

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

399. I do. We both recognize Christ did not commit transgression, and that his blood was not required in regard to himself for any thing of that kind. Yet he did shed his blood for himself. What was it then for which he shed his blood for himself ?

Answer: I have answered that several times, Bro Andrew. He was a mortal man, inheriting death from Adam.

400. You have answered it by evading it.

Answer: By no means. I have not answered it in your precise terms which conceal meanings.

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

401. Did he not require to shed his blood to cleanse himself from his own sin nature, and has not God made that basis by which those in him may be justified from the sin of that nature and have forgiveness of sins?

Answer. I prefer the scriptural definition of what was done by the death of Christ. The scriptures never use the word cleanse in that sense.

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

402. Never use the word cleanse in regard to physical sin?

Answer: Not in that connection.

403. Did not the inanimate things of the Mosaic tabernacle required to be cleansed, justified, or atoned for by bloodshedding? **Answer:** Yes as a shadow doubtless.

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

404. Was there any moral guilt attaching to them?

Answer: You do not require me to answer that of course ?

405. Then it was for imputed guilt ?

Answer: It was a ritual prophecy.

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

406. Does it not teach that the sin nature, which in the first instance has no moral guilt, requires blood shedding in order that it may be cleansed or justified ?

Answer: Bloodshedding is never spoken of except in connection with actual sin.

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

711. It is not clear that Christ as a necessity, must offer up for himself for the purging of his own sin nature?

Answer: As a son of Adam, a son of Abraham, and a son of David, yes.

712. First from the uncleanness of death that having by his own blood having obtained eternal life himself, he might be able to save others?

Answer: Certainly.

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

713. Then he died for himself apart from being a sin bearer for others?

Answer: I do not admit that I cannot separate from his work.

714. Was he not separated 20 years ago to refute the free life theory?

Answer: Not by me, it might be by you.

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

715. How could Jesus be made free from sin which God laid upon him with his own nature, “made in the likeness of sinful flesh,” if he had not died for himself as well as for us?

Answer: He could not.

716. Then he offered for himself as well as for us?

Answer: Oh certainly.

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

717. It is not clear then that the death of Christ was necessary to purify his own nature from the sin power?

Answer: Oh certainly.

718. That was hereditary in the days of his flesh?

Answer : No doubt of it.

Andrew / Roberts / Debate. 1894.

719. And he as the first one had to undergo purification through his shed blood and resurrection?

Answer: Certainly I have not called that in question in the least.

720. Did you not say on Tuesday night that he did not need to shed his blood for himself?

Answer: That was on your impossible supposition that he stood apart from us, and was new Adam altogether.