Himself.

Now you would have remembered then, our little sentence, (and I'll try and rescue that if I can for you) 'HE DID THESE THINGS FOR HIMSELF THAT IT MIGHT BE FOR US', and I remember saying that to you that that was found in the Law of Moses, which it is in inverted commas so he quoted it from somewhere else, it was used by bro. Sargent and it was used by bro. Carter, to my knowledge if not by others, and it may have been used by others but I haven't been able to find them. I haven't read probably sufficient, but to my knowledge it was used by bro. Roberts, he quoted it from somebody else. It was used by bro. Sargent and it was used by bro. Carter, and you might say, 'Well, why are you stressing that? Because it so beautifully expresses the point, HE DID THESE THINGS FOR HIMSELF THAT IT MIGHT BE FOR US. (Let me put that sentence up as to how it would be read by the two extremes, and how it would be read by the truth.

The 'clean flesh' people would read it like this, HE DID THESE THINGS ONLY FOR US. That's wrong!

J.J. Andrew would read it like this, HE DID THESE THINGS FOR HIMSELF AND FOR US.

But the pioneering expression was, HE DID THESE THINGS FOR HIMSELF THAT IT MIGHT BE FOR US. Can you see the difference? Can you see the imbalance? and can you see the balance in the centre? HE DID THESE THINGS ONLY FOR US - no way! HE DID THESE THINGS FOR HIMSELF AND FOR US - no way! HE DID THESE THINGS FOR HIMSELF THAT IT MIGHT BE FOR US - and right there in the middle, balanced beautifully, is the Lord's involvement in His work, on behalf of others.

So we might illustrate the point like this, JESUS, OUR REPRESENTATIVE, A RIGHT AND A WRONG. We see Him like this or that; I say it is wrong to see it like that, that FOR HIMSELF THEN FOR US. I say, b&s, that this is right, HE DIED AS OUR REPRESENTATIVE. Now, people say to me, 'Wait a minute, John, wait a minute,



you're wrong, you're wrong, you're wrong! because what you're saying is that the Lord didn't have to offer for Himself, that He did not benefit from His own sacrifice'. I'M NOT SAYING THAT; you'll notice in that circle, HE'S IN THERE! He's not out of there. He's in there, He's not excluded, but you see, b&s, He's in there as our representative. If the people say, 'Wait a minute, He did that before we could be saved, He had to do that first for Himself'. Sure He did! not a question of that at all! As bro. Roberts said, 'If He hadn't done it first in Himself, we could never had been saved'. But you see, b&s, when He was doing it, He wasn't doing it just for #1, He was doing it for everybody. To quote the apostle Paul, 'He tasted death for every man'.

Now let me give you a string of biblical quotations, and you watch what the apostles do. This is what they said,

1. He bore our sins in His own body. See what they've done! They don't emphasize that He bore our sins, or they don't emphasize in His own body, they say, He bore our sins in His own body. And there's the representative man; or again, the apostle in Hebrews 1 says,
2. When He had in Himself purged our sins; they don't emphasize in Himself, and they don't emphasize purging our sins, they say when He had in Himself purged our sins. The famous quotation in Hebrews 9 and verse 12,
3. He entered once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption. (full stop) We know in the Greek text the words 'for us' do not appear; and they don't! What does it mean then? Does it mean therefore, that there's something individual in that which the Lord is doing? NO, it does not. What was He doing? He was obtaining eternal redemption. What for? Verse 24 of the same chapter, 'now to appear in heaven FOR US', and that is in the original. So what He obtained in Himself, He obtained on behalf of others; that's what they did with Him every time. So all the apostolic expressions bring Him to that centre.

This brings me to a scriptural quotation, which has been variously interpreted. I know there are other views of this quotation, Hebrews 7 verse 27, 'He needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sins, first for Himself, and then for the people: for this He did once, when He offered up Himself', and many see that as being the type of a one-two situation. First for Himself and then for the people; but you see, if you read that quotation in context, you will notice, and this is the point, b&s, Paul is not making a comparison in Hebrews 7, but a contrast. And the whole chapter is about a contrast. You read the whole chapter, 'we have not a High Priest, he says, 'those priests died, we have one that lives' and he goes on to make contrasts through that chapter. And what he is teaching is this, that under the Law of Moses, they had to make two separate sacrifices because Aaron was a separate sinner; he needed to make the two, because as a typical high priest, he was not a perfect man, he was a sinner in his own right, and therefore, it required two sacrifices. Paul says, 'this Jesus did once'; what did He do once? For Himself and for the people, He did that once. What did He do once? For Himself and the people, he's not excluding Him, he's not saying because He was a perfect man, He was excluded, he's saying He's included, but because He's

representing the sins of His people, He's in there as their representative. 'Such an high priest became us, Who was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners'. But Aaron was a separate sinner, it's a contrast not a comparison; but still, b&s, the apostle is teaching that He was included, but because He was only there as a representative, bearing the nature of sin, to represent His people, what they did twice, He did once. And the word 'once' I believe, is contrasted both to the term 'daily' and 'to the two sacrifices', all that He did, once, in one great representative offering; and when you see the Lord Jesus Christ like that, believe me, it will drive home a motive force that you will see working out in the Atonement.

This will be the result, and I want to demonstrate this in our last talk, which will purely and simply be an exhortation based upon this principle. If we grasp the absolute essence of the Atonement, we will have a motive force in our lives second to none. But, if we misrepresent it, if we misunderstand it, there will be an imbalance in that motive force and an imbalance in our lives. If I believe that Jesus Christ got #1 right first, and then, once He got Himself right He did something for someone else, (that's what I would do!) But I don't believe that; I believe that we had a problem, and in the mercy and grace of a loving and kind heavenly Father, He sent His Son into the world, because we were sinners. And Jesus came into the world, not as an individual, as bro. Roberts says, not just to save Himself, He came into the world to save others, and in the doing of that, He saved Himself. If I believed that, then my life is going to change, and I'm going to come to the point of view, slowly by degrees and thinking about that, but my life is not a question of being on the earth to obey a set of rules to get myself right first, that I might then help somebody else; but that God is telling me, that your individual responsibility is to help others, so that my individual responsibility becomes collective and the collective responsibility I have, is my individual responsibility, and God is going to save to me, 'that if I'm going to follow His Son, in accordance with which I'm prepared to lay down my life for others in service to the truth, in that measure I will be saved'. Not because I've got to concentrate on #1 before I can help #2.

Let me put it biblically; listen to the beautiful balance. BEAR YE ONE ANOTHER'S BURDENS AND SO FULFIL THE LAW OF CHRIST. Have you ever heard it put better than that? BEAR YE ONE ANOTHER'S BURDENS AND SO FULFIL THE LAW OF CHRIST, to fulfil, to fulfil, the Law of Christ is to help each other. Now there is the moral thrust of the Atonement. I believe, b&s, that's where the balance truly is! We keep that ever in mind, there's nothing written in the pioneers, however it may be expressed, one way or the other, that can't be understood by bringing that to centre. But whatever they stressed with His own benefits, it was because of what He was doing for us; and whatever benefits we receive from His work, it was because He first did that in Himself, because He was our representative. That I believe, is the true balance of Atonement!

That leads me then, to our last transparency, IN EXACTLY WHAT WAY DID JESUS BENEFIT FROM HIS DEATH? Well, Jesus benefitted for various reasons;

1. His death fulfilled God's will. Let me say something about that b&s. There was an argument once with bro. Roberts in which he was accused of saying, 'You say that Christ benefitted by His mere obedience? MERE OBEDIENCE, bro. Islip Collyer in 'Principles and Proverbs' said 'what more could He do? But you see, b&s, when He died to fulfil God's will, what was God's will? TO SAVE SINNERS. How do sinners get saved? By learning principles. What principles? That the flesh profits nothing; so He benefitted by fulfilling God's will, in setting forth principles that sinners might understand.

2. Paul argues that His death was the last act of obedience; 'He'd become obedient unto death even the death of the cross, wherefore, God hath highly exalted Him and gave Him a name which is above every name'. So Jesus benefitted according to Paul because of His obedience. His obedience to what? DEATH. What sort of death? DEATH ON THE CROSS. Why? TO DECLARE GOD'S RIGHTEOUSNESS. And because He did all that, He was rewarded for that, He gained His benefit.

3. In His death, He declared God's righteousness. And because He was with His Father, and agreed with His Father, God gave Him a benefit, didn't He? He gave Him eternal life and changed His nature. The Son came with a nature that was prone to sin; that was our problem. It was our problem, He took it upon Himself, He wore it as bro. Roberts said, 'He came down among the weakness, the distress, the tragedies, the sadness, the tears, He came amongst it all, and came down among men in that sense. And when He went to the cross, He'd never done a wrong thing in His life. He never thought a wrong thought, and not only that, b&s, He gave His whole heart to His Father; but still He said God was right, in rightly relating that nature to death. And all God asks is that we respond to that. I want to tell you something. I find this moving; it never fails to move me! When Abraham took Isaac to mount Moriah (you think about this) and with a determined mind to kill that boy; he raised that knife in the air, b&s, and with every intention in the world, to stab him to death and then to offer him as a sacrifice. Fully intended to do that! God stopped him, and this is what God said, this is what He said, 'because thou hast not withheld thy son, thy only son from Me, in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thee, and thy seed shall be as the stars of heaven'. (B&S, listen carefully, listen!) GOD RESPONDED TO A FATHER OFFERING HIS SON; GOD RESPONDED, but He stopped that father in the act. Hundreds of years later, the drama was repeated, this time God is the Father, and it's His beloved Son, and all He asks of us, is to respond to that sacrifice as HE DID! People talk about God Manifestation; God responded to a man offering his son. 'Because you have not withheld thy son, thine only son from Me', I will respond Abraham. Now, God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, and nobody stopped it that day! It went through to the end, and God offers Him and says, 'All I want from you people is a response'. The Son went to the cross to declare His Father to be right, and what God requires of us, is a response.

4. He benefitted because He acknowledged His own relationship to death. He never saw Himself separate from His brethren because He didn't sin. He identified Himself with them, as we do with Him. So Paul says in Hebrews, 'He tasted death for every man'; He's not ashamed in that sense to call them 'brethren'. He shared their problem

and so He benefitted because He identified Himself with the race, and that's what God wanted Him to do. He didn't consider Himself above them.

5. In the end He benefitted because He demonstrated in His death, His absolute trust of God, upon that cross, crying onto His Father, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me? Do you know why He said that, b&s? It's often a puzzle in people's minds why the Lord said that; there's an answer you know to that. It's in the same psalm; I believe what our Lord was doing, was commencing to recite that psalm and He had sufficient strength audibly to express that when He started it, but after a while His voice would have grown to a whisper. They wouldn't have heard the rest of it, but He would have recited it; the Jews had enormous memories, what about this One? His memory would have been phenomenal, and He would have seen the last closing hours, that this is the one He had been waiting for, He was counting them off one by one. He knew what must happen, this is the last one! and He starts it off, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me; why?' You know why, b&s, because verse 4 said, 'Thou art holy; Thou art holy that inhabitest the praises of Israel', and Jesus knew at the moment of death that God was the antithesis of death. DEATH CAME BY SIN, 'but Thou art holy'. God did not forsake Him; verse 24 of that same psalm said, 'that God had not forsaken the voice of Him that cried', He didn't forsake Him in that personal sense. But the spirit went, it flooded out of His veins, and He hung there, b&s, a man. A man, and if by one man sin entered into the world, this is a result of sin, He's there a man. Why have you forsaken Me? because you're holy; God has no relationship to sin and death.

And He expired, and because He had carried that out to the full, and obeyed His Father, in the process of making that sacrifice, to fulfil God's will for others, He Himself was saved in the very process. His nature was cleansed in the very process, He became con-substantial with the Father, sat at the Father's right hand, that He might mediate forever on behalf of those for whom He once had and still has, a deep and abiding sympathy. Jesus Christ, b&s, is our representative.