

6337

## THE ATONEMENT

Speaker: Bro. John Martin

Study #1

Reconciled by His Death

Reading: Romans 3

My beloved brethren and sisters in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Well, b&s, we gather today to review the fundamentals about our faith concerning the work of God in Jesus Christ our Lord. And that work, b&s, was done in order that men might be reconciled to God, and if reconciled to God, they must be at one with one another. That was the whole purpose of that work, and yet tragically, b&s, there has been no doctrine that has caused so much trouble, in our brotherhood than this one. That is tragic! because it is so simple and yet so profound. And it is not that the truth is complex, b&s, but that when men turn away from the fundamentals of the simplicity as it is in Christ, it unfortunately, does become a little bit complex. We have no intention however today, to be complex; we want to run through this subject, b&s, slowly and deliberately and very simply, because, you see, it's something like this, isn't it? that when we come into the truth, we are baptised into the gospel; and we understand the gospel to be, the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.

Now, the things concerning the kingdom, b&s, once learnt, are relatively easy to remember; it's a matter of a promise, of things that God has promised that He will do; the land, the return of Christ, the kingdom, and so forth, and we don't forget those things! But, the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ are not like that, they're not promises, they're principles, and principles are harder to remember than promises. It's very difficult to retain in our mind, the principles that make up the work of God in Jesus Christ our Lord. And it has been for that reason, b&s, in my own ecclesia back home, in Enfield, it's always been our policy, at the end of the year, to review that doctrine amongst us. So come the end of the classes for the year, the final class is nearly always, (whenever it's possible and it rarely hasn't been possible) nearly always we have a night on The Atonement, and we bring everybody up to date for that year, with a review of that subject, for the very reason that I said, for it's easy to forget those principles.

You may wonder, b&s, why we have those two elements of the gospel. Well, you see, it's very simple, because you see, the first element, the gospel of the kingdom of God, provides the incentive, it's the driving force; it's like a magnet that attracts us towards

the future. It's the incentive that we press forward to, that we might be a part and parcel of that wonderful kingdom. But the name of Jesus Christ, b&s, is those things concerning, the sober realities of the principles that we have to know, understand and practice, if we're going to be in that kingdom. And so the apostle came forth preaching the kingdom, but teaching those things which concerned the Lord Jesus Christ, and no man forbidding him. Or in another place, he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, but he persuaded them concerning Jesus. And so there was your incentive and there was the reality and the principles that we've got to live by, if we want to be in that kingdom. That's why we've got those two elements.

You know, b&s, on this subject, Christendom abounds with every conceivable theory but the truth. And unfortunately in our brotherhood, almost from its inception, from its infancy, this subject has been, of course, one of controversy and has plagued us, and it should not have plagued us. It's extremely simple yet wonderfully profound. Now b&s, I want you to listen carefully, as I give as I believe, the reason for the problems that have arisen, and they invariably arise for this reason and that is this, there is always in the way we go wrong, an imbalance in emphasis. That's where it comes, there is not one controversy in this subject that I've reviewed, that that hasn't been the foundation error; an imbalance in the emphasis as to either, what God did for us, or what benefit the Lord Jesus Christ derived for Himself. And it's the imbalance in the emphasis one way or the other that has created all the problems on the Atonement. Where people blinded as to what the Lord's part in His sacrifice was, putting over emphasis on what He did for us, exclude Him altogether. And as a counter reaction to that, others, trying to readdress that balance, placing overdue emphasis on what He did for Himself, and make Him almost having an individual need, and for that very reason coming into the world, and losing sight of the fact, that He came in to represent us in our problems. And so there is either one imbalance or the other, which creates the foundation principle upon which all those errors have been created. And there is only one true way to see the Atonement, and that's the way our pioneers saw it, and the way particularly our bro. Roberts and our bro. Carter so beautifully presented it, and that is that the Lord Jesus Christ must be seen, b&s, as our representative. WE ARE IN HIM! that's the issue.

As our representative, to represent us in our weakness, that by being in Him, we might by Him be extricated from that weakness, and therefore, when we see these imbalances in emphasis either on what He did for us or what He did for Himself, we must bring those two things back to centre, b&s, and see Him as a total representative of the people for whom He came to die. We must never isolate Him from His work and if we do that and keep Him there, we will go straight down the middle of those errors and we will see the truth in its pristine beauty. Now what we intend to do today, is to present these talks mainly on transparency; not the last one, we will do without them for the last one, and that will be a different type of talk. We've done that, b&s, to conserve time, because it's a big subject and because we want to be very clear on the matter; it's not the best way to do it. I like to turn the references up, but to conserve time we've done it that way. And that's why we brought over a book with us, to explain in that book these transparencies because people are going to get this tape, and they're going to hear this and it won't make any sense to them, if they don't have a book in front of them, looking

at those transparencies, and for that reason we did that book, with a few explanations in the book of the particular transparencies under review. So we're going to do it like this, we'll have the first two talks this morning, and we'll try to go from A to Z on that subject. In those two talks we'll try and cover the Atonement simply and clearly, if we possibly can. Then we want to show you, b&s, in particular, how Jesus Christ is our representative. We want to make certain that we all understand that we've got to get Him there with us; we've got to see Him as someone who shared our problem, and that we share His victory. WE MUST KEEP IT LIKE THAT! because if we don't, if we go like that, we go off on tangents and we'll finish up on wrong conclusions. And so our third talk will be to demonstrate that principle. And in the end, what I want to show you, b&s, not by way of study so much, but together, we might exhort one another, I want to show you how the apostle Paul, in what must be the most moving section, as far as the personal conviction was concerned in Romans, how that all this doctrine affected him. The motive force of it, when it's truly understood, how that propels us forward, to do things which under normal circumstances, we would never do.

And so then let's start and have a look at this subject on the Atonement. First of all we note this that there are four governing principles of the Atonement. And they are stated in the Word of God, for example we read in 1 Corinthians chapter 1 in verses 23 and 24, that Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. Now they are two governing principles of the Atonement. God's power and God's wisdom; in Romans 3 which was read for us this morning, we saw there that also in the Atonement, one of the other governing principles is the righteousness of God, and of course, in 1 John chapter 4 and verse 10, we read, 'Not that we love God, but that He loved us, and gave His Son that He might be a propitiation for our sins'. And the love of God, of course, is seen everywhere in the Atonement. They are GOVERNING PRINCIPLES; why do we call them governing principles? For this reason, if we hear a theory on the Atonement that won't fit all of those principles, it's wrong. It's just plainly wrong if it won't fit those principles.

Let me give you perhaps a couple of ridiculous examples, just by way of illustration, not that any of us would believe these things, but just to show you what I mean. Take the doctrine of the churches, the doctrine that says for example that there is an immortal thing called the devil which has all miserable sinners chained to him, and that God paid the ransom for their release, in the blood of His Son, Jesus Christ. Now you try and fit that theory with those principles; it certainly doesn't demonstrate the power of God, b&s, because in this particular instance we have a devil equal in power with God, because He has to pay him to release miserable sinners; so it's got nothing to do with power. This has no wisdom in it, there's no wisdom in paying the price to an immortal monster like that; it certainly is not righteous because once having paid the ransom fee of the death of His Son, God snatched the price back in resurrection and cheaped him. And there is certainly no love in a theory like that; it won't fit any of those principles.

Now take another ridiculous example, the example of substitution. Where a man is convicted of some heinous crime and he's obviously guilty and they're going to hang him, and just before they hang him, someone runs forward, his friend comes out and

says, 'No, no, don't do that; hang me in his stead'. So they take the noose from the guilty man and put it around the innocent man's neck and hang him in the place of the guilty man, and the churches present that as being the 'Atonement'. What a lot of rubbish, where on earth is the power and wisdom of God in that, b&s? it's an utter travesty of justice, but righteousness of God, there's nothing righteous about that. It is a travesty of justice, and though some people may see an exhibition of love, I don't; because all that that guilty man would learn was 'let us sin that grace may abound'. He would not appreciate what was done for him in the end, he would go his own sweet way and learn nothing, and love always has for its objective, that the person may improve. So there are a couple of ridiculous theories which just demonstrate that they will not fit those principles, but take the truth of the matter.

If the Lord Jesus Christ had not been born of God by the virgin, He would never have had the strength to overcome sin. There was an incredible thing there, God's power was seen in that man; we saw a phenomenon of the earth, a human being perfect in form and in action and in deed. God's power was seen there, b&s, and when we see the workings of the Atonement, which we'll see today, we will see that God's wisdom was there, because it was not only that God upheld His own justice, it was not only that God did not abdicate His righteousness, but what was set before men was so wise, because men saw that to be recipients of God's grace was not just something they picked up out of the gutter, but something they must learn and understand and be disciplined to, and there's wisdom in that! And God's righteousness was certainly declared, b&s, in the death of His Son, as we'll see, as God showed that the very nature that He bore, was rightly related to death. GOD WAS RIGHT ABOUT THAT! and our Lord Jesus Christ co-operated with His Father, to tell the world that my Father is right about that. And yet in it all, and over it all and through it all, there was the love of God! God was not obligated to save the human race; God would have been justified in wiping out Adam and Eve from the very beginning and no one could have questioned it. But God didn't deal that way, He 'so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son', and the love of God in the transaction of the Atonement, b&s, is incomprehensible in its depth, and in its breadth, and in its width; and so all of those principles are beautifully found in the truth, but never in error.

Now let's have a look at the origin of sin. It is so important for us to understand the origin of sin. Why is it? Well, because you see, sin, b&s, is the responsibility of man; God is NOT responsible for sin. We must understand in its simplicity, how sin entered into the world. And so the apostle says in that famous chapter in Romans, chapter 5, 'By one MAN sin entered into the world', and so bro. Carter used that quaint expression, 'man is older than sin'. He introduced it. Now why do we emphasize that? Well, because man sinned AFTER the serpent had told his lie; AFTER THE SERPENT HAD TOLD HIS LIE. Paul didn't say 'by one serpent sinned entered into the world', he said by one man sin entered into the world, which means b&s, we've got to understand something of the nature of the serpent.

So the serpent was an amoral creature, he was neither moral nor immoral; he was incapable of expressing himself in moral terms or understanding moral terms. He did

not have a conscience that could accuse or excuse his actions. He was a beast of the field, he was amoral. He had no moral susceptibilities; we must understand that, it is important to understand that. Why is it important to understand that? Because if the serpent did have moral susceptibilities, if he did understand moral truths, then b&s, we are left with the inevitable logic which is inescapable, that in some indirect way, God Himself could be held accountable for the introduction of sin into the world, because He made that creature. THAT IS NOT SO; God made him amoral! When we read about his subtilty, the subtlety of the serpent (as we read in that third chapter of Genesis), is not necessarily an evil characteristic. It wasn't in his case an evil characteristic; for example if it was, then the Lord Jesus Christ in Matthew chapter 10 and verse 16, gave His disciples some diabolical advice, when He told them to be 'wise as serpents'. And He's obviously alluding to that record in Genesis, not that the serpent was wise in the sense that he was telling them, because that's wisdom in the moral sense, but because 'the serpent was more subtle, more discerning than any of the beasts of the field which the LORD God had made'. And so that subtlety is not necessarily in the serpent, an evil characteristic.

So we find in point #5 that its lie was not a deliberate or a malicious lie, it couldn't be; because to tell a deliberate lie is to be immoral, to tell a malicious lie is to be immoral. He could not be immoral, it was but an expression, b&s, of the way that his mind thought, an expression of a carnal mind. A mind of the flesh, not necessarily sinful as in his case, it was not, but still in all, something that only he thought, and the finest exposition of the serpent's lie which will never be bettered this side of the kingdom, is from the lips of our Lord Jesus Christ when He said this, 'when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own', in John chapter 8 He said that. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, in other words, he merely said what he thought, but Jesus said, nevertheless, it was a lie because it was opposite to what God said. But when he spoke that lie he spoke what he thought. Now, b&s, when man who was a moral creature, different from the serpent, who could exercise a conscience to either accuse or excuse themselves, when a man who was a moral creature adopted the serpent's mode of thinking, it resulted in sin entering the world, because they were capable of knowing better. And as a result of sin, death came, the cessation of being, and so sin came into the world by one man, not by the serpent. So John could say, 'all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, (listen!) is not of the Father, but is of the world.' God is NOT responsible for that but man is responsible for that. Because man had adopted that way of thinking in opposition to God, and because in their enflamed passions, they not only partook of the fruit, but beheld the possibility of the union with each other, and because their passions were enflamed, and because Cain was conceived in that frame of mind, b&s, so that John could say, 'he was of that wicked one'; he was almost a direct product of the thinking of the serpent, and because of that, men became biased in their thinking. All the equilibrium was upset and they now no longer think as God would have had them think; and instead of being 'very good' they are now 'evil continually' and Isaiah tragically commented, God says 'my thoughts are not your thoughts'; man is now permanently biased in his thinking.

That then, of course, is written through the scripture, we are mortal, b&s, because of

sin. But when we talk about mortality we are also talking about a proneness to sin. Now in Australia in 1958, we achieved to a large degree unity in our country on the doctrine of the Atonement, through the superb work of bro. John Carter, for whom I have an absolute, profound regard; I was still young enough or old enough I might say to experience some of his talks and although I had only been in the truth, myself for about 5 years, I was an arranging brother and had something to do with him, although very little at that time, but was heavily involved subsequently with the things that went on in that reunion movement. And one of the things that bro. Carter and bro. Cooper of England did for us, when they wrote a letter to the Australian ecclesias, was to explain that mortality must be understood also, in the sense, that whilst we are subject to death, there is also within our frame, proneness to sin. And that expression which you might think is quite common, was really not common in Australia, and it helped enormously, for simple folk to understand much of the principles of the truth, as God was working it out in Christ Jesus our Lord.

So we do have in our nature, a proneness to sin. Adam was made very good; sin made him as Genesis 6 tells us, 'evil continually'. Look at the difference, b&s, there was no change in the nature of Adam, he was flesh and blood before the fall, and he was flesh and blood after the fall, but there was an enormous change in the condition of that nature. And now he found himself, after being made in the image and likeness of God, he finds himself now going from 'very good' to 'evil continually'. And so there is a battery of scripture which testifies to the evil instincts that we have in us by birth; so Jeremiah says, 'the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately sick' (as the Hebrew word has it), it's a sick heart that we've got. He tells us in his 10th chapter that 'it is not in man that walketh, to direct his steps', men cannot of their own selves take a strait course. Job adds his testimony that 'man that is born of a woman is full of trouble'. And Paul, the greatest man ever, to follow Jesus Christ, (he's been described as that and we won't contradict that) said, 'that in my flesh dwells no good thing'; in my flesh dwells no good thing. He didn't say 'my flesh is no good thing', he said 'in my flesh dwells no good thing. There are propensities in there, they are real and they're no good thing. And I suppose the greatest testimony of all, without a doubt, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ when they came and said to Him, 'good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?' and before He would answer them, He corrected their understanding and said, 'don't call Me good; there is none good but God'. B&S, He was good, He was perfect morally and mentally, what did He mean? He meant this, that the goodness they beheld in Him, in His words, in His deeds, in His thinking, was not of the origin of His body. It never sprang from in here, it came external to Him! So whatever goodness He had was not to be attributed to the man Christ Jesus, but the Son of God, who willingly co-operated with His Father, that the Father might work and speak through Him. There's no good in Me, in that sense, saith the Lord, and so the apostle could describe those propensities within our body, the lust of the flesh, the lust of eyes, and the pride of life, biased to evil, he could describe them in the words, 'sin that dwelleth in me'. Very, very plain that is, b&s, isn't it?

Now, that sin and the bias to sin, presented a challenge to God, if we can express ourselves in human terms, like that. There was a challenge to God's purpose; so God's

eternal purpose was that the creation was for His pleasure and His glory. But you see, b&s, sin is an expression of a will in opposition to God; now let's just dwell upon that a moment. Sin is not just the breaking of law, in 1 John 3 and verse 4, the AV says 'sin is transgression of the law', but the Greek text is more expressive and conveys a wider idea than that, b&s, when it says this, 'sin is lawlessness'. It's not just individual acts of breaking certain laws, it is a principle at work, of lawlessness, of the inability of men to keep law, especially God's law, and therefore, sin becomes lawlessness. In other words, there is a will among men that is absolutely opposite to the will of God, and the whole creation was made in order that God's will might be done; now we've got two wills, and so you see, God's purpose is challenged, but will it be frustrated? 'Shall their (unrighteousness) unbelief make the faith of God without effect?' says the apostle, in other words, will the sin of man bring God's purpose to nought? Will it?

NO, b&s, and so in The Blood of Christ, our bro. Roberts (you'll recognize this from The Blood of Christ, for those of you who are familiar with it) our bro. Roberts set forth three ways which were open to God in dealing with this problem of sin. I couldn't find a better way of putting it, so I'll put up here what he said. So God could, he said, first of all, wipe out the Adamic creation; He would have been justified in doing that, He would have been righteous. But you see, b&s, that would have been an admission of failure, because His purpose was that man should have dominion; not that he should have dominion in his own right, but that he should have dominion in the sense that he should manifest His maker. He should make God plain as the word 'manifest' means; that he should rule for God, that was the purpose of God! To wipe him out would be to admit failure of that purpose. As a matter of fact, you might just ponder this thought, b&s, in this respect, when you think about it, the flood came later and all flesh perished, but not all flesh. What did God do? He put 8 people in the ark, and what He did was to put the animals in there; the clean animals by sevens and the unclean by pairs, what He did, and we say, 'that was a quaint way of doing it', but you see what He did, don't you? He took a sample of the creation and He put a sample of the creation in the ark, that when the floods swept all flesh away, and these came out of the ark, God's purpose hadn't failed, had it? He still had His creation; man hadn't destroyed it, it was just the same. It was greatly reduced but out of the ark poured forth the creation. So you see, God doesn't do it that way, He doesn't destroy everything and admit failure; He will not admit failure.

Or, says bro. Roberts, He could disregard sin; what's called the universal pity method. You could say, 'Well, no good worrying over spilt milk, it's done now, we can't worry about it, we'll have to get on with the business'. But as bro. Roberts points out that would have been to commit an injustice; He would have had to wink at sin; GOD WILL NOT DO THAT!

There was only one way, says bro. Roberts, that was the way in which it was done. And that is, God must enforce the law against sin. Now if He enforces the law against sin, it means man goes into oblivion; death comes by sin. In other words, what bro. Roberts is saying, IT MUST STAND, IT CAN'T CHANGE, it must stand and death must come as a result of sin, but at the same time, says bro. Roberts, He must open up a way of

forgiveness. Now, b&s, there's not anyone alive who could have ever, ever, ever, conceived the Atonement in such a way, that God's majesty was upheld and yet He was able to forgive sinners. It was a marvellous way in which it was done, and if we didn't have the record of the scriptures before us, there is no way that we could ever have understood it or even explained it, or even conceived it, that it could be done that way. Yet we are going to find ourselves, on the earth one day, immortal, free from proneness to sin, forgiven for all the misdeeds that we have done, and all the evil thoughts that we've ever thought, and we're going to stand on the earth and we're going to be forgiven and made perfect, and yet God will still be righteous, an incredible thing, and how is that done? It was done in Jesus Christ our Lord, and so the law against sin was enforced.

Now, b&s, it could only be done when man had made a mess of it, it could only be done by God. And that's the thing about the Atonement, it's not so much what we say the sacrifice of Christ is. IT'S GOD THAT DID IT! and that's the most wonderful thing. And this next transparency is something I really think, is one of the most wonderful things in the bible, the most wonderful truth in the bible. THAT GOD WAS IN CHRIST RECONCILING THE WORLD UNTO HIMSELF. I want you to follow this transparency closely with me, b&s. You see, we have in Genesis 3 and verse 15, the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman. Now when Christadelphians hear the term 'seed of the woman' instinctively our minds consider the Lord as having come from the bowels of his mother, and therefore, a partaker of all the disabilities inherent in her flesh and in ours, and we understand that by the term 'seed of the woman'. And that is not wrong, that is right, but it is not what Genesis 3:15 is teaching primarily. And I'll prove it to you! You won't disagree, it won't take a few seconds to do it, you see, because it's the seed of the woman that bruises the seed of the serpent on the head. If the seed of the woman means, primarily teaching I say, that He is born of flesh, then flesh overcomes flesh, and it doesn't; IT'S GOD WHO'S THE DRIVING AND THE POWERFUL FORCE IN OUR LIVES THAT OVERCOMES FLESH, not flesh. And so the seed of the woman, b&s, was not so much that He would be the seed of the woman, but that He WOULD NOT BE the seed of the man. That's the issue! that's the issue THAT IS THE ISSUE! He would not be the seed of man, and so if flesh was going to be bruised on the head and destroyed, it took more than flesh to do it. Well, we say, if He wasn't going to be the seed of man, who then? 2 Samuel 7, the covenant made with David. God says, 'I will be His Father' and we might ask the next question, well, how would God be His Father? Isaiah 7 verse 14, a virgin would conceive. When would that happen we might ask? Well, Paul says, 'when the fullness of time was come, GOD SENT FORTH (and here's the emphasis) HIS SON, made of a woman (Gal.4:4). See the point? And so there was an emphasis there on the divine sonship as well as on the nature of man. And so when would it happen? When the fullness of time would come.

Why would God need to do this? For what the law could not do, because flesh could not keep it; God, God sending His own Son, in the very likeness of that sinned flesh, condemned sin in that very body. God did that! and if God had not moved like that, b&s, we would be nowhere! Now listen to this, (I should have put this on another transparency but I didn't). In Romans chapter 1 (and don't turn this reference up



because it's simple enough), in Romans chapter 1 the apostle says, 'He was separated unto the gospel of God; the good news, the glad tidings of God, that's what He was separated unto, b&s. Now those glad tidings were, of course, were glad tidings of God because it spoke of the time when God would become involved in our lives. Paul got it from the Old Testament; Isaiah had said, 'lift up thy voice with strength. Say unto the cities of Judah, bring good tidings. Behold, our God!' There's the gospel of God. Isaiah 52 said, 'How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace; bringing good tidings of good things; behold our God', and Isaiah 61 says, 'The Spirit of Yahweh hath anointed Me to preach the gospel unto the poor'. The glad tidings unto the poor, and the day of vengeance of our God". So in three places in Isaiah, he speaks of the gospel of God. What gospel of God, b&s? Did you notice, our God, your God, thy God; it's not just the good news about God, it's the good news that's your God, our God, thy God; it's GOD IN OUR LIVES, that's the good news and that's what that is all about. A marvellous thing, and so God was to manifest Himself in our Lord Jesus Christ. Did that make our Lord Jesus Christ any different, b&s? Did it make Him any different as far as His physical constitution was concerned?; IT DID NOT! Did it make Him any different as far as His mental ability was concerned? IT MOST CERTAINLY DID ! But the fact that God was His Father, the fact that that was the contributing factor in His perfection, without which He would never have perfected righteousness, the fact that He was born, b&s, with a capacity and a total predilection towards spiritual things way above normal man, made no difference to His physical constitution. There was nothing magical in His body; there was no chemistry there that was different. His substance was precisely the same as ours, 'forasmuch as we partake of flesh and blood, He also, Himself likewise, (4 words of emphasis) partook of the same'. Paul says, He was made sin for us; that He died unto sin ONCE; that He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself; and that He condemned sin in the flesh'. In all those expressions that are used there, where Paul uses the term 'sin' b&s, he's not talking in respect to the Lord Jesus Christ, about moral transgression, because He did no sin.

We must be very much aware of the use of that term 'sin' as Paul used it. He used the term 'sin' by what bro. Roberts and bro. Carter described, the figure of 'metonymy'. The figure of metonymy, b&s, is where one word is put for another, to which it stands related. And so when they put poison in the food, when Elisha was eating with the sons of the prophets, and one of them shredded into the pot some wild herbs that were very poisonous, they said to Elisha 'there is death' in the pot; there was not death in the pot, there was poison in the pot. But because the poison would cause the death, the figure of metonymy, one thing was put for another to which it stood related. The poison would cause death, and so when Paul said, 'He was made sin for us, who knew no sin', he must be talking about sin in another sense, other than actual transgression. It's simple, it must be, because He did know sin, he was talking, b&s, about the cause of sin; and the cause of sin in us, was also in Jesus though it did not cause sin. But the cause of all sin in us, was in Him. And in us it's the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, as much as it was in Him, and the fact that He was the Son of God, did not make Him unbiased to evil, HE WAS STILL BIASED TO EVIL. And the fact that He was born of God, b&s, did not automatically give Him a will that was different from ours, and exactly like the Father's, because He stood in the garden of Gethsemane and says, 'not

My will but your will be done'; and there were two wills there, and so you see, when we speak about our Lord Jesus Christ and we talk about Him being made sin for us, we are talking about Him being made of identical stuff as we're made of, and not talking about Him, of course, as being an actual sinner. That's, of course, an unthinkable thing.

And so our final transparency this morning, is this one. Being made sin for us, He found Himself in a situation that He needed desperately His God, He was made sin for us, says the apostle, He had this sin-proned nature, He was under the dominion of death. He had to die, it's an inescapable obligation, there's no way around that for Him; He was unable to save Himself, He said that in John chapter 5 and verse 19, 'I can of my own self do nothing', but it was God who strengthened Him to overcome, as Psalm 80 says, 'He was the man made strong for God, and in the end when He laid in the tomb, b&s, inert and unconscious, unconscious and there's no way He can redeem Himself. He was redeemed from death by God's power, that when He had offered up strong crying and tears, says the apostle, He was saved out of death (not from it, but out of it). The apostle said in another place, 'it was by the glory of God that our Lord Jesus Christ was made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption OF GOD, that no flesh (including His) should glory in the great victory that was wrought in Jesus Christ our Lord by the great and mighty God of heaven.'

We're half way through, b&s, so we'll terminate that there, and have a cup of coffee, which I'm looking forward to, and have a look at the snow, which I'm looking forward to, and then reconvene.