

**Chapter 1 : Calvary PHX :: Event Detail**

*Stunning Answers to the Mystery of Calvary Scholars Find Evidence of Jesus' Crucifixion at Golgotha by Benjamin Hartman. JERUSALEM, Israel - "There is no question in my mind the greatest single event in all of history happened on the cross."*

The discussion page may contain suggestions. January Learn how and when to remove this template message

A map of Jerusalem in the late second temple period from illustrating the question of the Holy Sepulchre. Contemporary scholars would no longer accept this reconstruction of the city walls. According to the Bible , Jesus was crucified very near the city of Jerusalem, outside its walls. For example, as early as AD Saint Willibald made the following claim: Clarke rejected the traditional location as a "mere delusion, a monkish juggle" [15] and suggested instead that the crucifixion took place just outside Zion Gate. After a careful consideration of the issue with the material available at the time Robinson concluded that: Robinson was careful not to propose an alternative site and had concluded that it would be impossible to identify the true location of the holy places. However, he did suggest that the crucifixion would have taken place somewhere on the road to Jaffa or the road to Damascus. The caption below it reads: The picture in the foreground is a historical photograph c. Since Golgotha is the Aramaic word for skull, and may perhaps refer to the shape of the place, Thenius concluded that the rocky escarpment was likely to have been Golgotha. In that essay Howe described the hill in these terms: The skull-like front, or face, on the south side is formed by the deep perpendicular cutting and removal of the ledge. To the observer, at a distance, the eyeless socket of the skull would be suggested at once by the yawning cavern, hewn within its face, beneath the hill. Canon Tristram was also one of the advocates of purchasing the nearby Garden Tomb in Conder[ edit ] Another prominent proponent of the "new Calvary" was Claude R. Conder , a lieutenant in the Royal Engineers, who was appointed in by the Palestine Exploration Fund along with Lord Kitchener to conduct a mapping survey of Western Palestine contemporary Israel and Palestine. Conder, Tent Work in Palestine: A Record of Discovery and Adventure, Vol. I London, , p. He based this identification on several arguments. First of all, since the Gospel according to John places Golgotha in the near vicinity of a garden and a tomb John He also pointed to a Christian tradition which associated that general area with the martyrdom of St. Stephen as additional evidence that it was a public place of execution during the New Testament era. Conder actually downplayed the supposed resemblance to a skull which he viewed as immaterial, remarking: In his writings Conder refers to Skull Hill by the Arabic name El-Heidhemiyeh which he interpreted as "the rent", and which he proposed was a corruption of El-Heiremiyeh - "the place of Jeremiah". The name of this legendary military commander had become so entwined with Skull Hill, that many contemporary news articles and guide books have erroneously stated that Gordon is the first to discover the site, and that this discovery was a sudden mystical epiphany. Gordon proposed a typological reading of Leviticus 1: Gordon interpreted this verse to mean that Christ, the prototype, must also have been slain north of the "altar" Skull Hill being north of Jerusalem and of the Temple Mount. I feel, for myself, convinced that the Hill near the Damascus Gate is Golgotha. From it, you can see the Temple, the Mount of Olives and the bulk of Jerusalem. His stretched out arms would, as it were, embrace it: Close to it is the slaughter-house of Jerusalem; quite pools of blood are lying there. It is covered with tombs of Muslim; There are many rock-hewn caves; and gardens surround it. It is very nice to see it so plain and simple, instead of having a huge church built on it. Harris in The Church of the Holy Sepulchre has its tomb just a few yards away from its Golgotha, corresponding with the account of John the Evangelist: This particular tomb also has a stone groove running along the ground outside it, which Gordon argued to be a slot that once housed a stone, corresponding to the biblical account of a stone being rolled over the tomb entrance to close it. A view of the Garden Tomb from the s Inside the tomb.

**Chapter 2 : THE SECRET OF THE CROSS**

*The Mystery of Calvary [Gerard Rooney] on calendrierdelascience.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. Wonderful spiritual book dealing with the Passion.*

The Cross of Christ A study of the meaning of the "cross of Christ", pointing out the many mystical meanings that have been used to apply the cross to Christian believers. You are free to download this article provided it remains intact without alteration. You are also free to transmit this article and quote this article provided that proper citation of authorship is included. Theological Articles The death of Jesus Christ on a cross is an important truth of the Christian gospel. In fact, it is crucial to the gospel, the crux of the message, if we might employ additional English words derived from the Latin word *crux*, from which we also derive the English word "cross. *Stauros* originally indicated a pointed, vertical stake firmly fixed in the ground. The word was used for "fence posts. The primary meaning of the word thus became a reference to an execution instrument comprised of wooden timbers and affixed in the ground. Sometimes the execution instrument was but a single pointed stake on which the offender was impaled. Sometimes the word was used of the timbers from which an offender was hanged. An example of this second usage may be found in the Greek text Septuagint of Esther 7: The predominate form of the *stauros* death instrument was the crossing of two timbers. There are abundant examples in history where most of the ancient cultures utilized the cross as an execution instrument. Although the Jews employed stoning as their primary method of execution, they were well acquainted with the use of the cross by other cultures to execute to their own people. Flavius Josephus, a Jewish historian, records that Alexander the Great "did one of the most barbarous actions in the world" to a group of Jews he had conquered. He "ordered about of them to be crucified. The Romans employed this form of execution primarily for slaves, although it was also used for foreigners, traitors and the most despicable of criminals. It was generally regarded as too degrading to be utilized for Roman citizens. Execution on a cross was a public display of capital punishment. Crosses were quite visible on the hills surrounding major towns and alongside the Roman roads. The visibility of these executions was considered to be a deterrent to further crime in the society. The condemned criminal was often forced to carry the wooden timber, or at least the cross-beam, the *patibulum*, to the site of his own execution, thus exposing himself as an object of public reproach. In the first century the Jewish people of Palestine were well acquainted with crosses being used as death instruments, execution devices. The gospel narratives record three incidents where Jesus made such a reference prior to His own experience with a cross: The figurative implications of these teachings will be considered later, but these five general references serve as the initial usages of the Greek noun, *stauros*, in each of the synoptic gospels, prior to any specific references to the particular cross on which Jesus died. The Material Object -- The Cross On one of the many timber stakes affixed in the ground outside of Jerusalem, Jesus was suspended in order to be executed. It was no doubt a stake that had been used many times previously to execute others. The material object itself was no different than thousands of other such instruments constructed by the Romans. But the One who was to be affixed to that specific execution instrument was unique among men; He was the Son of God. Henceforth that specific cross would be referred to as "the" cross on which Jesus Christ died. Apart from the aforementioned five general references to a cross as a death instrument, all of the other usages of the Greek word *stauros* within the New Testament gospel accounts refer to the physical, material object on which Jesus was crucified. Jesus was forced to "bear His own cross" John An inscription was attached at the top of the timber of the cross, reading "Jesus the Nazarene, King of the Jews" John There were by-standers, both friend and foe, standing near the cross Matt. Jesus was taunted to exhibit His supernatural power and come down from the cross Matt. These eleven references comprise all of the remaining usages of *stauros* in the gospel accounts. The point being made is that there are five general references to "bearing" or "taking up" a cross, and eleven specific references to the particular material cross on which Jesus was affixed, and these comprise all sixteen usages of the word *stauros* in the gospel accounts. Other biblical references to the material cross on which Jesus died may include Phil. The Historical Action on the Cross -- Crucifixion of Jesus On the particular death instrument to which Jesus was attached and suspended there transpired an historical event, the

crucifixion death of Jesus. Jesus Himself had prophesied that such an event would take place Matt. The Jewish mob demanded the crucifixion death of Jesus, crying "Crucify Him! Pilate, the Roman proconsul, questioned, "Shall I crucify your King? The Roman soldiers who were on "crucifixion detail" that eventful day "led Him out to be crucified" Matt. Jesus was crucified between two thieves who were suspended on other crosses nearby Matt. The Aramaic term for "skull" is transliterated into English as "Golgotha. The angel at the empty tomb advised His followers that he knew they were "looking for Jesus who was crucified" Matt. The men on the road to Emmaus told the as yet unidentified risen Jesus of the prophecy and event of Jesus being "delivered into the hands of sinful men and crucified" Luke The foregoing citations are the gospel references to the historical death by crucifixion of "the man, Christ Jesus" I Tim. Additional references to the historical death of Christ are made by Peter at Pentecost when he tells the great gathering of Jews at Pentecost of "Jesus, whom you crucified," Acts 2: To the Corinthians Paul writes that if those who were instrumental in Jesus crucifixion had understood "they would not have crucified the Lord of glory" I Corinthians 2: In His death on the cross Jesus was taking the death consequence of sin for all mankind. This He could do in that He was the sinless Savior enacting a consequential spiritual solidarity with the whole human race. The first man, Adam, had enacted a consequential spiritual solidarity, when by his sin all men died spiritually Rom. God had originally told Adam in the garden, "In the day that you eat thereof" from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, "dying you shall die" Genesis 2: The consequence of sin was death in its various spiritual, psychological and physical forms. Jesus, the Son of God, was incarnated as the God-man, who as man could experience the death consequences of sin, who as sinless man could take those death consequences vicariously and substitutionally for all man, and who as God could restore divine life to man spiritually in order to restore functional humanity. As a man Jesus incurred all the death consequences that had occurred in Adam. As a sinless man death had no right to Him personally and could not hold Him. As God He could thus save us from the consequences of sin and further expression of sin by becoming life within us. Jesus "came to give His life a ransom for many" Matt. Jesus "came that we might have life" John The remedial purpose of death and the restorative purpose of life are inseparable in the consideration of the theological significance of the death of Jesus Christ on a cross. While still suspended from the cross and facing imminent physical death, Jesus exclaimed, "Tetelestai! To amplify the meaning, it could be translated "completed," "accomplished," "fulfilled," "brought to its intended end. In the death of Jesus Christ this has been "Paid in full," "It is finished. There is no more condemnation. There is no more indebtedness. There are no more performance requirements. Such is the "finished work" of Jesus Christ. Redemption, whereby we are "bought with a price" I Cor. Thus we see that reference to the "cross" on which Jesus died necessarily conveys the theological significance of the "finished work" of God for and in man by His Son, Jesus Christ, inclusive of the death, burial, resurrection, ascension, Pentecostal outpouring and complete eschatological expectations. Ian Thomas writes, " He came that you might have life! His life -- imparted to you by the renewing of the Holy Spirit on the grounds of redemption He came to restore to you all that makes the mystery of godliness an open secret -- the presence of the Living God within a human soul. He asks the Corinthians a rhetorical question: Paul was a mere man whose death by whatever means would not have theological significance for mankind. Only the death of Jesus Christ, Son of God, God-man, could take our death-consequences that we might have His life-consequences. Continuing his correspondence Paul states, "Christ sent me to preach the gospel, not in cleverness of speech, that the cross of Christ should not be made void. Christians who are "being saved" from the dysfunction of fallen humanity receive that divine dynamic in order to function as God intended. The perfect tense verb indicates completed action in the past, the consequences of which remain to the present, i. Likewise, in I Cor. He refers to the "Galatians Paul had clearly spelled out, graphically presented to the Galatians how Jesus took our death to give us His life, took the consequences of our unrighteousness to give us His righteousness. The implication is that if the Galatians have understood the "finished work" of Christ, they would not continue to be persuaded by the false purveyors of legalism to pursue performance, "works," self-efforts to finish the work. The stumblingblock, the scandal, the offense of the cross is that Jesus finished doing everything that needed to be done before God. There is nothing we can do! The death of Jesus Christ on the cross and the subsequent availability of the divine life to all mankind, comprises the "finished work," the sole basis of right

relationship and fellowship with God. Religion and all its "works" programs have been exposed as frauds by the "finished work" of Christ. Consequently they are quick to denigrate and persecute those who teach and live by the grace-work of God in Christ. Paul explains that the religionists "try to compel you to be circumcised, that they may not be persecuted for the cross of Christ" Gal. They do not want to be persecuted and mocked by other religionists for preaching the grace of God in the activity of Jesus Christ alone. Paul then declares, "may it never be that I should boast, except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" Gal. Paul never wants to boast in what he has done by self-effort or performance, only in what Christ has done and continues to do -- the "finished work. Likewise, "all things" are reconciled to God by His "having made peace through the blood of the cross" Col. The alienation of the whole creation was due to sin, the consequence of sin was death, and death has been taken by Jesus Christ. Reconciliation, peace, the restoration of all things, the restoration of creation has been effected by the "finished work" of Jesus. Through his tears Paul decries that there are many who "are enemies of the cross of Christ" Phil. Many there are who do not understand and live on the basis of the "finished work" of Christ.

**Chapter 3 : Calvary and the Mystery of the Trinity - Patience of the Saints**

*The Argument of Calvary It is popularly assumed that Father, Son and Holy Ghost make a Trinity; further, that the Trinity concept is a mystery that is difficult to explain but should be accepted by faith.*

One of the most important answers, undoubtedly, is that he does not know what it is to die to himself and to the world. He has repented of some sins, but knows not what it is to turn, not only from sin, but from his old nature and self-will. Yet this is what the Lord Jesus taught. He said to the disciples that if any man would come after Him, he must hate and lose his own life. He taught them to take up the cross. That meant they were to consider their life as sinful and under sentence of death. They must give up themselves, their own will and power, and any goodness of their own. When their Lord had died on the cross, they would learn what it was to die to themselves and the world, and to live their life in the fullness of God. Our Lord used the Apostle Paul to put this still more clearly. Paul did not know Christ after the flesh, but through the Holy Spirit Christ was revealed in his heart, and he could testify: As the season of Lent approaches each year, our thoughts will be occupied with the sufferings and death of our Lord. Emphasis will be laid, in the preaching, on Christ for us on the cross as the foundation of our salvation. Less is said about our death with Christ. The subject is a deep and difficult one, yet every Christian needs to consider it. It is my earnest desire to help those Christians who are considering this great truth, that death to self and to the world is necessary for a life in the love and joy of Christ. I have sought to explain the chief words of our Lord and of His disciples on this subject. May I point out two things to my reader. First, take time to read over what you do not understand at once. Spiritual truth is not easy to grasp. And secondly, be assured that only through the continual teaching of the Holy Spirit in your heart will you be able to appropriate spiritual truths. The great work of the Holy Spirit is to reveal Christ in our hearts and lives as the Crucified One who dwells within us. Let this be the chief aim of all your devotion: Thus will you learn to die to yourself and to the world, and will receive Christ, the Crucified and Glorified One, into your heart, and be kept through the continual working of the Holy Spirit. Let us pray fervently for each other that God may teach us what it is to die with Christ -- a death to ourselves and to the world; a life in Christ Jesus. How shall I thank Thee for our eternal salvation, wrought out by that death on the cross! He died for me that I might live eternally. Through His death on the cross I am dead to sin, and live in the power of His life. Father in heaven, teach me, I humbly entreat Thee, what it means that I am dead with Christ and can live my life in Him. Teach me to realize that my sinful flesh is wholly corrupt and nailed to the cross to be destroyed, that the life of Christ may be manifest in me. Teach me, above all, to believe that I cannot either understand or experience this except through the continual working of the Holy Spirit dwelling within me. He hath many desirous of consolation, but few of tribulation. He findeth many companions of His table, but few of His abstinence. All desire to rejoice with Him, few are willing to endure anything for Him, or with Him. Many follow Jesus unto the breaking of bread, but few to the drinking of the cup of His passion. Many reverence His miracles, few follow the ignominy of His cross. Christ dying for us as our complete deliverance from the curse of sin. Christ taking us up to die with Him, and making us partakers of the fellowship of His death in our own experience. In our text we have three great unsearchable thoughts. The law of God has pronounced a curse on all sin and on all that is sinful. Christ took our curse upon Him -- yea, became a curse -- and so destroyed its power, and in that cross we now have the everlasting redemption from sin and all its power. In these thoughts the lost and most hopeless sinner finds a sure ground of confidence and of hope. God had indeed in Paradise pronounced a curse upon this earth and all that belongs to it. On Mount Ebal, in connection with giving the law, half of the people of Israel were twelve times over to pronounce a curse on all sin. And there was to be in their midst a continual reminder of it: And yet who could ever have thought that the Son of God Himself would die upon the accursed tree, and become a curse for us? The preaching of the redemption of the cross is the foundation and center of the salvation the gospel brings us. To those who believe its full truth it is a cause of unceasing thanksgiving. It gives us boldness to rejoice in God. There is nothing which will keep the heart more tender towards God, enabling us to live in His love and to make Him known to those who have never yet found Him. God be praised for the redemption of the cross! Paul here tells us what that mind was in Christ: He

emptied Himself; He took the form of a servant; He humbled Himself, even to the death of the cross. It is this mind that was in Christ, the deep humility that gave up His life to the very death, that is to be the spirit that animates us. It is thus that we shall prove and enjoy the blessed fellowship of His cross. Paul had said ver. As they strove to do this, they would feel the need of a deeper insight into their real oneness with Christ. They would learn to know what it meant that the crucified Christ lived in them, and that they had crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts. It was because the crucified Jesus lived in them that they could live crucified to the world. And so they would gradually enter more deeply into the meaning and the power of their high calling to live as those who were dead to sin and the world and self. Each in his own measure would bear about in his life the marks of the cross, with its sentence of death on the flesh, with its hating of the self life and its entire denial of self, with its growing conformity to the crucified Redeemer in His deep humility and entire surrender of His will to the life of God. It is no easy school and no hurried learning -- this school of the cross. But it will lead to a deeper apprehension and a higher appreciation of the redemption of the cross, through the personal experience of the fellowship of the cross. The thought of fellowship with Christ in His bearing the cross has often led to the vain attempt in our own power to follow Him and bear His image. But this is impossible to man until he first learns to know something of what it means to say, "I have been crucified with Christ. When Adam died, all his descendants died with him and in him. In his sin in Paradise, and in the spiritual death into which he fell, I had a share: I died in him. And the power of that sin and death, in which all his descendants share, works in every child of Adam every day. Christ came as the second Adam. In His death on the cross all who believe in Him had a share. Each one may say in truth, "I have been crucified with Christ. The life that He gives is the crucified life, in which He entered heaven and was exalted to the throne, standing as a Lamb as it had been slain. The power of His death and life work in me, and as I hold fast the truth that I have been crucified with Him, and that now I myself live no more but Christ liveth in me, I receive power to conquer sin; the life that I have received from Him is a life that has been crucified and made free from the power of sin. We have here a deep and very precious truth. Most Christians have but little knowledge of it. That knowledge is not gained easily or speedily. It needs a great longing in very deed to be dead to all sin. It needs a strong faith, wrought by the Holy Spirit, that the union with Christ crucified -- the fellowship of His cross -- can day by day become our life. The life that He lives in heaven has its strength and its glory in the fact that it is a crucified life. It is in very deed true that I no longer live, but Christ liveth in me as a Crucified One. As faith realizes and holds fast the fact that the crucified Christ lives in me, life in the fellowship of the cross becomes a possibility and a blessed experience. He speaks of his only glory being that in Christ he has in very deed been crucified to the world and entirely delivered from its power. When he said "I have been crucified with Christ," it was not only an inner spiritual truth, but an actual, practical experience in relation to the world and its temptations. Christ had spoken about the world hating Him, and His having overcome the world. Paul knows that the world, which nailed Christ to the cross, had in that deed done the same to him. He boasts that he lives as one crucified to the world, and that now the world as an impotent enemy was crucified to him. It was this that made him glory in the cross of Christ. It had wrought out a complete deliverance from the world. How very different the relation of Christians to the world in our day! They agree that they may not commit the sins that the world allows. But except for that they are good friends with the world, and have liberty to enjoy as much of it as they can, if they only keep from open sin. They do not know that the most dangerous source of sin is the love of the world with its lusts and pleasures. O Christian, when the world crucified Christ, it crucified you with Him, When Christ overcame the world on the cross, He made you an overcomer too. He calls you now, at whatever cost of self-denial, to regard the world, in its hostility to God and His kingdom, as a crucified enemy over whom the cross can ever keep you conqueror. What a different relationship to the pleasures and attractions of the world the Christian has who by the Holy Spirit has learned to say: Let us pray God fervently that the Holy Spirit, through whom Christ offered Himself on the cross, may reveal to us in power what it means to "glory in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world had been crucified unto me. Of the flesh Paul teaches us Romans 7: Flesh is the expression for the evil, corrupt nature that we inherit from Adam. Of this flesh it is written, "Our old man was crucified with Him" Romans 6:

## Chapter 4 : Stunning Answers to the Mystery of Calvary

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

Calvary and the Mystery of the Trinity Posted by: Zerubbabel on November 18, The Argument of Calvary It is popularly assumed that Father, Son and Holy Ghost make a Trinity; further, that the Trinity concept is a mystery that is difficult to explain but should be accepted by faith. But, does the supposed difficulty in explaining it really expose us to embracing questionable ideas that could be detrimental to accept? First of all, what is the Trinity and why is the question important? Is this a valid position? Could we, unwittingly, be offering worship where it does not belong – making us guilty of idolatry? Further, the Trinity presents Jesus as being eternally self-existent as the Father. Does this imply that Jesus did not die at Calvary or that there is a part of a person that is alive when their body is dead? These and other issues bear on the validity and consistency of the faith that we profess. When all is said and done, the answer to all mysteries is revealed in the light that streams from Calvary. If the argument of Calvary is not sufficient to settle all mysteries for us Christians and set us on the straight path, perhaps nothing else can. It is an established historical fact that neither the Jews, nor the Apostles nor the Seventh-day Adventist Pioneers believed or taught that God was a Trinity. The concept was developed between A. But it is more than that. The Trinity doctrine asserts that there is one God who is made up of three persons. Some people prefer to use the term Godhead, but in essence hold to the same concept as is held by those who use the term Trinity. Standard definitions of Trinity are as follows: If the testimony of the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism is not sufficient to convince us that the Trinity is a false and pernicious doctrine, then perhaps, Rome herself can do the job by telling us that she was the one who formulated the doctrine. If the testimony of the Jews, to whom was committed the oracles of God, is not sufficient to convince us that God is one and not one in three or three in one, then, maybe the pagans of their day, who invariably had a Trinity of gods, may help us to see that the Trinity concept is of pagan origin. But, if all else fails, I hope the argument of Calvary will be sufficient to settle all questions once and for all. Such was the sacrifice that was made by the Father and the Son because of their great love for humanity. To this we respond with gratitude by worshipping the Father and the Son in accordance with the precedents in scripture. This implies that no separation took place at Calvary. Which will you believe? The doctrine of antichrist denies the Father and the Son 1 John 2: Contrary to the argument of Calvary, the Trinity concept declares that the Son is as eternally self-existent as the Father. To be eternally self-existent means that you cannot die. This implies that the Son of God cannot die and, therefore, did not die at Calvary. It is either the truth as declared at Calvary that the Son of God was made flesh so that He could die and did in fact die or the doctrine of antichrist that denies that Christ came in the flesh 1 John 4: Contrary to the argument of Calvary, the Trinity concept declares that, apart from the Father and the Son, there is another who is deserving of worship and adoration. There is no precedent or authority given in scripture for worship to be offered to anyone except the Father and the Son, for they only are worthy Rev. In the name of this other object of worship, many are supposedly speaking in tongues, performing many miracles and communicating with all manner of spirits. Believing in the Trinity, fulfils the one criterion necessary for acceptance with the World Council of Churches and being a part of the Babylonish ecumenical spiritualistic confederation that will be overthrown at the second coming of Christ. Calvary discounts the three pivotal concepts of the Trinity, namely: Would one dare contend with the argument of Calvary? I hope that, once and for all, those who were ready to declare the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism in error in their rejection of the Trinity will thoughtfully reconsider. If such is the case, then, by the same premise, would it not also be true that Jesus must always exist and therefore could not have died at any point if He is to be regarded as a Divine Being? If that was true of Christ, then, what of human beings who were made in the image of God? In following the Trinitarian line, one is inescapably led to justify not only the doctrine of the immortality of the soul but every single Roman Catholic doctrine. Indeed, the Roman Catholic Church has declared that all their other doctrines

are based on the doctrine of the Trinity: Consider even the idea of Mary being co-mediatrix. If Jesus Christ is also, Himself, the God from whom humanity has been estranged and to whom humanity needs to be reconciled, then, is it not evident that there would be a need for someone to go between us and Jesus Christ? How have Seventh-day Adventists come to the place where they are now declaring that Jesus raised Himself from the dead? Could the Bible have made itself any clearer when, in Gal. Or, could Ellen G. Which set of people would more fit the bill of being classified as Babylon, if Trinitarianism should be regarded as truth? Would not the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism be found as fitting the bill of being labeled false prophets and Babylon? Is it not inexplicable that some of these very persons had previously belonged to Trinitarian churches before accepting Seventh-day Adventism and this great enlightenment that was brought to their spiritual experience should be tainted by the rejection of truth the so-called truth of Trinitarianism, which they had previously embraced, only to have it replaced with damnable heresy the supposed error of non-Trinitarianism? Yet the world was to accept and believe that these people were specially called by God? Trinity Concept Denies Bible and Spirit of Prophecy Consistency If the Trinitarian line that is being advanced is correct, then the inescapable conclusion is that the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy contradict themselves. I will now highlight some statements that cannot be reconciled to a Trinitarian position all emphases mine. The associate was not Himself the Sovereign. Plainly, the God that the Word was John 1: The Father first, The Son second and Lucifer third. The third was not worshipped, being a creature. The third wanted to be worshipped. After being removed from his position Lucifer now Satan, has obviously found a way of getting humanity to accept the idea of offering worship to a third being. To Christ has been given an exalted position. He has been made equal with the Father. In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. But it is not necessary. The point is that there are many statements that simply cannot be reconciled to a Trinitarian concept of God. Seeming Contradictions There are statements that have been attributed to Ellen G. White that, on the face of it, appear to give a Trinitarian viewpoint. However, a number of them can be explained otherwise. In fact, they must be explained otherwise if contradiction is not to be conceded, since the overwhelming weight of evidence does not support a Trinity. As supporting a Trinity, persons cite, for example, Evangelism p. To say that Christ is self-existent does not preclude His being begotten. In fact, that is what the Bible says in St. The expression eternal Son does not preclude His being begotten either. Even the Nicene Creed recognizes a difference between being created and being begotten in the following words: The point here, is that being created and being begotten are two different things that even the Nicene Creed recognizes, and further, that being begotten does not imply inferiority. Why should one seek to deny that a literal Father-Son relationship exists? This does not detract from the Divinity of Christ. This does not make Him an inferior kind of Being. What would make one think that an offspring could be other than the same kind as the parent? Another statement of Ellen G. White that is seized upon to advance the concept of a Trinity is the following: Here is the full statement as it was originally published in Signs of the Times: This life is not inherent in man. He can possess it only through Christ. He cannot earn it; it is given him as a free gift if he will believe in Christ as a personal Saviour. Being described is the nature and quality of this life and not the origin of it. Original "not a pattern or copy, but something genuine, authentic. Unborrowed "does not have to be returned. Underived "not drawn from a source; He has it in Himself. How He came in possession of it? It was given to Him by His Father. This matter seems to be quite straightforward and should not lend itself to much of the confusion that this statement is used to create, since Ellen G. White was not even discussing the matter of a Trinity. Give Prophet the Benefit of the Doubt It is only reasonable that the prophet be given the benefit of the doubt by understanding her statements in a manner that is consistent with other clear statements that she made and with the unanimous position that the church held during her lifetime. Indeed, the non-Trinitarian statements of faith of, Signs of the Times, June 4, 14, , and represented the generally accepted position of the church of which Ellen G. White was a part, and she did not object to it. It is not reasonable to construe the words of the prophet in a manner that brings the prophet into disrepute and calls into question the credibility of the entire foundation of the Seventh-day Adventist movement. Nowhere in Ellen G. She never corrected any of the pioneers, including her own husband, James White, who were staunchly non-Trinitarian. Is that the way a church and a prophet go about the business of correcting a foundational heresy? Can one, for even a passing moment, entertain the

thought that a prophet and a church, realizing that they were in fundamental error, preaching a false concept of a non-Trinitarian God, misleading people, and they just silently publish a book that does not even mention the term Trinity? No acknowledgement that they were wrong?

**Chapter 5 : Ephesians - Commentary on Ephesians - The Mystery of Christ - Calvary Tucson Church**

*Calvary is the place where Jesus died. Allan looks at the mystery of Calvary -where a holy and righteous God-man Christ Jesus was put to death.*

Altar at the traditional site of Golgotha. The altar at the traditional site of Golgotha. The church fathers offer different interpretations for the name; either deriving it from a topographic feature resembling a cranium Pseudo-Tertullian , [9] or alternatively as the site where the skull of Adam was said to be buried Origenes , or from skulls of those executed there Jerome , locum decollatorum. According to Hebrews Hebrews Thus, locating the crucifixion site involves identifying a site that, in the city of Jerusalem some four decades before its destruction in AD 70 , would have been outside the city walls and well visible to passers-by. Church of the Holy Sepulchre[ edit ] Christian tradition since the 4th century has favoured a location now within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Those opposing it doubt this. That means, this place [was] outside of the city, without any doubtâ€œ", [15] thus maintaining that there are no scientific, archaeological grounds for rejecting the traditional location for Calvary. Essentially, for the traditional site to have been outside the wall, the city would have had to be limited to the lower parts of the Tyropoeon Valley , rather than including the defensively advantageous western hill. Since these geographic considerations imply that not including the hill within the walls would be willfully making the city prone to attack from it, some scholars, including the late 19th century surveyors of the Palestine Exploration Fund , consider it unlikely that people would build a wall that cut the hill off from the city in the valley. The traditional location of Golgotha derives from its identification by Helena , the mother of Constantine I , in In , the Pilgrim of Bordeaux , entering from the east described the result: On the left hand is the little hill of Golgotha where the Lord was crucified. There, at present, by the command of the Emperor Constantine, has been built a basilica ; that is to say, a church of wondrous beauty. Temple to Aphrodite[ edit ] Jerusalem after being rebuilt by Hadrian. Christian tradition claims that the location had originally been a Christian place of veneration, but that Hadrian had deliberately buried these Christian sites and built his own temple on top, on account of his alleged hatred for Christianity. While the positioning of the Temple of Aphrodite may be, in light of the common Colonia layout, entirely unintentional, Hadrian is known to have concurrently built pagan temples on top of other holy sites in Jerusalem as part of an overall Romanization policy. Rockface[ edit ] Natural stone of Golgotha in the Chapel of Adam below site During â€œ restoration works and excavations inside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and under the nearby Muristan , it was found that the area was originally a quarry, from which white Meleke limestone was struck; [35] surviving parts of the quarry to the north-east of the chapel of St. Helena are now accessible from within the chapel by permission. Virgilio Corbo , a Franciscan priest and archaeologist, present at the excavations, suggested that from the city the little hill which still exists could have looked like a skull. These often attempt to show the site as it would have appeared to Constantine. However, as the ground level in Roman times was about 4â€œ5 feet 1. The height of the Golgotha rock itself would have caused it to jut through the platform level of the Aphrodite temple, where it would be clearly visible. The reason for Hadrian not cutting the rock down is uncertain, but Virgilio Corbo suggested that a statue, probably of Aphrodite, was placed on it, [41] a suggestion also made by Jerome. The Itinerarium Burdigalense speaks of Golgotha in Here the Lord was crucified. All around that hill, there are silver screens. Eusebius in [49]. In , heavily relying on the research of Edward Robinson , a German theologian and biblical scholar from Dresden named Otto Thenius was the first to publish a proposal that the rocky knoll north of Damascus Gate was the biblical Golgotha. The location, usually referred to today as Skull Hill , is beneath a cliff that contains two large sunken holes, which Gordon regarded as resembling the eyes of a skull. He and a few others before him believed that the skull-like appearance would have caused the location to be known as Golgotha. The Garden Tomb contains several ancient burial places, although the archaeologist Gabriel Barkay has proposed that the tomb dates to the 7th century BCE and that the site may have been abandoned by the 1st century. Outside Lions Gate[ edit ] The hill having the appearance of a cranium the skull-pan of the head , approx. He claims that the location of Golgotha is just outside the Lions Gate. Unlike Skufion skull , Kranion in English - cranium [58] is the upper part of the

skull excluding the face bones. Since the temple faced east, [59] the curtain in front of the entrance [60] of the temple would have been in direct view of those gathered on this mount at the northeast corner of the Temple Mount , just outside the city wall. And to testify that the curtain ripped at the very moment when Jesus died, [61] there must have been eyewitnesses. The Gospel of John refers to Golgotha as being very near the city, so near that all who passed by could read the inscription [ Considering also the prophecy in Psalms And just as Eusebius comments in Onomasticon concerning Golgotha as being a hill just outside Jerusalem, north of the ancient Mount Zion , this hill fits his description.

**Chapter 6 : Cross of Christ**

*Mass! Especially the Liturgy of the Eucharist - the whole Eucharistic Prayer celebrates the mystery of Jesus death and resurrection.*

And because of that, McDonagh has crafted a minor gem, one very much out of step with modern Western film, and one which will resonate far longer. His goal is vengeance, not absolution. The would-be murderer gives the priest a deadline. He will do the deed in one week, thereby allowing Father James to put his affairs in order. So, in typical mystery fashion, we can wonder about the identity of the killer. If and when we narrow in on a suspect, we can then speculate about how Father James will deal with the threat. Will he be proactive? Will he live or die? The remarkable thing about Calvary is that virtually none of those questions play a very big role in the ensuing ninety minutes. But the scenes that play out, which all include Father James, do not focus on his impending doom, at least not in the way we might expect from an American movie. In this regard, McDonagh is building on a rich cinematic tradition. Why did Kane behave in a certain way? They were reacting against the classic Perry Mason episode, which would propose a whodunit. Defence attorney Perry would save his seemingly guilty client by pulling out some mysterious piece of evidence heretofore unknown to the audience. Link and Levinson, along with their star, Peter Falk, created Columbo, a detective story in which the identity of the murderer was made clear in the opening sequence. Freed from the mystery over who done it, the audience could then focus attention on how the crime was going to be solved. You can probably make a good guess from somewhere in the middle. But after that exchange with the bishop, McDonagh has Father James go about his weekly routine. He deals with the various problems faced by his parishioners. He deals with personal problems and tragedy. The threat is obviously weighing on him, but he takes almost no steps to address it. He spends the week doing exactly what the mystery man suggested. He puts his affairs in order. There are cheating and abusive spouses, old men nearing death, and young men tired of life. There is homosexuality and suicide. Father James attempts to bring peace and perspective to his charges and does so with mixed results. Many appear to like him personally but have little interest in what he is selling. Indeed, perhaps the most telling thing about Calvary is not the murder threat, but the sharply drawn portrait of an Irish population engaged in an extreme love-hate relationship with the Catholic Church. It is not even a movie specifically about faith. It is a movie about dichotomy. Tragedy and comedy coexist in Calvary from the opening exchange. Father James spends a good part of the week with his daughter Fiona Kelly Reilly, recent survivor of a suicide attempt. When he first sees the bandages on her wrist, Father James makes a joke about it – a joke that is later repeated by another member of the town. Terrible things happen in Calvary, but we are never far removed from humour. The ultimate dichotomy gets at the central thematic concern of the film. It concerns the issue of revenge and forgiveness. It is a thorny issue on many levels and one that saturates virtually every part of the world today. I will not reveal the end of the story, but I will offer that Calvary resolves this issue in a more profound manner than The Railway Man recently attempted. In that movie, the mystery remained front and centre, and turned out to be somewhat of a jumbled mess. Calvary does not offer an easy solution, but I believe it places the question in proper perspective. This holds true right up until the final scene, which echoes the opening. Two characters are seated, this time looking directly at each other, in a ritualised setting. We have a pretty good indication of what is going to be said between them. But still, McDonagh manages a surprise which some may find maddening, but I found pitch perfect. It does not focus on plot. It does not focus on mystery and suspense. It focuses on character and moral issues, the way we live our lives and the way we deal with our death. There is one potent moment one of the two scenes in the film during which there were audible gasps from the audience which is never adequately explained. As I write that, I realise that I may have misstated my case. I have said that Calvary does not concern itself with mystery. But if we take just one thing away from Calvary it is to be forgiving of the flaws we encounter. And maybe not to focus so much on the final mystery. After all, we all know how our own stories will end. Deciding how we live our lives, or our final week, provides mystery enough. He has been a regular contributor on Huffington Post and his writing about film can be found at <http://>

Chapter 7 : Jesus, Thank You | Sovereign Grace Music

*Father Gerard Rooney explains the great mystery of Christ's death, telling why God became man. He also explains how Christ repaired the broken bond between God and man. The author speaks of the evil that God permits to exist in the world".*

Before I enter into a reflection on the Holy Eucharist as the Mystery of Faith, however, I draw your attention to a most important event in the archdiocese, which is directed toward the richer participation in the Sacred Liturgy, especially the Holy Mass, by all the faithful. This is from the afternoon of Thursday, April 7, to the afternoon of Friday, April 8. A number of excellent presenters from the archdiocese and from other parts of our nation will offer sessions, treating a great variety of liturgical matters. The opening address on Thursday afternoon will be given by Msgr. Moroney, a priest of the Diocese of Worcester and currently executive director of the Secretariat for the Liturgy of the U. Conference of Catholic Bishops. He will speak on the development and completion of the vernacular edition of the Roman Missal for the United States. The archdiocese is most deeply honored by the participation of Cardinal Francis Arinze, prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, in the Gateway Liturgical Conference. Cardinal Arinze will give the keynote address on Friday morning, speaking on the topic, "Liturgical Norms and Liturgical Piety. Please consider taking part in all, or at least some, of the Gateway Liturgical Conference. Because of the fundamental importance of the subject matter, I am asking all of the priests of the archdiocese to participate in, at least, the Friday morning sessions with Cardinal Arinze. The seminarians at Kenrick-Glennon Seminary will take part in these sessions. If you wish more information about the conference or need assistance in registering for it, please contact the Office of Worship of the Archdiocese at or worship.archstl. I hope that you will be able to join me, together with other faithful of the archdiocese, at the Gateway Liturgical Conference.

**Eucharistic Sacrifice** After the consecration of the bread and wine at Holy Mass, that is after the bread and wine have become truly and completely the Body and Blood of Christ, and after the priest has shown the sacred species, the Body and Blood of Christ, to the congregation and has adored Christ by genuflecting before the Sacred Host and the Precious Blood, he immediately invites the congregation to proclaim the mystery of faith. The congregation then sings or says: The memorial acclamation reflects the deepest truth about the Holy Eucharist, the inseparability of the Holy Eucharist from the Passion, Death and Resurrection of Christ. He instituted the Holy Eucharist so that the fruits of His Suffering and Dying on the Cross on the next day would be constantly offered in the Church, to all peoples of every time and place. Christ desired that the sacrifice which He was going to offer on Calvary on Good Friday continue always in the Church, and He fulfills His desire by the most wondrous sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, in which He, acting through His minister, the ordained priest, offers ever anew, now in an unbloody manner, the one sacrifice of His life on the Cross. In a concise and striking manner, our Holy Father describes the inseparability of the Sacrifice of Calvary and the Sacrifice of the Mass: Each member of the faithful can thus take part in it and inexhaustibly gain its fruits" no. The Holy Eucharist is indeed the "inestimable gift" of Christ to us, before which the only fitting response is adoration. The Holy Eucharist is not just one of the many gifts which Christ has left to us in the Church. All the other gifts of Christ to us are only fully understood in relationship to the gift of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and Banquet. That is why the Holy Father rightly first turns to the teaching on the Holy Eucharist in assisting us to carry out the new evangelization. The heavenly Bread, which is the Holy Eucharist, is essentially sacrificial, it is the Body and Blood of Christ, offered and poured out for us as He gave up His life for us on the Cross. The sacrifice of the Cross is perpetuated at every celebration of the Mass. It is important to understand that the sacrifice of Christ is one. This is the great wonder and treasure of the Holy Mass. The Mass is not an additional sacrifice to Calvary. It is not a constant multiplication of the one sacrifice of Calvary. God the Father, in response to the total obedience of His Son, gives Christ eternal life by raising Him from the dead. We are called to share in His universal charity, which "knows no measure. Christ can only become the Bread of Life for us because He is risen from the dead and is alive for us in the Church. In order to help us understand more fully the meaning of the Real Presence, our Holy Father recalls for us a

text of Pope Paul VI, who explained that the term does not imply that the other presences of Christ in the Church are "not real" but underlines that the eucharistic presence "is a presence in the fullest sense: The proper term for the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, which takes place during the Holy Mass, at the consecration, is transubstantiation. No other term has been found to be as adequate in pointing to the Eucharistic mystery. Theologians and saints, down the Christian centuries, have desired to plumb more and more the depth of the mystery of the Eucharist, of the profound reality which transubstantiation expresses. Often, too, their love of the Holy Eucharist and desire to express their love has taken poetic form, for example, the hymn of St. Once again, Pope Paul VI underlined the truth which must be reflected in our thinking, speaking and writing about the Holy Eucharist: Eucharistic banquet Christ makes Himself substantially present to us through the Holy Eucharist with one only end in view, namely that we may receive Him in Holy Communion. The Holy Eucharist is true spiritual food, Christ nourishing the life of the Holy Spirit within us through the reception of His glorious Body and Blood. The sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John helps us very much to understand the Eucharistic Banquet. Christ made it clear that only by eating His Body and drinking His Blood can we have life within us. The disciples understood the true import of His teaching, for, from that day, some refused to believe in Him and left His company. Conclusion Communion in the Body and Blood of Christ is already now a participation in the fullness of communion with God, which will be ours, God willing, in the Kingdom of Heaven. In the wonderful words of St. Ignatius of Antioch, Holy Communion is "a medicine of immortality, an antidote to death" quoted in no. That is why the Church so much desires that the dying receive Holy Communion and calls the Holy Communion of the dying by a special name, Viaticum, "food for the journey" from this life to the life which is to come. The account of the institution of the Holy Eucharist in the Gospel according to St. John underlines the mandate which the Holy Eucharist is for us. I conclude my reflection with the inspiring words of our Holy Father: May you have a blessed celebration of the Sacred Triduum and of the Easter Octave. During these holiest of days, may you receive strong grace to make your life "completely Eucharistic.

**Chapter 8 : The Mystery of the Cross. A Good Friday Sermon.**

*Listen to Pastor Robert Furrow as he continues his commentary on Ephesians, talking today about gentiles in the body of Christ.*

Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: They give us the facts, in language most awful from its perfect calmness, most pathetic from its perfect simplicity. But the passage of St Paul which I have chosen for my text gives us an explanation of those facts which is utterly amazing. That He who stooped to die upon the Cross is Very God of Very God, the Creator and Sustainer of the Universe, is a thought so overwhelming, whenever we try to comprehend even a part of it in our small imaginations, that it is no wonder if, in all ages, many a pious soul, as it contemplated the Cross of Christ, has been rapt itself into a passion of gratitude, an ecstasy of wonder and of love, which is beautiful, honourable, just, and in the deepest sense most rational, whenever it is spontaneous and natural. But there have been thousands, as there may be many here to-day, of colder temperament; who would distrust in themselves, even while they respected in others, any violence of religious emotion: But there have been those, and there are still, who have found no such satisfaction in the story which the Gospel tells, and still less in the explanation which the Epistle gives; who have, as St Paul says, stumbled at the stumblingblock of the Cross. It would be easy to ignore such persons, were they scoffers or profligates: To such men the idea of the Incarnation, and still more, that of the Passion, is derogatory to the very notion of a God. That a God should suffer, and that a God should die, is shocking -- and, to do them justice, I believe they speak sincerely -- to their notions of the absolute majesty, the undisturbed serenity, of the Author of the universe; of Him in whom all things live and move and have their being; who dwells in the light to which none may approach. And therefore they have, in every age, tried various expedients to escape from a doctrine which seemed repugnant to that most precious part of them, their moral sense. In these later times, when the belief in such beings, and even their very names, have become dim and dead, men have tried to shew that the words of Scripture apply to a mere man. They have seen in Christ -- and they have revered and loved Him for what they have seen in Him -- the noblest and purest, the wisest and the most loving of all human beings; and have attributed such language as that in the text, which -- translate it as you will -- ascribes absolute divinity, and nothing less, to our Lord Jesus Christ -- they have attributed it, I say, to some fondness for Oriental hyperbole, and mystic Theosophy, in the minds of the Apostles. Others, again, have gone further, and been, I think, more logically honest. Such a saying as that one, "Before Abraham was, I am," and others beside it, could be escaped from only by one of two methods. To the first of them I shall not allude in this sacred place, popular as a late work has made it in its native France, and I fear in England likewise. The other alternative, more reverent indeed, but, as I believe, just as mistaken, is to suppose that the words were never uttered at all; that Christ -- it is not I who say it -- possibly never existed at all; that His whole story was gradually built up, like certain fabulous legends of Romish saints, out of the moral consciousness of various devout persons during the first three centuries; each of whom added to the portrait, as it grew more and more lovely under the hands of succeeding generations, some new touch of beauty, some fresh trait, half invented, half traditional, of purity, love, nobleness, majesty; till men at last became fascinated with the ideal to which they themselves had contributed; and fell down and worshipped their own humanity; and christened that The Son of God. If I believed that theory, or either of the others, I need not say that I should not be preaching here. I will go further, and say, that if I believed either of those theories, or any save that which stands out in the text, sharp-cut and colossal like some old Egyptian Memnon, and like that statue, with a smile of sweetness on its lips which tempers the royal majesty of its looks, -- if I did not believe that, I say -- I should be inclined to confess with Homer of old, that man is the most miserable of all the beasts of the field. For consider but this one argument. It is no new one; it has lain, I believe, unspoken and instinctive, yet most potent and inspiring, in many a mind, in many an age. If there be a God, must He not be the best of all beings? But if He who suffered on Calvary were not God, but a mere creature; then -- as I hold -- there must have been a creature in the universe better than God Himself. Thousands of the best men and women in the world through all the ages of Christendom have agreed with this argument, under some shape or other. Thousands there have been, and I

trust there will be thousands hereafter, who have felt, as they looked upon the Cross of the Son of God, not that it was derogatory to Christ to believe that He had suffered, but derogatory to Him to believe that He had not suffered: Think, I beg you, over that one word. We all agree that God is good; all at least do so, who worship Him in spirit and in truth. We adore His majesty, because it is the moral and spiritual majesty of perfect goodness. We give thanks to Him for His great glory, because it is the glory, not merely of perfect power, wisdom, order, justice; but of perfect love, of perfect magnanimity, beneficence, activity, condescension, pity -- in one word, of perfect grace. But how much must that last word comprehend, as long as there is misery and evil in this world, or in any other corner of the whole universe? Grace, to be perfect, must shew itself by graciously forgiving penitents. Pity, to be perfect, must shew itself by helping the miserable. Beneficence, to be perfect, must shew itself by delivering the oppressed. The old prophets and psalmists saw as much as this; and preached that this too was part of the essence and character of God. They saw that the Lord was gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repented Him of the evil. They saw that the Lord helped them to right who suffered wrong, and fed the hungry; that the Lord loosed men out of prison, the Lord gave sight to the blind; that the Lord helped the fallen, and defended the fatherless and widow. They saw too a further truth, and a more awful one. They saw that the Lord was actually and practically King of kings and Lord of lords: That vision, in whatsoever metaphors it may be wrapped up, is real and true, and will be so as long as evil exists within this universe. Were it not true, there would be something wanting to the perfect justice and the perfect benevolence of God. But is this all? If this be all, what have we Christians learnt from the New Testament which is not already taught us in the Old? Where is that new, deeper, higher revelation of the goodness of God, which Jesus of Nazareth preached, and which John and Paul and all the apostles believed that they had found in Jesus Himself? They believed, and all those who accepted their gospel believed, that they had found for that word "grace," a deeper meaning than had ever been revealed to the prophets of old time; that grace and goodness, if they were perfect, involved self-sacrifice. And does not our own highest reason tell us that they were right? Does not our own highest reason, which is our moral sense, tell us that perfect goodness requires, not merely that we should pity our fellow-creatures, not merely that we should help them, not merely that we should right them magisterially and royally, without danger or injury to ourselves: Is not this the very element of goodness which we all confess to be most noble, beautiful, pure, heroic, divine? Divine even in sinful and fallen man, who must forgive because he needs to be forgiven; who must help others because he needs help himself; who, if he suffers for others, deserves to suffer, and probably will suffer, in himself. But how much more heroic, and how much more divine in a Being who needs neither forgiveness nor help, and who is as far from deserving as He is from needing to suffer! And shall this noblest form of goodness be possible to sinful man, and yet impossible to a perfectly good God? Shall we say that the martyr at the stake, the patriot dying for his country, the missionary spending his life for the good of heathens; ay more, shall we say that those women, martyrs by the pang without the palm, who in secret chambers, in lowly cottages, have sacrificed and do still sacrifice self and all the joys of life for the sake of simple duties, little charities, kindness unnoticed and unknown by all, save God -- shall we say that all who have from the beginning of the world shewn forth the beauty of self-sacrifice have had no divine prototype in heaven? Shall we say this, and so suppose them holier than their own Maker? Shall we say this, and suppose that they, when they attributed self-sacrifice to God, made indeed a God in their own image, but a God of greater love, greater pity, greater graciousness because of greater unselfishness, than Him who really exists? Shall we say this, the very words whereof confute themselves and shock alike our reason and our conscience? Or shall we say with St John and with St Paul, that if men can be so good, God must be infinitely better; that if man can love so much, God must love more; if man, by shaking off the selfishness which is his bane, can do such deeds, then God, in whom is no selfishness at all, may at least have done a deed as far above theirs as the heavens are above the earth? Shall we not say this: We reverence, and rightly, the majesty of God. How can that infinite majesty be proved more perfectly than by condescension equally infinite? We adore, and justly, the serenity of God, who has neither parts nor passions. How can that serenity be proved more perfectly, than by passing, still serene, through all the storm and crowd of circumstance which disturb the weak serenity of man; by passing through poverty, helplessness, temptation, desertion, shame, torture, death;

and passing through them all victorious and magnificent; with a moral calm as undisturbed, a moral purity as unspotted, as it had been from all eternity, as it will be to all eternity, in that abysmal source of being, which we call the Bosom of the Father? It is the moral majesty of God, as shewn on Calvary, which I uphold. Shew that Calvary was not inconsistent with that; shew that Calvary was not inconsistent with the goodness of God, but rather the perfection of that goodness shewn forth in time and space: Provided God be proved to be morally infinite -- that is, in plain English, infinitely good; provided God be proved to be morally absolute -- that is, absolutely unable to have His goodness affected by any circumstance outside Him, even by the death upon the Cross: All words about absoluteness and infinity and majesty, beyond that, are physical -- metaphors drawn from matter, which have nothing to do with God who is a Spirit. If the mystery of the Cross contradict any of these carnal or material notions, so much the more glory to the mystery of the Cross. One spiritual infinite, one spiritual absolute, it does not contradict: Let all the rest remain a mystery, so long as the mystery of the Cross gives us faith for all the rest. The mystery of evil, of sorrow, of death, the Gospel does not pretend to solve: For God Himself has taken on Himself the task of solving it; and has proved by His own act, that if there be evil in the world, it is none of His; for He hates it, and fights against it, and has fought against it to the death. It simply says -- Have faith in God. Ask no more of Him -- Why hast Thou made me thus? Ask no more -- Why do the wicked prosper on the earth? Ask no more -- Whence pain and death, war and famine, earthquake and tempest, and all the ills to which flesh is heir? All fruitless questionings, all peevish repinings, are precluded henceforth by the passion and death of Christ. Thou canst not suffer more than the Son of God. Dost thou sympathize with thy fellow-men? Thou canst not sympathize more than the Son of God. Dost thou long to right them, to deliver them, even at the price of thine own blood? Thou canst not long more ardently than the Son of God, who carried His longing into act, and died for them and thee. What if the end be not yet? What if evil still endure? What if the medicine have not yet conquered the disease? For however ill the world may go, or seem to go, the Cross is the everlasting token that God so loved the world, that He spared not His only-begotten Son, but freely gave Him for it. Whatsoever else is doubtful, this at least is sure, -- that good must conquer, because God is good; that evil must perish, because God hates evil, even to the death.

## Chapter 9 : What celebrates the great mystery of Jesus' sacrifice on Calvary

*INTRODUCTION The question often arises how it is, with so much church-going, Bible-reading, and prayer, that the Christian fails to live the life of complete victory over sin and lacks the love and joy of the Lord.*