

ASPECTS OF THE ATONEMENT

A Compilation of lectures, reviews and correspondence relating to the controversy between Robert Roberts and Edward Turney after the death of Dr John Thomas causing the first major division in Christadelphia which cannot be healed because Robert Roberts rejected Dr Thomas' latest teachings for three or four years prior to the Drs' death..

During the controversy a close friend of Dr Thomas, S. W. Coffman, wrote to Edward Turney from the USA about their belief and understanding, saying that shortly before he died, "The Doctor told me that if he lived to go over to England, and to get control of Roberts's paper, he would teach it (his latest understanding), regardless of seeming self-contradictions."

Contents

- Page 2** Edward Turney's lecture "The Sacrifice of Christ, given in Birmingham U.K. on 28th August 1873
- Edward Turney was invited by some brethren in Birmingham to explain his views. At this first meeting some 20 brethren were present and were so impressed with what he had to say they asked him to give a lecture to a much larger audience at the Temperance only six days later. The title of Edward Turney's address was "The Sacrifice of Christ" and it was at this gathering that Robert Roberts after repeatedly interrupting the speaker finally cut short the meeting by an outburst of shouting at the top of his voice after Edward Turney had suggested yet again that they meet in discussion with one another. But rather than come face to face with Edward Turney, Roberts wrote "The Slain Lamb."
- Page 43** Robert Roberts Lecture "The Slain Lamb" in reply to the above lecture also given in Birmingham on the next evening, 29th August 1873.
- The lecture as reproduced here is copied from the August 1873 Christadelphian magazine and is Robert Roberts' own revised speech. Some who were present when Robert Roberts gave his speech said that though it had been considerably improved and so much altered as to be scarcely recognisable by many who heard it but it was unsatisfactory.
- After his death other Christadelphians also made alterations to some sections while deleting others.
- Page 59** "The Slain Lamb Dissected". This article was written by Edward Turney in response to Robert Roberts lecture above. This was first published in The Christadelphian Lamp for December 1873
- Page 70** A Review of "The Slain Lamb" by F.J.Pearce and first published in our Circular Letter for March 1953.
- Page 99** A Few Thoughts on 'Free Life' by Russell Gregory. Comments which came to mind after a study of "The Slain Lamb."
- Page 101** Further Notes and Observations

THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST

By
EDWARD TURNEY

The verbatim record of the Lecture
Given in Birmingham on Thursday, August 28th 1873

Extract from Edward Turney's Lecture

“This is not a theory started yesterday or the day before, but it is a theory which was set forth in a very lucid manner some two years ago, and as clearly accepted by the Editor (Robert Roberts) after he had six months to consider the matter. I refer to a letter by Brother Handley in 1871 and is in the Christadelphian, November number.”

The Letter is quoted in full in Appendix A following the Lecture.

PROLOGUE

to the edition copied by A. L. Wilson,
who is eternally convinced of the truth and the indisputable nature
of the arguments in favour of the theory herein demonstrated.
Reader, unto what then were ye baptised? A.L.W.

“And now brethren I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified.”
Acts 20:13

The following contains that which every earnest Christadelphian desires, viz., the truth concerning the Bread of Life; therefore we send it forth reprinted and express our gratitude that such has been made possible. It is a question of vital importance and a necessity upon which the prophet Malachi discourses: -

“Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another and the Lord hearkened and heard it, and a Book of Remembrance was written before Him for them that fear the Lord and thought upon His Name.”

Extract from the 1961 reprint:-

The original edition was made from a manuscript copied by F. J. Pearce from the one made by A. L. Wilson. Some confusion in the text of quotations has now been corrected.

The Sacrifice of Christ

By EDWARD TURNEY

Introduction

If envy and malice had not been hard at work to misrepresent my mode of procedure, there had been no occasion for this explanation as to the origin of my lecture in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham. It is in consequence of the extraordinary behaviour of Mr Roberts and his repeated mis-statements, that I feel it incumbent upon me to inform the brethren why I went to Birmingham on such an errand. Some days before the 22nd of August, I received letters from Brethren in Birmingham desiring me to go there and give some explanation of this "New idea" concerning Christ.

I was informed that many were anxious to hear me. Mr Roberts, it was stated, was doing his best to suppress my writings on this subject which I also knew to be true. There is a time however, for everything. But, Mr Roberts, it would appear not being able to "discern this time," and perhaps forgetting that the Holy Office of the Inquisition is now closed his attempted revival of literary proscription answered my purpose not amiss, urging forward that very publicity and freedom which seemed to bring on him "wailing and gnashing of teeth."

The invitation to which I have referred was not of my seeking: in fact it was quite unexpected, and when it did come I had very little idea whom I should meet. After accepting the pressing request of the Birmingham brethren, Dr. Hayes and Brother Farmer agreed to accompany me.

About seven in the evening more than twenty brethren and sisters had assembled at 71 Belgrave Road. I then proceeded to sketch out my subject. This occupied about an hour and a half. Before starting I gave permission to the reporters present to take down the whole of my remarks if they thought well, and to have them published in the "Christadelphian."

At this there were significant shrugs of the shoulders, and some smiles, which I interpreted to mean that the Editor of that periodical would bravely bar the door against "the wolf" which mild zoological individual the good editor soon afterwards discovered to be my humble self, against whom he stoutly refused to open the Athenaeum doors at the request of his brethren, although they offered to pay for the use of it. I have proof of this in writing.

After I had got through the sketch many questions were asked, and at the end of nearly four hours hard work in a small closely packed room, one of the brethren rose to express the thanks of the meeting at the free, fair and ready manner in which at their request, I had come forward. This was supplemented in a few days by a long and very sensible letter from another brother who was present, from which I venture to give the following extract:-

"I have already expressed thanks for your kindness in attending Birmingham purposely to express your theory; and I think it only proper gratefully to acknowledge the Christlike courtesy and sincerity; the frankness and fairness with which you met your querists. I attended the meeting to gain instruction, and I returned home wiser than I left."

This meeting broke up a little before midnight, and in a few days afterwards I received several letters from brethren present stating that the meeting as a whole were convinced that what I had taught was true and scriptural.

Here then, is the origin of my lecture in the Temperance Hall. An urgent request was made for me to deliver a lecture to as many of the Birmingham brethren as could be got together on the subject of "The Sacrifice of Christ." I was distinctly informed in writing that I must consider the

meeting entirely in my hands. This being so, I requested Dr. Hayes to take the chair, and he consented.

I was also informed in writing that it was chiefly that portion of the Birmingham meeting who had come to hear me on the 22nd that would pay for the Hall. But while communication was on its way to Nottingham, there was another flying to Birmingham from Brother Farmer saying; "Take the Temperance Hall for Brother Turney's lecture, I will pay all expenses."

But the reader will very likely ask why this lecture was not delivered in the Athenaeum Rooms, seeing that brethren alone were allowed to be present? This is the answer. Mr Roberts holds the Athenaeum Rooms in his own name, though he does not, of course pay all the rent himself. A number of brethren wished him to grant them the use of the room, and were so anxious that, as before stated they preferred to pay for the use of it. What was the reply of this good and valiant man, this mighty warrior who is ever ready to let in a foe in order to display his prowess in putting him to flight? Oh, this was quite another matter! "No! Never! Not while I hold the place shall the wolf enter here." Certainly this argument was effective so far as the Athenaeum was concerned, but, happily the prescriptive spirit of our modern inquisitor could not operate beyond the precincts of that habitation, the rent of which he did not pay.

Sensible people may perhaps wonder why he is even the Lord of the ascendant. The reader will now know the reason why I found myself in the Temperance Hall.

Up to the moment of going on the platform I was told in writing that the meeting was mine; and that the man who courageously bolted the Athenaeum doors against me was doing his utmost to "neutralize" the effect of the lecture. He had for nights been declaiming against me, and against my doctrine. And although he knew perfectly well that he and his friends had not taken the Temperance Hall and would not have to pay for it, he had the singular audacity to request that the brethren would grant him the privilege of putting all the questions to me on Thursday night assuming that questions would be allowed. Yes, says he there was an overwhelming majority for this. No doubt. But did this overwhelming majority hire the Hall, and pay for it? Did this "overwhelming majority" invite me to deliver the lecture? And was it not my would-be interrogator that had refused me a door of utterance? Will any sensible person not see that under these circumstances it was not exactly strange that at my lecture I deliberately ignored the authority of the man who kept out the "wolf"? What else should he expect, except a severe rebuke for his incivility, if I condescended to notice him at all?

During the lecture I was occasionally compelled to administer a reproof. The whole assembly conducted itself in a most exemplary manner for the whole two hours and a half, but the Editor disgraced himself about a dozen times by attempted interruptions. Now in conclusion of this explanation what does Mr Roberts say of the meeting of the 22nd August and the lecture on the 28th? He says that I ran away from him at Nottingham. He insinuated distinctly that I knew he would be absent from Birmingham on the 22nd, and therefore I took the opportunity of holding a hole and corner meeting, as one of his partisans styled it, and that the Lecture of the 28th was an underhand affair. Is it worthwhile for me to put myself to the trouble of saying that these statements are entirely untrue? They are only put forth to make a show of courage; but it is doubtful from the evidence soon to be before the reader whether they are not after all, but the empty boasts of faint-hearted conceit.

Edward Turney.

“The Sacrifice of Christ”

The Chairman, Dr. S. G. Hayes, in opening the meeting said:

Dear Brethren and Sisters, allow me before the lecture is commenced to make a few observations respecting it.

Our brother Mr. E. Turney, is here this evening, by invitation to deliver a lecture on a topic of absorbing interest to all Christadelphians, a topic, the importance of which it is impossible to overrate in view of that passage in John where it says:- “This is life eternal to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.” John 17:3. We can only know God and we can only know His Son as God has been pleased to reveal Himself and His Son in the Scriptures of truth. And it is of course of the first importance that we should know what that record is: for if we are under a misapprehension concerning God or concerning His Son, how can we attain to life everlasting? The lecture which will be delivered to-night is for the purpose of laying before you in detail, as far as time will permit, what our Brother Turney believes conscientiously to be the truth concerning this most important matter; I beg you to hear him patiently and attentively throughout. I must request that you will in no way interrupt the discourse, either by manifestations of approval or dissent. Some of the details put before you will be those on which we are all agreed; on the other hand some points will be raised about which we do not see at present eye to eye. We hope the day may arrive when we shall all see eye to eye concerning all matters of mutual interest; but I am hopeful with regard to those who may entertain doubts on the subject that the lecture tonight will cause such doubts to be removed. And with regard to those who are wavering on the points at issue, I have hope that they will decide on what our Brother Turney and those who believe on this subject with him believe to be the truth.

I would suggest the question whether we have not ourselves perhaps fallen into the same error which we have not been slow to condemn in others, namely, that of allowing our-selves, in some measure at least, to be carried by those supposed to know better than ourselves; but, however much, or however long we may have studied the truth, still I think we must all admit the possibility at least of our having been mistaken on one or perhaps more points. It has been said that an open mind is the best mark of a philosopher and truly it will be wise on our part not to be hasty in condemning neither to be hasty in receiving what may appear at first sight to contradict that which we may have believed perhaps for a very long time, but to carefully weigh and consider the arguments adduced and decide accordingly.

Since Brother Turney first published the views which he now holds concerning the nature of Christ, a great deal of pressure has been put upon him from various quarters.

As you are aware, he has recently been very seriously ill, and in consequence of that illness he has been recommended by his medical adviser to abstain altogether for several months from public speaking or public controversy; but, under the circumstances, he has not been able to avail himself of this advice, on account of the pressure I have mentioned. If he had consulted his own ease and convenience he might very well have objected to meet here tonight and have put off the meeting to a more convenient season, when he would have been more able by renewed health to speak on this matter. But here he is tonight agreeably to your invitation. I beg your best attention to what will be advanced, and I think our brother will be able to satisfy you concerning this matter, perhaps not tonight but at all events he will put you into such a position that you will be able to examine the matter for yourselves. I do not think I need detain you longer with any further observations of mine, but I will now call upon our Brother to commence his lecture.

The Lecture

Mr Turney:-

Brethren, as the chairman has said, I am here tonight in response to several invitations in writing, and the object of my visit is to set before you in as plain a manner as I possibly can, the "New Light" which I have received from conversation with our Brother Handley of Maldon.* (see appendix A)

Having many matters to discourse upon I beg you will hear me patiently, and as I do not feel endowed at present with any spare physical strength, at the end of the first hour I may find it necessary to crave your forbearance by sitting down to rest myself for five minutes. I do not know that I shall have to ask for the privilege, but if I have, I think you will not refuse to grant it to me, as I am anxious to go through the whole of my programme.

I have had, brethren, upon this subject many deep and painful feelings. From my first understanding of it, it seemed to me a matter about which we ought rather to pray and to weep than quarrel and denounce, and I feel like that tonight

I take it that I am only partly understood, and in some cases not understood at all; but when upon my feet having as a rule the faculty of making myself understood, I do not despair tonight - however dim my writings might be - of reaching your understandings. Whether I convince you or not of what I do mean, time alone will tell.

Now brethren, there has been a vast amount of what may be fairly styled party feeling thrown out in connection with this matter. Unfortunately so. For my part I have refrained from bringing to the front those who have sympathized with me in this controversy; but if I were to read you all the letters which I have received - not merely letters of sympathy but letters with eyes in them, and can see straight to the end. I think there would be about as many as would cover an ordinary dining table. The last letter I have received I beg to read before proceeding with my lecture. It is from Brother Wm. Ellis, of Liverpool, a well-known, highly respected, and long tried Brother in what we believe to be the faith. Brother Ellis had been for several days at Nottingham, and he came like others armed to the teeth ready to destroy this new heresy; but I will say this, brethren, that he came forward in a most Christian temper, spirit, and disposition, he came in the manner advised by James 1:19, to be "swift to hear, slow to speak, and above all, slow to wrath." Now the best way to get at the understanding of another is at least to hear him out. I now proceed to read Brother Ellis's letter:-

86 Crown Street, Liverpool.
August 26th, 1873.

Dear Brother Farmer,

I am happy to say I reached home safely last night shortly after ten, and found all well. Before I had got seated Sister E. asked me: "Well have you converted them, or have they converted you?" I said they have converted me. I was wrong upon the nature of Christ. I never did before see that, because God was His Father He was free from the Adamic or divine curse against transgression. I now frankly and thankfully confess to yourself, brethren Handley and Turney that my understanding of that point aright is due to my visit to you and the conversations with you from Saturday to Monday evening.

With kindest Love to you all and many thanks for all your kindness towards me.

I am yours in haste, William Ellis.

I do hope Brethren, that many more will yet feel as Brother Ellis now feels upon this subject, and I trust when they do that they will have his frankness and courage to give expression to their minds. I will begin my lecture, brethren, by asking you to read with me Romans 5.

Having read the chapter, the lecturer continued : -

The first point I wish to speak upon in that chapter is that mentioned by Paul in the 6th verse; viz. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly." Now, brethren we ought to know what the apostle would have us understand by that clause, "When we were yet without strength." As to the expression "in due time," I think we are all probably agreed that it refers to the end or nearly the end of the "seventy weeks" spoken of by the Prophet Daniel. But what can be signified by the phrase "without strength"? That is the question now for decision. My answer is with Paul thus - that we lost all our strength by the Adamic transgression. "In whom all sinned." By one man's disobedience sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men "in whom (Adam) all sinned." The Greek word means "in whom." To express it as Milton does in his 3rd Book of "Paradise Lost" at the 290th line, "His crime makes guilty all his sons." And in his Eleventh Book, line 317, he says, "In me all posterity stands cursed." That is our position; we are prospectively dead men. Now, then, I shall take this position - that if Christ came into the world in this position, He cannot help us.

It may be said, and probably will be said that it was the Father who provided the help. That is perfectly scriptural. But, I would have you to observe that He did not provide that help "apart" from His Son, but "in" His Son. And you will see this in a pointed manner by referring to Psalm 89:19,20, which reads thus:- "Then Thou speakest in vision to Thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help on one that is mighty. I have exalted one chosen out of the people." We shall agree, I think, that this refers to this Messiah. Now to have brought Christ into the world under the Adamic curse would have been to deprive Him of "all help" instead of to have "laid help upon Him."

Our being brought into the world in that state deprived us of all help, and if He had been so brought in He would likewise have been utterly helpless... or as Paul says:- "Without strength." The very fact that His death helps or saves us, is proof that He did not come into the world like us, viz;- "without strength." But there is something more. This help I take to be presented to us in a two-fold way, and I would speak of the first part of it as natural help, and the next as supernatural help. But the supernatural, would have been of no value without the natural help.

You will enquire what I mean by natural help. I mean this; assuming for the moment that the second man, the last Adam, the Christ, came into the world as free as the first Adam, not under condemnation to death caused by the first man's transgression, that is what I mean by "natural help." There was a life as free as Adam's was when he sprang from the ground a living soul. Now, that life was the price or ransom that had to be paid for those who had lost theirs by Adam's transgression. I can see help in a natural way there.

By supernatural help I mean this, that had the Almighty not raised Jesus from the dead He would have been there now. Supernatural help was necessary to bring Him again to the surface, to bestow upon Him eternal life, and to empower Him to impart that life to those who shall be found worthy at the Judgment seat. Now, that in brief is what I mean by the two phrases, natural and supernatural help.

Let me proceed now to give a diagram. There can be no objection to this, because Christadelphians have long since employed charts and employed them, especially to explain God's manifestation, that is, to understand the purpose of redemption in Christ Jesus. I employ mine therefore, not very elaborate but I think lucid, in order to set forth my present view of God's scheme of redemption in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Imagine that mark (drawing a small perpendicular line on the blackboard) to represent Adam when God made him fresh from the dust. I will now pass over the interval of time long or short for there must have been an interval before the Almighty energized Adam with the breath of life. I first ask you to consider what was this Adam? What was his physical structure and composition? The testimony is that he was made "a living soul." And by the aid of Paul we understand that to be "a natural body" a man of living flesh and blood. 1 Corinthians 15:44-49.

Now the question here to consider is this. Was Adam in any sense a sinner: Was there any sin at all in him? I say there was none. Adam was not then a Sinner. But I would have you to understand, brethren,

that though there was no sin in him, there was in this Adam all the propensities, all the impulses to sin, as Mr Roberts has truly said in a certain place to which I shall refer by and by: for if this had not been the case, there never could have been sin. Now what I want to impress upon you is that these impulses, or propensities are not sin, the impulses to sin are one thing and sin is another. One is cause, the other effect. James says, and I think an Apostle may be accepted as an authority on this subject, that when lust, or desire hath conceived - and that implies a time- it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished brings forth death. James 1:14,15.

Now I maintain that there is nothing in man with which the Almighty has endowed him, that is sinful of itself; but by the too great exercise of certain endowments or faculties, he oversteps the divine boundary line, and then we have what is called sin, but not till then. If desires were sin then God would be the author of sin, for man can only be what his Creator made him. I may here use a familiar illustration. If you place a prisoner within four walls, and you tell him those four walls are his place of abode, he must not go beyond the threshold; he can pass round and round as much as he pleases, and he can even place himself just on a level with the threshold, but unless he crosses the line there is no transgression. However brethren, let me make an explanation lest I should be misunderstood. There is a sense in which desire or lust is sin when nothing actually is done. Christ said whoso looketh on a woman, etc., Matthew 5:28, he is guilty. Lust or propensity is sin when a man purposes to commit a forbidden act, but by some circumstance beyond his control he cannot accomplish it, then he is just as much a sinner as if he had done it: he only lacked the opportunity. Now I return to this man who was not at first a sinner, neither by nature nor by action, but who had desires. I draw a horizontal line, at right angles with the perpendicular one, which represents the period of probation. Adam is now on probation for immortality. But this other perpendicular line upon the horizontal one I would have you to understand that the Almighty gave Adam a law, and that at the time signified by this next mark he broke that law.

Now in all the interval from the time he was made only of the dust until he broke the law, he was not a sinner, but as soon as he broke the law, then "Sin entered into the world."

Now let me finish his career and mark the downright line which represents the period at which he dropped into the grave.

I want you now to consider this question. Could anything which this man might do in the way of righteousness, in the way of true piety, in the way of perfect godliness, after the passing of this sentence of death on account of his transgression, revoke the sentence pronounced?

My answer is emphatically no. And as a proof of his utter helplessness and dependence upon the mercy of God, there was at once set forth a scheme of redemption or means of paying the debt incurred by sin. The sentence could no more be revoked by Adam's subsequent obedience, piety and repentance of themselves than the subsequent obedience piety and penitence of a man having committed a crime worthy of death as Adam had, and lying in gaol, could revoke the just sentence of death passed upon him by a human Judge. Therefore, for the sake of a better illustration, I would lengthen this upright line representing the point at which Adam broke the law, and I would draw an oblique line to the end of the horizontal one representing Adam's probation, and what I wish you to understand by this line is this, that the man was now, after transgression, under the sentence of death, however long he might live and however good might be his subsequent acts.

I will assume, if you like, that he lived after a perfect Christian manner, even as perfect as the Lord Jesus Himself, and I would ask this question, Could that perfect that subsequent life have brought him from the grave? I am utterly unable to see how it could: because there was this old debt first to be discharged.

His life had been forfeited, or lost, and though the subsequent, excellent probation might be worthy of something in the future, that something could not be realized until the obstacle, the old debt, that is the loss of life, had it been cleared out of the way Adam's probation consisted of two phases, first he was on probation for eternal life without redemption; second, he was on probation after sin under redemption. I hope this is clear.

Now this other downright line shall represent the "Second Adam," our Lord Jesus Christ. I will draw the horizontal line of probation, but I will put no mark upon that line, for this reason, that probation was perfect; there was no breach of law committed.

But suppose this Second Adam had come into the world in the condition the first was in after transgression, that is to say, under the penalty of death for the breach of law by the first Adam, where would have been His life? If it be true that by one man's offence death hath passed upon all men, Jesus included as Mr Roberts will have it, then death would have passed upon Him also, and His natural life would have been lost. I use the word "lost" because it has been said it is not correct to use the word "forfeit." But I think it must be granted that with respect to the first Adam it is correct, however incorrect in regard to his posterity, because he did commit an act of treason against High Heaven, and forfeited his life thereby.

But I still hold that I used the word "forfeit" correctly with regard to his sons also, for I find it used in the English classics in the same sense in which I used it. Those who are acquainted with Shakespeare will probably recollect this passage. In the play called "Measure for Measure" we have certain dramatic personae Angelo and Izabella.

Angelo says: "Your brother is a forfeit of the law and you but waste your words." Izabella replies: "Alas! Alas! Why all the souls that were, were forfeit once."

And so I hold they were forfeited once by that one act, and if Jesus had been born under the curse of the old law, His life would necessarily have been lost also and however perfect His probation might be, I affirm that the former debt must first be paid by the shedding of blood for Him before He could help us. His own blood could no more redeem Him, in such a case, than our blood could redeem us. But I maintain this, that by the Almighty endowing Him with "Free life" He began by that means to lay help upon one mighty to save, and perfected that help by the addition of supernatural help, that is - eternal, life.

Now brethren, there were two things required of the last Adam; one was that He should run His probation after a perfect manner; the other that He should lay down His life for us.

I am utterly unable to see how He could lay down a life He did not possess. If His is lost or forfeited as ours is at birth He did not really possess it free, and as His natural life was the price to be paid He had in that case absolutely nothing to pay with.

But if He begins, as I represent Him, when He comes to the end of His career He is in a position to do what God commanded Him. He said: "Therefore doth My Father love me; because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." John 10:17, 18.

Now why did He lay it down? As "a ransom for all." Matthew 20:28. No man who is in pledge can redeem or buy back another. I therefore say that it was imperative Jesus should have been free.

Well having got to the end of His probationary career to the foot of the Cross, what do we observe? Two things are now to be done; one that He should lay down His life "a ransom for all." The other, that He should lay it down in such a manner as would meet the case of the Jews who had broken the Mosaic Law.

If Jesus had been a Gentile there had been no necessity that I can see for Him to lay down His life upon a Cross. But as Paul teaches it was needful for Him to be obedient unto the death of the Cross, to redeem the Jews from the curse of the Law; and this act was quite voluntary on His part. He was not a mere passive instrument in this matter. He was determined to do His Father's will. He loved righteousness. Hebrews 1:9, and hated iniquity.

We find Him then nailed upon the Cross to redeem the Jews, and He sinks into the grave, and after three days He rises again.

I think we shall all agree that He did not rise immortal, but that He entered the perfect state very soon after, perhaps on the same day. He first took His natural state again* (see Appendix B)

Now cannot you see that this being so, that if He were sinful flesh when He went down into the grave, He must have been sinful flesh when He rose again? But neither you nor I should like to affirm such thing

He rose from the dead as we all believe, and entered into eternal life, and He then may be said to have obtained eternal redemption. There will be some redeemed, or brought back who have denied the Lord that bought them; these will not attain to eternal redemption, but will return unto the dust.

Eternal redemption is based on approval at the Judgment seat of Christ. Now redemption as I understand it, is the old debt incurred by Adam paid for us by Christ.

We “now” enter upon probation, and we are required to give all diligence to make our calling and election sure. We are required to run so as to obtain. 2 Peter 1:10. This I hope we shall all be able to do.

Now I wish to call your attention at this point, to a few lines in an otherwise admirable little work entitled “Jesus Christ and Him Crucified” by J.J.Andrew of London.

I shall just read what I wish to draw your attention to. The reason I do this is because it is still sought by the author to support this view, otherwise I should not have done it. Page 77, line 1, 1st edition: -

“Being a Jew by birth, He was under the law. Galatians 4:4, and therefore it was necessary that He should comply with the injunctions of that law. This He did in every particular except one; consequently He became obnoxious to the curse of that law. For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point is guilty of all, and cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them, Galatians 3:13. Among the things written in the book of the law it is said: “He that is hanged is accursed of God” (see also page 115, 1996 edition of “The Real Christ”). This was the one item of the law which was infringed by Jesus, and therefore He became obnoxious to its curse.”

Now brethren, listen to this, it was necessary that such should be the case in order to obey the will of God.

I cannot understand that I am first told He complied with every particular except one; that there was one point in which He was guilty and therefore guilty of all; that He infringed the law, that means to break it, and that it was necessary to do this (namely to be “guilty” of the whole) in order to “obey” the will of God.

In plain language it means this, that it was necessary to “break” the law in order to “keep” it, to “disobey” God in order to “obey” Him. Shall I tell you that whosoever offends in one point is guilty of all? James 2:10.

A dishonourer of God does not obey Him. But what says Paul in his epistle to the Philippians 2:8 He says that Christ was “obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.”

So that this death on the cross was not an infringement of the law but an act of obedience to the law. However, brethren, passing over these contradictions, I would point out that it was needful for Jesus to come under the curse of God, but not to infringe the law. Oh no. Let me explain. I have used this familiar illustration before and it may serve tonight; supposing we are now in the dog days, and here are two persons each in possession of a dog. The bye-laws of this town say that whosoever lets his dog at large at this time will be fined £5. Now if A lets his dog run loose, and thereby breaks the law, and the penalty comes upon him justly. B keeps his dog chained up, and thereby honours the law. Now just suppose B says to A, “I am sorry for you my friend, you have broken the law, you are in a calamity.” “Yes” replies A, “and I have not the wherewith to pay the fine.” “Never mind,” says the other, “I will pay it for you. I will place myself under the penalty and you shall go out clear.” Now in this case is B a

breaker of the law? No, he is a fulfiller of the law; he takes the penalty of the breach upon himself. It was precisely so with Jesus; He bore the penalty of the law for those who had broken it. He having fulfilled it and made it honourable. Isaiah 42:21.

In this death He bore both the Edenic and Mosaic curses for those who were justly under them.

When debating with Mr Smith of Edinburgh. I urged this about the breach erroneously termed by Mr Andrews, of the law upon the Cross. He, Mr Smith, saw the position, and beat a retreat. He said; "I won't say He broke the law" but he did not see the corner he was driven into by that admission. I answered, "Then if it was not necessary for Jesus to break or infringe the Mosaic Law in order to redeem them that were under the law neither was it necessary for Jesus to be made a sinner under the Edenic law, in order to redeem them that were accursed by its transgression in Adam."

And then I reversed the argument thus. "If it was necessary for Jesus to infringe the Edenic law to redeem transgressors then it was necessary to infringe the Mosaic Law in order to redeem the Jews." But dogmatism is blind.

This position brings to my recollection the story of a Chinaman who made a tub, and to put on the lid got inside, and consequently fastened himself in, and had to remain there until someone came and let him out. I say, brethren, that to curse Jesus in His death as having infringed the law of Moses, and to curse Him in His birth as a sinner in Adam, is to make it doubly impossible for Him to rise from the dead, and for the Almighty to retain the title of Just.

We must not forget that God is just as well as the Justifier, Romans 3:26. But if He had liberated Jesus from death, first as a sinner in Adam, and lastly as being "guilty of offence" against the Law of Moses, there would be a manifest injustice thrown upon Him.

Allow me to demonstrate this by a simple figure on the board. Here are two parallel lines of equal length representing a tube. This dot represents a pea in a tube, put there of course, through the opening at one end, now I draw a line which blocks up the other end, the two ends signify the double sin first "in Adam" then against Moses' law, both of which are justly punishable with death.

Now I want you to show me how to get the pea, which stands for Jesus, out of the tube, which tube represents death? This is clearly impossible unless the Almighty breaks two laws arbitrarily in favour of Jesus. To do this would not, I repeat, be just, but manifestly unjust, and as God is never unjust we may safely say He adopted no such plan.

To return to Christ as I now see Him. He had His natural life free because God was His Father; and having died for us He then held eternal life, earned by obedience, and holds it now having the keys of Hades and of death; Revelation 1:13, and those who are worthy will share it with Him. Such a Christ is a Redeemer indeed, and such a Christ I can understand.

Many times under the old view - and I think you will agree that I knew it, seeing I had been a student for fifteen years, and of late have had a good deal more leisure than many of you therefore, I think it is not presumption in me to say that I knew what the view was, when I regarded Jesus as having done no sin, as 1 Peter 2:22 says, having no guile in His mouth, I have walked about and wept tears of joy. He had been a character of the highest admiration to my mind; and so I rejoiced exceedingly before God. But all this was marred as soon as I turned round and saw Him coming into life with "sinful flesh" and therefore a sinner, as I used to think, and consequently cursed with death.

The logical part of my mind revolted from that picture in great distress and confusion, and I tried to pacify myself by saying "It is in the hands of God; it is alright."

Brethren, I shall not be out of place in making this observation that our esteemed Brother, the chairman has told me since we have daily studied this matter together, that for 15 years he had not been able to understand what Dr. Thomas meant by "sin-in-the-flesh." That is the fixation of sin in the flesh which he speaks of in "Elpis Israel," page 126, that otherwise admirable work and to which we are all so

much indebted, directly or indirectly; and I confess to you without reserve, neither have I been able to understand it.

But still I have many a time taught it. I have taken the 9th article of the book of common prayer and pulled it to pieces and said that Christ came in flesh full of sin; for said I to the people, what can sinful flesh mean, but flesh full of sin?

Well now, since my mind has been more especially directed to the study of this subject, I have arrived at this conviction that there is no such thing as flesh full of sin, and never was, nor can be. I am perfectly aware that this emphatic statement will suggest to you some verse of Paul's which you imagine will disprove my assertion; but you know, brethren, that when we are arguing with orthodox believers, and tell them there is no such thing as an "immortal soul" they think the Bible glistens with it on almost every page; but on searching they cannot find it at all, so it is with this "sinful flesh."

In studying this question, I took up a concordance as the readiest means of getting at the texts, and I found that the adjective "sinful" occurs only some seven or eight times in the whole of the Scriptures.

We find it in connection with language of this kind, "Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity." Numbers 22:4; Isaiah 1:4; Amos 9:8. And I began to say to myself, "Does this mean that every particle of flesh of the men, women and children is full of sin from the top of their heads to the sole of their feet?"

That view of the case presents insuperable difficulties to me. For example, when a vessel is full you cannot put any more in. Before any more of the new can enter, some of the old must be poured out. Now if our flesh is "full of sin" how can righteousness find admission? For sin being in the flesh itself there is no possibility of driving it out, Proverbs 22:15, it would be an element of the man himself. This will not stand, said I, and I proceeded in this way. "O righteous nation." Genesis 20:4; Isaiah 26:2.

Then I asked myself this question, Is the flesh of a righteous nation different from the flesh of a sinful nation?

Does not sinful apply to "character" and not to "flesh"? And so I concluded; for we shall have a righteous nation in the age to come. I know that it may be objected that the sins of that nation will be blotted out, but if sin be in the flesh you cannot put it out unless you burn or otherwise destroy the flesh. And talk about resisting sin, James 4:7, or diabolos which is equivalent to sin, as we are told to do and he will flee from us, it is simply preposterous if fixed in our flesh, for wherever I went with my sinful flesh, there he would go; it would be an element of myself, in every particle of my flesh. But the Scriptures teach that we can put away sin, lay it down, and pass on.

We retain the propensities to sin, but the propensities are not sin. Please observe the importance of cause and effect.

Desire leads to sin, but desire is not sin, sin brings death, but death is not sin, death is an evil consequent upon sin. It is quite untrue to say we have sin "fixed in our flesh." We have plenty of it in our character, but it is a thing we can put away if we will, for we have many exhortations in the Scriptures to this end. Romans 6:12, 1 Corinthians 9:27. We are expected not to let sin reign in our mortal bodies. Now, if you do let sin reign, what are you to do?

If one King is stronger than another, and he makes war upon the other, and conquers, does he not depose the vanquished? That is what we have to do in this case. We can depose sin, put him out of "office" and bring in another King, Jesus, who must dwell in our hearts by faith. Ephesians 3:17.

I began to see that "sinful" was quite a wrong adjective wherewith to qualify the noun "flesh."

A certain portion of the audience will excuse me pointing out that adjectives qualify nouns; for example "white" paper qualifies or shows the colour of the noun "paper" and so forth, and you cannot find it in the Scriptures that "sinful" applies to the flesh.

If you want to know whether an adjective is suitable to qualify a noun, it is not a bad plan to bring in the opposite; all things have their opposites.

Now the opposite word to “sinful” is “righteous.”

What would be thought of us if we spoke of “righteous flesh”? We read of “Holy Flesh,” Haggai 2:12, Leviticus 22:10, Deuteronomy 7:6, Psalm 87:1, 89:20, Luke 1:35, but “Holy” means sanctified or something set apart; it does not refer to the quality of the flesh itself.

I say then that “sinful” is not a proper adjective to qualify the noun “flesh,” but it qualifies the noun “character.”

A sinful man is a man of bad character, not of bad flesh.

Sin is an act, 1 John 3:4, not a fixed principle. 1 Corinthians 6:18. It seems to me just as appropriate to speak of “long” noise, “green” music, “tall” tunes, etc., as to speak of “sinful” flesh.

But so ignorant was I upon this subject that I thought I should have no difficulty in finding this adjective used in connection with flesh, and betook myself to the concordance and also to the Scriptures, but the only place in which I could find the phrase “sinful flesh” was in Romans 8:3. “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh.”

That is the only place in which sinful flesh occurs and in that place it is no translation at all. The Greek words are “*en homoiomati sarkos hamartias*” which in English is “in the likeness of flesh of sin.” But in good English we don’t say “the hat of John” but “John’s hat,” and so we must say for *sarkos hamartias*, “Sins flesh.” This is a scriptural phrase, and it sets forth a scriptural doctrine.

Let us look at it a little. You all know what is meant by the possessive case, it means “possession” or ownership, as John’s book, that is the book that belongs to John.

Change the name then, and put in the word “sin,” “sin’s” book. The book that belongs to sin.

Let us take another figure, a figure of flesh, the horse for instance, “sin’s horse.” The horse which belongs to sin, which is his property. Do you think now that sin’s horse is necessarily a horse that is made of “sinful flesh”? I think you will all see the absurdity of this conclusion. Well, let us again change the figure, “sin’s man” that is a man belonging to sin. Is the man’s flesh necessarily full of sin because he belongs to sin? Certainly not. Take yet one more figure; here are two sheep, they both belong to one shepherd, one strays away, the other remains in the care of the shepherd. The stray sheep wanders over a boundary line and becomes the property of a person whom we will call “sin;” for sin is personified in the Scriptures as a “king reigning,” etc.

Now please observe, here is the other sheep still where they both were at first. Do you think the wool, do you think the skin, do you think the flesh of the stray sheep are at all changed? Do you believe that its wool, skin and flesh have become in any way different from those of the sheep which remain with their Master?

I cannot see any difference whatever. It is merely a question of possession. It may be thought that this is scarcely a proper illustration; perhaps it may be objected to as being too commercial or too carnal. Well it is carnal, inasmuch as it relates to flesh, for sheep are made of flesh. But I think it will serve my purpose, and it happens to be scriptural as you will find if you turn to Isaiah 53:6, “All we like sheep, have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Now when those sheep had gone astray, whose property were they? They had served sin, and they are “sin’s sheep.”

What I want you now to consider, brethren, is this. Was Israel at all changed in regard to their flesh? I cannot see that they were.

A very important and serious change had taken place, but that change was in their character and in their relation to God, but not in their flesh, and God proposed to redeem or buy them back to Himself. Now cannot you see that if Jesus was “sin’s flesh” then God is a swindler and a bungler. We must not forget that God is just as well as a justifier, but if He effected the redemption of man by yielding up to sin what already belonged to sin, then we are redeemed by fraud.

That is the logical outcome of this “Sinful flesh” theory. No change had taken place in the quality of their flesh, it was precisely the same as before they went astray.

I think perhaps that will be sufficient for the present about sin, flesh, and sinful flesh, the last expression please remember being nowhere found in Scripture.

I now wish to draw your attention to some testimony from two of our brethren, one dead and the other living.

The first I shall take up is contained in a letter to “The Rock” which is to be found in this month’s “Christadelphian” page 364.

It was drawn from the pen of our late highly esteemed Brother Dr. Thomas, in answer to a correspondent who signed himself “Testimony.” Testimony says that if the manifestation of Jesus was in “sinful flesh” then Jesus was a sinner.

Well, so say I - how could it be otherwise, for if every particle of the flesh is full of sin, how can a man be anything else? And when a vessel is full how can you get anything else in?

Then if the demon, sin, is in every particle of a man, and you do not exorcize it, I do not see how you can get any righteousness into him. But I proceed with the letter. Testimony desires to know if Dr. Thomas means to say this:-

“Christadelphians mean to say neither more nor less than Paul saith.” Now, with the deepest respect, indeed, respect which amounts well-nigh to reverence for our departed Brother, I cannot see why he replied to “Testimony” in this fashion, that is by saying Christadelphians mean to say neither more nor less than Paul saith. Why did he not say he meant His flesh was full of sin? I can see no good reason why he would not say it was full of sin, because frequently in his writings he used that style, but, as I take it, perceiving the rocks ahead like a shrewd pilot in argument, and he was a shrewd one, he tried to steer clear of those rocks by putting his answer in this form. Dr. Thomas, this unsurpassed teacher of the truth then continues:-

“God sent His own Son in the likeness of “Sin’s flesh.” I think I have shown you, brethren, what a wonderfully different thing this is from “Sinful flesh.”

Let me return to the illustration. Here are two sheep, the one on the left belongs to “sin” and I am required say to produce a likeness of that sheep. How could I better respond than by pointing to the sheep on the right which did not go astray? That is how I understand the matter. A “likeness” of Sin’s flesh. Here is flesh “not belonging” to sin, there is flesh “belonging” to sin. The one is the precise likeness of the other, but it does not belong to the same master, though the “flesh” is just the same.

Now, then, the Dr. says God sent His own Son in the likeness of flesh of sin, or “Sin’s flesh” which he declares was the same as ours, and so do I, but I say our flesh was once under the sentence of death, but not flesh “full of sin.” There lies all the difference.

The Dr. next refers “Testimony” to Hebrews 7:27, thus: “He, Jesus, offered for His own Sins and the peoples when He once offered up Himself.”

Now I want you to notice this particularly. But what has to be understood by “His own sins”? Are we to understand sin in Jesus’ flesh, muscles and bones and all His physical system full of sin? Or are we to understand our sins put into his flesh as you would put a half-crown into a box?

Hear the Dr. - “What is to be understood by “His own sins?” The sins committed by others and borne in His own body on the cross as testified by Paul. 1 Peter 2:24, saying, “who His own self bore our sins in His own body to the tree,” upon which He became a curse for us.”

Now mark this, in the Mosaic and Christian systems the unsinning victim is regarded as the sinner, in the sense of being the sin “Bearer.” Personally, Jesus was Holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners, if He had not been so He would not have been fit for the “Sin bearer” of the world.

The purpose of God being the condemnation of sin in the nature that sinned in Eden, in the person of one who had himself committed no sin.

Paul says Jesus was “undefiled.” Can this be said even of a new born babe? Are we not all defiled as sinners in Adam?

Did not death then pass on every one of us? And if Jesus had been under that sentence would He not in like manner have been defiled? But the Scriptures declare He was “undefiled” and separate from sinners, and the Scriptures cannot be broken. John 10:35.

It is evident, therefore, that though He appeared in the flesh, that flesh was not defiled by the death sentence passed upon all Adam’s begotten sons. The reason is plain enough. Jesus was begotten of the Holy Spirit. Matthew 1:13. Luke 1:31-35. Now returning to the diagram for a moment, here is a line representing Adam when God made him. We have seen he was flesh and blood; we have asked if he was sinful, and the answer was no. Well, that was the nature that transgressed in Eden. Now then, the matter is perfectly plain; and I can justly claim this statement of the Doctor’s to be on my side.

I am sorry, however, that some confusion arises by finding statements from the Doctor’s pen on the other side.

The nature in Eden had no sin inhering in it. It was corruptible and relatively imperfect as compared with Angelic nature. There was no sin in the “nature” after it had transgressed. No, what was there then? There was mortality. What does that mean? Death. “Of man’s disobedience and the fruit of the forbidden tree, whose mortal taste brought death into our world, and all our woes, with loss of Eden till one greater man restored us and regain the blissful seat, sing heavenly muse.”* (See Appendix c)

There was mortality. There was man destined to die; but sin was not a fixed principle in the man’s flesh. However, inasmuch as I have said that Dr.Thomas has taught this, I cannot do better than refer you to the place. Elpis Israel, page 113, 3rd paragraph:-

“The word sin is used in two principle acceptations in scripture. It signifies in the first place. “The transgression of law.” 1 John 3:4. (Yes, brethren, and let me tell you that unless you use it in a “metonymic” way it signifies nothing else, unless you use it to signify the propensities. But mark what the Dr. further says) – “And in the next it represents that physical principle in the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh which has the power of death, and it is called “sin” because the development, or fixation of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression.”

There is a fixation of “sin” in the flesh. The Doctor pushes this matter beyond man; but he gives no proof, and when I have spoken in support of this theory I have given no proof. I have merely asserted it and it was not until I came to look for proof that I found there was absolutely none.

The Doctor says lower down,

“The nature of the lower animals is as full of this physical evil principle as the nature of man, though it cannot be styled “sin” with the same expressiveness, because it does not possess them as the result of their own transgression. The name however, does not alter the nature of the thing.”

I have heard the Doctor use the phrase “Confusion worse confounded” when criticizing other men’s writings, and if it were not for the respect in which I hold him, I should be inclined on that statement to say the same.

The Doctor has laid down that sin came into the flesh by transgression, and then he says it became a fixed principle.

He also says it is in the flesh of the lower animals. If so I want to know how it came there. Did it come into the animals in the same way as into man? Is a lion a sinful lion because he transgressed? If not, tell me how it is he is full of sin. But this would lead to absurdity, and I shall refrain from drawing some logical conclusions which I might justly draw.

I turn from that view and present to you another. The animals, we learn from Genesis sprang from the ground by Almighty power. They have all the same breath, all were of flesh, that is corruptible. You may call them “mortal” if you like, in a general or loose sense; but it is more strictly correct to style them “corruptible” because “mortal” means destined to die through breach of law* (see Appendix c). I do not know that the lions, giraffes, elephants, bears, and the serpent tribes have been guilty of moral transgression, and therefore I do not see how sin was established in their flesh. If it be said that sin was put into their flesh because of Adam’s transgression I ask for proof. I have seen no proof, but I have seen this, that there was dissension instead of harmony and peace which before obtained; for whereas Adam before the fall was king of all these and they were under his control, afterwards the tiger’s eye, and the lion’s teeth may be said to have turned against him in rage. But if I mistake not, prophecy declares that this peaceful state is to be restored, Isaiah 11:6, unless we are to receive that passage altogether in a figurative sense?

The second sense in which the word “sin” is used by the Dr. is quite imaginary. It is what Webster calls the theological sense that is to say, sin is supposed to mean the native depravity of the human heart. All this is supposition. I repeat that sin is an act, not a literal element existing in the flesh.

If the act is not repeated, then one can be said to have laid aside that sin. If a man kill unlawfully, the sin of killing does not affect the man’s physical self. He bears the character of a murderer. So it was with Adam, his transgression did not change his flesh; it placed him under sentence of death, who, by his very nature was capable of but not destined to death until sin was committed.

And now brethren, be kind enough to give me your special attention. I have shown you that Dr. Thomas has distinctly affirmed the existence of sin in the flesh, as a fixed principle. I am now going to turn to a living author, and show you that he flatly contradicts the Doctor on that point. I refer you to an article in the “Ambassador” for March 1869, entitled, “The relation of Jesus to the law of sin and death” by the Editor; and if I mistake not it was written chiefly to rectify what was conceived to be an erroneous impression in the mind of our esteemed Brother David Handley previous to his immersion.

Now what I want you specially to notice is this, that the Doctor affirms positively and clearly the existence of sin in the flesh as a fixed principle, while the Brother with whom for the time being I am unhappily at discord upon this matter, affirms the direct contrary. Here are his own words. Page 58, left column: -

“The phrase sin in the flesh is metonymical.” – [“The Slain Lamb,” page 19]. (Pardon me for explaining the term “meta” means to change; “nomen,” a name. It is that figure of speech which puts one thing for another, and may be exemplified by the very familiar illustration, “the kettle boils,” when we mean the water in the kettle). The Editor proceeds “Sin in the flesh is metonymical, it is not the expression of a literal element or principle pervading physical organization. (Is not that plain enough?). Literally, sin is disobedience or an act of rebellion. The impulses that lead to this reside in the flesh and

therefore came to be called by the name of the act to which they gave birth. In defining first principles we must be accurate in our conceptions."

I respond to that most heartily. I wish I had been more accurate in my own ten years ago. But the writer proceeds:

"The impulses which lead to sin existed in Adam before transgression as much as they did afterwards: else disobedience would not have occurred." Further down, in a complete sentence, *"There is no such thing as essential evil or sin."*

Now I think that perfectly clear, and I rejoice to be able to agree with Mr Roberts, at least when he penned those lines, that there is no sin in the flesh. But it is said by those who hear him regularly, that only a week ago he held precisely the same language in public discourse. I think he had the advantage of me then, he seemed to see the matter then. I did not. I wish I had.

I next call your attention to another part of this article to show you that the flesh of Jesus is said to be sinful. I refer to the second paragraph:-

"If Jesus came in the flesh He was under condemnation, for the nature He inherited was condemned."

Mr Roberts gives no proof of this, it is merely round assertion. He instances the proposition as a conclusion, instead of showing the reason of its conclusion. That is what logicians call "reasoning in a circle."

If Jesus came in the flesh He was under condemnation. Will that hold water? Or is it like pouring water into a sieve which lets it through as fast as it is poured in? Let us make a test. Was Adam in the flesh before he sinned? He was. Was he then under condemnation because he came in the flesh? Oh, no, that is bad logic. Therefore if he came in the flesh and was not under condemnation how could Jesus be under condemnation because He came in the flesh?

Mr Robert's answer is the flesh he inherited was condemned nature. Mark what nature means. It does not mean "character," it means substance, body.

Now then, I shall show where he has palpably contradicted himself again on this matter. He says:-

"Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he transgressed. There is no evidence of this whatever, and the presumption and evidence are entirely the contrary way."

Then the Editor goes on to give the best of all reasons when he goes on to say:-

"There was a change in Adam's relation to his Maker; but not in the nature of his organization. What are the facts? He was formed from the dust a living soul, or natural body. His mental constitution gave him moral relation to God. He was given a law to observe, that law he disobeyed, and sentence was passed that he, the disobedient living soul should return to mother earth (see Appendix D). What was the difference between his position before disobedience and his position after? Simply this. In the one case he was a living soul or natural body on probation for immortality, and in the other case he was a living soul under sentence of death. He was a living soul or natural body in both cases."*

I perfectly agree with that, brethren, it is a well written piece, and it serves my purpose admirably. You must get Mr Roberts to reconcile that with "Flesh full of sin" and "Condemned nature." I am only sorry however to find confusion in other parts, sorry to find him asserting the other side, as did Dr.Thomas, who also, as clearly as he, taught this view and proved it. There is much I had marked in the article for criticism, He says, page 84:-

"The blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin, and the suffering of angels could not avail."

Now, here is a question of death and I do not understand the meaning of the clause “the suffering of angels.” I read nothing about it in Scriptures. I understand when we possess Angelic nature we shall be beyond all suffering, and tears shall be wiped away from all faces and there will be no more curse. “Death having passed on the race of Adam. He will not accept the death of Angels.” Does not Christ say that they that are equal to the Angels can die no more?

My understanding of Angelic nature is that in it inheres the principle of “deathlessness” and therefore it is an evident contradiction, I had almost said an absurdity, to speak of “the death of angels.”

Let us examine some other passages in this article;-

“The sentence of death ran in the blood which He inherited from Adam through Mary. Jesus was therefore in the days of His flesh as much under its power as those He came to save. This conclusion follows from the testimony that He was a man. It would stand secure upon that foundation alone; but it is also reaffirmed in divers parts of the word.”

Now brethren, if Jesus were as much under the power of death as those He came to save, was He not, like them, a child of wrath? Can a child of wrath deliver another from death? If he can, then the Scriptures which saith no man can redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him (Psalm 49:7) is made false. On the other hand, if this Scripture be true then one man born under sentence of death could by no means redeem those under the same sentence. He could not give to God a ransom which is “life” because being under sentence to die his life is already lost.

Now let us take the next statement in hand:-

“The mere fact that Jesus was a man is alone a sufficient foundation for the assertion that He was under sentence of death.”

Nothing is easier than to demonstrate the incorrectness of this statement. Look at Adam, was he a man before he sinned? Of course he was. Was he under sentence of death before he sinned? Of course he was not. It is therefore false to teach that because Jesus was a man He was under sentence of death. Before this can be taught we should first have to prove that Jesus was a sinner. But that is nowhere found in Scripture; on the contrary there are the plainest statements possible to show that Jesus was not a sinner. What saith John? – “And we know that He was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin.” 1 John 3:5.

Now if there were no sin in Him, then He could not be under sentence of death; for death can only come by sin, as it is written, “By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin.” Mr. Roberts says; *“It is expressly affirmed in divers parts of the word, that Jesus was under the Adamic sentence of death.”* I should very much like to see one of these express affirmations. Where are they? Well, Mr. Roberts points us to 2 Corinthians 5:21.

It is testified that Jesus was made sin for us. How does Mr. Roberts explain this verse? Please pay attention :-

“As Jesus was not of sinful character, this could only apply to His physical nature, which drawn from the veins of Mary, was made sin.”

You have not forgotten, brethren, that in this very article Mr. Roberts has told us distinctly there is no such thing as sin pervading our physical organization; that there is no such thing as essential evil or sin; That sin is an act of disobedience; and that the physical, nature of Adam was not changed by transgression. Now he tells us that sin ran in the blood of Mary, and from her, in this way was Jesus made sin. There could not be a more palpable contradiction than this; a gross stultification of himself and therefore a complete proof that he does not understand the subject. He is quite ignorant as to the manner in which Jesus, who knew no sin was made sin for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.

I will now explain the matter. The word "sin" in this verse is in Greek "*hamartia*." Now this word means both "sin" and "sin-offering." The question which arises therefore is this. Does the word mean "sin" or does it mean "sin-offering" in this place? If it means sin and not sin-offering; then surely we should be able to produce proofs from other parts of the word that Jesus was made sin in this sense. But I am sure there is no proof. You have already heard the testimony of Paul and John. The first teaches us that Jesus was undefiled and separate from sinners; the second that "in him is no sin." Dr. A. Clarke observes that he has noticed more than a hundred places in the Scriptures where the word "*hamartia*" stands for sin-offering, and he says that is its meaning in 2 Corinthians 5:21 'He who knew no sin, was made a sin-offering for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.'

This certainly commends itself to one's judgment. He was made a sin-offering that something might follow for our eternal benefit, viz: that we might be made the righteousness of God "in Him." And now brethren, ask yourselves whether we could have been "in Him" unless He had been made a sin-offering for us? Ask yourselves whether we could have been made the righteousness of God "in Him" unless we had been baptized into "His death"? And how could we have been baptized into His death unless He first had been made a sin-offering for us? Now survey the interpretation given by Mr. Roberts, viz; That Jesus was made sinful by nature: that He drew this sin from the blood of His mother, although he emphatically declares there is no such thing as "sin" in the nature. I would ask you, brethren, how we could be made the righteousness of God "in Jesus" because He was made "full of sin"? How could the circumstance of sin in Jesus' blood clothe us with the righteousness of God? Such an interpretation of the text sounds to me very much like "darkening counsel by words without knowledge." To present one sinner to clothe all other sinners with righteousness is what I cannot at all comprehend. It resembles to my mind a project for clothing all the ragged wretches in the world with suits of apparel made out of the filthy rags of one like themselves.

I suppose my inability to apprehend the wisdom and justice of this plan is to be found in the fact that I am not spiritual but carnal, and that I cannot see below the surface. Be it so. But those who have had the advantage of a longer "spiritual education" (?) and whose powers of vision are well nigh prophetic ought surely to employ a little eye-salve instead of a hurricane of abuse and misrepresentation.

I will explain the matter by reference to another passage to which I ask your special attention, as I presume some little light may shine out of this which has not perhaps been seen, at any rate by some of us. The passage I refer to is in Genesis 4:7 - "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door."

That verse is usually understood this way, that when Cain sinned, sin lay at his door as a kind of debt, a kind of witness or evidence of his iniquity, and this Scripture is often cited in this sense. But when we look below the surface in this matter by aid of those who do know, we find that is not at all the sense of the original. The word is "*chattath*" and that means sin-offering.

The phrase is "*lappethach chattath rabbets*" meaning a sin-offering lieth at the door. Lightfoot, Clarke, Boothroyd, thus expound the text. "There is an animal suitable for a sin-offering crouching at the door of the fold. If thou doest not well, take and offer it." That is the explanation, and I consider it a beautiful passage.

It shows that God has provided a means for covering sin. As Clarke says, "'It is not that the Almighty has not provided a lamb; that the Almighty is not reconcile; it is not that there is no sin offering lying at the door.'" No, there was one outside the gate. That was the proper place. It pleased the Lord, His Father, to bruise Him there, and by that death we may be reconciled to God, if we place ourselves in relation to Him, not without.

Now then, this "*chattath*" or sin-offering is translated in the Septuagint by the word "*hamartia*," the word before us.

Our attention has been called to my discussion with Mr. Smith of Edinburgh. I had supposed him to be especially expert in the Law and in the Psalms, but I am very sorry to say that I did not find him so. His use of the types and shadows "slew him."

To understand this phrase we will refer to the types. Here is a bullock, there is a ram, and yonder is a lamb. These are physically without blemish. How are they made sin? Just as the Doctor says "by laying the sin upon them." They then became sin-bearers.

How was Christ, the spotless Lamb of God made sin? By the same means - by laying sin upon Him. A sinless victim was made sin "for us."

I have a book here brethren, from which I should much like to read an extract; but the time is so far gone, and I must content myself by making a very limited quotation from it.

The article upon which I open is entitled, "The bullock for a sin-offering."

The first offering brought by Moses was a bullock for a sin-offering or, in Hebrew, "the bullock, the sin." The word "offering" is never found in Hebrew connected with sacrifice. It reads "The bullock the sin, the ram the sin, the lamb the sin," and so forth.

How are these victims made sin? By sin being laid upon them, The Priest laid his hands "heavily" upon them (the word means "to lay heavily"), and so was understood to transfer his sins from himself on to them, and these animals bore away his sins into the plain.

I refer to the scape-goats. However, when the tenth day of the seventh month came around again, they must needs avail themselves of another animal for a scape-goat.

Therefore the law was but a shadow, a representative way of sin covering. It was very different when "God's Lamb" came, one who could be tried with all the impulses to sin, but who did no sin, and in whose mouth no guile was found, one upon whom, as Isaiah graphically says, "our sins were laid." They were put away by the death of Christ, to be brought against us no more for ever.

Now it has been objected to this way of putting the matter that my view, as it has been styled, lays our sins on Christ's back like a bundle of sticks or something of the kind. I cannot help that. The Spirit in the prophet Isaiah says they were "laid on Christ" or made to meet on Him. You know the testimony but it is as well to read it; "He was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from Him. He was despised and we esteemed Him not. Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions. He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He was numbered with the transgressors, and He bore the sin of many."

The former part of this prophecy found its fulfilment in the miracles performed by Jesus. Matthew 8:16 says:-

"When the even was come, they brought unto Him many that were possessed with devils; and He cast out the spirits with His word and healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bore our sicknesses."

My brethren, the Lord was pleased to impute, or transfer, or lay on this victim's head the sins of the whole world. As the poet most beautifully expresses it, "By faith I lay my hand on that dear head of thine. While like a penitent I stand and there confess my sin."

Our friend has said that sin is not a literal principle, and I agree with that. Sin is not a thing you can transfer from one to another like change for a sovereign. Nor am I disposed to think that in blood itself there is any intrinsic value.

Take the blood of the Passover Lamb in Egypt. Its value was the value which had been put upon it. The blood of Christ also was the same as that of any other man, but the Almighty has appointed that blood to us upon His plan, or scheme of redemption, which rendered it "precious." 1 Peter 1:19.

Because our life is not worth a rush, it is lost in Adam. I see how the blood of Christ is precious, because His life was not so lost.

The precious blood of Christ as of a Lamb “without spot and without blemish.” It is His blood in which is no sin, that cleanseth us from all sin, if we walk in the Light. 1 John 1:7.

Now, then, I come to another point. The pamphlet I hold in my hand is by Mr. Roberts, and is entitled, “A Review of Brother Turney’s answers to the Sacrifice of Christ.” In it he positively affirms that the types were “wholly unclean.” This I wholly deny. Now then for proof. He says,

“Again Paul writes, “The bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood suffered without the gate.” Hebrews 13:11.

Here is a parallel between the burnt bullock as a type, and the slain body of Jesus as the antitype. Now let us mark the facts connected with the bodies of those beasts in their significance with regard to the body of Jesus. Numbers 19; “Speak unto the children of Israel that they bring thee a red heifer without spot, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke. And he shall give her unto Eleazer the High Priest, that he may bring forth without the camp, and one shall slay her before his face. And one shall burn the heifer in his sight, her skin, her flesh, and her blood with her dung, shall he burn; and the Priest shall take cedar wood, and hyssop and scarlet and cast it into the midst of the burning of the heifer. Then the Priest shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterwards he shall come into the camp, and the Priest shall be unclean until the evening. And he that burneth her shall be unclean until the evening. It is a purification for sin. He that gathereth the ashes of the heifer shall wash his clothes and be unclean until the evening.”

Everyone who had to do with the bodies of those beasts burned without the camp, for purification of sin, contracted uncleanness by contact with the bodies.

Now the type being so wholly unclean what is the uncleanness of the antitype? The heifer was without spot, and had never been put under yoke pointing to the sinlessness of Christ, and of the fact that He was brought into the world for the service of God alone; but what counterpart had the uncleanness? The answer is found in the fact that Jesus was of the seed of Abraham, the flesh of David, the sin nature of the condemned Adam, for the condemnation of sin in the flesh. The condemnation rested upon him which was the uncleanness and this antitype uncleanness of that one great offering could only be cleansed after the example of the type, by death, and burning, the burning being the change effected by the spirit on the risen body of the Lord after His death for sin.

The new theory contains no parallel to this uncleanness of the typical bodies burned without the camp.” - R.Roberts.

Now let me try to show whether it does or not. Here the types are said to be unclean. If it means after the sins were laid upon it, I say that is true, but if it means that the flesh of the types was wholly unclean, I deny it, because if any one had brought to the priest an unclean animal for offering, he would have been worthy of death. It was only when the sins had been laid upon the victim that they were reputed unclean, and those who touched them contracted uncleanness; he must then wash his clothes and remain apart from Jewish society until the evening.

“This uncleanness” writes Mr. Roberts, “could only be cleansed after the example of the type, by death and burning; the burning being the change effected by the Spirit on the risen body of the Lord after His death for sin.”

Where is the proof of this idea? Mr. Roberts gives none. What in the world does he mean by cleansing Jesus after the manner of the type? Will he show where and when the typical victim was cleansed? He says, “By burning”! Did burning the bullock “cleanse” the bullock? If cleansing be the

same as “destroying” then perhaps the bullock was cleansed. But I should like Mr. Roberts to show us the bullock after it had thus been cleansed.

The truth is brethren he does not know what he is taking about. If Jesus must be cleansed after such a fashion, then he is not alive now but was reduced to ashes 18 centuries ago. I think we may call this “a burning” argument which utterly devours the position maintained by Mr. Roberts, and leaves him neither root nor branch, neither type nor antitype. How long will he wallow in the ashes? Further, having informed us that the type was “wholly unclean” in his very next line says, “The heifer was without spot, and this spotlessness pointed to the sinlessness of Christ.” Is not this another strange contradiction? If the heifer were “wholly unclean” as he has just stated, I want to know what was the nature of that uncleanness? The heifer was not a moral agent like man, and certainly therefore, was not morally unclean. Well, was the heifer physically unclean? Certainly not. It was without spot or blemish. The slightest disease, lameness, or deformity would have rendered it quite unfit for an offering. If therefore, the position of Mr. Roberts rests upon the types which are wholly unclean and on examination we find them to be wholly clean, where, I ask you, is his standing? When the premises are false, the best logician is the least safe guide. Let us now look at what Mr. Roberts says about the goats :-

“So with the two goats, Leviticus 16:15,26. The one that was burned without the camp “was unclean” necessitating ablution on the part of the man who carried out the body to be burnt, and the one that was allowed to escape alive into the wilderness, as the sin bearer of the people, imparted uncleanness to the man who let him go.”

All this, brethren, is put forward to prove the necessity for the physical nature of Jesus to be unclean. But one little question will reveal the mistake. Were these goats unclean when led up to the Priest? Now you see the blunder. If it had been made by a man of short spiritual education, by a man who could not see below the surface, there had been some excuse. As it is, I think there is none. The goats, brethren were perfectly clean, not wholly unclean.

Now I will show you in Mr. Roberts’ own words how they came to be unclean: -

“The sins,” he says, *“were ceremonially put upon the goats.”* Precisely so. But before that ceremony they were free from sin.

“If this is so with the types, what are we to look for in the antitype?” He asks. I answer a harmonious counterpart. In other words the antitype must be a wholly clean thing before sins are laid upon Him.

This is exactly what “The Lamb of God” was. John 1:29.

To lay sins on a sinner would not avail to remove sin. They must be borne by one “Mighty to save.” And that mightiness could only consist of absolute sinlessness.

All under sin are “without strength” and therefore, just the reverse of “mighty.”

I now beg to read a little from the prophet Malachi, in which we shall see the awful consequences of the types being wholly unclean. Malachi 1:12,14:

“But ye have profaned it, in that ye say the table of the Lord is polluted, and the fruit thereof, even His meat, is contemptible, Ye said also, behold what a weariness it is, and ye have snuffed at it saith the Lord of hosts, and ye have brought that which was torn, and the lame and the sick. Thus ye have brought an offering. Should I accept this of your hands, saith the Lord? But cursed be the deceiver who hath in his flock a male, and voweth and sacrificeth to the Lord a corrupt thing.”

If the type had been unclean, you see it would have brought down a heavy curse, and if Jesus had been unclean in the sense of sins being in His flesh He must have been quite out of harmony with the type. I would not dwell longer on that point.

I want to mention three passages, one in Hebrew - Daniel 9:26, another in the Greek copy of the Septuagint, and another in the Greek copy of the New Testament.

It was once said that if that passage in Daniel meant what the English translation said, it would settle this question.

I have been able to prove, and the chairman will bear me out, that that which is given in the margin is not intended as a translation at all. But we will read the text:-

“And after threescore and two weeks shall the Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.”

The words which touch the matter in hand are “but not for himself.”

I want you to notice that in the margin we have these words, “And shall have nothing” and please observe the reference is to John 14:30. That is a reference, not a translation.

Those who have a marginal Bible will observe that where another rendering is given there is no reference made to another text, but in Daniel 9:26 there is a reference to John 14:30. The words “*ewe ayin lo*” of this verse in Daniel, Dr. Clark renders:-

“But not for himself.” He agrees with Dean Prideaux in this translation. Others have altered the common rendering on the supposition that there was at one time another word in the original text meaning justice. So Houbigant translates the passage: “He shall have no justice.” Boothroyd considers the text elliptical and renders it; “Though he had no fault.” When Doctors disagree, disciples may go free. Still, we have great weight of learning on the side of the reading in our English version:- “But not for Himself.” It seems to me a most comprehensive statement of the Prophet. It covers the whole ground, excluding at once the idea of the Messiah being a sinner either by birth or by His own actions.

The next reading I would draw your attention to is the LXX:- “And condemnation is not in Him.” This reading is also very significant. It may, I think, fairly be taken to cover the whole case, that is to say, it may be taken to signify that the Christ was not under condemnation either as a birthright or as an actual sinner. Mr. Roberts says the book of Daniel is not in the LXX. I am sorry, brethren, to see he knows so little about the matter. Is he to be trusted as an authority? Instead of there being no book of Daniel, there are as it happens two books of Daniel in that copy of the Old Scriptures. I do not desire to be severe upon him, but if he pushes his interruptions and provocations too far, I shall be compelled to retort, and if I do, it will be in no measured terms. Brethren, the Scriptures saith “The fear of man brings a snare.” Proverbs 29:25. And I hold it to be a degradation for a man to be afraid of another in a free country.

The last text to be noticed is that John 14:30 – “The Ruler of this world cometh and in me he hath nothing.” This Ruler was undoubtedly Pontius Pilate, and we have Pilate’s own testimony that he found no fault in Him. His wife also believed Jesus to be “a Just man.” The other texts were long before trial of Jesus. Daniel’s, about 500 years before, and the LXX about 200 years. I think, brethren, we may gather from the three readings this grand conclusion, that though Messiah appeared in our nature, He was absolutely free from sin until our sins were laid upon Him.

As it is gone ten o’clock I shall come to a conclusion as soon as possible. What is worse in argument than putting into your opponent’s mouth things which he desires?

It has been said that my doctrine makes Christ commit sin. I simply deny this. In our part of the Globe they have been so hard put to as to say that the sin in the nature of Christ was washed out in the waters of Jordan.

Now we are told that the blood of Christ cleanseth us from sin in its application to our hearts by faith, but if water could wash away sin, there was a source in Eden from which sprang four rivers, Genesis 2:10, and how is it that Elohim did not command Adam to wash in them and be clean? 2 Kings 5:13. The enemy is in a very miserable case.

Why was Jesus baptized of John? The answer is “to fulfil all righteousness.” Matthew 3:15.

But what righteousness was fulfilled by this act? I would suppose two things. First that the baptism of Jesus was the means of putting on His efficient robes, for it was after this we find Him becoming the great miracle worker and Prophet. It was at His immersion that the Spirit was shed upon Him. Secondly, the baptism may have foreshadowed His death, burial and resurrection. And besides this it might be that as John came baptizing the sons of Israel, Jesus felt it needful to set an example of obedience to the new ordinance.

Mr. Macknight renders the passage: “For so it becometh us to establish every ordinance.” John does not appear to have perceived the need of Jesus being immersed, and hence “He forbid Him,” but being pressed, “He suffered Him.”

The answer of the Master Himself is conclusive, “It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.” To have neglected one item - all righteousness, had been fatal to all. Offend in one point, guilty of all.

It is preposterous to talk of washing away the taints of sin in Jordon if Jesus had even been tainted; but I have shown He was neither tainted, nor defiled. Then there is another foolish accusation which has been set up like a man of straw, which, when brought to the fire of the word perishes. The Gnostic theory has been imputed to us. I had brought a long extract to read to you, showing the belief of the Gnostics, but the time is too far gone. I may say, however, that the Gnostics did not believe that Jesus was flesh and blood but only an apparition that looked like flesh and blood. They believed that His body was bruised; but that He did not suffer. Others believed that Jesus was not Christ; but when the anointing Spirit came from the Eternal throne, then the Christ united Himself with Jesus, and many, many other absurd things. Have I taught these things? I have uniformly taught that the nature of Jesus was precisely like our own, necessarily so, because it was that flesh which had impulses to sin, but which, unlike us, did not lead Him into sin.

I ought also to say something about “The Immaculate Conception.” And there are seven or eight other items I should like to go through.

The doctrine of the “Immaculate conception” is peculiar to Papists. “*Macula*” means a “spot,” prefixed signifies not. It means therefore, “without spot.” That is the very phrase the Apostle Peter uses concerning Christ and therefore, it is a proper form of words to describe Him. But the Papists, like Mr. Roberts, holding this sin-in-the-flesh doctrine, invented the idea that Mary was immaculate also, in order to get a spotless Son. But why set up the idea of the immaculate Mary? I imagine that it was to overcome this difficulty of the taint called “Sin-in-the-flesh.”

But suppose there is no taint; what need for such an invention? Suppose that instead of Mary’s flesh being “full of sin” we regard her as being simply under sentence of death on account of sin (which conclusion itself would also be absurd seeing she was in the Covenant of God). This would explain the matter. If she could have had a child of herself, that child would have been under sentence of death. But she could not. That she knew herself, “seeing I know not a man.”

The first woman was indeed in the transgression. But Mary was Jehovah’s redeemed handmaid, therefore her Son was free from the sentence passed on Adam. Her other children by Joseph were under sentence. The flesh of their brother Jesus was just like theirs, but it was not “Sin’s flesh” but “God’s flesh.” We ought to praise God for this scheme, for sending “His Son” in our nature to be tried, to resist, and to give His life a ransom for all.

Mr. Roberts charges me with Papal delusion; grosser ignorance of my theory could not, brethren, be expressed in words.

I have renounced the Papal myth of “sin-in-the-flesh” by which Mr. Roberts is yet bewitched, hence his utter ignorance of the matter and bland contradiction of himself when dealing with the subject. But instead of trying to enlighten me, he at the first appearance of my 32 question wrote letters to Brother Farmer in which he said, first I had renounced the truth, next had abjured the faith, next was on the verge

of the territory of the Mother of Harlots and finally that I had never understood the truth. At this last statement I began to compare notes and to wonder how I had achieved the marvellous feat of “renouncing” and “Abjuring” that which I had never understood. And to this day I do not know how I have managed it. You see, brethren, that short of time as Mr. Roberts professes to be, he can find time to write such epistles as these. If he were to refrain from the unchristian practise and calmly study the matter for himself, I am positive he would like a great many more of us be ashamed of the great amount of matter he has published.

I would now speak briefly of Jesus under several aspects.

First as an Apostle. Paul describes Him as “the Great Apostle,” Hebrews 3:1, “of our profession,” and invites us to consider Him in this capacity. An Apostle is one sent, from a Greek word which means “to send.” When did Jesus become an Apostle? I believe it was when He was baptized, being about thirty years of age.

He then began to evangelize the house of Israel. The twelve were all sent of God, but we observe that Jesus was sent in a peculiar and prominent manner. He came literally from God. He was God’s only begotten Son - John 1:18; He was the great Apostle. Paul has been styled the great apostle; but not in Scripture. We have thought to do him honour by this title, but scripturally speaking, the Great Apostle is none other than Jesus Christ.

He is next to be viewed as a Prophet; the Prophet of Nazareth, the great Prophet like unto Moses - Acts 3:22. I cannot now speak to any length under this head. Those who wish to see an able treatise on this may read “Newton on the Prophecies.” Suffice it for the present to say that several original prophecies were delivered by Jesus.

Perhaps you will expect me to say something in the next place of Jesus as a Priest; but that would be going too far.

I must speak of Him as a “victim.” There has been some confusion on this subject, a jumbling together of these high offices, and I wish to arrange them in proper order, so that your minds may apprehend each division separately, and then be able afterwards to take a clear and full view of the whole.

When the career of Jesus closed as an Apostle, and a Prophet on earth He became “a victim” on whom was laid not only the sins of Israel, but the sins of the whole world. I John 2:2. He was the “Lamb of God” - John 1:29. It pleased the Lord to bruise Him. This was done by the command which His Father gave Him. “To lay down His life” - John 10. The Jews and Romans executed the blood deed as murderers. They killed the “Prince of Life” - Acts 3:15, without being able to prove any crime against Him.

The giving of that life, however, was voluntary on His part, inasmuch as He had power to summon twelve legions of angels. But how then must the Scriptures be fulfilled? - Matthew 26:53, 54. You will observe that as soon as the sins were transferred to the head of the bullock or the goat, death followed. It was so with Christ. The sentence being passed, the sins of the world were laid upon Him and He bore them to the Cross: that is to say the chastisement due to the sons of Adam, the Jews made other attempts to assassinate Him but failed. His hour was not yet come - John 7:30.

We must distinguish between a Victim and an Offering! Killing is not sacrifice; there must be both killing and presenting, or offering, before you have a sacrifice. If killing were offering, then as many beasts as the butcher killed there would be just as many offerings. We shall get some light on this distinction by referring to Leviticus 9:15. “And he brought the people’s offering, and took the goat which was for the sin offering for the people, and slew and offered it for sin as the first.”

Here you notice the slaying is the one thing, and the offering is another and both these make a sacrifice. - Ephesians 5:25.

Now the type and antitype must agree. It will not do, therefore to repeat the blunders so frequently made by our opponents in this controversy, and speak of Jesus as a Priest while on earth, and to say that He offered Himself on the Cross. I say He did not offer Himself on the Cross - neither was the great Offering made there. You shall be fully furnished with proof of this. It will be admitted by all that none but a Priest can offer. Another may bring an offering to the Priest, i.e., may bring an animal to be offered; but the Priest alone is authorised to offer it. If, therefore, it should turn out in this argument that Jesus was not a Priest while on earth, if He could not be a Priest in the days of His flesh, I ask you to say what becomes of the conclusion based upon His offering for Himself and for the people upon the Cross?

To say that Jesus was then “a victim” is in effect to say that He was not at the same time a “priest.”

But I shall now draw your attention to the testimony which speaks of the Messiah’s Priesthood. There are not merely one or two texts so that we are not left to conjecture. The evidence on this point is abundant and decisive.

Jesus was constituted a Priest by a Divine oath, - “The word of the oath” in Psalm 110 saith, “Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec.”

Now there was this peculiarity about the original Melchizedec, that nothing is specified touching the termination of His Priesthood; and therefore, so far as the record goes, he stands before us an undying Priest, “made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually.” It seems certain, then, that this Melchizedec was not typical of the Priesthood of Aaron, inasmuch as it is really superior to it.

The greater does not foreshadow the less; but the less, the greater. Of the superiority of Melchizedec to Aaron Paul leaves us in no doubt. Now this advantage of Melchizedec over Aaron, arises in part from the longer period during which Melchizedec holds office. For the law says Paul “makes men High Priests which have infirmity but the word of the oath which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.” Hebrews 8:28. Here we have a strong contrast, infirmity, and evermore.

Again Paul writes:- “Who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment but after the power of an endless life.” The greater excellence is seen in the phrase “endless life,” whereas the house of Aaron must succumb to death. “And they,” says the apostle, “truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; but this man because he continueth ever hath an unchangeable Priesthood;” or as the margin reads, “Which passeth not from one to another.”

This testimony establishes the fact that Christ was to be an immortal Priest.

In the present discussion no fact is of greater weight than this. It follows from this that Jesus was not, as Paul says, a Priest on earth. This is also further evident when we remember that there was not on earth more than one divinely recognized Priesthood in the days of Jesus, and He was not of this line.

“For He of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning Priesthood.”

Paul further writes:- “For if He were on earth, He should not be a Priest, seeing that there are Priests that offer gifts according to the law. But now hath He obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much more also He is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established on better promises.” Hebrews 8:4-6.

From this teaching the conclusion is easy and safe that Jesus did not enter upon His Priesthood before He ascended to heaven. This conclusion is confirmed by the following statement:- “But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater, and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building.” Hebrews 9:2.

If Jesus did not, and could not be a Priest in the Temple at Jerusalem, into what Holy of Holies did He enter? The answer is this, “for Christ is not entered into Holy Places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.” Verse 24.

There is yet another question to ask on this subject, and it is one of some importance. Was Jesus an Advocate the moment He entered into the presence of God? I answer that question in the negative.

Why was He not an Advocate at the first? I answer because He had not yet presented His offering to God. What was that offering? Paul says: Himself. “He needed not to offer Himself often, as the High Priest entered into the holy place every year; but now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.” You have not forgotten that sacrifice consists of two things, killing and offering- Jesus was killed on earth, He offered Himself in Heaven; then His sacrifice was complete.

Let me now draw your attention for a moment to Hebrews 7:27. Mr. Roberts has adduced this text to prove that Jesus offered for His own sins and the people’s on the Cross.

I shall show you that our friend does not know what he is talking about, the verse reads:- “Who needeth not daily as the High Priests to offer up sacrifice, first for His own sins, and then for the peoples, for this He did once when He offered up Himself.”

Now the question is this, when, and where did Jesus offer up Himself? What I said a few minutes ago shows clearly that Jesus offered Himself, not on the Cross, but in Heaven. He did not, like the High Priest offer Himself often, but once He appeared to put away sin-offering by the sacrifice of Himself. Do not forget that there had been no sacrifice until He had been offered, or presented to God.

The next question is this. Does this verse show that Jesus offered for Himself? I say certainly not. You will remember the amount of plain testimony and argument in the former part of my lecture in proof of this which cannot of course be recapitulated. On another occasion I pointed out that the two offerings, not slayings by the High Priest were necessarily distinct from each other, and could not possibly be blended into one. And I remarked that if Paul wished us to believe that Jesus, like Aaron, offered for His own sins and the peoples also, he would not, I think have said this He did once, but *these* He did once, these being totally separate offerings. Besides this I asked, what could He offer if, as Mr. Roberts contends the offering was the shedding of His life blood for the people, after He had offered it for Himself. This has not yet been answered.

The truth is brethren that Jesus offered Himself for the sins of the people, not for His own sins. “In Him is no sin” - 1 John 3:5.

Well, having offered Himself without spot to God for us, He then sat down at His Father’s right hand, there to be our intercessor, there to present our petitions to the Throne of Grace, and there to wait till His foes shall be made His footstool. After that, He will descend upon earth again to be for the first time a King and a Priest, not a Priest for us, for we are to be Kings and Priests with Him, but King and Priest of all nations.

At this time, Ezekiel, Isaiah and others teach that Messiah the Prince will offer and prepare sin-offerings. But we may consider these offerings in a memorial sense, as pointing back to His own complete sacrifice for sins, just as the offerings under the Law not being able to remit sin, but directing the mind to an offering which had that power, so I judge the sin offerings of the age to come will cause the nations to look back, and to remember with gratitude the deliverance provided in the sacrifice of “The Lamb Of God.” This was the principle object for keeping the Jewish Passover, to carry the hearts of the Israelites back to the time when God delivered their fathers out of the hand of Pharaoh.

The next thing brethren I must speak of is “God manifestation.” I need not to explain this term, you all know how it is used among us. I am not quite sure however, that God manifestation is a proper expression, but let that pass.

It has been said that this new idea destroys the Scripture teaching of God manifest in the flesh. Nothing, I conceive, but ignorance of the new idea could lead anyone to make such a serious mistake. Why, brethren, the scheme is all of God. Without God there could be no Son of God.

To begin with then, we have a, literal manifestation of God in our Lord Jesus. Then I ask, who devised the plan of redemption but God? When this is understood, we have the most marvellous manifestation of God's love to death-stricken man.

Then, who educated Jesus? Was He not directly taught of God? Who raised Him from the dead? And who glorified Him? And placed Him at His own right hand? Brethren! It is all of God, of whom are all things.

What blind assertion to say, as Mr. Roberts says, this scheme ignores the relation of the Father to Jesus in the matter! This to my mind is another proof that Mr. Roberts does not understand the subject. He says he does understand it. He had told me tonight he knows all I can say on the subject before I begin. To say the least, I think any man cultivating this frame of mind is very far from being teachable; a disposition the Lord makes necessary to our entering the Kingdom of God. Some men like the honour of teaching others, but are not able to see any honour or advantage in being instructed themselves.

But, my brethren, Jesus was not a passive instrument. He was a willing and obedient agent, and co-operated with the Father, therefore a share of the glory is due to Him. Hence it is written;- "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests unto God, even His Father; to Him be glory, and dominion for ever and ever, Amen." - Revelation 1:5,6. The language held by Mr. Roberts makes Jesus to far exceed other men in His power to avoid Sin, while it condemns all other men for doing what they had not the power to avoid!

Here are his own words :-

"When at the age of 30, the Holy Spirit descended upon Him in bodily form, and as it were, took possession of His being, the Father dwelt in Him, and His qualification was complete."

Now, I wish to know by what power Jesus walked without sin up to thirty, seeing that Mr. Roberts, at this age makes the Father, "take possession of His being" and so account for His resisting all temptations? If the Father, at thirty took possession of His being in order to help Him not to yield to His fleshly impulses, we ought to be enlightened by Mr. Roberts as to the means of keeping these impulses in check without the aid of the Holy Spirit during fifteen or twenty years out of the previous thirty. And then we come to wonder why the same power which had kept the impulses in check so many years could not hold them at bay for three or four years longer? The truth is brethren, that this taking possession of His being at thirty is no more than theological fancy engendered in the brain of a man who does not understand the subject: it is a mere fume, or curl of mist floating between the mind of the writer and the object, distorting it to his eye, and imparting to it an imaginary shape and colour. But hear what Mr. Roberts further says:-

"Yet He was tempted because He possessed the impulses common to our nature. He possessed, however, the counter-balancing endowment of knowledge and superior power which enabled Him to do what no man ever has done, that is to pass through this state of existence without sin."
"Ambassador," March 1869, page 86.

If this theory be true then God is more unjust than most men. What Mr. Roberts says just amounts to this: Here is a heavy weight, you call this man to lift it, but find it too heavy for him. He is willing enough, but not strong enough and because he cannot raise the weight you condemn him. You then call that man, and order him to lift the weight, which he does forthwith, and because he has more strength than the other, you reward him and exalt him.

Brethren I ask you to say what sort of justice, what sort of love, what sort of mercy is this? I ask you to say whether such a proceeding is not a piece of injustice altogether unworthy even of His finite and fallible creatures? It is most obvious that, if you make Christ either stronger or weaker than His brethren,

you destroy the Scriptures which saith that “He was tempted in all points like as we are.” Hebrews 4:15. Temptation is weak or strong just as we have power to bear it. 1 Corinthians 10:13.

If you give Christ an almost infinite strength you thereby blunt or destroy the temptation, in fact you make it no temptation at all. There is no suffering. But we read that Jesus “suffered being tempted.” Hebrews 2:18.

Let me quote once more from the wonderful article:-

“When therefore, we realize the fact that divine power directly wielded by the Holy Spirit, was the energy which incepted His being, we are enabled to see that the type and texture of His being, though developed from the flesh of Mary, was something far above what falls to the lot of the mere children of men, and we shall find that this is one of the secrets of His sinlessness.”

I must say this is a statement passing contradiction and absurdity, coming as it does from a man who is exerting all his power to prove that “Christ was as much under the law of sin and death as those He came to save,” and that His nature was quite as fallen, and depraved as any of the sons of Adam. With one breath he tells us that Jesus was absolutely the same as His brethren in this respect, then with the next he says, the type and texture of His being were far above what fell to the lot of the mere children of men.

By such conflicting statements as these we are reminded of Paul’s word when he says:-

“For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God and are become such as have need of milk and not strong meat.” Hebrews 5:12.

Let me now lay down this article and take up for a few moments the next item on my list, that is “Redemption.”

Now in this discussion my opponents have been shocked at what they call the commercial aspect of this new idea. A religious plan which we venture to illustrate by “the full payment of our debt” seems to one or two, in Birmingham more especially, to have something about it not to be tolerated.

I venture to call this “zeal but not according to knowledge.” Romans 10:2. The higher man’s spiritual education is the further he is removed from this evil world, and especially that most hideous of all wickedness that of professing to be Christ’s brethren, the quicker, I say will be his perception and recognition of any simile or figure of a scriptural kind. If this “buying” and “selling” be not scriptural but carnal and worldly, such a spiritually educated person will be able at once to show us that it is so. However brethren, let us not be frightened by shouts and denunciations, let us look and see whether Christ Himself did not refer to “commercial” transactions to teach better things:-

“The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field which, when a man hath found he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.” Matthew 13:44. “Again the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a merchant seeking goodly pearls; who, when he hath found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had and bought it.” Matthew 13:45,46.

Then see how Christ teaches the forgiveness of sins; “Therefore is the Kingdom of Heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants, and when he had begun to reckon one was brought unto him which owed him ten thousand talents; but inasmuch as he had not wherewith to pay his Lord commanded him to be sold and payment to be made. The servant, therefore, fell down and worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me and I will pay thee all. Then the Lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him and forgave him the debt. But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow servants that owed him an hundred pence, and he laid hands on him and took him by the throat, saying, Pay me what thou owest, And his fellow servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, have patience with me and I will pay thee all. But he would not and went and cast him into prison till he should pay the debt, so when his fellow servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told their Lord all that was done. Then his Lord, after he had called him, said

unto him , O thou wicked servant. I forgave all that debt because thou desirest me. Should not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow servant, even as I had pity on thee? And his Lord was wrath, and delivered him to the tormentors till he should pay all that was due to him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not everyone his brother their trespasses.” Matthew 18:23-35.

I have put emphasis on all the commercial words in this beautiful piece.

The sublimest of all the doctrines of the Bible, namely, “Forgiveness of sins” is taught by Christ is a “business figure.” And see how fit and proper this figure is. “Redemption” and “Pardon” are the highest questions of “Bought” and “Sold.” We are “sold” under sin: Romans 7:14, we are now “bought” with a “price.” 1 Corinthians 6:20. To scorn this phraseology is to scorn Christ and His Apostles, or to affirm that they were “too commercial” and “too carnal.” I could imagine a self-complacent, self-righteous, Pharisaic individual falling into such a grievous error; but I cannot conceive how this should happen to one of “a prolonged spiritual training.”

But there is one grand trait that marks a truly spiritual man, that is “a cool spirit.” A man of understanding saith the Proverb is of “a cool spirit.” Proverbs 17:27.

A truly spiritual minded man does not make fierce anger a virtue, nor poverty arising from indiscretion and extravagance a passport to the Kingdom of God.

A man of deep spiritual training is temperate, 1 Corinthians 8:25, and sober, 1 Peter 1:13, in all things, and does not think more highly of himself than he ought to think. These, brethren are some of the features by which you may know a spiritual; from a carnal minded man.

If Jesus had to die in order to cleanse himself either from “sin” “defilement” or “condemnation” in Adam, is it not passing strange that there is not even one solitary passage of Scripture which says He did?

How is it that we are to take such an important fact for granted, and yet we find so many texts which tell us that it was for “us” He died?

If it was needful to repeat it so many times that Christ died for “our sins” how is it, if He were under sin Himself, that not a single text points it out?

One fact is quite as important as the other, and if one must be received without testimony, why is there any need of so much testimony to establish and confirm the other?

I will now show some passages which distinctly show that it was for “our sins” Jesus was offered up:-

“But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all, for the transgression of my people was He stricken. He bare the sin of many. For He bare their iniquities.” - Isaiah 53.

“Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself” - Daniel 9:26.

“The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world” - John 1:29.

“The thief cometh not but for to steal, and to kill and to destroy. I am come that they might have life. I am the Good Shepherd: the Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep. I lay down my life for the sheep.” - John 10:10-15.

“And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the High Priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself. but being High Priest that

year he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only, but that also He should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad” - John 11:49-52.

“Who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification” - Romans 4:25

“For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. But God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him” - Romans 5:6,8,9.

“He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all. How shall He not with Him also freely give us all things” - Romans 8:32.

“But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walketh thou not charitably, destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died” - Romans 14:15.

“Purge out therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us” - 1 Corinthians 5:7.

“For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus Judge, and if one died for all then were all dead. And that He died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them and rose again” - 2 Corinthians 5:14,15.

“For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him” - 2 Corinthians 5:21.

“For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich” - 2 Corinthians 8:9.

“Who gave Himself for our sins that He might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God” - Galatians 1:4.

“The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me” - Galatians 2:20.

“Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us” - Galatians 3:13.

“God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons” - Galatians 4:4,5.

“Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free” - Galatians 5:1.

“In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace” - Ephesians 1:7.

“And walk in love as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering, and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.” Ephesians 5:1

“Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for us” - Ephesians 5:25.

“Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son” - Colossians 1:13, 14.

“And you that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy, unblameable and unprovable in His sight” - Colossians 1:21, 22.

“For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us” - 1 Thessalonians 5:9, 10.

“Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners” - 1 Timothy 1:15.

“For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time” - 1 Timothy 2:5, 6.

“Who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” - Titus 2:14.

“When He had by Himself purged our sins sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High” - Hebrews 1:3.

“But we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with Glory and Honour, that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man” - Hebrews 2:9.

“How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God. So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many” - Hebrews 9:14, 48.

“By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” - Hebrews 10:10.

“Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood suffered without the gate” - Hebrews 13:12.

“For even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us. Leaving us an example that we should follow His steps. Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed.” - 1 Peter 2:21, 24.

“For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God” - 1 Peter 3:18.

“Forasmuch then as Christ suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind” - 1 Peter 4:1.

“But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son cleanseth us from all sin” - 1 John 1:7.

“And ye know that He was manifested to take away our sins and in Him is no sin, hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us” - 1 John 3:5, 16.

“And they sang a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred, people and tongue, and nation” - Revelation 5:9.

Now, brethren, having presented to you this array of texts, each emphatically pointing us to the love of God in giving His well-beloved Son to die for us where shall I turn to find one text which even fairly hints that He died to cleanse Himself?

The word of God is as silent as the tomb and it is only by some bad inference or other that even a shadow of support can be adduced.

Yea, Christ redeemed us by His blood. Adam lost his life and ours by sin. Christ died for all, which as the apostle points out, was because all were dead. The apostle said He judged thus of the effect of Adam's sin.

But Mr. Roberts seems to know better than Paul; he says:-

“As the children of Adam we inherit his condemnation, but we did not forfeit our lives in him. We have forfeited our lives since, by transgression.”

Now, brethren, I should ask you to say whether this statement is not a flat contradiction of Paul's. And besides, I ask what was Adam's condemnation? Was it not death?

Do we not then inherit death through him? If not, what else? But whatever else, we are certainly thereby children of death? By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death hath passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned. No. No, says somebody of prolonged spiritual education! You cannot see beyond the surface, we did not lose our lives by the sin of our first parents; we have lost them by our own acts. Truly brethren, wisdom is justified of her children. Paul reminded the Ephesians with tears that they had been “purchased with the blood of Christ.” Acts 20:28.

Peter called the attention of his brethren to the fact that they were redeemed with the precious blood of Jesus, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. 1 Peter 1:19. The value of His blood lay in the fact of its spotlessness, that is, of its being undefiled by the sin of Adam: in other words, of its not being under sentence of death. Has not this sentence, brethren, made us all sinners? Has not this sentence defiled the whole human race, in the sense of putting them under the sentence of death? Has not the sting of death been thrust into the heart of every son of Adam?

Whence then comes this mighty power to redeem, to ransom from the power of the grave? The answer is Christ was not under penalty, and could therefore, and did “give His life a ransom for all.”

The blood itself was of no better and no worse quality than your blood and mine, for God hath made of one blood all nations of men. Acts 17:26. It was, brethren, the precious “life” wherein lay the exceeding, nay the “countless price.”

Why is the death of God's saints precious in His sight? (Psalm 116:15). Because they have been redeemed by the blood of His Son from the curse. The death of the wicked is as nothing to Him; whole nations are counted as only the drop of a bucket. Isaiah 40:15.

Sufficient has been said, I think to make it clear in what way Jesus redeemed us; to show that life had been lost through sin; that Jesus gave His life for all. You have not forgotten, of course, that I pointed out that Jesus by perfect obedience earned immortality. Now having seen how Christ hath redeemed us, let us enquire whether Christ needed to be redeemed, and in what way?

I answer that Jesus did not need to be redeemed. The sense however, is that of being released or saved from death; of being brought up again from the pit. Here Jehovah appears as the Great Redeemer; the great Saviour, besides whom, strictly speaking there is none else.

The power of Jesus to take His life again lay in His right, but it was God alone, the fountain of all power, who could bring Jesus again from the dead. As God is just it was impossible that the bars of death should hold His Son who had kept all His Father's commandments.

It was not possible, says Peter, “that He should be holden of it.” Acts 2:24. When about to enter the chamber of the “King of terrors” Jesus offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him who was able to save Him from death. Hebrews 5:7.

The sum, then, of what I have said is this; Christ redeemed us with the price of His own life. His Father redeemed or released Him without a price because in Him is no sin. 1 John 3:5.

Mr. Roberts would have us believe that this is a profoundly intricate subject requiring “a prolonged spiritual education” to comprehend it, and to give a show of truth to this assertion he quotes the prophet Isaiah:- “For my thoughts are not your thoughts, for as the Heavens are high above the earth...” Isaiah 55:8.

I ask whether this passage is to be taken to mean what Mr. Roberts wishes you to think it means, namely that you cannot understand redemption without “a prolonged education”?

Just read the preceding verse: “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God for He will abundantly pardon. For my thoughts are not your thoughts...” and so forth. You see, the comparison is made between wicked man’s thoughts and God’s thoughts. The passage was never penned to tell you that redemption is so abstruse that you cannot see through it until you have had “a prolonged spiritual education.”

Oh no, Redemption is a first principle. Redemption shows God’s righteousness, which a man must put on first before he can hope for acceptance in the sight of God. Matthew 6:33. 1 Corinthians 2:2.

If, brethren, we must go through “a prolonged spiritual education” before this first step can be taken, I fear there is precious little chance for us. To the poor the Gospel is preached - Luke 11:5, Matthew 11:25, 21:16. The poor have less opportunities than others. But I will unmask this sort of talk. It does not require one to see very far below the surface; the plain meaning of it is this:- “I have had more spiritual education than you have had months.” “This is a profound subject.” “It is not to be expected that you should understand it.” “Look to me.” “Trust to my judgment.”

Brethren, this is precisely the policy of the Clergy, it is nothing more than the strategy of the Papist. I tell you the plan of redemption is not subtle, it is plain; but it requires on our part a child-like teachable mind.

When I issued my “Thirty-two Questions” Mr. Roberts published some remarkable replies. Question 17 enquires “Was the life of Jesus His own?”

Now listen, brethren to Mr. Roberts reply:-

“If it be asked could He have given it for the sin of the world, if it had not been His own (in the earned sense) the answer is, He might have given it. But it would have been of no avail, because the law of sin would have condemned Him personally, and barred the way to His resurrection.”

No words of mine, except those in parenthesis, could better convey my meaning. I feel sure that unless the natural life of Jesus had been under no pledge, He could not justly have been raised again. But what is the import of these words: “In the earned sense”? I understand Mr. Roberts to mean that Jesus by perfect obedience earned life, and then laid it down. Now what life did He earn? Surely not His natural life; that He receive as every child does, from His Father. I understand that the life Jesus earned was eternal life. If therefore He laid down His life in the earned sense, then He laid down His eternal life. No, it was not the life “in the earned sense” that Jesus gave for the sins of the world; it was the life of His flesh (John 6:37) which His Father gave him in His mother’s womb and which, by obedience, He kept, having by the same obedience earned the higher life. When therefore He laid down the first freely, He still held the right to the other as his resurrection demonstrates.

It has also been directly concluded that as Joshua, the High Priest was clothed with “filthy garments,” Zechariah 3:3, Jesus the antitype, must necessarily be physically clothed with filthiness of Adam’s sin. We will now examine whether this High Priest was a type of Christ. But let us examine this “filthy garment” argument.

Remarkable things have been known in nature. Children have been known to be born with teeth, and so many other remarkable things; but never in the creation of God has it been known of one to be born with garments. So that whatever the “garments” may typify, they must mean something put on the Christ

sometime, at least subsequent to birth. And I think it agrees with the prophet Isaiah "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." "The Christadelphian" affirms that physically, Jesus was as much involved in Adam's transgression as they, for He inherited Adam's nature from Mary's blood, in which Adam's life existed, "for the life of all flesh is in the blood thereof."

I myself allow that Jesus inherited Adam's nature from Mary's blood. I allow that Adam's life was in Mary's blood, but the life of Jesus is the pith of the dispute. I have no dispute about flesh. The flesh of Adam, the flesh of Christ, and the flesh of Judas, was all the same flesh. There is one kind of flesh of man, 1 Corinthians 15:39, and doubtless the Christ appeared in this one kind. "And God hath made of one blood all nations." Acts 17:26. I have no dispute, therefore, about flesh and blood, for whether Jews, Chinese, or Esquimaux, they are all one.

Nor do I deny that the life is in the blood. The life of Adam was undoubtedly in Mary's blood, and if Adam had been the direct father of Jesus, as he was of Mary, then his life would have been the life of Jesus also.

The Almighty put the life into Adam's blood when He breathed into him the breath of life. And afterwards he forfeited that life by sin, both for himself and for all whom he should beget. Now I hold that if Jesus derived His life through Adam that life also would have been under condemnation, to argue about flesh is to overrun the subject. The Creator did not begin by condemning Adam's flesh, as flesh. The sentence was "Thou shalt surely die." Genesis 2:17. That is, lose thy life. The body then perished as the effect of this just deprivation. See 1 Samuel 14:44 and 22:16, 1 Kings 2:37,42,46.* (see Appendix D).

"If Jesus was the seed of David," says "The Christadelphian," "according to the flesh, He stood in the days of His flesh in all the relations of David." I say this will not stand, Jesse was David's father and therefore Adam was. But the Almighty was the Father of Jesus, therefore Adam was not. If we say Adam's life was in Jesus, this is in effect affirming that His paternity was from man. If we hold also that God was His Father, confusion sets in, for in that case He had two fathers.

Truly He was the son of David according to the flesh, but not according to the life. Thus constituted every whit suitable for a sin-offering unto redemption. "The last Adam" set out on a career of probation ending in Victory.

The Editor of "The Christadelphian" puts in as evidence against the doctrine propounded in my "32 Questions" a letter from the late Dr. Thomas which he no doubt thinks a heavy counter blow. This letter was familiar to me long before it appeared in the last "Christadelphian."

The Doctor in the last line of it, as in other parts of his writings appears to employ the phrase "sinful flesh" at times merely as an equivalent for flesh and blood. At any rate, I, as a well known student and admirer of the Doctor's works, undertake to prove that the Doctor has distinctly taught the theory set forth in my "32 Questions," which is that Jesus did not derive His life from Mary, but directly from God. Consequently, that life could not be forfeited by Adam's sin.

In "Eureka" volume 1, page 277, the Doctor says:-

"His germination was irrespective of the lust of the flesh. In this particular the germination of Jesus was different from that of all other men. If Joseph had been His Father, He would have been born of blood, of the will of the flesh, and of man, instead of the Spirit. He would have been son of man only, and not Son of God.

Now I ask, would not this have been so if His life came from Mary? Certainly, for her life was Adam's life. But hear the Doctor:-

"The name then in connection with the testimony of the prophets indicates a conversion of Spirit into flesh and blood, developed by the formative power of the Eternal, independently of, and apart from the will of man.

The spirit operated germinatively upon the contents of Mary's womb. Here, as the spirit germ of the Second man, it remained the usual set time subject to the laws of the animal economy. Such was the page in preparation for the Sacrificial man. His germination was irrespective of the lust of the flesh.

Jesus Anointed is the Creator of this new Creation, and Himself also the first element of it that has been created without human intervention. Enoch, Moses and Elijah were glorified men before His creation, but they were not a direct creation of the Deity, for their paternity was human.

Jesus had no human father, but was created by the spirit as independently of the will of the flesh as Adam, the beginning of the animal creation of the deity was before him."

"Eureka" Volume 1, pages 276 and 406.

What can be plainer than this? But if we say the life of Jesus came from Mary we say in effect that it came from Adam; otherwise Jesus had two lives.

I feel sure the Doctor meant that the life of Jesus came direct from God, as Adam's did and by furnishing Jesus with this life he could, at the close of His career give His life a ransom for many.

I now proceed to quote from "Phanerosis" page 34.

"He was not begotten by the impulse of the flesh, nor of the will of man, so that being born of the human nature, He would be directly Son of woman, and only indirectly Son of man. But if He were not directly Son of man, He must have been directly Son of Power, as Adam was who had no human father."

Is it not evident from this that Jesus' life did not descend from Mary, but from God? In this way, as the Doctor elsewhere observes, the Jews might have known what was meant when Jesus said:- "I came down from heaven, and that He would go up where He was before." John 6:42,62.

Here the Doctor once more:-

"When we contemplate the Cherub before His sealing and anointing, we see only the son of Mary, the seed of the woman, and Son of God in the same sense that Adam was." Page 43.

Is it not from this beyond all doubt that Christ's life was direct from God and not through His mother from Adam?

If this only could be seen in its effects in the scheme of redemption my object is attained, and I would impress upon you, brethren that if the life of Jesus were imparted to Him through Mary, the issue must be that He is still among the dead.

I wish now to call your attention for a moment to a very solemn thing. I have called it, "The condemned loaf."

If Jesus Christ's body was, as Mr. Roberts declares, "a sinful body" then the loaf is emblematical of that body. When, therefore, we eat of that loaf, we are figuratively eating of a "sinful body." Brethren, is not this repulsive in the extreme?

Take this illustration. Suppose the Officers of the Board of Health had set his brand upon this loaf, had condemned it, had pronounced it unfit for food, would you eat it? And if you were to eat it, what must be expected to follow? Why, that you would, of course be made sick; that you would thereby become infected.

The body of Christ symbolized by the loaf was as the body of a lamb without blemish and without spot. That body was broken for sin, after sin had laid upon it. Are we, then eating of a body of sin, or are

we eating of Christ, our spotless Passover, who was sacrificed for us? Brethren, let us purge out this old leaven, that we may be a new lump. 1 Corinthians 5:7,8.

In conclusion of this long lecture, I would speak a word of exhortation. There has been a great deal of talk among us as a body to this effect, that we cannot please God; “when we would do good evil is present with us...” and so on. And the usual place of shelter is the 7th chapter of Romans, one verse of which says:- “For in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.” I shall show you that we have been grossly mistaken on this point; our ideas have been quite subversive of Christian perseverance, and holiness of life.

In the first place, is not man with all his tastes just what the Creator made him? Has the creature man any more senses or faculties now than he had at first? Can you implant in him any additional faculty or sense? By no means. In his senses, as in his hair and stature, no alteration can be made. Now, brethren, what follows from this? It follows that if any of the senses or faculties of man are sin, then God is the author of sin. There is not in fact one inclination in all the human mind but what, when you come to consider, is good in itself. Romans 14:14. It is only when these inclinations are allowed to run on without restraint that sin occurs.

This may be seen in a moment by considering some of those passions which, un- guided, lead to the grossest crimes.

God commanded His new-made earth borns to multiply and replenish the earth. Genesis 1:28. But He also said, “Thou shalt not commit adultery.” Exodus 20:14. This last being no more than the same act unlawfully committed. God allows we eat our fill, but He also put in a law on gluttony and drunkenness, which is the undue indulgence of hunger and thirst. And so it is throughout the entire range of human appetites. To kill is good, but to slay unlawfully is murder.

I say then that the exercise of desires is not displeasing to God: that our flesh which He made is not an abomination in His sight: but like all other works of His hands is very good.

To teach otherwise implies a defect in the understanding. One great Divine of the Protestant church professed to feel his natural depravity so keenly that he said, even his very tears of repentance needed washing. Surely this was not that kind of repentance Paul says “needeth not to be repented of.” 2 Corinthians 7:10.

All this, brethren, I am persuaded is mistaken humility; it is too near akin to Popish penance to be pleasing in the eyes of the Divine being.

You will do well to make a fresh study of the 7th chapter of Romans. Instead of its language applying to Paul the Apostle as has been so commonly thought, I feel sure you will see that it has no such application, but that it refers to a Jew outside Christ, as Milton holds, to a person of unregenerated mind.

The key so to speak, to a right understanding of this chapter lies in the 1st line of the 5th verse, “For when we were in the flesh.” What means the Apostle here? Does he speak of the flesh of the body? No, he speaks of the unbridled lusts. You see this by that other saying of his, “So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.” Romans 8:8. Does this signify that so long as a man “is flesh and blood” he cannot please God? Certainly not. Paul explains himself. He says, “But ye are not in the flesh.” The phrase “the flesh” therefore does not point to the body of the flesh but to the unlawful exercise of the desires of the flesh.

“If ye live after the flesh ye shall die.” That is not because we are bodies of flesh, but if we follow after the desires of the flesh so far as to set aside the commandments of the Lord. We are all physically in the flesh, but that is not displeasing to God. But we who are in Christ are neither legally nor morally in the flesh, in the Apostle’s use of the phrase.

A fleshly-minded man cannot please God, because such a man's hope is not set in God, and is without faith. But a man, though physically flesh including the appetites can please Him if he comes under the guidance of that faith "which works by love" and purifies the heart. Acts 15:9.

You will find brethren, that the fleshly-minded man of Romans 7 is not the Apostle Paul after he had yielded himself wholly to Christ. Paul simply uses the pronouns "I" and "me" as is common in illustration.

After describing most graphically the tossings and self-reproaches of this "I" and "me" of this unregenerated man under the law who by the law is convicted as a transgressor who, distracted and in despair as to deliverance therefrom, is led by Paul at the close of the chapter to a recognition of deliverance through Christ. He then continues; "There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit, for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Here is the glorious release from "the flesh" to "the spirit" according as these phrases are used by Paul.

The conclusion therefore is brethren, that Paul did not decry the flesh; did not bemoan himself because he was just what God made him, but he rejoiced in the discovery of a motive power sufficiently strong and enduring to overcome the desires of the flesh and to reward him for keeping under the body and bringing it into subjection. What is it then that God has commanded us to do which we cannot do? Are we not exhorted to keep His commandments? If there be those that it is impossible to keep, then that command is a mockery and God a monster.

But what saith the word? "His commandments are not grievous." 1 John 5:3, and that He tempts no man above what he is able to bear and will with the temptation make a way of escape that ye may be able to bear it. Again, "take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for my yoke is easy and my burden is light." Matthew 11:29. Peter's reference to the law being a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear (Acts 15:10) is clearly indicative of the Scribes and Pharisees interpretation of the law. "Yea they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders but they themselves will not move them with their fingers." Matthew 23:4.

If no mere man is able in this life to keep the commandments of God, I would ask you to consult carefully the Book of Deuteronomy alone. I am sure it will exhibit this monster delusion in absolute nakedness. Truly Rome has corrupted all nations.

But let us rouse ourselves from such degrading thoughts to a cheerful perseverance; let us gird up the loins of our minds with truth and be vigilant, lest this enemy; this bad-flesh doctrine should get an advantage over us. 1 Peter 1:13.

Let us resist the devil, being assured that if we do he will flee from us, James 4:7.

And let us run the race that is set before us, not uncertainly but so as to obtain. 1 Corinthians 9:24 to end.

Paul was a man of like passions with ourselves and inspiration did not alter these passions. He said:- "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

If Paul did so brethren, cannot we? Let us say we will. By the grace of God we will.

To alter one in Moores beautiful lines:-

But then, celestial warrior, then
When all earth's shrines and thrones before our banner fall,
And the glad slave shall at those feet lay down his broken chain
The tyrant lord his crown, the priest his book, the conqueror his wreath,
And from the lips of truth one mighty breath
Shall, like a whirlwind, scatter in its breeze

The whole dark pile of human mockeries;
Then shall the reign of Christ begin on earth,
And, starting fresh as from a second birth,
Man, in the sunshine of the world's new spring,
Shall walk transparent, like some holy thing.

REMARKS

And now brethren, I have finished my lecture, but I will beg your attention for five minutes while I relate a few personal matters. Mr. Roberts has noised abroad that I have not courage to meet him in discussion. If that be true, all I can say is that he is the first man of whom I have felt afraid. But brethren, I am not naturally afraid of the faces of men especially of men who, I firmly believe cannot maintain the cause they have undertaken to defend.

To tell you the truth, I rather like a sharp encounter, it does me good; but I do not put much faith in such things as a means of settling questions of importance. This can only come after quiet and patient private investigation.

Now I will tell you in a few words the story of these challenges.

First of all Mr. Roberts attacked my 32 Questions in the "Christadelphian" for June 1873, suppressing the name of the author. Upon this Brother Farmer here present asked me if I would see Mr. Roberts privately, provided he was willing. I said Yes, I should like to see him privately. Then Brother Farmer arranged with Brother Sulley to go at once to Birmingham with the object of bringing about this interview.

What message did Brother Sulley bring back? Listen:

Brother Sulley: "Will you see Brother Turney privately about this affair?"

Mr. Roberts: "*Oh, if Brother Turney had wished to see me, he would not have launched the 32 questions.*"

Brother Sulley: "*But I know Brother Turney does wish to see you.*"

Mr. Roberts: "*Then I don't know that I want to see him.*"

And as a confirmation of this he said in a letter: "*I would rather not be hampered by personal influences.*"

After this I said I was willing to meet him before one or two brethren on each side, with Dr. Hayes for chairman and Brother A. Andrew for reporter, the report to be used by either party as he thought well. This offer he absolutely refused. He said:- "*It would be submitting himself to an irritating situation.*"

I dare say it would, and he spoke as he felt. But why should he be irritated, seeing, as he pretends, he has all truth on his side and I have all error on mine?

Men are not usually irritated at the prospect of an easy victory. But we know that some men who are loud and brave before a sick and weakly antagonist do feel irritated when they have to stand close to an opponent who likes to be close to them. They then prefer either more room or else some condition to place a great advantage on their side to start with. Anybody can fight a winning battle, but to pull against wind and tide requires coolness, not irritation, and steady nerve and tried courage. Well then, the truth is brethren, that I have been the party ready to meet Mr. Roberts on anything like fair terms, time and time. But he would not, for reasons best known to himself.

In place of what all other men would consider fair conditions, he proposed to ask me a lot of questions. He seems to have cross-examination on the brain, and to think himself born to ask questions. But if you are to get at what a man means, it will not be by asking him only such questions as you hope will make him contradict himself, but by letting him speak freely, listening attentively, not to catch him in his words, but to get at his ideas.

This presupposes that you regard him as honest and sincere in his motive; the other presupposes that he is not, and therefore must be caught and exposed.

Now then I put down a public challenge to discuss three or four nights before you all when I return. (I repeat it. Mr. Roberts did not accept it). I hope Mr. Roberts will be better informed on the scheme of redemption before I return, for instead of publicly debating the question it would be far more profitable to go round the country helping him to set it forth. But so long as he is hostile, it will be war to the last. I never give in when I feel sure I am in the right.

Edward Turney.

* * *

CHAIRMAN

At the close of the lecture the Chairman rose for the purpose of addressing a few words to the audience, but was prevented by Mr. Roberts who, shouting at the top of his voice, threw into confusion a meeting which up to that point, with the exception of some interruptions from the same quarter, had been marked by the most exemplary order and attention throughout the whole period of two hours and a half which was occupied by Brother Turney in the delivering of his address.

There were two or three points alluded to in the course of the lecture to which the Chairman was desirous of calling the particular attention of the audience. The first was the very significant fact that those who have written on this question “contradicted” themselves, as already shown by the extracts made from their published works; and no stronger proof could be adduced that the theory they seek to uphold is false.

It stands condemned by its own advocates. Another point of great importance in this controversy is the fact that the words “sinful flesh” on which so much stress has been laid, and which are so frequently on the lips of those who hold what may be called “The condemnation theory” of Christ, are not found in the Scriptures. It is true that the phrase “sinful flesh” occurs in the authorized version, but no such phrase was ever written by the Apostle Paul.

The form of sound words used by him was a likeness of “Sin’s flesh” predicating “property” or “possession” and not “quality.”

This is the rendering of the original, and it is certain no Greek scholar can call it in question. It is sound speech which cannot be condemned, and harmonizes perfectly with the entire record concerning the Anointed Saviour. Let this particular form of words be studied, and it will be found that there is very much involved in it.

The confounding of “sin” with the impulses which lead to sin has introduced an element of confusion into this question which should be carefully avoided.

It is a figure of speech peculiar to the Apostle Paul; it shortens or abridges discourses, in fact, conveys the “maximum of thought in the minimum of words.” “*meta*,” to change, “*nomen*” a name. The important distinction between “sin” and “sin-offering” is still another point calling for attention which cannot be too strongly enforced, the right understanding of this at once removes a great difficulty.

There has unfortunately throughout this controversy been much misunderstanding, and in consequence much misrepresentation though it is not here intended to insinuate that it has been wilful.

But after the detailed explanation of his views which has been given tonight by our Brother Turney, there will be no longer any excuse for misrepresentation, for surely the matter has been made sufficiently plain for the comprehension of anyone of ordinary intelligence, and certainly of those who are supposed to be, not mere readers, but students of the Bible. It is much to be regretted that a spirit of animosity has been manifested, which, among those professing godliness, is especially reprehensible.

The one object to be kept in view is to ascertain the truth, and no rightly disposed person of independent mind, who has no party interest to serve, can possibly have any other.

Noisy declamations, hard speeches, and personalities, will not aid the search. They do but tend to show that the parties who indulge in them are in a measure conscious of the weakness of their cause. The points at issue can be decided only by an earnest investigation of the Scriptures of truth.

So then let us apply ourselves, in an humble, teachable, and child-like spirit, and there need be no fear of the result.

Appendix A.

The letter from David Handley published by R. Roberts some two years previous to the lecture: -

Dear Brother Roberts, I am surprised that any looking for redemption through Jesus, should ever suppose Him to be mere man. I do not think that any maintain that they can be saved unless redeemed. I am aware that saying and writing too much often mystifies that which the writer or speaker wishes to make plain; yet I venture to write a little on this subject, though some may think there has already been too much written.

I will endeavour to express my mind in a few words. First, what is the position of every son of Adam? By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; so that every son of Adam being under sentence of death, it was not possible for any to escape from it, unless redeemed. Now is Jesus Christ the Redeemer? We say Yes. What qualified Him for the great work? We shall see that to do this, He must be both Son of God, and Son of man. First, He must pay the debt, in order to release the Debtor. It was the mortal race that had fallen under the wrath of God, which ended in death. In order to meet the law, He must be the seed of the woman, for there could be no compromise. The law could not be set aside. It had no power to release the dead until a sacrifice had been offered in the flesh that sinned. Here we see the need of Jesus being in the likeness of sinful flesh. But He must be Son of God in order for there to be virtue in His death to redeem; His life must be independent of the Adamic race. Therefore though Son of David's daughter, and made of a woman, He was a New Creation, "The Lord from Heaven." Not dependent on Adam for His life, but received it direct from the Father, as John hath it. (John 5:26, 6:57).

Here I think we see the wisdom of God in Redemption; a body in our nature; a life independent of our race; the life of the flesh is given for the life of the world; here is what men of business call 20 shillings in the pound. But again I say, there could be no virtue in the giving up of His life if He was a mere man, or if He had derived His life in any way from the seed of Adam, for all who derived life from Adam, lost it; for in him all sinned. But Christ in our flesh could suffer the penalty and then redeem His brethren, for He had never forfeited His life by personal transgression, and His life being independent of the race, He could give it for a ransom. To me this appears clear, while no man could give to God a ransom for his brother, the Son of God, who was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, could, having the price of redemption in His own power. You will see from these few lines what I wish to convey to the brethren. If

you think the matter worthy of insertion in the Christadelphian, use it; if not, refuse it. My house all join in love to thee, and to thy house, and the household of faith, farewell. D.Handley, Maldon.

Note: It is said that before he died the writer of the above letter renounced the views expressed in it and developed by Edward Turney. Whether this is so or not does not affect the issues involved.

Appendix B.

The lecturer here endorsed the belief held almost without exception by the brethren of his day, that Jesus rose mortal. It is fairly certain that before very long he perceived the incongruity of the idea and realized that as the first-begotten from the dead Jesus must have come from the tomb in incorruptible nature. Most Bible students today recognize that the words Jesus spoke to the woman in the garden do not justify the deduction made from them that Jesus was not to be touched because He was defiled by the grave.

Appendix C.

Mortal and Corruptible. The speaker appears to have been slightly ambiguous here. He asks what was in the nature after transgression and says there was mortality, meaning death. As in Appendix B it is evident that he had not yet completely shaken off Christadelphian confusion on the point. It is still a very general misconception that mortality and corruptibility are synonymous terms. Actually mortal means subject to death by law whereas corruptible means perishable by nature. The lecturer made this clear however in the first paragraph on the next page.

Appendix D.

The sentence upon Adam. In expressing agreement with R. Roberts statement commencing "There was a change in Adam's relation to his Maker..." Edward Turney appears to have endorsed the view that the sentence upon Adam was the return to dust. It is not perhaps surprising that at the time of the lecture he had not reached the point where he could distinguish between the death Adam incurred, which as the wages of sin was an inflicted or violent death, and natural death. The significance of sacrifice and blood shedding in connection with the remission of sin had not been fully appreciated even yet. When later, in "The Two Sons Of God" he wrote, "The return to the ground is not strictly speaking perhaps any part of the penalty," he had reached the grand truth towards which he had been groping, that if Adam had not been prospectively redeemed in Eden by a typical sacrifice foreshadowing Calvary, he must have been put to death there and then and our human race would have perished with him. Thus it is that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of all men - because our very existence was purchased by Him at the price of His own life - specially of them that believe, because through faith in Him they are promised the gift of God - the Eternal Life.

THE SLAIN LAMB

**A Lecture delivered by The Editor in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham,
on Friday, August¹ 29th 1873.**

In reply to one given in the Renunciationist Interest the Previous Evening.

“This meeting is necessitated by that which took place last night. As to some things which took place at the close having an untoward appearance, I would say, Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment. Paul turned upon Elymas the sorcerer with an emphasis apparently inconsistent with that meek and quiet spirit recommended under ordinary circumstances. We read also of Jesus being frequently stirred to anger by the perversity of subtle and hypocritical foes. Little wonder, then, if in our own weak days, under the goading presence of many evil circumstances, there should be a departure from that perfect equanimity which it is desirable at all times to observe.

You are aware that I was delegated by you to put questions to Edward Turney, at the close of his lecture last night. This was well known to him and those who were with him, yet no notice was taken of the fact. The whole time was occupied to deprive me of the opportunity. To add to the aggravation of this, the chairman refused me permission to make a communication to the meeting. What could I do but call “mere lung-power” to the aid of duty? As one with whom the interests of the truth are supreme, I felt called upon not to allow the conventionalities of public assembly to override those interests. Therefore, over-leaping the opposition of the chair, I asked the lecturer, in loud voice, to meet me in public debate; for without loudness of voice, my object would not have been attained. You know his answer - “No!” I said “Why?” He said “You know why.” I said “If it be your health, I am no more in a fit state of health to debate than you, but I am willing to sacrifice my health for the truth’s sake, if necessary.” He said, “What you are willing to do is your lookout, not mine. I’ll be back in seven months, and then you shall have it.” I then gave out, as you know, as my only remaining alternative, that I would, to-night, answer his lecture, and break, link by link, the whole chain of sophistical reasoning by which he had attempted to maintain his positions. What else could I do, deprived of the opportunity of putting his arguments to the proof either by questioning or debate? It has been thus from the beginning of this mischievous matter. In the first instance, I proposed to test it by putting questions and submitting to be questioned under proper regulations. This was declined, and instead, an offer was made to engage in speech-discussion for publication. This, at that time, when there was a possibility of concealing the disgrace from the public eye, I did not accept; but, at a latter stage, when the reckless procedure of those who have espoused this heresy shewed me the disgrace could no longer be hid, I offered to debate the matter, in the ordinary way, with Edward Turney, before the Nottingham ecclesia; but this, though a debate with brother Smith was eagerly accepted, was disregarded. By the invitation of the Nottingham ecclesia, I submitted myself for two nights, in their assembly, to public and indiscriminate questioning. Instead of being present to test and be put to the test on this important matter, Edward Turney left Nottingham on the day of my arrival there. Two weeks subsequently, knowing that weakness compelled my absence at the sea-side for a week, he took advantage of the opportunity to come and lay his clever fallacies before you un-resisted.

Under all these circumstances, aggravated by the circulated rumour that I feared to meet him, you cannot wonder that I was, last night, goaded into a breach of public etiquette. I am not dissatisfied with my offence in the matter. It enabled me to show you the true state of the case as regards the antagonist of the truth, as he has become, and it has enabled me to bring you together to-night to hear what I have to say in reply to the argument of last night’s lecture. Leaving these personal but necessary explanations, I will now proceed to the question itself.

The question, as a whole, is a difficult question, for one reason: it has to do with God’s view of the case; that is, God’s objects, God’s intentions, God’s principles in the manifestation of Himself through the seed of Abraham; and it is testified through Isaiah that God’s ways are not our ways: that “As the heaven is high above the earth, so are His ways higher than our ways.” It is difficult for the mind of the flesh to enter into the divine methods of working, and to realize divine views and

principles of action. It is only after a prolonged spiritual education that we come at this. Paul expresses the idea in a form of words that are unintelligible on the theory propounded last night (1 Corinthians 2:12,13); "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God, which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto Him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Now, one thing that distinguishes this disturbing heresy more than another is that it cannot express itself in the words which the Holy Spirit teacheth, but is obliged continually to employ invented phrases, and those invented phrases, I will shew, contain invented fallacies. I will, to-night, place the theory of the truth side by side with the theory of this error, and I will explain the theory of the truth in the language of the Spirit; and I will shew wherein the language of the Spirit is destructive of the language - the artificial and carnal language - which this Renunciationist heresy is incessantly compelled to employ in defining its principles.

I employ the aid of a chart to do it, not because I think a chart proves anything; it is good to illustrate; it cannot demonstrate; but because a chart has been made use of to dazzle your eyes, so to speak, and to sorcerise your imagination, and to implant heresy in your minds - I thought it well, by the same means, to try and undo these mischievous effects; and to-day, with the assistance of brother Shuttleworth, I have sketched out this diagram, in which you will perceive the one submitted to you last night and one not then submitted, but which represents the truth, which ¹ will endeavour to unfold to-night.

I will begin with that part of the diagram setting forth the truth. I call attention especially and prominently, to the central sun at the top of the diagram. That sun, as I daresay you will be aware, is intended to represent the Father - God, of whom, and through whom, and to whom, are all things; and, this matter more particularly, for this is the contrivance of His wisdom, and not to be judged by carnal rules, such as the mind of the flesh may devise. I seek more particularly to impress God upon the mind to begin with, as the centre and focus and essence of the matter, for God is too much left out of modern theorisations and definitions of the plan of salvation. We want to get back to the apostolic method of expressing these things, and you will find that, through the whole of the epistles, and in all the discourses of Christ, the Father is brought forward as the great initiator and operator in the case. Paul speaks (Ephesians 1:5) of the Father "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself according to the good pleasure of His will." Again he says (Romans 3:23), "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." And again, in the 11th. chapter of the same epistle, at the 23rd verse: "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all." Again, in his second letter to the Corinthians (5:18,19), he tells us that God hath reconciled us unto Himself by Jesus Christ; and that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. And, again, in his letter to Titus (3:4): "The kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy, he saved us." And in chapter 2:11: "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men."

You also know that Jesus never disconnected himself from the Father in all His discourses. He always set forth the Father as the instigator and operator in all His proceedings. This is His style of language: "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me" (John 6:38). "I am not come of myself" (John 7:28). "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works" (John 14:10). "I am come in my Father's name" (John 5:43). "I can of mine own self do nothing" (John 5:30). "He that sent me is with me" (John 8:29). "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. How sayest thou, then, Shew us the Father" (John 14:9).

And, therefore, the first idea which I seek, in those words of the Spirit, to impress upon your minds is, that the source, origin, and mover in this whole matter of the appearance, life, and sacrifice of Christ is to be found in that which is represented by the central figure at the top of the diagram, and that we have simply to ask, What has been His way and object in the devising of it, and finding it out - to believe it.

Well, let us go back to the beginning. We find God creating Adam, but not manifesting himself in Adam, and, therefore, the line from the central Sun, in the diagram, proceeding towards Adam, is a cloudy line. The first man was of the earth earthy; the second was different from the first. Paul defines them in contrast. While he says the first is of the earth earthy, he says, the second man, who will come into our consideration more particularly, when we come into this part of the chart, is “the Lord from heaven,” by the manifestation of God in the flesh through the Spirit, as we learn from other portions of the testimony. The first Adam was merely a mechanism of “natural” life, produced as the beginning or the basis of a plan which God had in His mind from the beginning with regard to this earth which we inhabited. Nothing is of chance. All things are foreknown of the Father, for all things are the work of His hands, and made to work out His ultimate designs. The rule in the working out of His plan on earth is “first that which is natural, afterwards that which is spiritual” (I Corinthians 15:46). Adam is the beginning of the natural, Jesus is the beginning of the spiritual. He is God manifest in the flesh, and not a mere Adam. The Renunciationist heresy makes Him a mere man. God-manifestation is denied, though in words professed. We shall see this more clearly as we proceed.

Looking back at the first Adam, we see him for a while in a state of innocence. An attempt was made last night, to draw a parallel between this period of Adam’s career and the probation of the Lord Jesus. But look, brethren, at the great difference. Adam suffered no evil, no pain, no weakness, no grief. His state was a “very good” state. He was no man of sorrows, had no acquaintance of grief, inherited no evil of any kind. But look at the Lord Jesus. From the very beginning, he experienced in himself those results that came by Adamic disobedience. This is sufficiently manifest in the apostolic testimony that He was the subject of “crying and tears” (Hebrews 5:8), a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief (Isaiah 53:3), made in all things like to His brethren of Adam’s fallen stock (Hebrews 2:16, 17), and finally crucified through weakness” (2 Corinthians 13:4). But I propose to strengthen this testimony beyond the power of resistance, by reading to you the words of the Spirit in the Psalms, describing the personal experiences of the Messiah in the days of His flesh. That there may be no doubt as to the applicability of what I shall read to the Messiah, I will use only those Psalms which are quoted by the Spirit in the apostles, as applicable to the Lord Jesus Christ and belonging to him. I cannot read all that I have chosen out; it would take too much time. I will give you one or two extracts, and I will give you the references to the other places, with the parts where they are referred to in the New Testament, in order that you may see that Jesus, in the days of his flesh, inherited and experienced the results and feelings that have come by Adam’s transgression; from which I will argue, and prove otherwise my argument, that this inheritance extended to mortality itself, and that “free life,” so called, is a myth. First, I will take Hebrews 10:4-10. Here Paul applies the 40th Psalm to Christ. Let us be quite sure. I wish to establish, link by link, all my evidence, as I will undertake to destroy, link by link, the whole chain of sophistry by the which the minds of the brethren are being bewitched and turned aside from the truth. Hebrews 10:5 - “Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.” Thus the Spirit in Paul says, Christ, in the 40th Psalm, speaks. Very well, now let us go to the 40th Psalm: “I waited patiently for the Lord; and he inclined unto me, and heard my cry. He brought me up also out of an horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings.” At the 6th verse, we have the words quoted by Paul; and then, at the 11th and 12th verses: “Withhold not now thy tender mercies from me, O Lord; let thy loving kindness and thy truth continually preserve me. For innumerable evils compassed me about; mine iniquities (the iniquities of His brethren laid on Him in their effects) have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look; they are more than the hairs of my head; therefore my heart faileth me.” 17th verse: “But I am poor and needy; yet the Lord thinketh upon me: Thou art my help and my deliverer; make no tarrying, O my God.” Adam, in his probation, had not to ask to be delivered, and could not say that innumerable evils had compassed him about. But you will find something more striking in other cases. In the 1st chapter of Hebrews, Paul quotes, as you perceive, at the 8th verse: “Unto the Son he saith” certain things; again, in the 10th verse: “And thou, Lord,” and so forth. The things that the Spirit, in Paul, here applies to the Messiah you will find in the 102nd Psalm, from the 1st to the 11th verses: “Hear my prayer, O Lord, and let my cry come unto Thee. Hide not Thy face from me the day when I am in trouble; incline Thine ear unto me; in the day when I call, answer me speedily. For my days are consumed like smoke, and my bones are burned as an hearth. My heart is smitten and withered like grass, so that I forget to eat my bread. By reason of the voice of my groaning, my bones cleave to my skin. I am like a pelican of the wilderness; I am like

an owl of the desert. I watch, and am as a sparrow alone upon the housetop; mine enemies reproach me all the day; and they that are mad against me, are sworn against me. For I have eaten ashes like bread, and mingled my drink with weeping, because of thine indignation and thy wrath; for Thou hast lifted me up and cast me down. My days are like a shadow that declineth, and I am withered like grass." I quote that to shew that Jesus, in the days of His flesh (as Paul says in the 5th chapter of Hebrews, at the 7th verse) with strong crying and tears made supplication unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared, and not because He had "free life." I will shew you before I am done, that He had not a free life, but bore our condemnation in His own person, as much as any of us, necessitating His death before He could be purified from the curse. This "free life" is a thing you do not read of in the Scriptures; it is a mere invention; a plausible thing, but a gratuitous thing; an unproved assumption, which is made the starting point of the train of reasoning by which it is attempted to establish this heresy. If the initial fallacy is taken for granted, the false conclusion comes with all the appearance of irresistible logic. But let the initial fallacy be perceived, and the whole argument falls to pieces like a rope of sand.

The fallacy is two-fold. First, it is a fallacy to speak of "life" as distinct from "nature." "Life" is used by the Lord and by the apostles in a way to cover the whole idea of existence; and not as an element of existence to be considered abstractly by itself. Thus the sacrifice of Christ is expressed variously, as the "laying down of his life," "the giving of his body" (Luke 22:19), "the pouring-out of his soul" (Isaiah 53:12), or "the offering up of himself" (Hebrews 9:25), as the case requires. All these literally mean His submission to death, and not the disentanglement of a so-called "life" from His body for presentation to the eternal throne. It was "a body" that was prepared for sacrifice, and not a "life." It was death and not life that was required for the putting-away of sin. But by the incessant iteration of the word "life," as if it were an element separate from being, the Renunciationists bewilder the perceptions of inexperienced minds, and throw them into confusion, which time itself will, doubtless, enable them to recover from, where they are given to reading and thought.

We are not unacquainted ourselves with this elliptical use of the word life - I mean in ordinary talk. When we say a man's "life" is not worth a week's purchase, we do not mean that the vital energy in his body, considered as an element, is not worth purchase, but the body's possession of vitality is uncertain. So when we say a long life, we do not mean any peculiarity in the (vita) energy, but that the possessor holds it for a long time. Also, when we say a man's life is in danger, we do not mean that the invisible energy by which God preserves us in being is in danger; for that can never be in danger, because God is the fountain thereof, in whom we live and move and have our being, and to Him it returns. We mean that the living man's continuance in being is imperilled. It is an elliptical way of expression. There are many other instances. How absurd it would be to construct a theory out of these elliptical expressions, which should assume, in every case, that the "life" was an entity, sustaining relations to, length, danger, safety, etc. This is what is done with a few passages of Scripture, in the present case, with results vastly more mischievous, in a spiritual sense, than those led captive by the glamour are aware of.

But, returning to the testimony of the Psalms, which Jesus, by His own lips, said were "concerning him" (Luke 24:44), I will, without further quotation, give you a list of them and the New testament reference, in each case, where the Psalm is by the Spirit applied to Jesus. You can put them down in pencil and compare them at your leisure: Matthew 21:42 (Psalm 118); Matthew 27:25 (Psalm 22); Hebrews 2:12 (the same Psalm); Luke 4:10; Psalm 91); Luke 23:46 (Psalm 31); John 2:17 (Psalm 69); Acts 1:20 (Psalm 109); Acts 2:25 (Psalm 16).

And please remember that Jesus, in conversation with His disciples after His resurrection, reasoned with them and expounded unto them the things that were written in Moses, and the prophets and in the Psalms, concerning Himself. These very words were spoken by Him in proof of the fact that He was appointed to suffer. In these things there is scriptural evidence of the entire dissimilarity between the position of Adam and the probation of the Lord Jesus Christ; and the difference arises from the difference of the position of the two, which I will proceed to illustrate.

Adam's innocence ended with the fall; and here a little dazzle is thrown into the eyes. Instead of taking the simple testimony of the word that death came, you have it that your life was forfeited - that

your life came under pledge - that a debt was incurred which the theorists describe as "eternal death," - and you are asked to look at the third upright line in the Renunciationist diagram, as the "debt" which had to be paid. And by much more of such artificial unscriptural Jargon, you are argued into a conviction the very opposite of truth. Has it never occurred to these Renunciationists, that if "eternal death," so called, was the debt to be paid, as they say, and Jesus paid that debt; that the resurrection of Jesus was impossible? I will shew before I have done that our inheritance in Adam is not eternal death; that that which stands in the way of our resurrection by nature, is not our hereditary mortality in Adam, but our personal offences; and that what has brought resurrection is not "free life," but the personal righteousness of God's own anointed, specially provided in our mortal nature that He might open a way out of mortality by obedience, death and resurrection.

Adam was condemned, and we have the testimony of the Spirit that his condemnation hath passed upon all men. Now what is that condemnation? Is it a condemnation against the nature or against the life in the nature? Which? It cannot be a condemnation against the life in the nature: that is what immortal-soulism says; and, in this respect, the new theory makes an advance towards immortal-soulism. The abstract life in all nature is the same. Men and animals have all one breath. With God is the fountain of life. God is the life of all; and He giveth unto all life, and breath, and all things; and when death happens, the dust returns unto the dust, and the spirit or the life returns to God who gave it. It is not the life that is condemned, for it is not the life that is the sinner. It is the person, the individual, the nature that is condemned, because it was the person, Adam, that was the sinner. Condemnation in Adam means, therefore, that we are mortal in Adam: mortal in the physical constitution - the organization. Look at any of us when we are just newly born. Why are we mortal at that moment? We have not sinned. "Oh, but we sinned in Adam," says this same theory. Did we sin in the individual sense in him? How could we sin individually when we did not exist? Paul says. No. He says death reigned over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. Why is it we are mortal then? In what sense is the sentence of Adam upon us when we are born? Well, we are Adam's organization. It is in the organization that the law of mortality resides. It is in the physical substance that the principle of death is at work. Hence the phrase, "this corruptible." If the substance were not corruptible, "life" would be ours for ever.

Here suggests itself the question with regard to sin in the flesh, which I will enter fully at a subsequent part of the lecture. I will endeavour to make manifest the most unscriptural, the most carnal, and the most untrue and mischievous character of the new philosophy, with which it is now attempted to inoculate the brethren, on the subject of "the flesh." Enough on that point when we come to the cross in the diagram.

"Death reigned from Adam to Moses." This fact is represented by the perpendicular line from the angle where you see the word "fall." The line stands for the posterity of Adam, between these two epochs, without taking cognizance of the flood, because posterity was continued through Noah: therefore, there was no break; death reigned in them all, though not without the light of hope through faith.

Coming down to the time of Moses, we note particularly the fact that God had chosen the "seed of Abraham," according to the flesh, as a nation for Himself, as the basis of the development of the purpose He had conceived in Himself from the beginning, which Paul styles "a purpose of grace," according to the good pleasure of His own will, "not of works lest any man should boast."

What do we find in connection with Moses? A law is given to the chosen nation. This law condemned to death all who disobeyed it in the meanest particular, Those to whom the law was given were, of course, under the Adamic curse; that is, they inherited Adam's mortal nature, because in him when he sinned. This Adamic curse is represented by the horizontal band between "Death reigns," and the cross; the Mosaic curse (for none kept the law in all particulars) is represented by the corresponding band below; the nation of Israel, "the seed of Abraham," between the two. The seed of Abraham, whose nature Paul testifies (Hebrews 2:16), Jesus took, are here represented as enclosed between two curses, the curse in Adam and the curse by Moses.

But before we consider how these two curses converge upon the Messiah (represented by the cross) that He might bear them away, let me ask what the law was given for. It was “added (to the promises) because of transgression” truly; but suppose the Jews had been able to keep it, what would have been the result to them? Now here let special attention be given to the testimony of the Word. Paul says, in the 7th chapter of Romans, 10th verse: “The commandment (speaking of the law) was ordained to life.” Does that mean eternal life? Yes. This is shown by what we read at Luke 10:25: “And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, What shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? How readest thou? And he answering said so and so (recapitulating the chief points of the law). And He (Jesus) said unto him, thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shall live.” Now there is the word of the Master Himself confirming the statement of Paul, that the law given was unto life, if they kept it.

But then how about the Adamic condemnation in such a case? Well, if there had been a Jew who had kept the law in all things, having done the will of the Father from the very beginning of life to the end of his life, he would have been in the very position of the Lord Jesus himself; it would then have been in his power, by dying, to cleanse himself from the Adamic condemnation, and his righteousness would have caused his resurrection from the dead. It is by the righteousness of one that resurrection has come (Romans 5:18; 1 Corinthians 15:21); it is not by the “free life” of one. “Free life” is a myth; an invention of the new heresy. Adamic mortality would not be to our “eternal-death,” if we were ourselves “without spot” of disobedience. God will keep no man in the grave because of Adam’s sin, if he himself be individually righteous. Death purifies him from hereditary condemnation (Romans 6:7; 1 Peter 4:1); resurrection comes by righteousness (Romans 5:9). How came it, then, that life could not come by the law, as Paul says, in the 3rd chapter of Galatians, at the 21st verse: “Is the law, then, against the promises of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.” Let me give the Spirit’s answer, Romans 8:3: “What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God” has done in the way which we shall consider when we come to that point. Here, then, is the Spirit’s teaching that the weakness of the law, in relation to the bestowing of life eternal, lay in the incapability of the flesh to keep it; as Jesus said to his disciples: “The Spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.” This is the teaching of the Word, and the teaching of God’s Word is decisive in such matters. You may shake a theory over it, and try to make it of none effect, but there the fact remains.

We next come to the question, Why was the flesh weak? Could not God have made human nature after such a pattern or constitution that it would have been able to keep the law? Doubtless He could. Why did He not? He had His own reason, and our wisdom lies in simply seeing and accepting it. I will give it you in the words of the Spirit: Galatians 3:22: “The scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.” But this suggests another question: Why was it devised that the promise should come in that way? The Spirit’s answer is: “That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God” (Romans 3:19). But again, we ask why? The final answer of the Spirit is, “That He may have mercy on all” (Romans 11:32); that no flesh should glory in His sight (1 Corinthians 1:29); not of works, lest any man should boast (Ephesians 2:9). This answer is symbolized on the chart by the lines proceeding from the sun toward the cross and the resurrection point, and by the concluding motto to the right. The spirit and essence of the plan of God’s redemption by Christ is that the praise and the glory may be to Him, and that no flesh should glory in His presence, in which we see at once the profoundest philosophy when we remember that God only exists inherently; that all things exist by His permission only; and that the highest delight of created beings is the recognition and adoration of the eternal prerogative of the Creator. In the proof I quote of these things, I use the words of the Father Himself. I give you the Father’s own declaration of the Father’s mind, instead of condescending; like the lecturer of last night, to quote heathen poets and the Doctors of the apostasy. I will read further testimony. Romans 3:9: “What then, are we better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin” (19th verse). The reason of which you will find in the 1st chapter of 1 Corinthians verse 29: “That no flesh should glory in His presence;” “Mine honour I will not give to another;” “Unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess” (Isaiah 45:23). As Paul otherwise expresses it, the glory shining in the face of Jesus is the glory of the Father, not of mere man (2 Corinthians 4:6). He is the central point of our adoration and the source of our indebtedness, upon a principle I will now proceed to illustrate.

Paul says, "But now is the righteousness of God without the law manifested." Does that mean that God set aside the law which was ordained unto life? No, for Christ (who is to us "the righteousness of God without the law") came to fulfil the law, and did fulfil it, entirely and absolutely, during the whole of His life. But, observe, to do this, it was necessary He should be under the law. Let me shew that point. Paul says, "God sent forth His Son, made under the law" (Galatians 4:4). Now how was that done? By the mode of His introduction into the world. His mother was a Jewess of the house of David, under the law. Consequently, He was a Jew, as much under the law as any other Jew. He was no new Adam, such as the Renunciationist theory makes him. He was the seed of Abraham, and the seed of David, and, therefore, stood in all the constitutional relations of David as to the law, both Edenic and Mosaic. The object of Jesus being made under the law was that He might die under its curse; but how could the curse of the law lay hold of Him so that He might endure it in His own person, seeing He kept the law spotless? Here comes that beautiful point set forth in Jesus Christ and Him crucified, about which a joke was attempted to be made last night; but which shows the beautiful contrivance of God in working out the scheme of His redemption, without setting aside a jot or tittle of His requirements of those who were to be redeemed. It is written in the law, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law." Here let us realize what the curse of the law means, as regards its effect on the subject of the curse. Paul says, and I quote his words, because I wish to make my ground scripturally sure upon every point - that your faith may stand in the wisdom of God, and not in my speculation or reasoning; he says, in the second epistle of Corinthians 3rd chapter, 7th verse, "If the ministration of death, written and graven in stones, was glorious," etc. Here he styles the law "the ministration of death." Again (6th verse), "the letter," he says "killeth" (speaking of the law); "but the Spirit" (that is the work of the Spirit of God in Christ) "giveth life." Now then, "cursed is he that hangeth on a tree." Jesus is represented by that cross in the diagram. He hung on a tree, and by that fact the law cursed Him. Thus He was made a curse for us in so far as hanging on the tree brought the curse of the law on Him. Now what was the argument which the other vainly attempted to upset? Brother Andrew argues thus in "Jesus Christ and Him Crucified," that it was necessary for Jesus to keep the law in all things, and yet that He should be cursed in this particular of hanging on a tree. But why? Why did Jesus incur its curse in that particular, in submitting to be hung on a tree? Because the Father required it of Him, which I will prove. "This commandment I have received of my Father." What commandment? To lay down his life. How? He says "the Son of Man goeth up to Jerusalem, and he shall be mocked and spit upon, and shall be crucified, and rise again the third day." Therefore Jesus knew that it was crucifixion which was required of Him, when the moment came for Him to submit - for mind you it was His own voluntary submission so far as man was concerned; but those who are misleading the brethren do not distinguish between God and man in the case. Jesus meant to say that although sinners would destroy Him, it would not be the triumph of sinners' violence, but a submission required of Him by the Father. In the garden of Gethsemane when the hour had come, He said, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless not my will, but Thine be done." In this connection we can understand what Paul means by saying that He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, which implies that He was commanded unto the death of the cross; for how can a man be obedient unto that which is not commanded? If Christ had refused to do that which was commanded, would not that have been sin? And if Christ had sinned, could Christ have been saved? Where then, is the talk of Christ having it in His power to enter eternal life alone, without dying? It is a carnal mind that talks thus; a mind not understanding God's plan. God required Jesus to submit to the death of the cross, in order that He might come under the curse of the law, in that particular way, because any other curse (involving his own personal transgression), would have prevented His resurrection. If He had stolen, or lied, or worshipped Baal, He would have been a transgressor: in submitting to the cross, He was not a transgressor but an obedient child doing what the Father required of Him; and therefore He did His Father's will in submitting to be placed in a position which the law cursed. When He died, the law obtained the utmost triumph it could claim. When God raised Him because of His obedience, it had no further claim. So far as He was concerned, the law ended with His death. Its handwriting was nailed to the cross (Colossians 2:14). He took it out of the way. Hence when Jewish believers buried themselves in the symbolic grave of Christ in baptism, and rose to a new life in Him (the risen Christ), whose name they thus took upon them, they became related to all that had been accomplished in Christ. Christ was "the end of the law for righteousness" to everyone of them (Romans 10:4), because Christ kept the righteousness of the law, and yet came under its curse, and gave it all it could claim. In Christ they were therefore free. As Paul said to them, "Ye

are become dead to the law by the (slain) body of Christ, that ye should be married to another (in baptism), even to him that rose from the dead” (Romans 7:4). Now if it was necessary that Jesus should come personally under the curse of the law in His own person, in order that He might bear it away in His resurrection, and so open a way for the redemption of such under the law as should accept of His name, what about this other curse? What about this upper band, bounding the seed of Abraham in the chart, and like the curse of the law, passing over the cross? We will consider that now. Was not Jesus to bear away all curse? Surely no one can say no. If it was necessary He should have the curse of Moses on Him to bear it away, was it not necessary He should have that other curse - the hereditary curse of Adam on Him also? Yes, beloved brothers and sisters, He did have it on Him, and He did bear it away; for what is the testimony? That He took not on Him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham; “forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh, it became him, likewise, to take part of the same, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is, the diabolos” (Hebrews 2:14,15). Upon what scriptural authority does this new theory say that He took the seed of Abraham without taking the curse inhering in it? What ground is there for the contradictory proposition that Jesus wore the nature of David, which was mortal, but was not Himself mortal? There is no proof. A sign is gratuitously set up in the chart, and it is said “There is Christ free.” Where is the evidence? The evidence is all the other way. Only one passage is quoted having at all the semblance of proof, and that is the saying of Christ: “As the Father hath life in Himself, even so hath he given the Son to have life in himself.” But this does not bear on the subject. Any one may see by observing the context that Christ is speaking of resurrection-power. The verse before is John 5:25: “The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.” The verse after is; “And hath given him authority also to execute judgment.” The matter in question, therefore, is the power given to Jesus by the Father over the lives of men, as He afterwards said in prayer; “Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given him” (John 17:3). But the time had not come to exercise that power. He had not become the “quickening (life-giving) spirit” (1 Corinthians 15:46) till after His glorification. He was said to have received life and “glory” (John 17:22) only in the sense in which we are said to have received eternal life; that is, a prospective title only. The days of the flesh of the Messiah were days of weakness (Hebrews 5:8), and through weakness he was crucified” (2 Corinthians 13:4). “He was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead” (Romans 1:2).

If it be contended in spite of the evidence that Christ’s words literally mean that life was, at that time, in Him in the same sense as in the Father, the objector’s attention has to be called to the fact that such a construction of His words would not prove “free life” so-called, but the deathlessness of Christ; for the Father is Spirit, and immortal and glorious and indestructible. Are the defenders of this heresy prepared to maintain that Jesus was so, “in the days of his flesh?” This “free-life” is a myth - a mere invention. Its advocates do not prove the starting point. The truth is the other way; the cross, as you see in the chart, is planted in the channel of the Adamic and Mosaic curses to illustrate the fact that Jesus was born in the channel of both.

And now let me ask why? And we begin again to enter upon a region of thought not congenial to minds little less than carnal. God is righteous. God will not do wrong. He will not do evil that good may come. This heresy represents God as doing wrong; for it says of the Christ, the Lamb of God, “here is a free life.” If so, why should a free life die? But Christ, instead of being what is called a free life, was, in the condemned nature of the children of Adam. Hence, when He died, nothing wrong happened, so far as God’s doings were concerned. The obedience of the Son of God led to his resurrection, and the triumph was complete.

Here I recur to Paul’s statement: “What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh,” weak through the flesh which all men have, the flesh of Adam, the flesh of Noah, the flesh of Abraham, the flesh of every man that ever lived - “God hath done.” And if you ask how the doctrine of God-manifestation comes to our aid. The power of the Highest came upon Mary and quickened her womb, causing germination and the formation of a child in nine months according to the ordinary gestatory law. This child was God manifest in the flesh - the sinful flesh - not all at once but gradually as the divine impress developed. You see it pretty much from the very beginning; as instance the boy of twelve puzzling the doctors in the temple. I have not altered on this question. I have understood this

question. I require not to make the lamentable confession that was made last night; I cannot say as the leading champion of this heresy said: "I have taught it 15 years from the platform without understanding it." This is something for those to think about who have been misled. This confident teacher of heresy for ten years at all events, taught from the platform with all confidence, a thing he did not understand. This is his own confession. If so, what confidence are brethren to put in him now? How are you sure that he understands it now? I know he does not. It was said by an alien who heard him three years ago, that he was a good copyist of Dr. Thomas and had remembered "Elpis Israel" well. He is now a good copyist of David Handley. He did not understand in the one case, by his own confession, and I am sure he does not understand now. These unpleasant things it is necessary to say in the interests of the warfare provoked by him.

Now, with regard to the subject of the flesh, you have had the doctrine propounded to you that the flesh is a good thing; that there is nothing evil in it; and some wonderful remarks were made which I shall notice. But I would ask you how comes it, if the doctrine be true, that Paul should say, "if ye walk after the flesh ye shall die" (Romans 8:13). "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption" (Galatians 6:8). "In me, that is in my flesh dwelleth no good thing" (Romans 7). "The carnal mind" (the fleshly mind), he says in the eighth chapter of Romans, "is enmity against God; it is not subject to the law of God neither indeed can be." Let us look into the philosophy of this, and I think we will see how shallow are some things that appear profound - but only profound because delivered with an air of profundity. I will quote from the notes I made. "There is nothing evil in the flesh." "Sin is not in the flesh, but sin is in the character." "Sinful applies to the character and not to the flesh." "We have sin in our character but not in our flesh." "Sinful is not the proper word to qualify flesh, but qualifies character." "So ignorant was I on this subject," he says, "that I expected so and so." Very well! Now what is character, brothers? Is it not the manifestation of the qualities of the flesh? I could understand an immortal-soulist talking like this; but how you can understand a man talking in this way who recognizes that the flesh thinks, and that character is but the outward manifestation of that thinking flesh, is difficult to say. It is a marvellous piece of new-born wisdom to say that "sinful" applies to the character but not to the substance that produces the character. That it does apply to the thing that produces it we shall see. Paul's definitions are more philosophical than Edward Turney's; for Paul goes to the root of the matter, and says, that in the flesh dwelleth no good.

Let me ask you to realize how true that is. People, you know, are apt to judge in this matter by their own particular experience at the moment when they happen to be thinking. That is not the way to judge of it. Our present mental state is the result of many external influences operating for a long time, and no clue to what the flesh would produce of itself. To see what the flesh would produce of itself you must look at a child with only what is native to its brain, and realize the result that comes when put away by itself in a wood, brought up with wolves say, like a boy of whom I read only a week or two ago; what sort of mental manifestation was there in that case? Pure barbarism. The man was a brute with two legs, with more aptitude in brutishness than his four-legged companions. You do not require so extreme a case to perceive the natural vacuity of good which is characteristic of the carnal mind. Take a far more common case, where some members of a family are educated and some are not. Suppose the first-born is brought up as an illiterate labourer, and later members of the family, through a change in the fortunes of the family, are sent to first-class schools: do you not see a great difference at manhood? Whence this difference? Because in the one case, the mind has been left to its own resources, whereas in the others, it has been helped from without. The same rule applies in all the varying degrees of human experience. In all society, men are barbarous or carnal in proportion as they are left to the unaided resources of the carnal mind; not that many (or in the world, any), are spiritual; for though they differ in their artificial acquirements, they are almost all carnal, from the clod-hopper to the squire, only the difference in the form of mentality is illustrative of the original poverty of the brain left to itself. The power of the Spirit as an educator in the Word is not brought into play, by reason of human neglect; therefore, though most rise above the dead level of nature, they do not in many cases attain to the spiritual, which only comes in subjecting the mind to the Spirit's teaching. The point illustrated is, that there is nothing in the mind of itself, except certain blind cravings, desires and impulses. These are inherent: they are native to the flesh of the brain. The knowledge of God is not native to the flesh of the brain. The knowledge of how we ought to do is not native. What Paul says is absolutely true, that the mind of the flesh is an evil and a sinful thing; for its natural impulses resident in the brain flesh, are all in directions opposed to God. As Paul says, "The carnal mind is

enmity against God. It is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” Paul is truly philosophical in going right down to the root of the thing - to the source of the thing. He talks not as a child of the mere manifestations upon the surface, but of the origin – the flesh - in which, by natural constitution dwells no good thing.

Now consider Adam in the garden of Eden; he had the instruction of the Father by the angels; for, as I admitted on Tuesday night last, he would not have known, in the absence of experience, how to walk or how to look at things, without this supernatural instruction. Those impressions which we get slowly from experience as children he got direct; as in the case of the apostles on the day of Pentecost upon whose brains the Spirit wrought those scholastic results which in the natural order of things could only be got at by five or seven years’ grinding; and who were therefore able to speak foreign languages in a moment without learning.

Adam was driven out of Eden because of disobedience. He was therefore thrown back upon himself, so to speak, and he soon found in himself and his progeny how weak and evil a thing the flesh is, for his first son was a murderer. And because disobedience or sin, was the cause of his expulsion, and that sin was the result of the desires of the flesh, and because all the desires that are natural to the flesh organization are because of native ignorance, in directions forbidden, there is no exaggeration, no high figure in talking of sin in the flesh. It is Paul’s figure. He speaks of “sin that dwelleth in me,” and as he defines me to be “my flesh,” sin that dwelleth in me is “sin in the flesh” - a metonym for those impulses which are native to the flesh, while knowledge of God and of duty is not native to the flesh. I cannot do better than read what Paul says in Romans 7: “What shall we say, then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said Thou shalt not covet! But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead.” That is to say, so long as a man is not forbidden to do a certain thing, the doing is not sin. But when the law says “don’t do it,” then you are made conscious of the activity of the propensity to do it; and, therefore, without the law, sin is in a state of quiescence; but as soon as the law comes, you are made aware of native rebelliousness. He proceeds “For I was alive without the law once:” that is, while he was in ignorance of it; before he had woken to the bearing of the law upon him, as in the earlier part of his life; “but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.” Sin in me, Paul, by the commandment, which I disobeyed by reason of sin in me, or impulses which lead to sin, slew me. “Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good. Was, then, that which is good,” that is the law, which was a good thing, outside of him, “made death unto me”? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin, by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.” It is God’s purpose to make us realize our native tendency to disobedience, and our native inability to conform; for there lives not a man who has, in all things conformed, except Christ. “For we know that the law is spiritual, but I (that is, the natural Paul) am (by constitution) carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not; for what I would that I do not, but what I hate, that I do.” The natural Paul was not destroyed, but only brought into subjection, and even in that state of subjection there were many things, as every son of God experiences, such as forgetfulness of God in sleep, for the sake of illustration, which the new man would rather not be subject to, and many aspirations and spiritual achievements to which it is impossible a saint in the flesh state can attain. “If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law that when I would do good evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O Wretched man that I am; Who shall deliver me from this body of death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but, with the flesh, the law of sin.”

Look at the 5th chapter of Galatians; you will there find the same doctrine taught at the 16th and 17th verses: “Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against

the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Let us now look at the works of the flesh - this good flesh - for we are asked now to believe that the flesh is a good thing. This is one of the most abhorrent features of this heresy. Here are the works of this good flesh: "Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like" (19-21). It is only those who sow to the Spirit that shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting. Those who sow to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption. The flesh is weak, unclean, and sinful.

Now, what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh. God has done, in sending His own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh. Let us consider this. What about this likeness? Moses informs us (Genesis 5:3) that Adam begat a son in his own image and likeness. You would not say the word "likeness" means that Seth was, in any wise, different from Adam. There is the word, "image." Suppose the word "image" had been used in this remark of Paul's: "sent His Son in the image of the earthy nature," we should then have had this argument - "Ah, you see it is only the image; it is not the nature itself." Whereas, what does Paul say concerning ourselves in 1 Corinthians 15:49, "We have borne the image of the earthy, and shall also bear the image of the heavenly." Shall we say we have not borne the earthy? Do not we bear the earthy? Yes, therefore in apostolic language "earthy" and "the image of the earthy" mean the same thing. Upon the same principle, sinful flesh and the likeness of sinful flesh mean the same thing. And we shall find that the same they are.

And now we have to consider in what sense did Christ come in sinful flesh. I do not go away from that phrase, although "the flesh of sin" is a more literal translation of *σαρξ αμαρτυ* "Sinful flesh" is the English idiomatic equivalent. Word for word is not always a good translation of any language. There must always be an accommodation to the idiom: and in this, the translators of the English version have shown themselves fitted for their work. Romans 7, immediately preceding, supplies the sense of the words "flesh of sin" used in Romans 8:3. Galatians 5, and all New Testament allusions to the subject teach that the flesh of human nature is a sinful thing. "Sinful flesh" in English, therefore, represents the Spirit's idea, which is of more consequence than a lexicographical equivalent. Now Christ took part of the flesh and blood of the children, that he might extirpate in it that which was destroying them. This is the apostolic testimony: "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil" (Hebrews 2:14) - the serpent principle, the death-power in us. Christ took on him the nature of Abraham and David, which was sinful nature. How, then, some say, was he, with sinful flesh, to be sinless? That - (placing the end of the pointer on the sun at the top of the chart) - is my explanation, brothers - that is my explanation! And it is Paul's explanation. God did it. The weak flesh could not do it. Jesus was God manifest in the flesh, that the glory might be to God. The light in His face is the light of the Father's glory. If you ask me how the Father could be manifest in a man with an independent volition, you ask a question not truly founded on reason. Do I know how the Almighty causes substance organized as brain to evolve thought? No; do you? No. But do we doubt the fact the less because we are unable to comprehend it? By no means. Do we know how the Father performs any of the myriad wonders of His power? Know we so small a matter as the *modus operandi* of the germination of grain in the field, to its multiplication twenty-fold? Nay verily; though we know a thousand things as facts, you will find, on a close scrutiny, that we are utterly ignorant of the mode of invisible working by which these facts have their existence. If it be so with things in nature, why must our inability to define the process be a difficulty to our receiving a heavenly fact, not only commended to us on the best of all testimony, but self-manifest before us? For who can contemplate the superhuman personage exhibited in the gospel narrative without seeing, with his own eyes, so to speak, that the Father is manifest in Him? When did ever man deport himself like this man? When spoke the most gifted of men like this? Is He not manifestly revealed the moral and intellectual image of the invisible God? Is He not, last Adam though He be - is He not "the Lord from heaven"? But what are we to say to the plain declaration eminent from the mouth of the Lord Himself, that the beholder looking on Him, saw the Father, and that the Father within Him by the Spirit - (for as He said on the subject of eating His flesh, it is the Spirit that maketh alive: the flesh profiteth nothing) - was the doer and the speaker? The answer of wisdom is, that we must simply believe; and true wisdom will gladly believe in so glorious a fact. What if our understanding be baffled? Shall we refuse to eat bread because we fail to comprehend the essence in which flour subsists? A childlike faith is alone

acceptable in this matter. The words used by Jesus to His disciples we may presume to be applicable to us, if they are true of us: "The Father himself loveth you because ye believe that I came out from God." Those who make the mistake of the Pharisees, and "judge after the flesh," stand back in gloomy quandary and talk of "mere man;" others who think to make a great mystery "simple" and plain, speak of the flesh of Christ as a mixture of human with "divine substance." Wisdom takes her stand between the two, and seeks to dive no deeper than the testimony that God was in Jesus manifest in the flesh: she troubles not herself with the impracticable question of "How?" Seeing the fact and the reason of the fact, she rejoices and gives praise to God, from whom "the dayspring from on high hath visited us."

As for the question asked, that "if God gave Jesus greater power than we, has He not dealt unjustly with us?" it is not the question of a child of God. What was done by Christ was God's work out of love to us; that we, subject to His will, and recognizing His supremacy, should become Heirs of His nature. Such a question as the one referred to is enough to secure for the questioner the grave of Korah, Dathan. and Abiram.

"What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God (has done), sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh." It was the same flesh, full of the same propensities, and the same desires. But, in Christ, all those desires were kept in subjection to the mind of God, because the Father, by the Spirit, taught Him and led Him from the beginning. "I do always those things that please him. I do nothing of myself. I do those things that I have learned of Him." These are His own words. God gave not the Spirit to him by measure; therefore, the praise is entirely of the Father. Christ is God manifest in the condemned flesh (for it is flesh and not life that is condemned), and justified in the Spirit. And in all He did for us, He was individually comprehended. What He did "for us" was not "instead of us," but on our account. The notion that it was "instead of us" is the old orthodox superstition being foisted again upon the brethren. He was born for us. "He hath raised up for us, in the house of David, a horn of salvation." He hath not raised instead of us a horn, but for us; but of course the babe born was born for Himself as well surely. "He hath gone to appear in the presence of God for us;" not instead of us. Begotten of God in the channel of Adamic and Mosaic condemnation. He died on our account, that we might escape, but on His own account as the first born of the family as well; for, in all things, it behoved Him to be made like unto his brethren.

What is the result then? This: that God is pleased, the sin-and-death law of our race being carried out upon His hereditarily-mortal, but righteous though law-cursed Son, to raise Him for His righteousness sake; and then asks us to look to Him to whom He has given the power of dealing with the rest of mankind. If we bow down to Him and recognize our position, He is pleased, for Christ's sake, to forgive us. He is not obliged to forgive us. Christ has given Him no satisfaction; paid no debt in the commercial sense. Christ's birth and death is the arrangement of His own mercy. We cannot claim it: it is all of grace: not of works lest any man should boast. The scheme of salvation is never comprehended by those who embrace this "free life" heresy.

And as for hearing of this one and that one accepting it, of whom better things were to be expected, I have only to read the response that Paul made under similar circumstances: "Those who seemed to be somewhat, it maketh no matter to me. God accepteth no man's person. They who seemed to be somewhat, in conference added nothing to me." Again: "False brethren brought in who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage, to whom we gave place by subjection; no, not for an hour: that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." Therefore, if I am left alone on the top of a mountain; if all the brethren and sisters forsake me, I will stand alone, waiting for the coming of the Lord from heaven. But there are to be some ready for Him. There are to be five wise virgins, if there are to be five foolish: and, for that reason, I have taken upon myself a great deal of labour, and have brought upon myself the infirmity of the flesh. But, for this I care not, if the truth be saved. I will die, if necessary, in the attempt to stem this tide of corruption which is streaming in and sweeping away the brethren.

The remaining part of the chart will be intelligible at a glance. The resurrection of the offered body of Christ was the Father's work as you know; and therefore a stream of light connects the central sun with that event. The glorious personage resulting from it, was by that means filled with the

fullness of the Godhead bodily; consequently, when He was presented to men as the only name given under heaven whereby they must be saved, it was the name of God that was presented; the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, comprehended in the name Jesus Christ. This glorious personage was exalted to heaven, and is absent from the earth for a time, as indicated by the elevated line, marked "the Saving Name."

During His absence, the work of taking out a people by faith, through the preaching of the remission of sins through His name, goes on, as indicated in the chart by the continuation beyond the cross of the broad band, representing the seed of Abraham, and the mottoes above and below. The Gentile element is not separately represented, because, in relation to the saving name, Jew and Gentile were all one after the apostolic sending forth. The return of Christ, to consummate the results of the preaching, is indicated by the line descending from the Saving Name, and His re-appearance in the earth, by the square of light, marked the Second Appearing. The result of this, after the kingdom, is the abolition of death, a result which will be directly due to the Father's own work of mercy, and not at all to the flesh, which He has expressly excluded from all share in the glory.

The other chart, illustrating the Renunciationist heresy, is altogether an anomaly, considered in the light of the Father's work in Christ. The first figure is well enough, as showing the individual history of Adam; but the second figure is a misrepresentation of the work of Christ. It represents Christ as independent of Adam; whereas he was born in the channel of Adamic generation. In Adam the human race fell into a ditch, and Christ is God come down into the ditch – so to speak – to lift us out. This finds no representation in a diagram which presents Christ, not in the ditch, but on the mountain top of "free life." In the death of Christ, the divine principles were not violated, because He was the mortal nature of the seed of Abraham, bearing the curse upon it; but here in this diagram you have the outrage of a so-called unforfeited life subjected to the fate belonging to forfeiture only, as represented by the cross at the end of the "unforfeited" line. Then you have, from the foot of the cross, an uprising line, which is logically unpermissible in the Renunciationist theory. That line is to represent Christ's resurrection; but how could that resurrection be possible if, as this theory says, the debt we owed was "eternal, death," and Christ paid that debt? The theory is contradictory and self-destructive, and brings with it principles which lead far more widely and deeply astray from the purity of apostolic faith, than some who are beguiled may conceive possible. They may awake to the discovery when it is too late. It is very natural for those who do not discern, to be cool and complacent, and respectful in their treatment of this heresy; but those who do see will by this class be considered harsh and intemperate, and unjustifiable in the strength of their denunciations. To this they can but submit, as one of the trials of the situation: the end will justify them. When the serpent, which is considered an inanimate and useful ornament of personal attire, is discovered in its true character as a venomous, living reptile, it will be thrown away and stamped under foot with all the vehemence of those who understood what it was in the first instance. Let us hope the creature will not by that time have fatally used its fangs on the necks of those for a time deceived.

Before concluding, I would notice a few points of detail in the Renunciationist lecture of last night. I had intended going through them all seriatim; but I find on looking at them, that I have virtually answered them all in the course of what I have said. Upon one thing I feel called upon to animadvert. You listened to the suggestion, last night, that Dr. Thomas Jesuitically trimmed his words in writing to "The Rock" upon this subject, in 1870. The question was asked, How came Dr. Thomas to express himself in such a style as the following: "Christadelphians mean to say neither more nor less than Paul said." And because it occurred not to the lecturer to discern the caution imposed on the Dr's speech when writing for the Episcopalian readers of "The Rock," he chose to answer it in a style in harmony with his own state of mind. He deliberately stated that the Dr. expressed himself as he did "because he saw rocks ahead." Do you think that if Dr. Thomas had been sitting in the audience, instead of sleeping where I laid him over two year ago, in Greenwood Cemetery, by the American margin of the Atlantic Ocean, that Edward Turney would have dared to insinuate such a dishonour against him? Nay, verily; he would have been dumb in his presence, and would have been found sitting at his feet as a listener, with the abjectness of that personal admiration which none appreciated less than the Dr.; but which a certain class of minds renders and imitates in the living presence, and, like children, forget when the object of it is far away. In the providence of God, I have been entrusted with the affairs of Dr. Thomas while he sleeps, and his honour is as tender with me now as in the day

when he came in and went out among us. I feel, therefore, called upon to rebut this foul accusation, which comes strangely from the man that wrote the following words: "You know I have held him as the only man commanding my full and entire admiration... He hears no more the voice of his traducers, and his work is finished. I hope he will be stronger in his death than he was in his life. I hope those who hold the grand truths he discoursed will redouble their efforts to spread them far and wide, so that when he gets up again, he will rejoice in their works." And again, "Well, we are left, and we must do our best to surprise the dear old man with joy when he wakes up again." What will "the dear old man's" surprise be when he gets up, to find that Edward Turney, one of his strongest personal admirers, two years after his death, publicly "renounced" his teaching on a vital element of the Mystery of Godliness, and before a large audience in Birmingham, in 1873, sought to create the impression that he was a trimmer of words under the influence of "rocks ahead"? The Dr's surprise will, doubtless, be great; but those will not share it who now withstand this shameful attempt to undo the "dear old man's" work, and to cast dishonour on his name. Dr.Thomas understood his subject, which Edward Turney, by his own confession, did not; and therein is to be found the explanation of some things at which he now affects great surprise. And God, in His mercy, when Dr.Thomas is in his grave, has placed others in the work who understand it, and who will spend, if need be, the last drop of their blood in the attempt to resist the Satanic effort now being made to corrupt it.

He talks of "confusion worse confounded" in the Dr's writings. In this he only gives expression to the confusion that reigns in his own mind, and that must reign on this subject in all minds that judge after the flesh. The understanding of it is not a matter of "learning." It is only to be got at by dwelling in the presence of the Word, and by listening reverently and implicitly to its voice. "Learned men," so-called, are the wise of this world, whose wisdom is foolishness with God. That Edward Turney should invoke their name and aid in this matter, shews how much he is away from the Spirit's standard. You would observe how much he made of the fact that my copy of the Septuagint lacked the book of Daniel, except a brief Apocryphal version of it, and of my forgetfulness of the fact that two ancient copies of the Septuagint contained it. You were asked, with indignant scorn, if you were to accept such a man as I for an authority. Brothers, I do not put myself forward as an authority, and never have done, as you know. I put forward the Holy Oracles as an authority, and for them I shall fight so long as God pleases to continue life in this body, I am not learned in the conventional sense. I know more of God's book than of any other document under the sun; and in this I am content and thankful. To cause men to know what it contains is a higher work than making them acquainted with the oddities and 56uiddities of human intellect, in past or present times, in countries near or far off. I leave those who are content with husks to make their bows at the shrine of human wisdom. I am determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified. Shortly with him I hope to stand, when human learning and human pride, with all its rusty paraphernalia of parchments, papers, ink marks, books, libraries, contradictions, disputations, bewilderments, and general craze, shall have disappeared in the abyss of rottenness and eternal decay.

There are one or two other points in the lecture last night, which I must reserve for some future occasion. They are in substance answered in what I have already said, but a more detailed treatment of them might have been, had time and strength allowed. If necessary, I will soon make good my present omission. Meanwhile, I undertake to solve any difficulty, or explain any passage, in harmony with the truth I have presented this evening. I had intended inviting questions publicly to-night, but after this prolonged effort, I feel I must ask to be excused. At some other time, I will, invite the advances omitted to-night. I will stand any number of nights, health permitting, to be questioned by anyone on this subject, and to be put to the test in the most, searching way. Meanwhile, I think I have said enough to show that Dr.Thomas has no more failed to reach divine truth in this particular, than in any other. But that he has exhibited to us the mind of the Spirit, in teaching that in the flesh dwelleth no good thing, and that it was necessary for God to interfere, to open the way from present curse, by operating through the nature suffering that curse, to the production of obedience unto life eternal, for all who should receive in faith the work done.

Robert Roberts - "The Christadelphian" October 1873

“THE SLAIN LAMB DISSECTED”

by Edward Turney

Edward Turney’s reply to Robert Roberts’ lecture entitled “The Slain Lamb” in which he reveals the inconsistencies, misconceptions, misrepresentations and absurdities of its Author.

Preface

In August, 1873, Edward Turney was invited by some brethren in Birmingham to explain his views. At this first meeting some 20 brethren were present and were so impressed with what he had to say they asked him to give a lecture to a much larger audience at the Temperance Hall, only six days later. The title of Edward Turney’s address was “The Sacrifice of Christ” and it was at this gathering that Robert, Roberts after repeatedly interrupting the speaker finally cut short the meeting by an outburst of shouting at the top of his voice after Edward Turney had suggested yet again that they meet in discussion with one another. But rather than come face to face with Edward Turney, Roberts wrote “The Slain Lamb,” a notorious article which has since been altered and sections deleted by various Christadelphians after Robert Roberts’ death. This reply which now follows, was Edward Turney’s answer to Robert Roberts’ own Revised Speech.

Foreword

As interest was growing in Edward Turney’s views it was arranged that he be invited to meet a small group of brethren in Birmingham on the 22nd August 1873, at 71 Belgrave Road when about 20 brethren turned up to here what he had to say. They were so greatly impressed that they arranged a meeting at the Temperance Hall for the 28th where he could expound his views to a large number of brethren and sisters. Robert Roberts, who had already started to oppose Turney’s views did all he could to prevent this meeting taking place and while it had been hoped to hold this meeting at the Athenean Rooms this was prevented by Roberts, stating, “No! Never! Not while I hold the place shall the wolf enter here!”

Thus it was that during the course of Turney’s lecture at the Temperance Hall, Roberts disgraced himself about a dozen times by attempted interruptions, but worse was to come at the end of the address when Turney went on to say:-

“And now, brethren I have finished my lecture, but I will beg your attention for five minutes while I relate a few personal matters. Mr Roberts has noised abroad that I have not the courage to meet him in discussion. If that be true, all I can say is that he is the first man of whom I have felt afraid. But brethren, I am not naturally afraid of the faces of men especially of men, who, I firmly believe cannot maintain the cause they have undertaken to defend. To tell you the truth I rather like a sharp encounter, it does me good; but I do not put much faith in such things as a means of settling questions of importance. This can only come after quiet and patient private investigation.

Now I will tell you in a few words the story of these challenges.

First of all Mr. Roberts attacked my 32 questions in “The Christadelphian” for June 1873, suppressing the name of the author. Upon this Bro. Farmer here present asked me if I would see Mr. Roberts privately, provided I was willing. I said yes, I should like to see him privately. Then Bro. Farmer arranged with Bro. Sulley to go at once to Birmingham with the object of bringing about this interview.

What message did Bro. Sulley bring back? Listen;

Bro. Sulley: “Will you see Bro. Turney privately about this affair?”

Mr. Roberts; “O, if Bro. Turney had wished to see me, he would not have launched the 32 questions.”

Bro. Sulley: “But I know Bro. Turney does wish to see you.”

Mr Roberts: “Then I don’t know that I want to see him,”

and as a confirmation of this he said in a letter:- “I would rather not be hampered by personal influences.”

After this I said I was willing to meet him before one or two brethren on each side, with Dr. Hayes for chairman and Bro. A. Andrew for reporter, the report to be used by either party as he thought well. This offer he absolutely refused;

He said: “It would be submitting himself to an irritating situation.”

I dare say it would, and he spoke as he felt. But why should he be irritated, seeing, as he pretends, he has all truth on his side and I have all error on mine?

Men are not usually irritated at the prospect of an easy victory. But we know that some men who are loud and brave before a sick and weakly antagonist do feel irritated when they have to stand close to an opponent who likes to be close to them. They then prefer either more room or else some condition to place a great advantage on their side to start with. Anybody can fight a winning battle, but to pull against wind and tide requires coolness, not irritation and a steady nerve and tried courage. Well, then, the truth is, brethren that I have been the party ready to meet Mr. Roberts on anything like fair terms, time and time. But he would not, for reasons best known to himself.

In place of what all other men would consider fair conditions, he proposed to ask me a lot of questions. He seems to have cross-examination on the brain, and to think himself born to ask questions. But if you are to get at what a man means, it will not be by asking him only such questions as you hope will make him contradict himself, but by letting him speak freely, listening attentively, not to catch him in his words, but to get at his ideas. This presupposes that you regard him as honest and sincere in his motive; the other presupposes that he is not, and therefore must be caught and exposed.

Now then I put down a public challenge to discuss three or four nights before you all when I return. I hope Mr Roberts will be better informed on the scheme before I return, for instead of publicly debating the question it would be far more profitable to go round the country helping him to set it forth. But so long as he is hostile, it will be war to the last. I never give in when I feel sure I am in the right.”

After this the Chairman rose to say a few words but was unable to for Roberts, shouting at the top of his voice threw the meeting into confusion.

Within a day of Edward Turney giving his above address, Mr. Roberts had written “The Slain Lamb” in response to Turney’s lecture and it is necessary here to note that later publishers of “The Slain Lamb” have been so embarrassed by it that sections have been deleted and alterations made. For the purpose of this present publication we have gone to “The Christadelphian” for October 1973 page 434 and copied “The Slain Lamb” as Robert Roberts originally published it. See also footnote 1 on page 66.

This “dissection” of Robert Roberts lecture has resulted from this original article, and it shows the outworking of the righteous anger of Edward Turney, knowing he had the truth of the Scriptures on his side, continuing to do battle though refused public debate or discussion with Mr. Roberts.

The Lecture entitled

“The Slain Lamb”

by
Robert Roberts

Dissected

by
Edward Turney

The truth and the reason that are found in this lecture can only be enjoyed by separating them from the predominating mass of slander, misstatement, and misapplied Scripture. The slander is as bad as it can be, because it is put forth in the name of the honourable dead.

The author of “The Slain Lamb,” well knowing the great esteem in which Dr. Thomas was held by the brethren at large, has sought to strengthen his calumnies against us by asserting that we, in our Birmingham lecture, “cast dishonour on the doctor’s name.” The best answer to this charge is our widely known respect for Dr. Thomas, and a request to read the allusion we have made to him in our lecture, the words of which allusion stand precisely as they were uttered. Whoever reads those words will see the utter untruthfulness of the above allegation, and perhaps detect the bad, acrimonious spirit by which their author, half conscious of the weakness of his cause, endeavoured to prop it up.

Much as we have admired Dr. Thomas, and profited by his works, we cannot descend to that abject state of hero-worship which would not allow his writings to come within the pale of fair and reasonable criticism. Perhaps the author of “the Slain Lamb” would fain pacify his own self-smiting memory at our expense, for he cannot have forgotten his own hostile and disrespectful attitude towards Dr. Thomas, concerning whom he was wont to say, “Yes, yes; but I must leave the Doctor and follow Christ.” If the Doctor was a follower of Christ, to leave him was to dishonour him, and Christ also; either he was or he was not. Brother Roberts may sit on the horn of his own dilemma which he finds the more comfortable.

We now proceed. The first paragraph of “The Slain Lamb” introduces “Elymas the Sorcerer” and “the subtle hypocritical foes” of Jesus as a sufficient excuse for the shouting and temper displayed by the editor at the close of our lecture on “The Sacrifice of Christ.” If it be possible that we are not a “subtle hypocrite” a “child of the devil, an enemy of all righteousness,” for so Elymas is described, then it would seem that there was no adequate cause for so violent a perturbation of “that perfect equanimity (as Brother Roberts’ says) which it is desirable at all times to observe.” Without fear we venture to leave our identification by this hue and cry to the brethren in all the earth.

Paragraph 2. Brother Roberts says he was delegated to ask us questions, and we knew it. Those who have read our lecture know how we came to be delegated, and those who have not should do so. Among his misstatements is this: “Knowing that weakness compelled his absence at the seaside, we took advantage of the opportunity to come and lay our clever fallacies before” the meeting at 71 Belgrave Road. If Brother Roberts knows the truth of the matter, he has told a deliberate falsehood; if he does not, and has any candour left at command, he will promptly apologise for this entirely untrue assertion.

Paragraph 3. This admits that he (Brother Roberts) “was goaded into a breach of public etiquette;” and then tells us he “was not dissatisfied with his offence in the matter”! That is to say, he was satisfied with his own disgraceful behaviour! Setting aside this peculiar logic, this utterance pictures a self-satisfied, self-sufficient individual.

Paragraph 4 opens thus: “The question, as a whole, is a difficult question, for one reason; it has to do with God’s view of the case.” “The case” is that of redemption, and if it is difficult to see through, God is made responsible for the difficulty and the consequences arising out of it; but if it is simple, easy, plain, and intelligible to an unlettered teachable mind, then Brother Roberts has quite misunderstood “the case.”

The real difficulty, and it is insuperable, is to make Brother Roberts' case plain and convincing to his own mind. Do what you will with it, his reason, his sense of justice and mercy remain unsatisfied; and feeling this, he sets out by saying, "The question as a whole, is a difficult question," and struggles into a "break down" to explain it. But the "one reason" he assigns for this difficulty is fatal to his position - viz., that "it has to do with God's view of the case." Now, if man had been left to propound a scheme of redemption the case would have been difficult indeed. This may be seen by the fruitless efforts of those holy men before the birth of Christ "to look into it;" but now we have a Revelation of the mystery the question is no longer difficult, but plain. The New Testament record of the birth, sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ are on a level with the minds of "the poor to whom the Gospel is preached." And this is still more largely true of those poor who delight to study "the record God has given of His Son." "These things" are said to have been written "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and believing ye might have life through His Name." God has condescended to make "the way so simple that a wayfaring man, though a fool (in worldly wisdom) cannot err therein." Brother Roberts' notion makes the knowledge of redemption harder of attainment than the summit of Parnassus; and thus convicts him, while professedly a teacher of the unwise, of profound ignorance of that perfect wisdom by which the Almighty has been able to speak to the poorest of His children. God's paths are straight, not crooked; those who walk in the m, walk in the light, not in darkness; it is only the wicked who accuse God of being a hard master, and of strewing their path with difficulties too hard to overcome.

This fourth paragraph closes in part with these words: "Now, one thing that distinguishes this disturbing heresy more than another is that it cannot express itself in the words which the Holy Spirit teacheth, but it is obliged continually to employ invented phrases."

Those who use invented phrases and coined words continually show that they are very imperfectly acquainted with the treasures of the English tongue, the richest, most apt, and copious, whether for prose or verse, of all known languages, except the Greek. But a lecture containing 423 quotations and allusions to Scripture does not very clearly prove the lecturer's inability to expound his subject "in the words which the Holy Spirit teacheth." It has been said that this number of allusions is found in the lecture on "The Sacrifice of Christ" by one who has had the curiosity to count it through.

Paragraph 5. Here Brother Roberts says; "I employ the aid of a chart, not because I think it proves anything it cannot demonstrate." This being admitted, any conclusion established by reference to the chart is not worthy of notice. But Paragraph 34 shows that Brother Roberts put his chart to this very use. Not being able to explain in words, either human or Divine, "how Jesus could be Sinful Flesh, and yet sinless," he pointed to the "central sun" at the top of his chart, and exclaimed, "That is my explanation, brothers; that is my explanation!" It is to be presumed, however, that some of the said "brothers" would hardly recognize that as a satisfactory "explanation," although they were domineeringly told that it was "Paul's explanation," and that "God did it." There must be some blunder here, either in the weakness of the moment, or else in somebody's weakness; we are not aware that Paul ever used that "pointer," and that "sun," or anything like them, to make his "explanation" of the plan of redemption.

Envy and rage are twin demons, and it is not astonishing that some sad things should be said, when we see by his own Revised Speech that Brother Roberts told his "brothers" that we had employed our chart not to explain, but "to dazzle their eyes, and to sorceries their imagination, and to implant heresy in their minds." He does not say that we did these wicked things unintentionally, but that we "made use of a chart" to accomplish these nefarious designs. While we are truly sorry for Brother Roberts on account of his bodily afflictions, we hope that under the cooling influences of hydropathic treatment his brain will cease to give off such wild and unsound asseverations.

Paragraph 6 calls for no particular remark except on the sentence which says: "God is too much left out of modern theorisations and definitions of the plan of salvation." It is difficult to see what this applies to. All sects, save Socinians, make very much of God in redemption: but Socinians are not a modern but a very ancient sect. This, therefore, looks like a random unintelligible phrase, such as one would expect from a person who almost regards ignorance of all things outside the Bible as a virtue.

Paragraph 7. This is the happy but rare exception. It appears scriptural enough.

Paragraph 8 we gladly assent. It is of the highest importance that we should recognize God as the Saviour in the strict and ultimate sense; but this is not incompatible with co-operation on the part of Jesus, any more than “working out our own salvation” is incompatible with God being our Saviour.

Paragraph 9 is conspicuously bad. It debases its author by putting a lie into the mouth of his opponent, who, he says, teaches Jesus to be “a mere man.” Now, which theory ought to be accused of this sin, the one that lays great stress on the fact that Jesus was the Son of God, or the one that makes Him the son of Adam?

Paragraph 10. This is a long paragraph, but its fault lies not in its length, but in its untrue statements and wrong use of Scripture. We have pointed to the parallel between Adam before he sinned and Jesus. Brother Roberts says there is no parallel but “a great difference.” He then shows what he imagines the “great difference” to consist in. “Adam,” he tells us, “suffered no evil, no pain, no weakness, no grief,” but Jesus did. This conception about Adam before he sinned is totally at variance with Dr. Thomas’s view on the subject. He says that our flesh is constitutionally no worse than Adam’s flesh before the fall. (See “Ambassador” August 1869, page 216).

How does Brother Roberts know that a corruptible body would feel no weakness and no pain? This looks contrary to the nature of the thing. Even now there are people to be found who live and die ignorant of sickness and suffering. But Brother Roberts is trying to make it appear that Christ’s being tired, His weeping, His grief, and finally His death, were all the result of Adam’s sin in His, that is, Christ’s own body! He might as well say that if Adam had not sinned Jesus would never have been hungry. Why did Jesus weep? Was it for Himself or His own bodily sufferings? There is not a line to prove that He was ever sick an hour, nor one to suggest that He had ever any cause to weep for Himself. The weakness through which Christ died was ours, not His, morally speaking, while as to His nature it was human “for the suffering of death.” But this weakness is of a very different sort from that sinful weakness which Brother Roberts finds in the flesh of Christ.

Jesus was a man of intense sympathy; He wept with those that wept. But had Adam no sympathy before he sinned? Could not his heart have been moved and his eyes filled with tears? If not then he was more than human; if not, then those human qualities came to him after transgression, so that he was more amiable and humane as a sinner than a just person! But Brother Roberts says “he proposes to strengthen this beyond the power of resistance.” This strengthening is to come from the Psalms to favour the idea of an **unclean Christ** would be more correctly styled weakness than strength.

The first Psalm referred to is the 40th, and the words emphasized are, “for innumerable evils compassed me about; mine iniquities have taken hold upon me; they are more than the hairs of my head, therefore my heart faileth me.” The sense in which these words are applied to Christ is most abominable; it makes Him the vilest wretch; He is worse than Saul, who thought himself “the chiefest of sinners.” Brother Roberts says, in a parenthesis which betrays his own embarrassment, “The iniquities of His brethren laid on Him in their effects.” Did the bearing of these “effects” fill His flesh with sin? Did the enduring of these “effects” make His own iniquities more than the hairs of His head? What were the “effects”?

The answer is death. Did the suffering of death as a sin offering for His brethren fill the flesh of that offering full of sin? O Socrates, we sigh for the abuse of thy method of finding out the truth of the matter.

When the priest’s hands were laid on the head of the victim all the hands of the congregation of Israel were represented - a great pyramid of hands, symbolizing a mountain of sins; so also “the hairs of the head” may symbolize the sins of the world. But was the victim physically unclean, physically a sinner? If so, then why was the type without spot? Brother Roberts, however, has elsewhere said “There is no sin pervading the physical nature; how, then, does he now say Christ’s body was filled with sins countless for multitudes? Let him keep to one side, whichever that is, he cannot be on both. As though not satisfied with the “strength” extracted out of the 40th Psalm, he says to his “brethren” – “But you will find something more striking in other cases.” However that may be, the “brothers,” we imagine, would not be struck with the “strength” of this effort to crush the “disturbing heresy.” Some of them would very likely be struck with astonishment to find their leader so perverting the Word of God.

As the “strengthening” process proceeds the weakness of Brother Roberts’ position becomes more painfully manifest. He next quotes from the Hebrews 1:8 & 10, and then proceeds to address his “brethren” as follows: “The things that the spirit, in Paul, here applies to the Messiah; you will find in the 102nd Psalm: 1-11.” For shame, Mr Editor! Do you think that an investigator is to be carried away by such miserable audacity as this?! It is true, as you say, that “at the 8th verse of Hebrews 1, we have the words, “Unto the Son He saith;” and also it is true that He saith “certain things.” At the 10th verse we read, “And thou Lord,” “and so forth,” but where among your “certain things” and your “so forth” do you find the eleven verses applied by Paul to Jesus from the 102nd Psalm? Is this “strengthening your position beyond the power of resistance”? It is an attempt to “strengthen” your position which cannot fail to injure it and you in the eyes of your best friends. Whoever of your “brothers” will compare the 102nd Psalm with the 8th and 10th verses, and your “certain things” and “so forth” will see that not one verse of your whole eleven is applied by “the spirit of Paul” to Jesus. It is quite enough for the cause of truth to adhere to the words of the Spirit when you profess to apply them, and it is no light offence against God and your brethren to make so glaring a false statement as this.

Paragraph 11. This is a miserable specimen of throwing literary mud and of raising a cloud of dust. The editor wishes to make his audience believe that we hold and teach that life is a thing, a living intelligent existence, which may go out of a man’s body and come into it again! No such nonsense was ever heard or read from us; and the editor, in raising an alarm on such grounds, is like the boy in the fable who cried wolf, wolf, when there was no wolf. But this is the way the editor shows how “a rope of sand falls to pieces when you see the initial fallacy.” If his opponent has no such “rope” he spins one for him, and like those bad men who put stolen goods into other people’s possession who are innocent, he gives it out that the said “rope” is the making and the property of his antagonist.

Paragraph 12 is but a continuation of talk on the false alarm raised in paragraph

Paragraph 13. Brother Roberts returns to the Psalms to prove that Christ was unclean, was full of sin, was “a child of wrath,” as every sinner is, and, therefore, born under sentence of death. It will be noticed that he deals with the Psalms in wholesale fashion, speaking of them as though they all and every verse belonged to Christ! Having seen how he tried to thrust eleven verses of the 102nd Psalm into Paul’s mouth, it will be nothing new to find him trying the same experiment with Christ. In this respect Brother Roberts may be said to be “no respecter of persons;” he treats friends and foes, inspired and uninspired, all alike, if they do not say the false and foolish things he wishes them to say, he says them in their name without asking their permission. Mark what he says here: “I will without further quotation give you a list of them (the Psalms), and the New Testament reference in each case where The Psalm is by the Spirit applied to Jesus.” Nothing could be more deliberately unfair and misleading. If he had said, “I will refer you to those verses in the Psalms which are applied to Jesus in the New Testament” there would have been nothing amiss; but he takes his besom, opens the sack’s mouth, and sweeps in the whole lot; throws the sack to his “brothers” and says, “There, I give you a list of the Psalms as applied by the Spirit to Christ.”!

Being favoured with that “leisure” in which the editor hopes his “brothers” will compare the texts given, we propose so to occupy it for our own benefit and the enlightenment of those whose time is all taken up by hard work.

We begin, then, with Brother Roberts’ first reference - Matthew 21:42 (Psalm 118). What saith Matthew? “The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner. This is the Lord’s doing, it is marvellous in our eyes.” Now here are the 22nd and 23rd verses of the Psalm, and not a word more. Whereas we are told that the Psalm is applied by the Spirit to Jesus in Matthew. But this is not by any means the worst of it. Brother Roberts appealed to the Psalms to demonstrate “beyond the power of resistance” that they proved Jesus to be full of sin. Do these two verses prove that? Does the rejection of Jesus by the Jews prove Jesus to be physically unclean? There could not be a worse instance than this of dishonesty in argument. We feel, however, somewhat relieved by the sheer ridiculousness of such a quotation. If Brother Roberts were quite sure he was addressing blind people, or people deprived of the Psalms in a language they could read, he might, by laying aside all honesty, venture to handle the

Psalms thus; but if he calmly reflects, surely he must see that he himself is doing more to bring his house down about his ears than those whom he contends against.

Next Matthew 27:25 (Psalm 22). Matthew's words are: "Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us and our children." What, the object is of referring this to Psalm 22 we know not. Brother Roberts promised faithfully to show us only those Psalms which are applied by the Spirit to Jesus, and to give the verses in which they are so applied. But this verse is not found at all in the 22nd Psalm, nor, as far as we remember, in any other part of Scripture. And if it were, does it prove that sin filled the body of our Lord? Does it prove that the flesh of "that Holy thing" born of the Lord's handmaid, begotten of Holy Spirit, was as unclean as any sinner from the loins of Adam is supposed to be? Alas! alas! If this is the "irresistible" argument for a Filthy Son of God.

Our attention is next directed to Hebrews 2:14, (and the same Psalm). This verse is a quotation of the 22nd verse of the Psalm, and no more. But, like the preceding, what does it help Brother Roberts? Does the announcement that Christ "will declare His Father's name to His brethren" demonstrate that He (Christ) was made of unclean flesh? Surely this is a new kind of proof. We could recommend Brother Roberts to issue a treatise on logic which we might understand how to apply such principles. We confess that the standard works we have glanced at are of no service in this new style.

Luke 4:10 (Psalm 91): "He shall give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee." These words agree with the 11th verse of the Psalm. And it is needless to tell the "brothers" that they furnish no proof of the editor's proposition. Let us state the matter formally.

Proposition: "The flesh of Jesus Christ was full of sin,"

Proof: "He shall give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee."

If some of the old masters of logic could rise up and see this new style, would they not say "Alas! alas! for our 'carnality' we could not see 'below the surface!'" Woe unto us, for we are not of "prolonged spiritual education," we are undone!"

Luke 13:46 (Psalm 31). Luke says: "Into thy hands I commit my spirit," quoting the 5th verse of the Psalm. Let us repeat our example.

Proposition: "The flesh of Jesus Christ was full of sin."

Proof: "Into thy hands I commit my spirit."

Again John 2:17 (Psalm 69): "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." This is from the 9th verse of the Psalm.

Proposition: "The flesh of Jesus Christ was full of sin."

Proof: "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up"!

Is not this a good specimen of the *reductio ad absurdum*?

But Brother Roberts is determined we shall be amused by his incongruities. Acts 1:20 (Psalm 109):- "Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein; and his bishopric let another take." This is drawn from the 8th verse of the Psalm, in our simplicity we always took it as applicable to Judas; it never struck us that it was intended to prove Jesus a constitutional sinner. Perhaps we may yet detect this by the aid of Brother Roberts' new system of reasoning.

Proposition: "The flesh of Jesus was full of sin."

Proof: "Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein, and his bishopric let another man take."

We are now arrived at the last reference and are not sorry, for such monstrous absurdities, such mockeries of reason, soon turn merriment into disgust.

Acts 2:25 (Psalm 16). We cut this short.

Proposition: “The flesh of Jesus was full of sin.”

Proof: “For David speaketh concerning him. I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved.”

We sincerely believe that any man who has got into the state of mind exhibited in the foregoing handling of the Word of God, to support his notion of the physical uncleanness of the unblemished “Lamb of God” is, for the time being, totally unfit to investigate any question, and entirely unworthy of any consideration as a professed teacher of the ignorant, and of them that are out of the way. We feel sure that this display of want of candour, of deliberate abuse of the Word of Truth, and of a list of gross incongruities and shocking absurdities will save many more from his trust and guidance, and we hope will be to them and others a standing lesson of the necessity of proving what they assent to for themselves.

Paragraph 14 reaffirms “the entirely dissimilarity between the position of Adam and the probation of the Lord Jesus Christ.” It is upon this entire dissimilarity that the leader of the theory of an unclean Christ rests his argument. If a striking similarity can be fairly made out, then the whole position which stands on the opposite idea will fall through. The author of “The Slain Lamb” will have no half measures. If he is to employ the Psalms, he will employ them wholesale. It is the same with the Adams; he will have no resemblance whatever; nothing short of entire dissimilarity will serve his purpose. Now for the facts:-

1. Adam was son of God; so was Jesus
2. Adam was made a living soul capable of death; so was Jesus.
3. Adam was human nature, or “flesh and blood;” so was Jesus.
4. Adam was formed of the dust; Jesus of flesh which sprang out of dust.
5. God must have taught Adam, for there was no other teacher; Jesus “heard and learned” of His Father.
6. Adam received a law of obedience from God; Jesus came to do His Father’s will.
7. Adam was put “on trial for immortality;” Jesus conquered through obedience under trial.
8. Adam’s desires tempted him to sin; Jesus suffered being tempted.
9. Adam’s nature and impulses were those common to all men; Jesus “was tried in all points like His brethren.”
10. Adam was born lord of the creation; Jesus was born King of all the earth.
11. Adam’s temptation had relation to eating; Jesus was tempted to make bread out of stones.
12. Upon Adam’s conduct depended the future happiness of his children; upon the obedience of Jesus depended the salvation of those He came to save.
13. Our relation to Adam involves us in real death; our relation to Jesus in figurative death.
14. Adam died through his own sin; Jesus “tasted death for every man” who sinned in Adam.
15. By one man’s (Adam’s) disobedience many were made sinners; by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

16. Adam “was appointed to suffer,” for in all trial there is suffering; Jesus suffered by the trials of His faith, besides the suffering of death.
17. Adam was simply innocent until he received God’s law; Jesus was innocent until He reached the age to know good and evil.
18. Adam was a man of character while he obeyed; Jesus perfected His character by perfect obedience.
19. Adam was the father of the old creation; Jesus is the founder of the new.
20. The old creation began in “flesh and blood” under obedience; the new creation began in Jesus, who was tried in and by our nature.
21. The old creation closes in death through sin; the new creation attains to life through righteousness.
22. If there is entire dissimilarity how then does Paul style “Adam the figure of Him who was to come”? Mark, Brother Roberts says in Question 70 that the second Adamship of Jesus did not begin until he became immortal.

In dismissing this paragraph, let it be observed that these twenty-two points of similarity betwixt the first Adam and the second must be all destroyed to bring Brother Roberts’ statement one step towards the threshold of truth. And when he has demonstrated the whole twenty-two to be false, then he must advance a sufficient number of points to cover the whole ground of comparison, and every point must be, not partially but entirely dissimilar. When he has achieved this we will acknowledge our defeat, and give up our sword.

Paragraph 15. Here Brother Roberts invites the audience to look at our diagram, and to notice that by using the word “debt,” to signify that which Jesus paid for our release, we employed “artificial and unscriptural jargon.” To very few persons is a “debt” an “artificial” thing; and if the word may be called “jargon” it is a jargon which most people can understand. But our devout editor has a perfect horror of the “unscriptural.” If “Debt” is unscriptural it will not be found in Scripture. We have before times ventured to give the editor this piece of information. But if the word “debt” should be found in the Scriptures, and particularly if it should be employed in relation to sin and death how then? The editor has probably read these words; “And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us.”

What is signified by “the Lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt.”? When the lecturer of “The Slain Lamb” has shown this language to be “artificial and unscriptural jargon” we will admit our error.

Paragraph 16 is unworthy of note as regards our position, except for the false application of that text which says “death reigned from Adam to Moses even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.” If these words be construed to mean that all men did not sin in Adam, then Paul, who writes “In whom all sinned,” is made a liar. And if it be held that the consequence of that sin was not death to all, the lie is again given to Paul’s teaching – “and so death hath passed on all.” The Apostle has taught that “remission of sins there is none without the shedding of blood.” Brother Roberts, therefore, in asserting that blood is only needful for personal sins of one’s own committing, makes the apostle a false teacher. Let Brother Roberts point us to one simple text which indicates that a man would be released from death inherited from Adam without the blood of Christ, and we will give up the dispute. That the reader may see we have not misrepresented Brother Roberts’ position, we will give his own words; “I will show before I have done... that that which stands in the way of our

resurrection by nature is not our hereditary mortality in Adam, but our personal offences” (paragraph 15, “The Christadelphian” page 440).

The “who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression,” we understand this to mean that although men had not literally and actually taken and eaten the forbidden fruit in Eden, the fatal consequences of Adam’s doing so were upon them. For this cause alone Christ’s blood was indispensable, to say nothing of their own personal offences, to efface which it was likewise shed.

Paragraph 17. In this section the lecturer threatens “to make manifest,” further on, “the most unscriptural, the most carnal, and the most untrue and mischievous character of the new philosophy.” When ever we arrive at this manifestation it shall have our best attention.

Paragraph 18. Here the lecturer directs his audience to a particular line in his diagram. What he says needs no attention from us.

Paragraph 19. Offers nothing for comment.

Paragraph 20 speaks of the Mosaic Law, and speaks falsely. The third sentence runs thus: “The law condemned to death all who disobeyed it in the meanest particular.” This makes God as harsh and unrelenting as Draco who instituted but one punishment for all offences, viz., death. There were numerous crimes which “the law” did not punish with death. On the crimes of theft, Moses imposed the punishment of double (and sometimes still higher) restitution, and in case the person was unable to pay, he was to be sold as a slave, and payment to be made with the purchase money (Exodus 22:1-4). In the case of personal injuries, payment for loss of time, and expense of cure. In other cases the law of retaliation was enforced (Exodus 21:18,19,22-25; Leviticus 24:19-23; Exodus 21:26,27; Deuteronomy 25:11,12). See Boothroyd’s Introduction.

This false statement, that for “the meanest offence” Moses imposed death, is needful to bring every Jew under sentence of death, and then it is randomly assumed that because Jesus was born a Jew He was under the curse, though the lecturer plainly says elsewhere that Jesus kept the law perfectly. If a man must be guilty in order to be condemned to death, though only “in the meanest particular,” and Jesus was not guilty at all, how was He, though born under the law, cursed with death by the law? The lecturer has increased his list of contradictions.

Perhaps this blunder about death for “the meanest” offence has arisen out of another blunder. It certainly cannot come from the words of the law itself. James says, “Whosoever offends in one point is guilty of all.” Does James mean that a man who stole a sparrow, or a pigeon, was as bad as a man who committed adultery, or murder? Certainly not. The sense of the passage appears to be this, that whereas some Jewish Doctors held that if certain points of the law were rigidly kept, a person was not guilty for neglecting others. A Jew was not at liberty to treat the law piece meal he must take it as a whole if, therefore, he committed a single offence, it was a breach of the law as a whole, but not of every section of the law. Whitby takes this view of the passage.

Paragraph 21. Brother Roberts now begs “special attention” to what we have elsewhere shown to be his perversion of the words of Christ, namely, that the law had power to give eternal life. He has, however, been compelled to admit that his statement “requires qualification.” We are glad to see this. If he would cultivate this virtue of admitting his errors, both he and his “brothers” would be benefited.

Paragraph 22. The exposure of one sentence in this section will reduce the whole to chaff. Brother Roberts says, “God will keep no man in the grave because of Adam’s sin, if he himself be individually righteous.” The nonsense of this utterance may be illustrated in the following manner:- “No man will be drowned if he keeps out of the water.” The absurdity of Brother Roberts’ speech is seen by inquiring what righteousness is? It is something indispensable to salvation - what is it? Brother Roberts speaks now as though it were conceivably possible for a man of himself to be righteous. If he had not trammelled his Scripture intelligence with bitter prejudice, he would have told his “brothers”

that all men are naked before God through Adam's offence; that, however good their actions, however pure their motives, unless they have on, or are related to, God's righteousness, they must perish. He speaks now as though a man might be righteous without Christ. Christ is God's righteousness to all men, both Jew and Gentile; whether as an object of hope before He appeared, or of faith and obedience after His resurrection. Without Christ no man can be righteous before God unto eternal life. And if not, then without the blood of Christ no son of Adam can rise from the dead to die no more. If what Brother Roberts here teaches were true, then the blood of Christ might be shed in vain, and resurrection might come through "works of righteousness which we have done." This is one of the saddest and silliest sentences in the whole lecture.

Paragraph 23 is conspicuous for two things; first, it makes God condemn man whom He made utterly helpless for being helpless. Second, it sneers at the use of learning; "heathen poets and doctors of the apostasy." But as Macaulay says, to call a man a block-head is not the way to convince him you are right; and if some persons were to occupy some of their time among "the heathen poets and doctors of the apostasy" instead of snoring in bed till noon, they would become aware of the fact that very much of what they imagine is original with one, is the result of searching, culling, and classifying from a hundred sources. As a quoter a man can readily acquire facility with fair memory; but quoting and thinking are not exactly the same thing. As Professor Stowe truly says, if you would be deeply acquainted with Scripture, you must read a little at a time. and think a great deal about it.

Paragraph 24 is very long. The lecturer here struggles to desperation to support the already exposed inaccuracy of certain things in Jesus Christ and Him Crucified.

Paragraph 25 belongs to those other speakers, which put what is not admitted into the opposite doctrine.

Paragraph 26. This is a "puffed up" insinuation, to the effect that the lecturer is of a "prolonged spiritual education," and that all those who do not acquiesce in his sentiments are "carnal."

Paragraph 27 is marked by what some fall back upon for lack of argument.

Paragraph 28 is occupied in decrying and execrating "flesh and blood." Perhaps the lecturer may live to see the ridiculousness of his remarks, and the injustice, not to say cruelty, which his scheme imputes to God.

Paragraph 29. The object here is the same on the whole as that in the preceding paragraph, but a grossly absurd contradiction marks its close. Paul is made to say that "in the flesh, by natural constitution, dwells no good thing." Let Whately be read on this. But what is natural constitution? Just what the flesh was made. Now, if Paul here refers to his body, how then can it be said by God that it was "very good"? This was said at the time of "its natural constitution" or making. We do not quite understand how the same thing can be pronounced "very good," and also to have "no good" thing in it. But if Paul in Romans 7 is regarded as speaking not of the body, but of the "flesh," or fleshly lusts unchecked by divine law, the matter is harmonious enough.

Paragraph 30 contains nothing to object to.

Paragraph 31 expresses a little nonsense. It is said that because of Adam's sin Cain was a murderer. This was the result of sin in Adam's flesh. We presume that before Seth and Abel were begotten, sin had left the flesh of Adam and his wife, for these sons were both righteous; in this case sin can hardly be regarded as a "fixed principle" in the flesh. We should rather take Brother Roberts' view and say, "sin is not a literal principle pervading the physical organisation." and that at most it can only be a "metonym for the impulses native to the flesh." Are the "impulses" sin? Surely not; otherwise God is the author of sin, for He implanted the impulses in man. The impulses are "very good" when properly directed, for the Creator pronounced "the man whom He had made very good." We trust that if Brother Roberts is wilfully blind to this, others will not be.

Paragraph 32 strains hard to establish sin in the flesh, and from its doctrine we might very well conclude that if “sinful flesh” were a possibility we had found a specimen of it in the lecturer. The argument runs thus:- “Here are the works of this good flesh - adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like.” Any person capable of calm reflection will see the egregious folly of such talk as this. What is adultery but lawful desire run riot. What is idolatry but the perversion of the faculties of worship? And so throughout. There is no faculty but what is capable of transgressing its lawful bounds, and there is no faculty, when within its bounds, but what is it “very good,” for God made them all.

Paragraph 33 is noticeable for the fallacious use it makes of the words “likeness” and “image” as regards Christ and us. Seth was made in the “image and likeness” of Adam. Brother Roberts denies that Seth “was in any wise different” from his father. What nonsense! This makes Seth Seth’s father, and Seth’s father Seth. Not content with this folly, he handles the passage which speaks of “the image of the earthy” after the same method. “Shall we say,” he asks, “we have not borne the earthy?” “Do we not bear the earthy?” “Yes.” This was presuming greatly on the dullness of his audience. The earthy here spoken of is Adam. We bear Adam’s image in that we are earthy, but that does not prove that we are Adam, it does not prove that we are not “in any wise different” from him. Adam was quite as “earthy” before he sinned as after, therefore the point Brother Roberts is trying to establish is lost, for it is not in the fact that Adam was “earthy” that made him a sinner, but in the fact that he transgressed.

Paragraph 34. Here we have a specimen of literary ignorance and impudence of passing shamefulness. After pointing out to his “brothers and sisters” that the true reading of Romans 8:3 is “the flesh of sin,” or “sin’s flesh” Brother Roberts then “dazzles” or, more correctly speaking, tries to befool them by saying “sinful flesh” is the English idiomatic equivalent for “sin’s flesh.” If any schoolboy dared to tell his tutor this, the “equivalent” he would get for it would make him sit uncomfortably all day afterwards. “Sin’s flesh,” or “the flesh of sin,” is a phrase in the possessive case. Brother Roberts, abusing the little learning he has, tells the people that if they want to say that in “good English” they must say “sinful flesh.” Miserable! More miserable!! Most miserable!!! If I were to say “Green’s hat,” “the hat of Green.” in Greek, and wished to translate the phrase into “good English,” should I have to say “a green hat”? So, if I say “*sarkos hamartias*” (sin’s flesh) - to make “good English,” must I say “sinful flesh.”? The possessive case points out the Possessor; the adjective the Quality of a thing, and was so ever since the confusion of tongues, and before it. The best counsel we can give Brother Roberts in this matter is to leave off talking about “idioms” and study Cobbett’s English Grammar for a twelvemonth.

Paragraph 35. “Elymas the sorcerer,” and the “subtle hypocrites” who confronted Jesus, are insufficient to portray our iniquities in ventilating what we believe to be the “the truth as it is in Jesus.” Brother Roberts has found us worthy of still worse company, if such were possible. What is the offence which, in his estimation, is enough to send us down quick into the pit? What is the crime which has earned us a grave with Korah, Dathan and Abiram? Listen, O heavens, and give ear, O earth. Brother Roberts declares that God made man too weak to keep His law, and then condemned him for not keeping it. God gave Christ that power which He would not give to Adam, and blessed Christ for using it. We venture to ask him to show us the justice of God in this. Herein we discern our fate; fire is already gone out, and will burn to the lowest hell! “It is not,” says one who can look below the surface, “It is not the question of a child of God.”

Paragraph 36 like several others, “beats the air.” It charges us with making nonsense of certain texts, and then rebukes us.

Paragraph 37 solemnly avers that “the scheme of salvation” is never comprehended by those who embrace the “free life” heresy.

Paragraph 38 takes a high tone. Who are they that have embraced this cursed doctrine? Who are they that are blasted with this cankering mildew? “Those who seemed to be somewhat, it maketh no matter to me. They who seemed to be somewhat, in conference added nothing to me.” Such is inflated drivel and sickly bombast of “prolonged spiritual education,” so called.

Paragraph 39. Before a man takes Paul's high stand he should be quite sure that he is his equal in knowledge; to say nothing of Divine inspiration. "The remaining part of the chart will be intelligible at a glance," says brother Roberts. Now we string ourselves up to discover the intelligibility of the next statement. "The resurrection of the offered body of Christ was the Father's work, as you know, and therefore a stream of light connects the central sun with that event." Now, on this point, as on others, we say, again, that if Brother Roberts will prove, either in Paul's words or in any words of Scripture, that Christ's body was offered before He rose from the dead, we will cease our contention. We maintain that Christ's body was offered once, and that once was in the most Holy Place - that is, "heaven itself" (Hebrews 9:11,12.24-26). "A stream of light," says Brother Roberts, "shows this on the chart." We say all the accumulated starlight and sunlight of the universe cannot prove it true. The priest under the law could not on the great day of Atonement offer outside the holy place. He entered there to offer by means of the blood shed outside. So, also, Christ slain on the Cross, entered the most holy heavenly by means of His own blood.

There He offered Himself. He who talks of the Resurrection of the offered body of Christ, says, in effect, that Christ was raised from the dead after His ascension!

In conclusion. Paragraphs 40 to 44 are undeserving of detailed criticism. Personal vituperation is their "trade mark." We close our dissection of this lecture on "The Slain Lamb" by giving a list of the falsehoods in doctrine which in this controversy Brother Roberts has tried to put into our mouths:-

Imputed Falsehoods

1. That the sentence in Adam was eternal death.
2. That Christ Jesus bore that sentence.
3. That the flesh of Christ was different flesh from ours.
4. That life, not flesh, was offered in sacrifice.
5. That life is a living intelligence distinct from body
6. That Christ's life was taken merely instead of ours.
7. That ours, therefore, might have served if His had not been given.
8. That Christ was "a mere man" - that is, not the Son of God.
9. That Christ was no more a manifestation of God than Adam was.
10. That Christ had no proper relation to our race.

Postscript - There is one thing we thank Brother Roberts for, namely, the insertion of a copy of our diagram in the "Christadelphian." His styling it the Renunciationist Heresy will not spoil its use with those whose eyes are not jaundiced with the spleen of envy. Finally, should this copious vomiting of bile relieve our fiery antagonist of his dizzy madness, we shall not regret it, even though our outer garments have been somewhat befouled thereby.

Edward Turney.

A REVIEW OF "THE SLAIN LAMB"

By
F. J. PEARCE

INTRODUCTION

In about 1953 F.J.Pearce first published his review of Robert Roberts booklet, "The Slain Lamb". The time would seem ripe for a reprint of this review, comprehensive as it is in exposing in detail the logically unsound and unscriptural doctrines on which Christadelphianism is so perilously based. The adoption of this false basis appears to have been due in great measure to an unfortunate character defect in Robert Roberts, one of arrogance and resolute stubbornness in the face of scriptural truths, some of which he had himself once understood, acknowledged and preached.

At this distance we can only speculate upon the reasons for this amazing about face by Robert Roberts, who was clearly an intelligent and gifted man. All we can do now is ponder how different and creditable the Christadelphian past and present might have been and above all how secure their future would be, if Robert Roberts' unscriptural views had not prevailed following those two evenings in the 1870's, and if instead, Edward Turney's noble spirit and stout defence of the true Gospel had appealed to that assembled company. Had that been the case these words would not need to have been written, but on such moments and events the history of religious groups and the fate of individuals depend. A wrong turn was taken by the Christadelphians at that time and the wrong road was chosen, and it can certainly be said that on that occasion, as on many others down the succeeding years, men seem to prefer darkness to light.

Thankfully the light is still in the world for those whose eyes are open to it and whose hearts and minds are receptive and hungry for truth. So once more it is with great joy that we put before you the eternal scriptural truths about human nature and salvation and we hope that these truths will be similarly received with equal joy by the reader, at present in darkness but on the look out for the glorious light.

In order to assist the reader Bold Type has been used in the text of the review to highlight the words of Robert Roberts, as well as the particular page and paragraph number indicating the section of "THE SLAIN LAMB" under scrutiny.

Helen Brady. (January 2000)

"The Slain Lamb" was written by Robert Roberts in reply to a lecture delivered the previous evening by Edward Turney. Robert Roberts was present at the lecture and frequently interrupted the speaker, much to the inconvenience of the brethren assembled. E.Turney ignored his interruptions for a long time, but at length told R.Roberts from the Platform that he would meet him at any time to debate the matter out before the brethren and sisters (not publicly). Had R.Roberts accepted the invitation extended to him he would have had the opportunity of saying all he had to say without interrupting the speaker at a meeting that he used all his power to prevent taking place. The writer thinks that there are very few of the Christadelphian body who are aware of the circumstances that brought about the deliverance of the lecture by Edward Turney and he has often been told by members of that body that personal hate took the place of brotherly love and that the personal hate was not on their (the Christadelphian) side. All who have made this statement are probably ignorant of the circumstances.

Most Christadelphians have read "The Slain Lamb," but how many have read the lecture to which it was a reply? In that lecture is a statement of the circumstances which led up to its being delivered and the writer would suggest that both "The Slain Lamb" and E.Turney's lecture be read as it is necessary before one can conscientiously say that R.Roberts has shown the fallacy of Edward Turney's theory (which foundation R.Roberts believed before him). See E. Turney's lecture, page 2 of cover. Let the reader be fully persuaded that R.Roberts is fairly answering that which E.Turney contended. Let the reader be fully

persuaded that R.Roberts is opposing what E.Turney is contending for and not what E.Turney is not contending for. Why did R.Roberts write "Slain Lamb" instead of meeting E.Turney? To any unbiased mind reading both, the reason is obvious. R.Roberts could do in writing "Slain Lamb" what he could not do if he met E.Turney in debate, and that is, misrepresent what E. Turney contended for.

I think that R.Roberts was well aware of this. At the foot of page 3 he says that the renunciationists renounce that Jesus was the Son of Man, that Jesus Christ came in the flesh. This is a glaring untruth and R.Roberts knew it. This is one of the statements that he could write, whereas he could not make it in debate because he well knew that E.Turney maintained all through his lecture that there is one flesh of man, as Paul says and that Jesus was the same kind of flesh - bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.

Look at the following example of the contradictory nature of his statement: on page 6, end of first paragraph, he says "The renunciationist heresy makes him a mere man." First he says that the renunciationists deny that Jesus came in the flesh, and then he says that their theory makes Him a mere man! Well can he say to Christadelphian brethren who accept "Slain Lamb" as the answer to the renunciationist theory without examination in an unbiased manner. "How readest thou?" Further comment of mine just here is unnecessary to invite the reader to read honestly.

R.Roberts had no excuse for misrepresenting what E.Turney contended for, but there is excuse for Christadelphian brethren to-day because they have been accustomed to accept what their leaders have said upon the matter to be the truth and have not troubled themselves to ascertain what these supposed heretics contended for.

The following is an example from Islip Collyer's book "The Meaning of Sacrifice," page 4, "If we ask (our brethren) what it is (the so-called clean flesh heresy) we are given a definition which is promptly repudiated by those who hold it." This is worthy of consideration because it is the truth, though not in the sense that Islip Collyer wished to convey it. The truth of the statement lies in the fact that the clean flesh heresy means and teaches certain things which are not believed nor taught by them at all. In other words the Christadelphians beat the air in attacking a theory the objects of their attacks do not hold.

Many letters have been received by the writer from them showing the fallacy of believing that Jesus did not come in the flesh. (I agree that to believe otherwise would be unscriptural). This only shows that they are, unfortunately, ignorant of that we contend for. R.Roberts' opening remarks on page 3 regarding "untoward appearance" are answered in brackets at the end of the paragraph: "It is best omitted." Why? Because it would supply the proof as to which side held the personal hate. It was not the first time that R.Roberts raised his voice when opposed to someone who knew what he was talking about (as E.Turney told him, "I like to be very near my opponent for my own edification"). E.Turney reminded him that he R.Roberts was "always ready to invite the clergy into the Athenaeum Hall to slay them in debate - poor deluded persons - which was an easy matter, but just as ready to shut the door against "the wolf," as he styled E.Turney when he said "the wolf shall not come in here."

Study R.Roberts' several debates and you will read often of him losing his temper and raising his voice. He always excused himself afterwards on the score of it being a weakness of the flesh, but it is more a sign of spiritual weakness, and this spiritual weakness was manifested in his refusal to debate with E.Turney after trying to cause confusion in a meeting which he did his utmost to prevent taking place. R.Roberts, unfortunately, always opposed any advancement not his own and I would give you this one as an example:- Nesbit of Glasgow wanted to start a weekly journal called "The Investigator." R.Roberts replied, "We are past the investigation stage." Are we? Why, we are merely on the fringe.

Page 3, paragraph 2. "The question as a whole is a difficult question," etc. We would refer you to "Christendom Astray," page 111, on the Sacrifice of Christ. R.Roberts says "nothing is simpler," (read Luke 10:21, 1 Corinthians 2:2). There is no need, as R.Roberts says in this paragraph, of a prolonged spiritual education to understand what is the most vital of the first principles of the oracles of God. Redemption was instituted in type in Eden and God kept this important factor before their eyes continually in the shadows of the law given to Moses. If redemption is not understood as the basic foundation upon which to build, then it will not stand. Redemption is the first requisite and the necessity of it being so will

be dealt with when considering other statements in “Slain Lamb.” With regard to the Scripture quoted in the book, the writer delights in it as much as those who think that he opposes it.

Page 4, paragraph 1. “Now, one thing that distinguishes this disturbing heresy more than another is that it cannot express itself in the words that the Holy Spirit teacheth but is obliged continually to employ invented phrases.”

In reply to this I ask, are invented phrases employed by the teachers of this disturbing heresy only? The following are a few of the phrases used by Christadelphians that are not found in the Bible (not that I wish to bring any charge against them for using unscriptural phrases if those phrases explain Scripture in harmony with Scripture, but to show that they are unwilling to allow others the privilege that they desire themselves); “Federal principle,” “Condemned nature,” “Unclean flesh,” “Representative,” “Eternal death,” etc. Now why cannot we try to understand the spirit of the teaching by phrases without getting into a rage? If the language is artificial and carnal are not also the characteristics of getting into a rage? A prolonged spiritual education is of no value if we cannot control ourselves. (Proverbs 14:29, 17:27, Ecclesiastes 7:9).

Page 5, paragraph 2. Sufficient here to say that we endorse the Scripture quoted, but we point out that it is we that receive the adoption into the family of God. Jesus never needed adoption. The only begotten Son does not need adoption into His Father’s family. C.C.Walker witness: “Jesus was the subject of a change of nature from the human to the divine... but He was never the subject of a change of status... As to adoption... still less does this term apply to our Lord.” (C.C.Walker, “Answers to Correspondents” The Christadelphian, February 1930). He was, by God’s love, the means of reconciliation. It was man’s need of reconciliation that was the cause of God producing Jesus as the ransom price for the sin of the world. What was the Sin, singular, of the world? The sin of the world was the sin that “all are concluded under,” namely, the sin of Adam which changed Adam’s relationship and all in Adam, not changed flesh.

R.Roberts agreed that Adam’s change was a change of relationship and not of flesh - see “Ambassador,” March 1869, page 85. But an examination of his writings shows that he was ever ready to change his view when it suited his purpose. It was the sin of Adam that Jesus paid the price for, because the violent death that Adam incurred was inflicted prior to Calvary only in type. It was the recognition of the type that opened up the way of Adam’s return to his former relationship to God. If the sin of the world that Jesus died for was the release from changed flesh, why does this not take place in the case of the believers at baptism in accordance with Romans 8:1? The condemnation placed upon all men is entirely legal as Romans 8:1 proves. Again, if it was physical, then Jesus was under it, in which case He would be in the same helpless position (without strength) as ourselves, being flesh. How then, could He redeem us? Paul says, when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly, (Romans 5:6) Paul did not say that Christ was without strength but that we were. If, then, our weakness lay in the assumption that we die because of Adam’s sin, then Christ was without strength. It is the legal aspect that shows the true understanding of Scripture, as we will show as we proceed. As to Christ being crucified through weakness we will explain when we come to the paragraph where R.Roberts makes mention of it.

Page 5, paragraph 5. “Let us go back to the beginning. We find God creating Adam, etc.” Yes, God created Adam (Genesis 2). He is the fountain of life (Psalm 36:9).

Adam received his life direct from God. He was then free from sin though “of the earth, earthy,” a natural man. (Dr.Thomas, Eureka, Volume 1, page 248). But sin had not as yet entered. Sin is scripturally defined as an act and not a physically fixed thing. The committing of that one act of sin did not cause Adam’s flesh to be changed. The fact that Adam had the desires and impulses before transgression as much as he did after transgression rules out the suggestion that impulses are sin apart from those desires and impulses becoming an act of disobedience. There we have the physical constitution of Adam who received his life direct from God.

Jesus also received His life direct from God. Who will deny this? To deny this would be admitting that He was born of the will of the flesh. The subtlety of R.Roberts’ reasoning that He was under physical condemnation though not born of the will of the flesh lies in the fact that He was born of a woman, but the fact that He was born of a woman does not make Him “the seed of the man.” He was the seed of the Lord,

born of Mary through the operation of the Holy Spirit, direct from God (Luke 1:35). Adam and Jesus are the only two in Scripture record who received their lives direct from God. Two separate federal heads. The seed of the woman will come in for further consideration later. John records the words of Jesus: "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given the Son to have life in Himself." (5:26). Is not this proof of God giving life to Jesus direct? What life did God give Jesus that is under consideration as a sacrifice for us? Why, "the life of His flesh which was in the blood." That life Jesus laid down and did not take it up again, or otherwise "sacrifice" could have no meaning: it would merely be a loan. The life that He afterwards received was not the life that He had laid down. He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in spirit (1 Peter 3:18). He rose with the same body, so that if flesh is under condemnation then Jesus rose under it. In both cases the life that Jesus received came direct from God as did Adam's. R.Roberts says in this paragraph, "The second was different from the first. (Paul defines them in contrast)." But how far does he show the difference? We agree that there was a difference between them, but not; in the way that he does. He agrees that Adam and Jesus were the same physically and makes the difference between them in the fact that Jesus was the Lord from Heaven. Was not Jesus the Lord from heaven in the fact that He received His life from God? Did not Adam receive his life direct from God and was in accord with God prior to transgression? Could God in His wisdom have produced Jesus in any other way except by blotting out mankind and making a new creation of man? Think on this latter question and endeavour to see the weakness of applying Paul's words "the Lord from heaven" to show a difference and at the same time contend that the Lord from heaven was as physically condemned as those whom He came to save. The difference between them lay in the fact that the sin of one necessitated the divine begetting of the other and also in the fact that Jesus retained His right to live whereas Adam did not. Jesus retained His right to the tree of life (Proverbs 3:18), Adam did not and was driven out of Eden because he could not be allowed to put forth his hand to eat of the tree of life and live for ever in accordance with God's Justice until the debt to sin had been paid. That is, he could not be allowed to work out his salvation in Eden after sin had entered. That would give us a type of his offspring being born in the kingdom instead of being all concluded under sin. Adam, through God's mercy, was spared from paying it. Had Adam paid it we would not have existed. Adam could not redeem himself and if Jesus was under any condemnation He would have been in the same position. The difference therefore between them was necessitated by Adam's transgression and is of a purely legal character. Had Jesus been born of the will of the flesh He would have been in Adam's loins and therefore born in Adamic relationship; hence the manner of His "legally free" production. No difference physically, because the life of the flesh which was in he blood was the equivalent ransom price of the wages of sin which Adam was spared by God's mercy toward him and us, as in "Adam's loins." Besides, if Jesus did not come in the flesh (there would be no necessity of Him coming otherwise) He could not have paid that price. Again, if Jesus was not made in all points and tempted like His brethren, His retaining His Sonship, His retaining His hold upon the tree of life, His overcoming and His right to life and obedience unto death, would be all a farce, which would have prevented Him succeeding where the first Adam failed and would have nullified His being the equivalent ransom price to pay to sin what another owed.

Page 6, paragraph 1. "The first Adam was merely a mechanism of natural life, produced as a beginning or basis of a plan God had in mind from the beginning, etc."

Yes. that is so but if this was strictly kept in mind half of the controversial trouble would be over, but to change the nature is absolutely in opposition to Scripture and to a just God in His attitude towards individuals who had no participation in the committing of Adam's sin. R.Roberts says that he was a natural body. Why tamper with the meaning of natural? Was Adam any more or less earthy or natural after transgression than he was before? Paul definitely states that there is "one flesh of men" (1 Corinthians 15:37) and speaks of Adam being of the earth, earthy at his creation and not after transgression, and too says that it became a physical law of his being after transgression is to add to the word of God. This is the beginning of the darkening of the counsel of God. R.Roberts said that it needed a miracle to change Adam's nature so that he would become a dying creature. Dr.Thomas contradicts him by saying it needed no such thing, as he would die in accordance with the peculiar laws to his organization, which were natural. Then R.Roberts turns round and says, or rather contradicts what he previously said, that the change was a moral one and not a physical one. He turned down the application for baptism of a candidate who believed at his examination that Adam's nature was changed. That candidate was a Mr David Handley and Roberts' remarks concerning his rejection of the application are found in "The Ambassador," March 1869, page 85.

Look, the very same as what Mr Handley was rejected for is expected to be believed by a candidate to-day before he can become a Christadelphian. Think on these things and be convinced in your own mind as to who is using the “dazzle” that R.Roberts mentions on page 9.

Continuing on page 6, paragraph 1, R.Roberts says, “Nothing is of chance. All things are foreknown of the Father, for all things are the work of His hands and made to work out His ultimate designs. The rule of the working out of His plan on earth is, first that which is natural, after that which is spiritual (1 Corinthians 15:46).”

We most certainly agree with him. But why doesn't he leave the natural alone? God's work was a finished work (creative - natural) from the beginning. The spiritual will arise out of the natural without the necessity of the flesh of Adam being changed. We agree that nothing is of chance as far as God's foreknowledge of His plan and purpose is concerned, hence the birth of Jesus taking place in accordance with the promise to the woman that her seed should bruise the serpent's (sin) head (Genesis 3:15). This was an absolute necessity for the redemption of man; which necessity was brought about through the first man selling himself to sin and all in his loins. But with regard to God's natural creation (the laws of which were set in motion from the beginning) it cannot be said that nothing is of chance with regard to humans or animals. “Time and chance happeneth to them all” (Ecclesiastes 9:11, 1 Kings 20:42. 1 Kings 22:34, Luke 10:31).

This is in accordance with the natural order. Christ's production was not of chance, as R.Roberts says, but was of God, and also was His putting to death by wicked hands in accordance with God's determinate foreknowledge and counsel. (Acts 2:23). Time and chance happened to Adam. He was himself to blame, because he did what he did with his eyes open. If he were not to blame, God, who is the habitation of justice, would not have said so.

Page 6, paragraph 2. “An attempt was made last night to draw a parallel between this period of Adam's career and the probation of the Lord Jesus Christ. But look at the great difference. Adam suffered no evil, no pain, no weakness, no grief. His state was a very good state. He was no man of sorrows, had no acquaintance with grief, inherited no evil of any kind. But look at the Lord Jesus: from the beginning He experienced in himself those results that came by Adam's transgression.”

The first thing to remember here is that sin made it necessary for Christ's birth. The necessity of Christ's birth demands a parallel to be drawn with Adam's sinless period, because Christ had to remain in that sinless position before He could be an equivalent ransom price for that which was forfeited, viz. Adam's life. Adam had lost nothing during this period of sinlessness. Therefore there was nothing to be redeemed. Adam was on probation for eternal life. If this were not so, why put him under law, being a natural man? During that period he was in no need of redemption. What he was in need of was deliverance from the natural order. He was under no condemnation, but when he sinned he brought upon himself the incurring of the sentence that had been hanging over him in accordance with God's just law - “Thou shalt not.” That sentence was death by slaying, as the wages of sin.

As we have previously shown, God did not allow Adam to pay for his sin, or we would have had no existence. Let us examine R.Roberts' view of Adam's state: - “He suffered no evil.” He could not suffer the effects of evil while he kept evil impulses in check. He had these impulses (as R.Roberts agrees) but those impulses were not sin until they culminated in an act of disobedience (James 1.14-17). Besides, who was in Eden to cause this evil? There is no comparison to be made between Adam and Jesus in the sense of evil being caused by others. Adam and Eve brought evil upon themselves by their own desires being uncontrolled. “When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, etc” (Genesis 3:6). Can you put your finger upon one passage in God's book which more clearly demonstrates the lust of the eye, the desires, pride and ambition of life?

“No pain.” On what authority does R.Roberts say this? Does he mean mental pain or physical pain? In either case he seems to infer that Adam was an impeccable wax doll. If Adam suffered no pain physically does that prove that he was incapable of suffering physical pain? The very Scriptures themselves prove that he was capable of physical suffering before transgression. We ask why was it

necessary for Elohim to put Adam into a deep sleep in order to take the “woman” from his side? What a pity the Elohim did not know that Adam could suffer no pain on his first probationary period. Adam was a natural man and subject to natural laws from his creation and no theorising can alter Paul’s definition. Why apply the term “very good” to Adam alone? Where is the evidence of Scripture restricting this to Adam? This term was applied to all - everything that He made (Genesis 1:31).

The animals were very good of themselves, like man. There is nothing unclean of itself (Romans 14:14). “Call no man common or unclean” (Acts 10:15,28), and this after the fall. God’s creating was very good of itself and it is the ways of man that has corrupted God’s way upon the earth.

“No weakness.” What does R.Roberts really mean here? Natural man is related to natural decay via the natural channels. If that be weakness then Adam had that weakness and would have returned to the ground in the natural order apart from divine intervention. This is hypothetical reasoning because it did not actually occur before transgression but hypothesis is not out of place when in harmony with the attributes of a just God. If Adam had no weakness then what was the make-up of his physical constitution? R.Roberts is not willing to apply weakness to Adam as a natural man of flesh but he is quite ready to apply the weakness to Christ’s flesh at the end of the paragraph - “crucified through weakness.” But this of course on the assumption that Adam’s flesh was changed and that Christ inherited that nature condemned by change. We do not for a moment deny that Jesus was in all points made like unto His brethren. It was necessary that He should be so as we have previously pointed out. To say that Jesus, or anyone else, experienced the physical results of Adam’s sin is to make God a liar. Everyone experiences the physical results of abused natural law. God placed His natural law in operation and that law must not be trifled with any more than His spiritual law. The natural law must be kept apart from the sentence upon Adam, being in operation before the sentence.

The sentence passed upon all men is entirely restricted to the legal sphere and only affects the physical in that one dies the natural death without having had the sentence removed by baptism in harmony with Romans 8:1 and we either perish or sleep in Christ. The “physical results of Adam’s sin” only comes upon man in that he will not rise, having died in Adamic relationship, which is entirely a legal affair in harmony with a just God, not physically shackling anyone.

The physical results of sin will be experienced physically by anyone who says they are in Christ and walk unworthily, in the second death, but not the effects of Adam’s sin, but their own sins imputed to them. The result will be felt - “bring them before me that I may slay them” (Luke 19:27). The natural laws operate to the third and fourth generation (Exodus 20:5) (What did Jesus say in answer to the question, “Who sinned; this man or his parents?” “Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents...” (John 9:2) . Scripture says, every man shall suffer for his own sins, not the son for the father or vice versa (Deuteronomy 24:16, Ezekiel 18). This is applicable to individual violation of the natural law, as well as the letter of the Law of Moses, and the violation of the spirit of that law. In treading under foot the blood of the covenant, and making it an unholy thing. Hebrews 10:29.

Adam brought the incurring of the sentence upon himself by his own sin, and that sentence was a violent death, not a natural one. (See “Echoes of Past Controversies,” page 99). We have already pointed out that he was spared from paying it. Adam’s natural death was not the result of his sin in the sense that his nature was changed to a dying nature (The Scriptures, Dr.Thomas and R.Roberts are witnesses). Genesis 3:16-19 are brought up to support the idea that his natural death was the result of his sin. Those Scriptures tell us that he was to return to what he was taken from and what he already was - dust. “Dust thou art.”

Let us consider Adam being forbidden to put forth his hand to partake of the tree of life and live for ever and its connection with the 16th to 19th verses. We believe that it was a literal tree like the others, or there would have been no figure of a higher significance. First natural, then spiritual. This tree was not debarred from Adam. Here are a few scriptural examples of the higher significance of the tree of life; “She (wisdom, God) is a tree of life to them that lay hold on her, and happy is everyone that retaineth her” (Proverbs 3:18). Read verses 13 to 26; Ezekiel 47:7 and 12, Eden restored, Revelation 22:2 and 14. We believe Adam partook of this tree all the while he was obedient and if he had remained obedient God would have made him incorruptible in harmony with His just attributes. As a natural man Adam had to

retain his hold and that he must have had a period of being retained. That period was his natural life. If there was no period his putting under law as a natural man would have had no force. There had been an end of probation in order to reap the fruits of probation. The words “Lest he put forth his hand... and live for ever” proves the possibility of living for ever. What would be the principle by which he would be allowed to live for ever if allowed to remain in Eden? He could again have partaken of the tree of life, literal and spiritual, and had he remained obedient God would have rewarded him finally with incorruptibility on the same principles as his first probation, which would only be in accordance with a just God. But God would not have Adam attain to life eternal upon the same principle in Eden. That is, God would not allow him to work out his salvation in Eden after having sinned in Eden. After he was driven out the way of the tree of life was kept with flaming swords- It is kept today in the higher significance. “No man cometh unto the Father but by me,” John 14:6. Imagine Adam living in Eden after sin had entered by him. Eden was the paradise of God and is to be restored, but none can enter the antitypical Eden who have not fulfilled God’s conditions. Adam and his posterity could not live in the paradise of God (literal Eden) after sin entered because the debt had to be paid. Why, it would be like walking into the Holy of Holies without even wiping our boots. Had Adam been allowed to remain in Eden after transgression there would be no type of God’s plan of entering the antitypical Eden by faith and obedience. For Adam to return to the dust was not the sentence, because he had previously incurred the execution of the sentence, which was “in the day (B’Yom - literal day) that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die (Muth Temuth - violent death).

Though he incurred it he was spared from paying it. He was to return to the earth (via the natural channels) because he could not possibly, in God’s wisdom, work out his salvation in Eden after having sold himself to sin. This is the principle in accordance with God’s righteousness and justice that the conditions of entering the Eden that is to come must be complied with by Adam’s posterity during their natural existence outside Eden (no children were born in Eden, though Adam had been told previous to transgression to multiply. (Genesis 1:28). Genesis 3:16 and 19 brought in this just principle of God without necessitating any change of flesh to a dying nature to bring it about as a sentence, because Adam was a natural man before transgression- Paul says so, so why contradict him?

“Crucified through weakness”! In concluding this paragraph R.Roberts says that “Jesus was made in all things like unto His brethren, of Adam’s fallen stock, and finally crucified through weakness” (2 Corinthians 13:4).

This of course, on the assumption that the fall was a physical one, though he had previously contended in his own writings that the change was a moral one - relationship. Jesus did not bring any sorrow, etc. upon Himself - it was wicked men. His crying was not for Himself, but for others.

What was the weakness through which he was crucified? He was crucified through OUR weakness. It was all for us as Isaiah 53 proves and not for Himself. He was made strong for us (Psalm 80:15-17). He was the arm of the Lord extended through love (John 3; 16) He (Jesus) in love to God and us willingly laid down His life for Adam and all in him as the price paid for our redemption, so that our release from sin may be accomplished.

Page 7, paragraph 1 ~ “Free life is a myth.” We have already shown how Adam and Jesus received their life direct from God. This does not in any way suggest a different kind of flesh. All life is the same in the abstract, and the life of the flesh of Jesus which was in the blood was the same kind of life that Adam had, only fresh from the same fountain head - God. Adam, through sin, forfeited a life that was previously unforfeited. Jesus gave His life which was not forfeited to sin for the redemption of Adam and all in him. Could He have done this if He was not free to do it? Jesus came that we may have life (John 10). If He was in Adam He would have needed redemption Himself and therefore could not have been the price of release for those in bondage, being in the same condemnation.

Why do so many delude themselves with the idea that the term FREE LIFE teaches a different kind of life or flesh? We have never contended otherwise than that the term is restricted to the legal vocabulary. The literal words FREE LIFE are not in the Scriptures but is there anything more clearly taught? Could Jesus have bought us out of the common market place if the price He paid was not His own and free to pay it? Peter said: We are bought with a price and that price was the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb

without blemish and without spot (1 Peter 1:18,19) in which blood was the life that He received from His Father. Could Jesus have bought the "field" if He was not free? Who is the purchased possession - we or Christ? Why, we are. No one in Adam could redeem his brother (Psalm 49:7,8). (Emphatic Diaglott, Matthew 16:26). Therefore it was necessary for someone who was free to accomplish it. The supremacy of Jesus lay in the fact that He was the special begetting of the Father for this very purpose. The apostle said that he was Christ's free man (Galatians 5:1) only upon the principle that he was set free by Jesus, which could not have been the case if Jesus was in bondage with him. Jesus said the children were free (Matthew 17:26).

We draw your attention to an incident recorded in John 8. Jesus said to certain Jews: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (Jesus was the way, the truth and the life). What was their answer to this? Verse 33, "They answered Him, We are Abraham's seed and were never in bondage to any man," etc. Why were they in bondage through Abraham's seed? Why was it necessary for them to know the truth to be free? Why, because they Judged after the flesh. That was the enigma to the Jew. They could not understand the Gentile having part in the promise which was by faith and not by fleshly descent. (See Galatians 5:1; Romans 8:1 regarding freedom from condemnation).

On page 6, paragraph 3 R.Roberts says, "I will only use those Psalms which are quoted by the Spirit in the apostles as applicable to the Lord Jesus Christ and belonging to him." Then on page 9, paragraph 2 he uses the testimony of Jesus of the Psalms concerning Him as though every Psalm he (R.Roberts) has selected are the ones concerning Jesus without question. Consider Psalm 40:12, ask yourself the question as to whether this Psalm is applicable to Christ. Why, it is deplorable. Note how R.Roberts applies "mine iniquities." Jesus had none and the only way He could have any was in the manner R.Roberts describes in his brackets ("the iniquities of His brethren laid upon Him in their effects"). See Dr. Thomas; same, "Echoes of Past Controversies," page 41. Read Isaiah 53 and note the "WE," "OUR," etc, but not "for Himself." Jesus needed deliverance from the natural order as Adam did prior to transgression, but Jesus did not need redemption. Adam needed both redemption and deliverance after sinning.

Page 8, paragraph 1 - "Because of thine indignation and thy wrath..." What? Did God have indignation and wrath against Jesus? Pitiably delusion"! God has this against sin or transgression of law (1 John 3:4), not against the nature (flesh and blood) which He created. God was well pleased with Jesus, not wrathful. If Jesus did not have a life free from sin's claim and a free will to lay it down there would be no virtue in His loving obedience. God's wrath and indignation are against sin and sinners and nothing else; and Jesus having no sin had no wrath or indignation of God against Him. If you prefer to call God's love a giving Him "wrath" you are free to do so - God will not stop you. Hear H.Fry in "Echoes of Past Controversies," pages 59,60, "Make His death a penalty due to Him personally and you destroy both aspects of His loving obedience, for there can be no virtue whatever in submitting to a penalty legally due to oneself." This is perfectly true and Oh that it was preached, and not a condemned Saviour! He bore our sins, not His own. In Him is no sin (1 John 3:5). To contend that the sacrifice of Jesus was necessary to cleanse or purify His nature is to contend for something that is foreign to Scripture. Where is it found in the Scriptures? We do not read of clean nor unclean flesh in the Scriptures. Search and see. It is always to be understood in the legal or moral sense and not the physical. Every sacrifice in God's book is positively enjoined for a conscience cleansing. There is nothing unclean of itself (Romans 14:14). "To the pure all things are pure" (Titus 1:15). "Call no man common or unclean" (Acts 10:15,28) Jesus said, "Ye are clean (John 15:3) "but not all" (John 13). Does this Scripture refer to their flesh or their moral relationship? Listen to Dr.Thomas, "Passing through the grave cleanses no one. They who emerge thence come forth with the same nature they carried into it and therefore their coming forth is a resurrection" (Eureka, Volume 3, page 587). On the Doctor's own reasoning then, if Jesus was condemned nature going into the grave, then He was condemned nature coming from it, if condemnation is physical. R.Roberts contradicts the Doctor, we know, and further says: "If any other Jew was obedient, it would have been in his power by dying to cleanse himself from Adamic condemnation" ("Echoes of Past Controversies," Page 52). This flatly contradicts the Doctor and more so, the Scriptures.

The most important fact has been ignored, viz., that the miraculous birth of Jesus was essential to produce one who could pay sin's claim before resurrection was possible. No Jew born of the will of the flesh could possibly do this, being born in Adamic relationship, which relationship, if continued in till natural death takes place, will mean the individual's perishing and not sleep. This is the condemnation

passed upon all men, which condemnation is removed in God's just manner without any physical change at baptism (Romans 8:1). God was the only one who could bring about the production of such an one. His own arm brought salvation (Isaiah 59:16). He gave Jesus through love and unless Jesus had been free legally from condemnation He would not have been a fit person for the sacrifice. Besides, if Jesus needed to purify Himself, then sacrifice would be a term of little understanding. He gave up all that He then possessed, the life of His flesh which was in the blood, for us. If He received the same life back it would have been merely a loan, thereby violating the term SACRIFICE. He was put to death in flesh, and quickened in spirit (1 Peter 3:18). If Jesus was constituted a sinner in Adam, He could not be the head into which we can be inducted. In that case He would need induction Himself! We believe, as the Doctor did, that Jesus had the same flesh after resurrection as before crucifixion, but we add, no blood. If flesh can only be purified by passing through the grave, we ask, why will the living not die who are alive at Christ's coming? R.Roberts says, "Free life is a thing you do not read of in the Scriptures." We agree with him; neither is Adamic condemnation, nor, "Jesus had to die to cleanse His nature;" nor, "Jesus was in the loins of Adam;" nor, "He was constituted a sinner in Adam," etc.

R.Roberts says, "Free life is a mere invention, a plausible thing, an unproved assumption which is made the starting point of the train of reasoning by which it is attempted to establish this heresy. If the initial fallacy is taken for granted, the false conclusion comes with all the appearance of irresistible logic. But let the initial fallacy be perceived and the whole argument falls to pieces like a rope of sand."

We ourselves say the same thing. If the initial fallacy of changed flesh be perceived the whole argument of Christadelphian physical condemnation falls to pieces like a rope of sand. We thank God that we have seen the initial Christadelphian fallacy of physical condemnation which involves the Lord Jesus Christ as a polluted sacrifice and are now built upon a rock, not sand, and can withstand (not pigeonhole) all the fallacies that can be hurled against it.

Page 8, paragraph 2 - "First, it is a fallacy to speak of life as distinct from nature." Further down R.Roberts says, "It was a body that was prepared for sacrifice, not a life." "It was death and not life that was required for the putting away of sin."

Well, why all this vivisection? What is the use of one without the other? Was it the "body" of Jesus that was the equivalent ransom price? If so, then the price was not paid. Or the life of His flesh which was in the blood which He did give? We agree with R.Roberts that life is an abstract principle and we also realize the necessity of discrimination, which discrimination can only be perceived through unbiased thoughts and reasoning. It would be wrong to say that Jesus derived His life from Adam. That would involve His being born of the will of the flesh. Roberts says on page 6 that "Adam was produced a mechanism of natural life." But he cannot deny that that natural body received its life direct from God. (I don't suggest that he did deny this). "God formed man... and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul" (Genesis 2:7). It was from God that Adam received that life. Now compare the Spirit's testimony in Luke 1:

"And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Was not the receiving of life direct from God in both cases, Adam and Jesus? (And Dr. Thomas says so in "Phanerosis" pages 34 and 38). Could Jesus be the only begotten of the Father if He received His life via Adam? If He could, why this special miracle? Adam and Jesus received life in such a special sense as no others did. Life is the same in general with all creation. The only difference is in the mode of manifestation. Natural life is manifested in a natural body; eternal life in an incorruptible body. "Life is more than meat and the body more than raiment" (Matthew 6:25). One is of no use without the other.

We believe that life covers the whole idea of existence; yet the importance is in the life. The life that Jesus received from God was not a different kind of life, but a supply fresh from the same fountain of life. That life was the life of His flesh, which was manifested in an organism capable of corrupting like our own, but God did not suffer Him to corrupt (Psalm 16:10). That life He laid down (John 10:11,15). The life He now has was from the same fountain, but manifested in an incorruptible body.

When we consider the sacrifice of Christ we consider the life of His flesh, or otherwise sacrifice is a farce. Such a life was requisite as an equivalent ransom of a life for a life. A life for a life was the principle that God laid down. That without the shedding of blood there is no remission (Hebrews 9:22), which principle is quite clear when the necessity of Christ's death by slaying is perceived- This life had to be free from condemnation. Life covers the whole existence. "For what is a man profited if he should gain the whole world and forfeit his life? Or what will a man give in ransom for his life?" (Matthew 16:26 - Emphatic Diaglott). "For what does it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his life? For what could a man give to redeem his life?" (Mark 12:27 - Emphatic Diaglott).

No mere man could redeem his brother; if he could, why the miraculous conception? God produced the life in Jesus to release Adam, and all in him, upon the principle that without the shedding of blood there was no remission (Hebrews 9:22). "The life of all flesh is in the blood, and it was the blood which made atonement or reconciliation" (Leviticus 17:11,14). Jesus gave His life (which was in the blood) a ransom for many (Matthew 20:28; I Timothy 2:6). Adam forfeited his life to sin, and if Jesus committed sin He would have done the same. But He did not; therefore He gave a life unforfeited to sin as the just, exact equivalent life for a life to effect the ransom and redeem His brother. Dr. Thomas had the right conception of this redemption and it is our basis of reasoning which removes all contradictory statements and proves God to be just. "Redemption means to buy back. Redemption is release for a ransom. All who become God's servants are released from a former lord by purchase. The purchaser is Jehovah. The price, or ransom price, the precious blood of Christ as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot." ("Eureka," volume 1, page 20, also "Phanerosis," footnote, page 59). "Now the life blood of Jesus was more precious than the life blood of any other man" (Ibid. 278). The death of Jesus would have been of no avail if the life blood was not free from Adam's race which sinned (federal principle, not individual transgression, being as yet unborn) in Adam. The blood, body and life of Jesus Christ as a sacrifice cannot be separated, as salvation could not be obtained apart from the principle of "without the shedding of blood there is no remission" (Hebrews 9:22). If we are wrong in using life in this manner, then you must charge Dr. Thomas as equally heretic with us.

Page 9, paragraph 3. We find R.Roberts again finding fault with phrases which he calls unscriptural jargon, because we say life was forfeited, and will end in eternal death. Here we remind you that the Doctor used these words, and R.Roberts uses the latter in the very same connection as we use it, and what is more, it is Scriptural (See Emphatic Diaglott quoted and R.V. for the word "forfeit"). Though the words 'eternal death' are not found in the Scriptures, who uses them more than Christadelphians from the following Scriptures - John 3:16; Romans 6:25; Revelation 20 (second death); Peter, eternal fire consumed, never see light, etc. Now Dr. Thomas: Eureka, volume 1, page 278, line 16; Elpis Israel, page 73, last line; "life forfeited for sin". "Their tenure of paradise was predicated upon their abstinence from sin, so that it could be forfeited only by transgression of law" (Clerical Theology, page 10). Also "Revealed Mystery" page 26, "God has set eternal life and eternal death before man," etc. The foregoing is merely to show how Christadelphians are unwilling to grant to others the latitude they desire for themselves.

Page 9, paragraph 4. R.Roberts says, "Adam's innocence ended with a fall, and here a little dazzle is thrown into the eyes." (He forgets the "dazzle" he throws himself. His dazzle after the fall is a change from a very good condition to a dying nature which, as we have already endeavoured to show, is not in accordance with Scripture). He says, "Instead of taking the simple testimony of Scripture that death came, you have it that your life was forfeited." (We correct R.Roberts here; E.Turney said "Adam's" life was forfeited"). We ask what is the difference between death came and life forfeited? There is no difference. The life that Adam forfeited was his own through sinning, the wages of which was death. Did not Adam incur this by disobedience of God's law? He did. But he did not pay it. He was typically forgiven, but his typical forgiveness does not alter the fact that death as the wages of sin entered. This just principle of God was in operation before transgression, as witness His warning to Adam as to disobeying Him: "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." That debt was paid by Jesus on Calvary. "God typically redeemed Adam with a paper note in Eden (shadow) but He laid down the golden sovereign on Calvary."

R.Roberts says, "You are asked to look at the third upright line in the renunciationist diagram as the debt which had to be paid." Can anyone prove that the debt to sin (which was death as wages) was paid

prior to Calvary? No; they cannot. If Adam paid it you would not be reading this and we would never have written it because it would have been final and we would have had no existence.

R.Roberts continues: “And by much more of such artificial unscriptural jargon you are argued into a conviction the very opposite of truth. Has it never occurred to the renunciationists that if eternal death, so called, was the debt to be paid, as they say (we do not say so), and Jesus paid the debt, that the resurrection of Jesus was impossible?” We reply, Has it not occurred to Christadelphians that the life that Jesus laid down in payment of that debt was the life of His flesh which was in the blood and that the life of His flesh that He laid down in sacrifice He received not again? Has it occurred to them that the life Jesus laid down as the redemption price of our souls (life) was precious, in that it could only be redeemed once and, as the Psalmist says, it ceaseth for ever? The life He laid down as the payment of that debt has ceased for ever, being put to death in flesh, quickened in spirit (1 Peter 3:18).

Regarding “death came” we ask, what death came as a sentence? Natural death? No. It was death as the wages of sin, which death is predicated upon a moral and not a physical constitution of things. The laws of nature operate irrespective of this; thus death as wages is something that must be earned (Romans 2:7). Therefore judicial. God’s law of death as the wages of sin is just. We read in Romans 5:12, “Therefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned.” (Margin - “in whom” - Adam). Here we have clearly stated that death came by sin. It most certainly did, because the wages of sin is death (Romans 6:23), but Adam, by God’s mercy, was spared from suffering the penalty as wages. How then, is this sentence affecting all in Adam who were not responsible for the committing of that sin? Are they counted as individually guilty of that sin of Adam’s because they were in his loins? No, they are not. They are all concluded under that sin; they were sold under sin (in Adam) (Romans 7:14) on the Federal Principle, which is legal and not physical.

When we realize that sin is never spoken of in Scripture other than of being transgression, which is disobedience of God’s law, which disobedience cannot take place before one is born, we can see the fallacy of applying Romans 5:12 to teach that man’s natural death is the wages of Adam’s sin. The sentence is that if we die in Adamic relationship our natural death will be eternal, because we will not rise. If we die unto Adamic relationship by reckoning ourselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, and continue in that state walking after the spirit) our natural death will be merely sleep. There we have the distinction between sleep and perish, though in both cases it is natural death via natural channels, as God set in motion in accordance with the natural law of a natural creation. First natural, then spiritual. The only death that has been passed upon all men in harmony with the attributes of a just God is death as the wages of sin. With sin God is displeased; with nature itself He is not. There is nothing unclean of itself. “Call no man common or unclean.” The wages that Adam incurred was paid by Christ. The just for the unjust (1 Peter 3:18). As the One act of Adam sold himself and all in him, so the one act of Jesus bought us back from sin’s claim. Read the seven fold divinely balanced antithesis of the two federal heads - Adam and Jesus - in Romans 5 (Emphatic Diaglott). Was it the obedient acts of Jesus that redeemed us? The obedient life of Jesus enabled Him to retain His right to life. The obedient act was the giving of His life blood as the price for the redemption of the sin of the world. Though His obedient life was necessary to retain His title to life this extra obedient act was necessary for our redemption. The obedient life of Jesus would not have saved us apart from His obedience to “even the death of the cross” (Philippians 2:8) because no one is free to enter upon the race of eternal life apart from being first redeemed. When a person accepts redemption he leaves Adam and becomes in Christ. There is now no condemnation (Romans 8:1). Is there any difference in the condemnation passed upon all men and the condemnation that is removed at baptism? It is the mixing up of the physical with the legal that sends so many earnest minds adrift. The believer dies unto sin symbolically in baptism, which removes the condemnation as Paul plainly says. If Romans 5:12 teaches that the natural death that all men die is the death passed upon all men, or the condemnation, please harmonise with Romans 8:1.

Page 10, paragraph 2, R.Roberts asks, “Now what is that condemnation?” We have just answered it and we emphatically say that if the condemnation is understood it is the key to the right understanding of the sacrifice of Christ. The right understanding of the condemnation removes the fallacy of having to contend that Christ was a physically polluted altar. R.Roberts says, “Is it against the nature or the life?” This paragraph is another example of vivisection in an endeavour to prove condemnation of nature. We repeat that we believe life to cover the whole idea of existence. Can the body be condemned without the life,

mind, strength or blood? Man is exactly what God made him and no theorizing can alter the fact. God has not condemned that nature, but sin which is a moral act. Every sin a man doeth is without the body (1 Corinthians 6:18). The sentence that Adam incurred was for sin and that sentence was not against the nature He created from the dust. It is only sin that will cause anyone to return to dust eternally, that is, the unworthy walker.

There is no need of R.Roberts' vivisection because a condemned man loses his all when he loses his life. For R.Roberts to say that it is not the life that is condemned is like saying that God has condemned something that is inanimate, because flesh is inanimate without life. He says further: "It is the person, the individual, the nature that is condemned because it was the person Adam that was the sinner." Exclude life from the person and explain how Adam sinned. For God to condemn our nature apart from transgression is to charge God with lashing man for his inevitable movements and then asking man to obey Him!" (R.Roberts subtly is in this statement that nature is equivalent to the person). R.Roberts continues, "Condemnation in Adam means, therefore, that we are mortal in Adam; mortal in the physical constitution - the organization." We ask the question here, if the term mortal predicates another kind of flesh, please define the term corruptible and explain the physical difference? Mortal is a legal term (unfortunately it has become universally applied to the physical) and it is only connected with the physical because the physical man is necessary to carry that legality. It means a physical body legally dead to sin, as Paul explains; "Let not sin reign in your mortal (reckoned dead to sin) bodies" (Romans 6). For a believer to reckon himself dead to sin means quite the reverse to his natural body being under condemnation. It is restricted to the legal sphere entirely. Mortal being a scriptural term has an entirely legal application; it follows that none can be scripturally mortal who have not died to sin. Can any keep a body dead unto sin who have not died unto sin? Certainly not.

Again, on R.Roberts understanding of MORTAL being that the nature is condemned, he is bound to admit upon his own teaching of Jesus being raised mortal that He arose under condemnation! Think on these things and examine R.Roberts' and Christadelphian leaders' writings in general, for they are striking upon superficial reading, but will not stand against the truth of the stone being cut out of the mountain without hands. The animal world proves Dr. Thomas right when he said on more than one occasion that the order of creation would have gone to the dust if there had been no sin ("Elpis Israel" p. 42; "Eureka" v. 1 p. 248). This is equivalent to saying that the natural man would have returned to the dust in accordance with the laws peculiar to his organization before transgression.

R.Roberts continues: "Oh but we sinned in Adam (compare "Echoes of Past Controversies" page 32), says this theory. Did we sin in the individual sense in him? How could we sin individually when we did not exist? Paul says, No. He says death reigned over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."

He is here supporting what E.Turney contended for, viz., that we did not sin individually, because we did not exist. Have you examined the meaning of Paul's words quoted above? To sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression would be to sin wilfully by disobeying law. Not to sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression means to sin without law. Read Romans 5 where the passage appears verse 13, "For until the law, sin was in the world (Adamic sin); but sin is not imputed where there is no law (light is ground of condemnation)." Where death reigns it means that the individual perishes, because sin is not imputed to him as to his responsibility to resurrection. Here is conclusive proof of this - Romans 2:12. "For as many as have sinned without law, shall perish without law." (Read the whole chapter). The sin imputed and the sin not imputed must be discriminated between, as light and darkness. When death reigns it means that they are dead, it means that every individual who dies in Adamic relationship will remain in the grave; all who leave Adam (and they cannot leave Adam if the term IN ADAM were physically applied) and become in Christ, cease to be under the reign of death and have as the apostle John says, "passed from death unto life" (John 5:24), (while yet being natural beings).

R.Roberts concludes this paragraph, "It is in the physical substance that the principle of death is at work." We reply, Of course it is, but in accordance with natural law and not because of original sin. (Compare "Echoes of Past Controversies," page 99).

Page 10, paragraph 3. “Sin in the flesh.” We have somewhat to say upon this when we come to the place where R.Roberts says, “I will endeavour to make manifest the most unscriptural, the most carnal, and mischievous character of the new philosophy.” This sentence is not in the Greek Scriptures and R.Roberts will prove us right when we consider page 19.

Page 11, paragraph 2. “Death reigned from Adam to Moses.” We have considered this in the previous paragraph but we further point out the sentence was on the federal principle (legal) as the following verses show, that God concluded all under sin that He might have mercy on all (Romans 3:9,19; 11:32; Galatians 3:32). The sentence of condemnation is removed by the love of God, even more willingly than it was put on. God is not willing that any should perish (2 Peter 3:9). No son of Adam, nor himself, need have perished. God’s everlasting arms are ever open to eagerly receive all into His family by adoption that believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him by faith (Hebrews 11:6). “God so loved the world that He gave...” (John 3:16). He does not afflict willingly (Lamentations 3:33). The multitude of His mercies are ever present, as proven by the wonderful provision He has made, not only in the necessities of life, but in the provision of the redemption price for the sin of the world which all are concluded under by Scripture. If we make a covenant by the sacrifice (Psalm 50:5) of Jesus, the sentence of condemnation is removed (Romans 8:1). Instead of being sons of Adam on the federal principle, we are sons of God upon the same principle. We like the last sentence on this paragraph of R-Roberts, “though not without the light of hope through faith.”

Page 11, paragraph 3. “Not of works lest any man should boast.” How great a statement this is. “By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified” (Romans 3:20). This ought to make those think who believe that Jesus was justified by the law. It is faith in the spirit of the law that makes a man honourable in God’s sight. Now, what was the first requisite to be recognized in the spirit of the Law of Moses? Why, redemption, as was typically shown in the shadows or ordinances of the law. This redemption law has ever been the basis of reconciliation. “Without the shedding of blood there is no remission” (Hebrews 9:22). All need the redemption that is of God in Christ Jesus before they can embark upon the road for eternal life as adopted sons and daughters.

Page 11, paragraph 4. “This law condemned to death all who disobeyed it in the meanest particular.” The deduction from this is that they all ought to have been stoned or burned. We ask, On what authority did R.Roberts say this? This is a grateful refuge for those who wish to excuse themselves upon the original sin basis. We have no hesitation in saying that this excuse gives a liberty in crime and is blasphemy against the God of Heaven. Fancy a Just God asking them to keep that which they could not possibly keep because of their sinful flesh nature inherited from Adam and then punish them for not keeping it! God has not put any trial or temptation upon us that we are unable to bear (1 Corinthians 10:13). We thank God for this truth. R.Roberts should draw a distinction between keeping the letter of the law and the spirit of the law. Men of faith went beyond the literal letter of the law. If he confines his meanest particular to the righteousness which was of the law, then we remind the reader that Paul in this respect was blameless. Paul went about persecuting those of the sect of the Nazarenes, thinking he was doing God a service. Had he understood the spirit of the law he would not have done so.

Page 11, paragraph 4. “This do and thou shalt live,” etc. We have previously commented upon this. This is the fallacy of justification by works of law. What did Jesus say to the Pharisees who kept the letter of the law? What was His complaint against them? His complaint against them was that they left out the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, faith (Matthew 23:3,23; Romans 9:32). “Wherefore they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law.” We see here the two phases of justification; first by redemption, by faith through grace, Ephesians 2:8; secondly, by works of faith (faithful walk). Faith without works (of faith, not of the mere letter) is dead (Romans 4; James 2:20 to end).

R.Roberts’ reference to the certain rich ruler does not go far enough. Most certainly Jesus did say, “Do this and thou shalt live,” but what was the rich young ruler’s response to Jesus’ advice to sell all that he had to show in a practical manner his love to his neighbour by keeping the spirit of the law? He was sorrowful, yes, and the keeping of the mere letter of the law can only end in sorrow. The statement that the law given was unto life is quite true, as R.Roberts says, “If they kept it” but it must be the spirit of the law as well as the letter, as Jesus said, “This do, and not leave the other undone.” “Love is the fulfilling of the law.” (Romans 13:10).

We ask here about the other portion of Romans 7:10 that was left out, viz., “The commandment that was ordained to life, and found to be unto death.” Why did Paul find a commandment that was ordained to life to be unto death? Was it because no flesh could keep it? If no flesh could keep it, how did Jesus, who was flesh, keep it? Think on these things. The law, as Paul says, “I would not have known sin if the law had not said Thou shalt not” etc. It made all guilty before God because federally operative and stopped every mouth which would speak against it, it being a JUST law and prevented everyone from establishing one’s own righteousness- Did not the law itself (in the ordinances) portray redemption? Did not the law, in the spirit of it and the letter, command all to be dead to sin? Paul says, “I, through the law, am dead to the law” Galatians 2:19). Paul found the law to be unto death on the federal principle, viz., that the very ordinances of the law portrayed the sacrifice that was to be made by Christ as the price of redemption from the sin that all were concluded under. Hence even those under the law were in need of that redemption, which redemption, when accepted, required the individual to be dead unto sin. If wilfully disobedient after accepting redemption the spirit of the law was still unto death (second death) though ordained to life.

That the Jews under the law were in need of redemption is proven by the Scripture which says that Jesus was born under the law to redeem under the law (Galatians 4:5). The foregoing is the law that was ordained to life being found by Paul to be unto death in its spiritual application, which application R.Roberts is silent upon, being content to confine his argument to physical death which we will now consider under the heading of “The Law in its Literal Application.”

Paul says that the law was a ministration of death (2 Corinthians 3:7). This is true in its spiritual application and also true in its practical application of the literal law. The literal law condemned to death the transgressor of it. But what was the manner in which the Jews kept the letter of the law? Did they keep it because it was their heartfelt desire to do so, or to save their necks? They could have kept the law in a feeling of boredom so long as they could avoid the penalty of not doing so falling upon them. (Read Galatians 3:12) “And the law is not of faith, but, the man that doeth them (the works) shall live in them.” The law itself was not of faith, but faith had to be exhibited in the law, therefore, those who kept the letter (doeth them) would save their necks by so doing. Well could the apostle say, “They sought it not by faith” (Romans 9:32). The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life (2 Corinthians 3:6) and this irrespective of this so-called physical condemnation.

Page 12, paragraph 2. We have already touched upon the righteousness of one and how the one act was the price of our release or redemption, also of the obedient life of Jesus apart from this one act (though also an act of obedience). John 15:10 shows that Jesus kept God’s commandments and therefore remained or abided in God’s love. We have also considered free life, which R.Roberts has completely misrepresented as E.Turney never contended for free life in the manner that R.Roberts accuses him of doing, as we will have occasion to point out later. We have also considered the incapability of flesh to keep the law, an assertion that is not found in Scripture. We wish to state here that Jesus was in flesh and He kept the law in both the spirit and the letter. He said on one occasion, “Ye have heard that it was said of them of old time. Thou shalt not kill. But I say unto you, whosoever is angry with his brother,” etc. (Matthew 5:21,22). This is the spirit of the law. Love is the fulfilling of the law and Jesus kept it. (This statement is proleptic – Love was the inciting factor upon which the law runs. Love was the incentive to introduce the law - without which the law had never been introduced). How, then, was flesh unable to keep it? Let me refer you back to page 11 of R.Roberts’ book - “The commandment (speaking of the law) was ordained to life. Does that mean eternal life? Yes.” Then he refers to a certain lawyer and concludes the paragraph by saying “The law was ordained to life, if they kept it.” How does this apply to Jesus on R.Roberts’ own reasoning? Did not Jesus earn eternal life by keeping the law, letter and spirit, apart from the one act necessary for our redemption? If He did not, then the law, which was holy, just and good, appears to be a worthless thing! It is by faith, operating through love, which is the complete fulfilment of the law and we repeat that if Jesus had not been produced by God but was born of the will of the flesh, which is the same as being described as “in Adam’s loins,” His obedience would have only benefited Himself, because in that case He could not have been the saviour of the world. Had He not been begotten of God He would not have been without spot and would not have been a pure offering to buy back. Redemption, justification by the grace of God must be the first requisite, or the Scriptures will be nullified

which say “Not by works, but by grace through faith,” and this applied to Jesus. Cornelius is a striking example of this.

R.Roberts continues, “God will keep no man in the grave because of Adam’s sin if he himself is individually righteous.” We reply, man does not go to the grave because of Adam’s sin. Man goes to the grave because he is of corruptible organization (natural) as God made him. Every man shall suffer for his own sin, be it violation of natural law (sinneth against his own body) or spiritual law. What will keep him in the grave will be his dying in Adamic relationship. Perish without law (to God) showing God’s just principle of free will without physical shackling. We most certainly agree that God will keep no man in the grave if he himself be individually righteous but his righteousness must be God’s righteousness that is by faith.

R.Roberts proceeds, “How came it then, that life could not come by the law as Paul says in the 3rd chapter of Galatians at the 21st verse: ‘Is the law then against the promise of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.’ He then gives Romans 8:3 as the spirit’s answer to show why the law could not give life and further down repeats his oft used phrase of the incapability of the flesh to keep it and at the same time holds that Jesus came in flesh (sinful flesh at that) to keep it! He merely says that the law could not give life because no one was able to keep it, which is equivalent to saying that there was no eternal life in the law, after himself agreeing that the law was ordained to eternal life. If no one kept the law then no one under the law will have eternal life. In that case, what about the worthies of Hebrews 11? What R.Roberts has omitted to explain (probably because it is in opposition to his argument) is the true Scriptural reason why the actual law itself would not give life. It is faith in what the law prefigured that gave life, not the law itself. The law itself was not of faith. If it was, how could the Scriptures say that faith cometh by hearing the word of God (Romans 10:17)? The law was given, but faith had to be exhibited in that law given. Did it ever occur to R.Roberts, or has it ever occurred to Christadelphians that if the law itself gave life the Jews were born into the kingdom of God? You may probably stare at this statement but it is the teaching of Scripture, which was Paul’s argument against the Jews who boasted in Moses’ law, as he says, “For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.” It was an enigma to the Jew that the Gentile should have a part in the promise. Paul says, “Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid.” The law was holy, just and good, and what is holy, just and good cannot be in opposition to the promises of God- But the promise was of faith. Therefore the literal law prefigured that wherein faith was to be exhibited, viz., the sacrifice of Jesus as the price of man’s redemption. Jesus did not take the law away, nailing it to His cross in its entirety. The spirit of the law (which was faith in the law) is as much in operation to-day as ever it was. What was blotted out was the handwriting of ordinances (Colossians 2:14). These ordinances or shadows were not required when Jesus who was the substance of them, paid the price that they foreshadowed, on Calvary. Eternal life was acquired in the law before Jesus was born, being provisional, which sets aside R.Roberts’ dazzle regarding the incapability of the flesh to keep it.

R.Roberts’ application of Romans 8:3 “What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh” is not the spirit’s answer nor the supporting of his theory of physical condemnation. What support does he find for his theory in this passage when he believes that Jesus came under the same physical condemnation? On this reasoning the law could have produced such an one.

It amounts to this; R.Roberts wants two Christs, viz., a morally sinless one and a physically condemned one. In other words, a black and white shield to hide behind to produce a black or white Christ when it suits him to do so.

What the law could not do was to produce one free from Adamic relationship that is legally free, by not being born of the will of the flesh, though of the same nature, thereby being not among the all concluded under sin. (More on this when we consider page 19).

R.Roberts uses the occasion of the disciples falling asleep in the garden of Gethsemane to support his argument. “The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak” (Matthew 26:41). He does not seem to desire to discriminate between natural physical exhaustion and condemned nature. There is the teaching of first natural then spiritual in this incident, viz., keep spiritually awake as a natural man. Concluding the

paragraph R.Roberts says, "This is the teaching of the word, and the teaching of God's word is decisive in such matters." We are quite agreed and rejoice in the fact that the teaching of God's word is decisive in such matters, but reject R.Roberts' interpretation of God's teaching. Where does God teach that nature is an unclean thing and physically condemned? Can he produce a passage of Scripture of the spirit's teaching in opposition to this - "There is nothing unclean of itself"? Read honestly; search and see.

Page 12, paragraph 3. This paragraph contains some very important Scripture, but R.Roberts lacks the necessary discrimination none the less. He asks, "Could not God have made human nature after such a pattern or constitution that it would have been able to keep the law? Doubtless He could. Why did He not?" Then he gives the reason of God not so making human nature as follows: "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise of faith by Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe" (Galatians 3:22). Here he is charging God with making human nature upon such a pattern or constitution that it could not possibly keep the law and at the same time asking man to obey Him. He says, "Our wisdom lies in simply seeing and accepting it." Have we to simply see and accept what is not to be found in the Scriptures? R.Roberts is asking us to accept that God made human nature of such a pattern or constitution that it could not possibly keep His law. Did R.Roberts ever reject free will? No, he always preached it, because it would be unscriptural to do otherwise. Here he is repudiating his own teaching to uphold physical condemnation. Did not Adam have a free will to obey or disobey in the nature God created? Certainly he did. Assuming that there was a physical change after transgression, has that change deprived man of free will? Why, the very Scriptures deny it. What does R.Roberts' reasoning amount to in accordance with his quotation of Galatians 3:22? This - that God raised up His only begotten Son to pay the penalty for what Adam, nor any other person could not have avoided - human nature. And he asks us to accept that all are concluded under a sin which could not possibly be avoided owing to God's wisdom in creating man of a nature that could not keep His law that the promise of faith by Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. Believe what? That God gave Jesus to suffer for what man could not avoid, or that He gave Jesus as the just for the unjust? We have shown that the law could be and was kept both in letter and spirit. God has not asked anyone to do what was impossible. Proof: "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able," etc. (1 Corinthians 10:13).

In Galatians 5 we read a list of the works of the flesh, and this is the spirit's list or teaching. We ask, can you place your finger upon one of the works mentioned there that cannot be avoided? Flee this delusion of "sinful flesh as a physical fixation" because it is built upon sand and needs the advocates of it to go to the very extreme of confusion to uphold, yes, to the very extreme of using the only begotten of the Father as a prop to support it and then knock the prop away when considering His moral freedom from sin. Be fully persuaded in your minds as to what is the scriptural definition of sin and you have the truth in its simplicity as to the record "in Him is no sin" (1 John 3:5). Galatians 3:22; Romans 3:19; and 11:32, prove conclusively that we are concluded under sin on the federal principle. The one sin of Adam brought upon him and all in him, a legal condemnation so that faith must be exhibited in God's loving and merciful provision of the ransom, not that we physically suffer for that one sin. It is imputed to all in Adam upon the same principle (which is just) that we are made righteous in Christ by faith in the one obedient act of shedding His blood, namely, legal (Romans 5 & 8:1). If we are all concluded physically under sin, then why are we not made physically righteous at baptism? Oh, says Christadelphianism, that occurs at resurrection. Well, in that case, the condemnation is not removed until resurrection, thereby making the spirit word of Romans 8:1 a lie. Perceive the double dealing (and contradiction - "Echoes of Past Controversies" - Dr.Thomas, page 48 and R.R., page 52) that has to be resorted to here. They are not prepared to accept the spirit's teaching that there is now no condemnation which proves conclusively that the condemnation is legal, but must contend that man must pass through the grave to be physically cleansed or purified from sin, thereby involving Jesus in such an absurdity as this - "In Him is no sin, but in Him was sin." Two condemnations in the face of the Spirit's declaration that there is only one, and that one God is more than pleased to remove now, while we are yet corruptible beings. Well may R.Roberts quote the Spirit's words "That He might have mercy on all," but what a God-dishonouring foundation he gives for quoting it. He quotes. "That no flesh should glory in His sight" (1 Corinthians 1:29). "Not of works, lest any man should boast" (Ephesians 2:9). Why doesn't he quote it upon a true foundation? The law prevented anyone being righteous in his own eyes. It made all conscious of sin as Paul says. Why did it stop every mouth and make all guilty before God? Simply because there was one thing requisite before works of righteousness could commence - and that was redemption, which redemption was as efficacious

before the antitypical ransom price was paid as after, being prefigured in the ordinances which was to be recognized before the spirit of the law could be kept. The mere works of the law (merely keeping the letter of the ordinances) justified no one. "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (Romans 3:20).

Christadelphians agree that morality is of no avail apart from belief and baptism, and so it was with the mere keeping of the letter of the law. The righteousness which was of the law justified no one, but the righteousness which is of faith does, though it had to be exhibited in the same law. We go one further than Christadelphians and say that if redemption be not recognized as the first requisite, baptism and works will be of no avail, because no one can commence works of righteousness who has not recognized God's redemption by Christ has made him legally free to do so.

R.Roberts continues: "The spirit and essence of the plan of God's redemption in Christ is that praise and glory may be to Him, and that no flesh should glory in His presence" etc. This is what we are contending for. R.Roberts is here supporting our contention, viz., that the redemption is God's, that God provided it, that flesh could not glory in His presence by providing it. We have pleasure here in quoting one of the leading Christadelphian advocates of to-day, Islip Collyer, in his book, "The Meaning of Sacrifice," here he says "Christ was begotten, not of the will of the flesh, but by the power of the Highest, the Holy Spirit of God. Human flesh was thus rejected as unable to effect any redemption." This proves the fact that had Jesus been in the loins of Adam He could not have been able to effect redemption; hence Jesus being produced by God, and in flesh, is evidence of proof of the statement that no flesh should glory in His presence has to do with His mode of production. It also proves the legal aspect of the condemnation. Jesus was Son of God from His conception (see Luke 1) "That holy thing that shall be born of thee."

Jesus was in flesh when He accomplished the ransom, as it could not be accomplished otherwise owing to the laying down of His life (the life of His flesh which was in the blood) being the equivalent of a life for a life. To say that Jesus was given extra power to accomplish this makes God unjust. What is the force of His being made in all points like unto His brethren if He were given extra power to overcome? It makes overcoming a farce. Jesus' power to do this lay in the fact that He was free from the sin of Adam that all were concluded under. His miraculous conception and His desire at all times to do His Father's will. Therefore, none but He could redeem His brother (Dr.Thomas, "Eureka," vol. 1, page 278).

Page 13, paragraph 1. R.Roberts says, "The highest delight of created beings is the recognition and adoration of the eternal prerogative of God." No one can more approve of this statement than we. The eternal prerogative of God we have endeavoured to show in the just method of the all-important understanding of the sacrifice of Christ. God's eternal prerogative we lovingly admit and, as R.Roberts says on page 12, paragraph 3, "Our wisdom lies in seeing and accepting it," but to accept God's prerogative and at the same time contend for what is not in harmony with His justice is a charge that we will ever endeavour to avoid. R.Roberts continues. "I give you the Father's own declaration of the Father's mind instead of condescending like the lecturer last night to quote heathen poets and the doctors of the apostasy." In reply we agree that E.Turney quoted heathen poets and the doctors of the apostasy and we say that E.Turney could very well have omitted them from his remarks, because heathen poets were not what he relied upon. Christadelphians, including R.Roberts and Dr.Thomas, have resorted to the very same thing. We are not saying this to excuse E.Turney but to suggest that they both (E.Turney and Christadelphians) found some truth in the heathen poets. It is a weak argument of R.Roberts to refer to it. Be it remembered that our beloved apostle Paul used the heathen poets wherein they were true (Acts 17:28; Titus 1:12). This appears that R.Roberts' complaint extended against Paul. Really, it was an attempt to belittle E.Turney (one of those things that R.Roberts always excused himself for afterwards because of the weakness of the flesh) yet he refused to debate the matter out with E.Turney for three or four nights or as long as he desired.

Page 13, paragraph 2. "But now is the righteousness of God manifested without the law." We would remind the reader that life in the blood is the ransom price, not the obedient acts under law. This is where the price of redemption is changed by Christadelphians. Works of law alone saved no one. The righteousness of God was manifested without the law in that the ordinances were not required, Jesus being the substance of them. Though He was the fulfilment of what the ordinances portrayed, He also fulfilled the spirit of the law, thereby manifesting the righteousness of God. We agree that He was subject to the

law owing to His mother being a Jewess of the line of David, but the fallacy of R.Roberts' reasoning lies in his assumed physical condemnation. All under the law were legally condemned in Adam until they saw the redemption prefigured in the law and upon seeing it and recognizing it, obeying the spirit of the ordinances. None under the law or outside the law were physically condemned. Therefore for Jesus to be the seed of Abraham and of David (in the female line) does not make Him physically condemned but more clearly demonstrates that the condemnation is legal. We will endeavour to demonstrate this from the Scriptures under three headings, viz., THE SEED OF ABRAHAM, as Paul scripturally demonstrates in harmony with the arguments of Jesus to the Jews; THE GENEALOGIES OF MATTHEW & LUKE; and THE SEED OF THE WOMAN.

Page 13, paragraph 3. "The object of Jesus being made under the law was that He might be under its curse." We reply, if Jesus died under the curse of the law He was a sinner. And the Scriptures and R.Roberts say that He was spotless. He was made a curse for us, not that He was under the curse (Galatians 3:10). He was made a curse at the same time that He was made a sin offering for us, viz., at 33 years of age, not at birth. Imagine the shadow cursing the substance. What does the apostle mean when he says "For as many as are under the law are under the curse? Does he merely restrict it to the transgressing of the law in its practical application? No. He goes beyond that. The spirit of the law as portrayed in the letter of it concluded all under the sin of Adam. Therefore the spirit of the law cursed all as in Adamic relationship on the federal principle and this curse had to be removed by the individual under the law before Christ appeared by recognizing the redemption that was prefigured. He was then in the position of being provisionally freed. The fallacy of applying the curse of the law to the literal application of it regarding the individual transgressor lies in the fact that it is only applied to the operation of the letter. But Paul clears away this fallacy in his exposition relating to himself. We quote as follows from the Emphatic Diaglott on Galatians 2:19, "Besides, I through the law, died by law, so that I might live by God." In what sense did Paul die by law? Physically? Absurd. The curse of the law concluded all under sin. Hence it was the ministration of death on the federal principle as well as in its literal application to the actual transgressor of its letter. Paul in writing on these things did not dwell on the letter (he had done that previously, thinking he was doing God service). Hence he could say that the law that was ordained to life he found to be unto death. Death unto sin. When we, like Paul, have died unto sin, the curse is removed, having been baptized into the death that removed the curse. Hence the glorious harmony between Paul's words concerning himself in Galatians 2:19 and Romans 8:1.

For the benefit of readers who do not know what the "joke" was that R.Roberts says was attempted last night we will explain. But first of all why is this supposed joke not explained by R.Roberts here? Perhaps he realized that it was no joke at all? But we leave that to the reader to judge when we quote it. It is indeed a pity that so few have made themselves acquainted with E.Turney's lecture so as to be enabled to see whether R.Roberts is combating what E.Turney did contend for. The following is the joke: J.J.Andrew wrote in "Jesus Christ and Him Crucified" that Jesus broke the law (page 77, line 1, first edition) as follows: "He that is hanged is accursed of God. This was the one item of the law which was infringed by Jesus, and therefore He became obnoxious to its curse." The attempted joke in the opinion of R.Roberts was in the following reply of E.Turney to J.J.Andrew's statement: "It was necessary then for Jesus to do this, namely, to be guilty of the whole law to obey it." Well, if this is a joke, what is the statement that it was made in reply to? What was the impression that J.J.Andrew's statement made in the eyes of others which caused the statement to be omitted in the reprint? Study Deuteronomy 21:22 and Galatians 3:10-13 and see if you can make a transgressor of the law a type of the Lord Jesus who was without sin. If you can, you may succeed in making His hanging on the tree His breaking of the law. Listen to another eminent Christadelphian leader, "It does not necessarily follow that hanging on a tree was a breach of law. It does not say that. If it were so, the law would be broken and in that case it would place Christ in the same position as those who were guilty of all (James 2:10, H.Fry in "Echoes of Past Controversies," Page 102). The law cursed the transgressor and he was hung upon a tree afterwards. Jesus voluntarily laid down His life and took the curse of the law away, nailing it to His cross. What did He nail to His cross - the spirit of the law? No. The handwriting of ordinances (Colossians 2:14). Why? Because they prefigured Him as the substance that would remove the curse. He was put to death by wicked hands as a transgressor in their opinions. Therefore they meted out to Him the literal physical penalty as of a transgressor of the law. Because wicked men did it, is that proof that the law, which was holy, just and good, did it? It was as the apostle Peter says, and no theorising can alter it - "the just for the

unjust.” He removed the curse for all. If all do not accept the removal of the condemnation it does not alter the fact that the redemption price has been paid.

Jesus opened up a new and living way for all under the federal sin of Adam. “Behold the lamb of God that taketh away the sin (singular) of the world” (John 1:29). So that whosoever believeth in Him (as the ransom, through faith) should not perish but have everlasting life (John 3:16), as one sin came by man, and death (as wages) by sin, so life came by the one act of the man Christ Jesus (Romans 5:18,19). It was in love that Jesus laid down His life for us (Ephesians 5:25) and not because the law cursed Him to do it. The wages of sin is death by execution. This penalty Adam did not pay. Jesus paid it to redeem all who are under that penalty; Adam first and we, as in him on the federal principle. To say that the law cursed Jesus and also say that He voluntarily gave, is to contend for the absurdity of voluntary compulsion. (Is this another joke?). Jesus was obedient even to the death of the cross. He was cursed by sinners but never by God, nor His law.

Page 14, paragraph 3: “If Christ had refused to do that which was commanded, would not that have been sin?” etc. We can easily put in our ifs and buts, but in this case it does not support R.Roberts’ argument at all. The request of God to Jesus was not compulsion. Jesus knew that it was for this cause that He came into the world and to this end was He born. (John 18:37). We will now take R.Roberts upon his own ground. Has he not already agreed that the law was ordained to eternal life? Has he not agreed that if one kept it he would obtain eternal life? Yes. Well, did Jesus keep it both in letter and in Spirit? He did. Did He not then earn eternal life? Certainly He did. What did Jesus mean when He said “Unless a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it remaineth alone” (John 12:24)? Do we require any more plain teaching than this? Jesus was entitled to eternal life apart from His one great act of obedience which was for us. Were it not for His supreme act in dying there would have been no bringing forth much fruit, as we would be still in need of redemption. But R.Roberts is emphasizing the fact that it was a commandment and to break a commandment was to sin. We ask here, does God command every man to lay down his life as an extra command to obeying Him in a manner which He is pleased with? Was this command an element of the law which He kept perfectly? Don’t be dazzled by R.Roberts’ fine flourish of words. It was for us that He was obedient unto the death of the cross, wherein was God’s love manifested towards us in giving Him. When Jesus said, “If it be possible, let this cup pass from me” He knew that it was the Father’s will for it not to pass and also the reason why, but, what made Him utter the words “If it be possible” at all? Had He not wholly honoured His Father’s name in the earth? The apostle says, “God commendeth His love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” “But if it die it bringeth forth much fruit.” Surely, it is not a carnal mind that speaks thus. Why command Jesus to lay down His life if it was for Himself as much as any other man? Only Jesus could possibly receive that command because He was the only one produced for that very purpose. The law did not claim the life of Jesus because it cursed Him. Sin claimed the life of Adam for breach of law, and God, by being just in not making the law death being the wages of sin of none effect, raised up Jesus who willingly paid sin’s claim so that release from it may be made by just means. One sin. Of Adam; one act, of Jesus, not a multitude of obedient acts of a lifetime for one sin, but the shedding of His blood, though His obedient life was necessary before He could have been fit to accomplish this one act. God forgives a hundred and one worse sins than that of Adam.

The one sin of Adam was the means of the institution of God’s plan of salvation upon a just principle, which is solely of His own love and grace. Yes, Christ has made us free. If He was not free Himself, then the following Scripture would equally apply to Him - “While they promise them liberty (or freedom) they themselves are servants of corruption, for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage” (2 Peter 2:19). Thank God He was the Son of the free and could therefore, offer freedom to the captives of sin. R.Roberts says, “The law obtained the utmost triumph it could claim.” We have previously pointed out that the death of Christ was sin’s claim, not the law’s. Throughout the paragraph R.Roberts fails to discriminate between the righteousness which is of the law and the righteousness which is of God through faith. What righteousness was Christ the end of the law for? Why, the righteousness which was of the law, because He was the substance of what the law prefigured and, as R.Roberts quotes lower down, “ye are become dead to the law (ordinances of) by the body of Christ (the substance).

Page 15, paragraph 2. We have been dealing with one curse that R.Roberts laid to Jesus; now, in this paragraph we have another one laid upon Him - the hereditary curse of Adam - physical. This is another

invented phrase which is not found nor supported in the Scriptures. This physical condemnation is the root of all the controversy that has split the Christadelphian household and shaken it to its very foundations. We need not repeat again what sin is, as scripturally defined. R.Roberts has said in several of his writings, “How could sin be condemned in the body of Jesus if it wasn’t there? Impossible, we say. You cannot condemn a rat in a barrel if it isn’t there, but if it is there you can at least make it stoop and come out leaving its body intact. If corruption was the price of sin, Jesus did not pay that. He saw no corruption. R.Roberts’ quotation of Hebrews 2:14 here proves what we contend for, not what he contends for. Jesus destroyed him (sin personified – the devil), not that physical body. He destroyed sin that had the power of death, which would be eternal. That sin was the sin all are concluded under and He did not destroy it in His own flesh, but He had to be flesh to do it. The life of His flesh was what He laid down as the ransom price, not a body already physically condemned to remove that physical condemnation as Christadelphian logic would have it. Oh, the fallacy!

Page 15, paragraph 3. We have already dealt with the seed of Abraham and David and have scripturally proved how Jesus came in the female line. R.Roberts seems to see nothing in the seed of Abraham but the natural descent. Regarding his statement “What ground is there for the contradictory proposition that Jesus wore the nature of David, which was mortal (we say, corruptible) and was not Himself mortal?” We say emphatically that this is a gross misrepresentation of E.Turney’s contention. E.Turney suggests that the term mortal was a legal term (E.Turney’s, lecture, page 22). His usage of the term never contradicted the fact that Jesus was of the same nature as Abraham, David, or any other son of Adam. His death is proof of that. He was made of a woman for the suffering of death, but not of the will of the flesh. He received His life direct from God (Luke 1) though that life was not a different kind of life than ours. The only difference was that He received it direct from God and not via the will of the flesh. The only difference between Jesus and ourselves was legal. He had to be legally free to remove a legal condemnation. Made, physically, in all points like unto His brethren, yet without sin. Without sin in not being under the sin that all were included under, and also in that He did not sin. If the condemnation was physical, why a miraculous begetting of the same nature to remove it? The very fact of Jesus being of our nature and born of the spirit of God would be all sufficient to show that the condemnation was legal and to scatter the physical condemnation theory of a Just God physically shackling every individual, including Jesus, for a sin they did not themselves commit, to the four winds of Heaven. We have considered Christ being free and have produced the evidence. If He was not free in the manner we contend, not as R.Roberts misrepresents E.Turney as contending, then you make Him an imposter. Read Matthew 11:28; 17:26; John 1:14; 8:23,36; 10:10; Romans 8:1; Galatians 5:1.

Page 16, paragraph 2. “Free life is a myth - a mere invention. Its advocates do not prove the starting point.” That is exactly what E.Turney did do, viz., prove the starting point. We have also done the same throughout this review, viz., shown how it was necessary for Jesus to be legally free, to ransom those who were in legal bondage. If we contended for free life in the manner that R.Roberts tells his brethren, we agree that we could not prove the starting point. The whole book is a complete misrepresentation of what E.Turney taught, in order to bolster up the theory of a physically condemned Jesus. As we stated in our opening remarks, it was an easy matter for him to misrepresent E.Turney in writing a book, which he would not have had the opportunity to do in debate without making a very bad impression upon the audience. R.Roberts often asks, “Where is the proof?” We claim the same privilege and ask, where is the proof that Jesus was under the double curse - Adamic and Mosaic?

Page 16, paragraph 3. “This heresy represents God as doing wrong, for it says of Christ, the Lamb of God, Here is free life. If so, why should a free life die?” We have explained this enough to show that R.Roberts is continually beating the air in opposing a theory that the other side does not contend for. Have we not explained, as E.Turney explained in R.Roberts’ presence, that the life Jesus had in the days of His flesh was the same kind of life that anyone else has? Was it not the same life which He laid down on Calvary? Was not the life of His flesh that He laid down on Calvary the same life that God caused to come into existence by His Holy Spirit operating upon Mary? The statement regarding “this heresy represents God as doing wrong” is applicable to Christadelphianism who represents God as doing wrong by contending that He has poured out His wrath upon all Adam’s descendants and Jesus in physically condemning them before they are born, when God plainly tells us that His wrath is only against transgressors. Condemned nature - where is it in the Bible? Prove that it is there and your arguments will harmonize; other- wise yours is the rope of sand, not ours.

Page 17, paragraph 1. This paragraph proves our point that God has done what no son of Adam (Psalm 49) or any law could do. We have shown that the law was not weak through the flesh being physically condemned and also that those of flesh did keep it. The divine impress developed in the child Jesus who was separate (holy) from birth (Luke 1) but was not physically different from any other child. The fact that the power of the Highest caused the germination and formation of a child in nine months according to the ordinary gestatory period does not prove that He was the seed of David according to the flesh via the will of the flesh. It proves the exact opposite by the fact that the Holy Spirit was the cause. Just one question here - can you give one instance in animal life where the female supplies the life germ? No, you cannot. Hence God was His Father. He was born of Mary for the very purpose that we have pointed out, viz., that He could lay down the life of His flesh which was in the blood as the equivalent ransom price of what sin claimed. It has been argued thus: you cannot have blood without life; therefore the blood of Mary during the gestatory period supplied the life of Jesus. Ask yourself this question here; was not Adam created a natural man with all the natural organism including blood before God breathed into His nostrils the breath of life? There is no use in dividing things up with regard to the conception and birth of Jesus. It was all of God, so that He could be legally free and the only one legally free.

Page 17, paragraph 2. R.Roberts says, "I have not altered on this question." That is only his statement, yet he has made many others that flatly contradict what he is now contending for; yes, statements that are the very pith and marrow of our belief. But he has ever had to change his garb in order to uphold his condemned nature theory. He continues: "I cannot say as the leading champion of this heresy said, 'I have taught it for fifteen years from the platform without understanding it (Christadelphianism).'" "E.Turney, like Paul, had the courage of his own convictions. Paul was as zealous as any for a thing that was not true, but when he found that what he had believed and done, thinking he was doing God service, was untrue, he was not ashamed to change - yea, he was willing to stand alone if necessary. There is more honour in E.Turney's admission than in R.Roberts' boast that he has passed the investigation state and that it needed a long spiritual education to understand this question, which question is the first principle. Eden teaching the necessity of Calvary. Where is the simplicity that is in Christ? We feel very thankful that the free life theory has given us the freedom and liberty that is denied those who are bound by man-made constitutions which contradict Scripture and even the teachings in many respects of the leaders who have made them. R.Roberts in his opening remarks says. "This is a difficult question." It is a difficult question, we agree, if we have preconceived ideas that make it so. If we have no preconceived ideas (which have to conjure up something unscriptural when a difficulty presents itself) we can go to the Scriptures as babies with a child-like disposition, having that disposition we can attain to the knowledge of the truth, as Jesus said he that willeth to know the doctrine shall know (John 7:17). We ourselves have fought against this supposed heresy tooth and nail, but upon what understanding of it? Why, upon the interpretation given it by R.Roberts in the very book we are reviewing. We were ignorant of the truth of what this supposed heresy taught until we had the opportunity of reading E.Turney's lecture- We were then able to discern with -little difficulty that R.Roberts in "Slain Lamb" was grossly misrepresenting him.

Page 17, paragraph 3. R.Roberts says, "You have had the doctrine propounded to you that flesh is a good thing," etc. If you read E.Turney's lecture you will find that he contends in harmony with Scripture, viz., that flesh is not spoken of in the Bible as being clean nor unclean. The apostle says, "There is nothing unclean of itself" and "nothing" cannot be restricted to meats- R.Roberts and Dr. Thomas have said the same, but contradicted themselves to uphold their hyphenated "sin-in-the-flesh." We agree that flesh thinks and also add that it thinks good as well as evil. We can be spiritually minded, but that spiritual mindedness is the thinking of the same flesh brain. The ultimate difference between the two kinds of thought will be that the spiritual mind will manifest the things of the spirit and the carnal or fleshly mind the things (or works) of the flesh (Galatians 5). We read in the Scripture. "The good man out of the treasures of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and the evil man out of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh" (Luke 6:45). As a man thinks so is he (Proverbs 23:7; and as James says, "When lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished bringeth forth death." (On Christadelphian reasoning we are sentenced to natural death before we are capable of sinning). We know the natural man can and does do worse than the beast, but this does not make of none effect the good that is found in those that do not manifest the works of the flesh through the imbibing of the spirit word. Both classes are the same flesh nevertheless and what is more, it is the

flesh as God created it. The characters of the worthies is proof of this, and their names (some of them) are given in Hebrews 11.

Though the Scriptures themselves are sufficient to convince us that sin is an act of disobedience against divine law, and not sin as “a fixation in the flesh” apart from this, we supplement the Scriptures with the writings of those who contend for the very opposite when it suits them to uphold a certain theory. The impulses that lead to sin existed in Adam before transgression as much as they did afterwards; else disobedience could not have occurred. These impulses in their own place are legitimate enough... “There is no propensity but serves a good purpose in its own place” (R.Roberts, “Ambassador” 1869). “The flesh that inhabited paradise, like ail the beasts, was very good of its sort... our flesh is the same flesh as Adam’s before transgression, only the worse for wear” (Dr. Thomas). We will deal with another when considering page 19 regarding R.Roberts saying, “It is not a physical quality.” We say that it is not the flesh that God created in Eden that He is displeased with (which was the same flesh that Jesus had). It is man’s obedience and character that God is pleased with and each individual character will settle the destiny of each individual. Paul says, “In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.” Listen to Dr. Thomas on this, “In the animal man there dwelleth no good thing. The apostle affirms this of himself, considered as an unenlightened son of the flesh.” (Elpis Israel, page 92). Those who believe that Adam, after he sinned was changed from a very good nature to a vile or very bad one, are very fond of quoting these words of Paul. Paul is contrasting himself with himself as an unenlightened person under the law, as the opening verses of the chapter show in the figure of marriage. Paul was speaking of the time when he knew nothing aright; but after his conversion, surely, his brain was capable of showing some goodness and did do so. For example, his speeches and epistles to the ecclesiasts, all emanations of his sanctified brain, when he was a purified temple of God; also the fact of Christ dwelling in his heart or affections by faith, are evidence of having some good things within him, and if they did not exist in his cerebrum, the seat of his mind and affections, where then did they have their existence? Compare 1 Corinthians 11:1; 9:26,27; Philippians 3:8,9.

We ask you now to consider Paul’s other words, “Ye are not in the flesh” (Romans 8:9). Did Paul mean that they were not literal flesh? Think on these things and judge for yourselves as to the subtlety of R.Roberts’ application of the Scriptures he quotes in this paragraph. He gives a mental application when it suits him, and vice versa. R.Roberts concludes this paragraph “Paul’s definitions are more philosophical than Edward Turney’s: for Paul goes to the root of the matter and says that in the flesh dwelleth no good thing.” We agree, quite, when understood as Paul meant it to be. It is the mental sphere entirely.

Page 18, paragraph 2. We have here a confirmation of what we have already said. It is the mental sphere every time that is the true understanding. He uses the illustration of a child brought up with wolves and. by so doing he only confirms Paul’s words, “Where there is no law (of God) there is no transgression” (Romans 4:15). In other words, sin is not imputed where there is no law (Romans 2:12). Just a question - have the animals sinful flesh? (man was made very good, like the animals, after its kind). Have they transgressed? Is their nature the result of Adam’s sin?

Page 18, paragraph 3. We endorse most of this.

Page 18, paragraph 4. This is qualified in previous paragraph. God made man upright and he was free to choose as to whether he would obey or disobey, or why put him under law? Still a matter of mind.

Page 19, paragraph 2. Agreed, but remember he was created a man, not a child.

Page 19, paragraph 3. “Adam was driven out of Eden because of disobedience.”

Quite true, but he did not find out that his literal flesh was an evil thing. He found out what an evil thing the desires and impulses were if not controlled. His reference to Adam’s first son being a murderer only confirms this. Adam had impulses which he failed to control before his first son had them. R.Roberts is applying this only one way, viz. the way of Cain. We remind you that his second son was the same flesh with the same impulses, but he controlled them. Both were the same flesh as their father. The difference between them being as scripturally defined, Abel was a son of faith, his works were righteous, and his brother’s evil (Hebrews 11:1; 1 John 3:12).

We now come to the consideration of R.Roberts' quotation, "Sinful flesh." We desire you to give this your earnest, prayerful consideration. Romans 8:3 is the basis of this false teaching of sin as a physical quality. We will produce the evidence of R.Roberts in which he repudiates it as a physical quality, though, as we stated, he is ever ready to change and even admits in this paragraph that it is a figure and metonymy. It is the word "flesh" that is employed metonymically in the same sense in which Jesus said, "This is my flesh..." it being requisite to prove that the sacrifice of Christ's life was the life in the blood thereof, thus refuting the teaching of those who advocate His LIFE TIME of works as the Ransom Price. Sin could not be condemned in the literal flesh, for "sin" is only a person by personification: neither could sin be condemned by the crucifixion of Jesus. Sin was condemned by the sacrifice of the Just for the unjust by the sight of the innocent where the guilty should have been. Hence, by one offering for sin, sin was condemned as a wrong thing to have done or committed.

"It is not the expression of a literal element or principle pervading the physical organization. Literally, sin is disobedience, the act of rebellion. The impulses that lead to this reside in the flesh and therefore came to be called by the name of the act to which they gave birth. In determining first principles we must be accurate in our conceptions" (R. Roberts in "The Ambassador" for March 1869). Certain brethren took exception to R. Roberts saying here that sin was not the expression of a literal element or principle pervading the physical organization, because the Christadelphian basis was that it was. In reply to a certain brother's exception, R.Roberts replied (pages 241 to 243), "This deranged condition of nature is, in us, the cause of sin, and therefore metonymically, may be expressed as sin, but literally, and in itself it is not sin. I would therefore take exception to your proposition that nothing but uncleanness was inherited in the babe of Bethlehem. Legally He was unclean." Examine this reply and see if you can ascertain as to whether R.Roberts considered Jesus to be physically unclean, physically clean, or legally unclean. Then Dr. Thomas in the same volume that the foregoing statements have been taken from (page 215), says, "He must, therefore, necessarily have been born corporeally unclean." R. Roberts says in this paragraph that it is Paul's figure - metonym for those impulses. As he also says in his preface of his debate with J.J.Andrew upon the Responsibility Question.

You have already read that sin is not a literal element and also the reverse, from the leaders of the same body. Keep this in mind in your earnest and unbiassed endeavour to ascertain whether there is any difference between the terms "sinful flesh" and "flesh of sin." The Greek for this is "sin's flesh," predicating property or possession and not the quality of the flesh. There is no adjective here in the Greek. Flesh can and does belong to God (Dr. Thomas witness. "Phanerosis" page 43). Also R.Roberts and Dr. Thomas say that the change was a moral one to which agree the Scriptures; one kind of flesh of men (1 Corinthians 15:39). When Adam sinned he sold himself to sin; he changed masters. He was son of God who became a bondman of sin. Note the following if you should think that the term "master" is too commercial; "His servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death, or obedience unto righteousness (God's servants)" (Romans 6:16). We cannot serve God and mammon (Matthew 6:24). We cannot be related to both at the same time. We were sinners on the federal principle and we become adopted sons and daughters upon the same just principle upon acknowledgement of God's ransom in Christ by faith in His shed blood. Jesus had the same flesh as other men but whereas they belonged to sin Jesus was never in Adam's loins. He was Son of God by birth and retained His freedom. Jesus came in the likeness of sin's bondmen but His flesh never belonged to sin, nor sin's dominion, being begotten of God for the purpose of doing what the law could not, viz. pay sin's claim for us because He was free to do it, not being in bondage to sin Himself. We cannot do better than quote Paul. "Being then made free from sin ye became servants of righteousness" Sin is by law. Sin is dead without law (Romans 3:18,20). By law is the knowledge of sin (Romans 7:8). This is proof that the flesh is not sin of itself. We agree with R.Roberts "that not forbidden is not sin and that when God (not man) says 'Don't do it,' a breach of that command is sin." This is the true understanding of the whole Scripture regarding sin. We can resist the devil (sin) and he will flee, but that would be impossible if sin was a fixation in the flesh. In that case everywhere we went sin would be sure to go.

Page 20, paragraph 2. "It is God's purpose to make us realize our native tendency to disobedience, and our native inability to conform." It is monstrous that one should utter such a statement, who believes that God is just. For God to make man with an inability to conform to His law and then punish man for not keeping that which God has made him that he cannot keep it is to make God a monster of the deepest dye.

Try it on in business, then ask yourself where your justice lies in so doing. Yet God is charged with doing such a thing. What depths one will go to to uphold a theory of man being physically shackled. We are thankful that through Paul and others God has told us that we will not be tried above what we are able to bear. Jesus Himself said “Unto whom much is given, much is expected,” and for Jesus to say it is evident that God only expects as much. Did Paul teach that God made him unable to keep His law. No. He said, “I can do all things through Him that strengtheneth me” (Philippians 4:13). Did God make Paul do all things by giving him His Holy Spirit to do away with the necessity of individual faith? No. Or he could have used the Holy Spirit to cure his own infirmity. He could do all things through the faith of Christ, and if we have not the faith of Christ we cannot do all things (that God requires of us). It is not our inability. Our ability lies in our loving reciprocation of the love wherewith God loved us in giving Jesus. Yes, God made men upright, as R.Roberts says. But why such a foolish illustration as forgetfulness in sleep when considering sin? His opening quotations of Paul in this paragraph is another mixing up of the mental with the physical. He says, “For we know that the law is spiritual, but I (that is the natural Paul) am carnal, sold under sin.” (Of course his brackets fit in with his theory). When a thing is condemned it means that it is due for destruction. But Paul does not say that “I, the natural Paul, am by constitution condemned, being sinful flesh.” He speaks of being carnal, sold under sin. Carnal has to do with the mind which is at enmity with God. When one is sold under sin one can be redeemed, bought back.

Continuing his quotation of Paul: “For that which I do, I allow not,” etc. Did Paul speak here of the time when he was a regenerated son of God? If he did, then he contradicts himself, because he testifies that he kept his body in subjection (1 Corinthians 9:27). Paul is speaking of the time when he was zealous for the law in its letter. Even when he thought that he could do good, he could not. owing to his zealousness for the letter. Had he realized that love was the fulfilling of the spirit of the law he would not have consented to Stephen’s death. He refers to all things that he did in opposition to Christ, in regarding himself as the least of the apostles having persecuted the church without mercy. Again, if Paul is speaking of himself in Romans 7 as a regenerated person, then Paul contradicts himself, viz. where is one sin of Paul recorded that God commanded, if so be that God made man unable to conform to His law? As Dr. Adam Clark says speaking upon the manner these words of Paul have been misconstrued: “This opinion has, most pitifully, and most shamefully, not only lowered the standard of Christianity, but destroyed its influence and disgraced its character.” Paul realized that as a natural Jew, though blameless in the letter of the law, he was sold under sin and that he was not justified by the works of the law but by faith in the shed blood of Jesus which was the means, by God’s grace, of buying us back from sin’s bondage. He realized that nothing else could have done this and most assuredly we can say with him “I thank God (for His unspeakable gift) through Christ our Lord.”

Page 20, paragraph 3. “Walk in the spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.” Is not this what we have all along contended for? The list of the works of the flesh in Galatians 5 are not applicable to a child of God; he does not fulfil them. If he did he would not be a child of God and therefore he would not enter the kingdom (Galatians 5:2-1; I Corinthians 5:9-11). We remind you that R.Roberts has said that these lusts and propensities are legitimate in itself and we have the opposite lusting which is every bit as legitimate - the spirit lusting against the flesh. What does the spirit lust against – the literal flesh or the desires of the flesh? We have the answer by referring to Scripture. David hated every false way (Psalm 119:104). Jude 23 hated the very garment spotted by the flesh. Did he mean that the literal flesh was so polluting that it defiled the literal garment? No. He, like David, hated every false way. The ones he was referring to professed to be clothed with righteousness, but walked after the flesh, hence his hating of any profession of righteousness which is not accompanied by a worthy walk. Spots and blemishes, clouds without water. A child of God is bound to hate the garment spotted by the flesh because it refers to the Adamic sin, and because it sows not to the spirit; but according to “Slain Lamb” none can do it because God has made them that they cannot.

Page 20, paragraph 4. “What the law could not do,” etc. Yes, we agree that mere law or flesh could not do for itself what God has done in Christ. We have explained why it couldn’t. He sent His Son, His property (not sin’s) in likeness (same flesh as the flesh that belongs to sin) but instead of being in bondage to sin He was God’s Son and never belonged to sin’s dominion (“Which of you convinceth me of sin?”). Flesh is not the deciding factor here; it is “to whom ye belong.” The word likeness does not necessarily mean the same in every respect. Adam was made in the likeness of God, yet he did not have incorruptibility. Thus, the term likeness in Romans 8:3 means that Jesus was like the bondmen of sin in

physical constitution. He was not sin's flesh nor did He follow sin's bondmen. The difference is, as we have endeavoured to point out, not in His physical constitution but in the ownership - God's Son - His own Son. It is the Greek genitive case denoting possession, which no Greek scholar will deny. This is the only place in the Scriptures where the words "sinful flesh" occur and even here it is a faulty translation. How often have we, as Christadelphians, when the orthodox believer has said that the Bible clearly teaches that the soul goes to Heaven at death, told them to search the Scriptures to see if it is there? Yet Christadelphians make a doctrine out of a term that is only found once and which is not a correct translation. Why, the Trinitarian and the heaven-going-at-death theorists have every whit as much support from the Scriptures as the sinful-flesh theorist. Yes, there is indeed a vast difference between sinful flesh and flesh of sin.

Page 21, paragraph 2. "And now we have to consider in what sense did Jesus come in sinful flesh." R.Roberts here supports what the R.V. says on this phrase, "The flesh of sin." It is the genitive case, as also in the following, "The kingdom of God" is the kingdom belonging to God. Ownership. He agrees that "flesh of sin" is a more literal translation of the Greek words and then has the audacity to suggest that the English idiom accommodated to the phrase should be given preference to the true Greek meaning of the genitive case, which no Greek scholar will deny. He says, "The translators of the English version have shown themselves fitted for the work." God forbid that we should depreciate their efforts. The English version gave him a handle to catch hold of in Romans 8:3 and if the R.V. was extant at the time he wrote "Slain Lamb" he would still have relied upon the authorised version because that supplied him with the only handle he could find in the Scriptures. He was not so ready to say that the translators were fitted for their work when he wrote of errors in translation and transcription (which we agree he was correct that there were errors) but he is not prepared to admit this one. We agree that there must be an accommodation to the idiom, but the accommodation must be in harmony with scriptural teaching. The trouble is that R.Roberts has done far too much accommodation of idioms. Take for example his accommodation of the Hebrew idioms YOM B'YOM and MUTH TEMUTH in Genesis 2. YOM (day) B'YOM (in the day) - MUTH TEMUTH (surely die). He agrees that B'YOM in Genesis 1, speaking of creation, is the literal day, but in Genesis 2 where the same idiom is used and qualified by MUTH TEMUTH distinguishing violent death from natural death, he makes the Hebrew idiom to mean over 900 years from the day of Adam's transgression. When it happens that the same Hebrew words appear in 1 Kings regarding Solomon's words to Shemei, he is quite agreeable that it means violent death on the literal day, because it would be ridiculous to say otherwise. We leave it to the reader to study for himself the accommodations that Christadelphian writers have resorted to to uphold a theory that cannot be supported by Scripture. We do not disagree with R.Roberts that the earthy and the image of the earthy are the same physically. E.Turney, as we have constantly repeated, never contended that Christ was of different nature to us. What was the distinction that Jesus drew between Himself and us when He said, "I am from above, ye are from beneath"? Lay hold upon the glorious truth and you will be free from the bondage of man-made constitutions.

Page 21, paragraph 4. R.Roberts says, "If you ask me how the Father could be manifest in a man with an independent volition you ask a question not truly founded on reason." We feel deeply grieved that Christadelphians have been so gulled as to what E. Turney taught. The above statement would be of striking force if E.Turney contended for independent volition in the manner that R.Roberts has persuaded his brethren. E.Turney never taught that the life of Jesus was any different to the life of any son of Adam considered as a life. It was the life of his flesh that was in the blood, the same as the life of our flesh which is in the blood. Where does the independent volition come in when He was made, tempted and tried in all points like unto His brethren? E.Turney never contended otherwise. R.Roberts is simply using the term independent volition to gull his brethren into believing that E.Turney taught that Jesus had an independent and different kind of life. Unfortunately, "Slain Lamb" has accomplished this right up till now, because the general body of Christadelphians are ignorant of its misrepresentation of Edward Turney. We have had correspondence with them and in every instance the reply has been, How can you say that Jesus was of a different nature to ourselves when the Scriptures declare that He died? This in 1934. Truly "Slain Lamb" has done its work well!

Page 22, paragraph 2. We agree with the Scripture that the flesh profiteth nothing and that it is the spirit that matters, but we certainly disagree with R.Roberts' mode of application, viz. that the flesh profiteth nothing - being a physically condemned thing. Jesus did not say Eat my condemned unclean flesh. Flesh

profiteth nothing, yet Jesus said, And the bread that I will give you is my flesh, for the life of the world (John 8:51). What body did Jesus rise with? Was it not flesh and bones? Let us be honest in our application of “the flesh profiteth nothing.” This refers to natural descent - having Abraham as our forefather and by such of the seed of Abraham. If you apply it to Christ you nullify the teaching of Christ that the eating of His flesh in the Memorial Bread profits us nothing. In the passage where it occurs (John 6:63) Jesus is teaching that the spirit words are life. The literal flesh will profit nothing in itself, as it will go to the grave via the natural laws and remain there, but if the spirit word be imbibed, there is profit withal. Jesus teaches here that His words are not the words of fleshly thought but the spirit word of the Father. If He merely spoke as the son of Joseph (which they understood Him to be - verse 42) it would have been impossible for Him to be the bread that came down from Heaven to give life unto the world. Flesh could profit nothing if it lacked the redeemed life. It is only the spirit that could give life eternal and that only by the literal person of flesh imbibing the spirit word. It could not give eternal life of itself, as Jesus taught, but that does not mean that it profiteth nothing being a worthless thing owing to being physically condemned. There is another sense, and a scripturally true sense, in which flesh profiteth nothing – that is, by the Jews being the natural descendants of Abraham, which we have already given consideration to. R.Roberts continues, “Others who think to make a great mystery simple and plain speak of the flesh of Christ as a mixture of human with divine substance.” We do not make the flesh of Christ a mixture. There is no mystery and nothing baffling. It is simplicity itself. The life of the flesh of Jesus was in the blood, like ourselves, and God gave Him this life (Luke 1:35), which life Jesus voluntarily laid down (sacrifice) for the sin of the world, thereby purchasing us with His own blood. We are not redeemed with corruptible things... gold and silver... but by the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot (Peter). Is there anything mysterious about this? Why was the blood of Jesus precious? Was it because it was of a different quality than the blood of others? No. It was because He was begotten of God and not of man, and being begotten of God He was legally free to lay down His life which was in that blood as the redemption price that could only be paid once. The redemption of their souls (life) is precious, and it ceaseth for ever. For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins (Hebrews 10:26). One sacrifice. We pray that we will all realize that that blood was so precious that none of us will trample it under foot. Surely, He came out from God, as the Scripture says, and He was not a mere man, but the only begotten Son of God.

Page 22, paragraph 3. “As for the question asked that if God gave Jesus greater power than we, has he not dealt unjustly with us? It is not the question of a child of God. What was done by Christ was God’s work out of love for us that we, subject to His will and recognising His supremacy, should become heirs of His Kingdom.” Why does not R. Roberts recognize the supremacy of Jesus over ourselves prior to His possessing the nature He now possesses in the legal sense, seeing that He was of our nature? The only way that he recognizes the supremacy of Jesus in the days of His flesh is that He always did His Father’s will. If He had extra power to do this, where is the glory of His supremacy? He was tempted, tried, etc. like ourselves. R.Roberts is rather subtle in his wording here. E. Turney did not restrict His words as R.Roberts does here; he did not stop at the word power. E.Turney said “extra power to overcome His temptations.” Did not Jesus have a free will to do or not do? He did. For Him to subject Himself to His Father’s will does not rule out His willing subjection. If God made Jesus a machine where would His obedience come in? Up pops the absurdity again of voluntary compulsion, thereby making His overcoming, testing, and obedience a farce. Regarding his closure of this paragraph, “Such a question as the one referred to is enough to secure for the questioner the grave of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram,” we leave this to the reader’s judgment and most of all to God’s.

Jesus was made strong for us in that He was begotten of God. We were weak, being concluded under sin; therefore as it is explained by Paul, when we were yet without strength - Romans 5:6 (needing life via redemption) it was necessary for someone with strength to redeem us. The strength required was someone not bound, therefore free, free in the legal sense we have contended for. In this respect Jesus was rich, not being in debt, not being sold under sin and for our sakes became poor (2 Corinthians 8:9). He gave His all: all that He then possessed, the life of His flesh. Had He not given His all, His brethren would not have been redeemed. This quibbling over power. Jesus honoured His Father’s name in the earth by His obedience to His Father’s commands, and to say that Jesus had extra power to do this is to rob Him of His honour and to charge God with giving honour where it was not due. It is “faith that overcomes the world” (1 John 5:4) and not the extra power of the Holy Spirit, as can be seen from Hebrews 6:4,5, that those who

tasted the good word and the power of the age to come, if they shall fall away to renew them (R.V. - it is impossible) again unto repentance, seeing that they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame. This is proof that the power to overcome did not rest in the Holy Spirit. The grave of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram is not our fear as we verily believe that we have passed from death into life. Death sentence in Adam removed and now in the glorious liberty that is in Christ in accordance with Romans 8:1.

Page 23, paragraph 1, R.Roberts says, "It is the flesh, not the life, that is condemned." This of course to involve Jesus in physical condemnation. He must cling to this like a leach to uphold his theory. We can only repeat that the flesh cannot be condemned - it is the person. R.Roberts cannot apply both to Jesus but he must continually resort to vivisection. The condemnation passed upon men brings death as the wages of sin, which is only on the federal principle as proven by Romans 8:1. If you make the condemnation physical you introduce absurdity and more obstacles than can be overcome, hence the splitting up of the Christadelphian body. Life and flesh comprehend the entire man in Scripture. In "Christendom Astray" he charges the metaphysicians with trying to expound a mystery by creating a bigger one. He is here trying to do the same thing himself. Life and flesh comprehend the entire man, of which we have a good illustration in Genesis 6; 12 and Psalm 56:4,11. There is also a good illustration in the Christadelphian hymn book, No 92, "eyes, ears, hands, feet - man."

The praise is to God in providing His Lamb (Genesis 22:8), but this does not take any honour away from Jesus because He was flesh. If flesh was condemned we have been redeemed with a polluted sacrifice. This could not possibly be, because condemned flesh can never be the ransom price for forfeited life.

R.Roberts continues, "What He did was for us, not instead of us, but on our account." Well, what is the difference? He says, "The notion that it was instead of us is the old orthodox superstition being foisted upon the brethren." It is nothing of the sort. True substitution is not the old orthodox superstition. A life for a life is the equivalent price for ransom. Jesus gave His life for the sin of the world. That one sin Adam brought forth and the penalty of that sin was death by slaying. Adam was spared from paying it by God's love and mercy, and was typically redeemed in the figure of the animal slain. Had Adam paid it himself there would be no quibble as to whether Jesus was a representative or a substitute, as we would not have existence. Being as Adam did not pay it himself it follows that Jesus did, because He was the lamb slain (in type) from the foundation (Eden). God spared Adam and the animal was slain instead (as in the case of Isaac - in the stead of his son, Genesis 22:13). Jesus gave His life in stead of Adam and all in his loins. Thus we can see on the federal principle that the foundation was laid in Eden in type and completed on Calvary by the antitype - Jesus. When the just principle of God is perceived there is no difficulty in understanding how we were concluded under Adam's sin and how the ransom for Adam and us, as in him, was also paid before we were born. Jesus tasted death for every man (Hebrews 2:9). Upon what principle? Did He taste death instead of every man? No, or in that case we shouldn't die (We leave that foolish reasoning to orthodoxy), Jesus tasted literal death as the equivalent that Adam incurred as the wages of sin. We were not individually responsible for that sin, but were concluded under it as in Adam on the federal principle. This is God's just method of concluding all under sin without in any way shackling men physically. We know that "for us" does not always mean instead of us, but this does not prove that the death of Jesus as the wages of sin was not instead of Adam. The opposers of substitution admit that the word "for" means instead of (or, as the Greek and English dictionary renders it, In place of. Matthew 20:28, Emphatic Diaglott).

We hear such as the following - "We know that Scripture says Christ died for us, but this means on account of us, not instead of us. The Scripture also says that Jesus died for our sins and this cannot mean instead of our sins," etc. The context should ever decide. We will put it in another form - "I have bought this cake for your tea." Do I mean that I bought the cake instead of your tea? This doesn't contradict the fact that it was for you. It is our duty to ascertain whether for, GAR, HUPER (on behalf of), or ANTI (in place of) are antagonistic. It is a simple task to demonstrate them to be like David and Jonathan, the closest bosom friends, that these propositions can perform separate functions. We will suppose that you, like Adam, were, through adverse circumstances, reduced to beggary. Your creditor, the devil, to secure his own, demanded the sale of your possessions - life and inheritance. Well, along comes a dear wealthy friend with the solution to your difficulty. "Cheer up, Tom," he says, I have plenty to spare, more than I

shall ever require” (John 12:24; Psalm 69:4). “I will square the bill for (GAR) you, on behalf of (HUPER) you, in place of (ANTI) you.” Would any law force Tom to pay it again? This is exactly what Jesus did, for (GAR), on behalf of (HUPER), in place of (ANTI), Adam. Can any logical person wrench asunder this threefold cord? Thus, GAR, HUPER, and ANTI, defy the power of darkness to blot out the divine ransom being instead of Adam. “He restored that which He took not away,” Psalm 69:4. (A.L.Wilson).

Page 23, paragraph 2. “He is pleased for Christ’s sake to forgive us. He is not obliged to forgive us. Christ has given Him no satisfaction, paid no debt in the commercial sense. Christ’s birth and death was the arrangement of His own mercy.” We verily agree with R.Roberts that it was all of God’s mercy. Were it not, the whole human race would have been blotted out in Eden. But where does the fallacy lie in his statement of Christ giving God no satisfaction; paid no debt in the commercial sense? It lies just here – the assumption is that God demanded satisfaction, that the debt was paid to Him. Why, God gave the ransom price. He did not pay Himself. If He received the price back where would sacrifice come in? Why, this is the reverse of truth. The ransom was the paying off of sin’s claim, not God’s, for us. God produced the price (Jesus). Jesus laid it down. R.Roberts is far behind Peter who says, the just for the unjust (1 Peter 3:18). He also objects to the commercial sense, but we hardly need remind you that it is scriptural usage. We were sold under sin; we are bought with a price - not redeemed with gold and silver but by the precious blood of Christ (1 Peter 1:19). Those are the commercial terms that we use. R.Roberts says, “The scheme of salvation is never comprehended by those who embrace this free life heresy.” We reply that we could not comprehend it if we believed the free life theory to be what he is trying to gull his brethren into believing that it is. What is more, we are convinced that apart from Jesus having a free life in the sense that we have contended. His sacrifice cannot be rightly nor scripturally understood. The advocates of sinful flesh call the sacrifice of Christ a difficult study, a subtle question, etc., which is used as an excuse for pigeonholing the sacrifice of Christ and our work.

Page 23, paragraph 3. R.Roberts’ reference here to certain individuals who have accepted what E.Turney taught is indeed a bit of self praise. He is so certain that E.Turney was among the false brethren who came in privily to spy out their liberty and that he himself is among the true ones, that he finishes the paragraph with a flourish, viz., “I will die if necessary to stem this tide of corruption which is streaming in and sweeping away the brethren.” Of course he said this in “writing” but though he said he would die if necessary, doesn’t it seem strange that he should refuse to debate with E.Turney before the brethren? We know that the Scriptures can be brought forward to support anything. But we also know most assuredly that the condemnation passed upon man can be removed now, while we are still corruptible beings and that we have therefore passed from death unto life in harmony with Romans 8:1. If this is what false brethren taught, thank God for them. Few are to be saved, as it was in Noah’s day, and there are many more Christadelphians who believe the free life theory but somehow haven’t the courage to stand alone if necessary but say that they can do more good by remaining in the body. They never will do any good while man-made constitutions keep them tongue-tied. We verily believe that R.Roberts laboured a great deal to uphold Christadelphian teaching and also that he suffered physically, and we appreciate much that he has taught. He was ever ready to fight against the errors of Christendom. But we do think that he was very unfair to misrepresent E.Turney in “Slain Lamb” instead of meeting him before the brethren. E.Turney did not privily spy out their liberty. He conscientiously joined their body and as conscientiously left it when he discovered their error and manfully sent it abroad for all to hear. He was quite open as everyone should be who has an honest conviction. His lecture at Temperance Hall was not of his seeking. R.Roberts says, “I will stand alone.” Yes and the writer can say the same. There are learned men in all religious bodies, but their learning will land them nowhere if it cannot stand an analysis by God’s truth. We are more than thankful that we are not among those wise ones, but are of the poor Galilean type. I will stand by myself when I see the truth, yet not alone, as God is my witness that I speak the truth as I understand it, and lie not.

Page 24, paragraph 3. This paragraph is another example of the misrepresentation of what we teach and believe. How can we believe that Jesus had a different flesh than Adam when Paul says there is one flesh of men? Jesus was independent of Adam in His legal relationship. R.Roberts does not say that He was born in direct Adamic generation but says “in the channel,” meaning here that He was born in Adamic generation because He was made of a woman. We have laboured to show the fallacy of this. The human race was in the ditch, we agree, being under legal condemnation (not physical) in Adam. We also believe that God, through Christ, came down to lift us out of the ditch and remove the condemnation. But if Jesus

was under condemnation (which R.Roberts says is physical), then He would have been born in the ditch Himself and would be in need of redemption. He could not be the ransom and the ransomed. Instead of being in the ditch, Jesus willingly went into it to lift us out. This was help from outside, as none could be obtained from within the ditch, all being in the same condemnation. It was while we had no strength to get out. The death of Christ is not in our understanding a violation of divine principles It is the Christadelphian understanding that does such. The Christadelphian understanding makes Christ physically condemned apart from His laying down His life in sacrifice. It was because we could find no scriptural support for physical condemnation which would involve the Son of God, we could not subscribe to the Birmingham constitution.

R.Roberts' reference to the outrage of unforfeited life subjected to the fate belonging to forfeiture only we have dealt with. The just for the unjust answers it. Regarding what R.Roberts says here is impermissible in the Renunciationist theory, viz., that the resurrection of Christ was impossible if the debt we owed was eternal death and Christ paid it, we will repeat in brief. The life Jesus laid down to pay that debt was the life of His flesh which was in the blood. He received that life not again, or it would have been a mere loan and not a sacrifice. It ceaseth forever (Psalm 49). He was put to death in flesh, quickened in spirit (1 Peter 3:18). If, as R.Roberts says on page 8, that it was a body that was prepared for sacrifice and not a life, we ask, was His body the price of release? If it was, He had it back. "Handle me and see." The life of Jesus was given instead of Adam's and we, as in Adam, not that it would prevent us dying by natural laws, but that we should not perish - and this, all of God's love (John 3:16). If this free life theory is contradictory and self-destructive, as R.Roberts says, there is indeed little hope for us. We leave the reader to be fully persuaded in his own mind regarding this, and we invite him to rightly divide the words of truth to discover which theory is the most honourable. We have expressed our views with the same zeal for God that we had as Christadelphians. We repeat that they do not see eye to eye with themselves over this important subject of the sacrifice of Christ. Hence the trouble in the body. This question will probably be asked, "Why write a review of "Slain Lamb" in 1934 in reply to a book written in 1873? Besides the author has been dead since 1898 and therefore he is not alive to reply to your review?" We answer thus:

Scripture says, "Abel being dead, yet speaketh (or is spoken of)." Why have we used this passage? It is in another connection, we admit. We have written brethren upon this matter and we have received the following reply: "Slain Lamb" answers all your sophistries." Therefore we have answered "Slain Lamb." This is written with the prayer that God's blessing will rest upon our small effort and that others may see light in His light, and not (unfortunately in most cases in ignorance) condemn the Saviour of the world.

Jesus lived unto God before He died unto sin. We must die unto sin before we can live unto God.

APPENDIX.

These notes were written in 1934. Since then many others have contributed to them; therefore the writer does not claim any honour. I compiled same as my loving duty and hope the sacrifice of Christ will be understood more clearly and that the love wherewith God loved us may engender within us the power to give unto God our lives or bodies as a living sacrifice well-pleasing to Him.

F.J.Pearce.

A Few Thoughts Regarding “Free Life”

When we talk of Jesus Christ having a Free Life we mean He was free from the condemnation which came into the world by Adam's transgression, which condemnation passed upon all Adam's posterity.

Adam was created and his Brother Jesus Christ was begotten by their Father with a life free from condemnation. It is commonly accepted that Adam's life was not under condemnation until he transgressed but with regard to Jesus' life we say the true reason for the Virgin Birth was to give Him free life. To be on probation for eternal life Adam had to be under law. Law gives choice. Adam lost his birthright when he made the wrong choice and ate of the forbidden tree. This necessitated the birth of Jesus Christ who kept His birthright safely.

Now let us consider Moses as a type of Christ. We will note many parallels but notice specially Moses “free life.”

Around the time of Moses birth other male infants were slain by order of the authorities to prevent an uprising against their own interests.

Moses was born into a family in bondage to Egyptian slavery. In his early days he was nourished by his mother who was in bondage, but he was brought up free of this bondage in the king's palace and educated and trained for a position in the royal household. Moses never forsook his kinsmen to pursue his interests in the royal household. Indeed he believed that his own people would see him as their champion when he slew the Egyptian. But that was not God's way any more than it would have been for Jesus Christ to have thrown Himself down from the pinnacle of the Temple in order to persuade the people to follow Him because of His great power and authority.

In due time God worked miracles by Moses - even Pharaoh had to accept that Moses was the leader of Israel.

Moses led the people out of bondage and gave them a law from God. Obedience to the law would bring great reward while disobedience would bring dire consequences. He led the people through the wilderness years as far as the land of Promise.

In all these things we see Moses as a type of Christ but the point to notice in our present context is that God chose a free man for the purpose. Why? What was the reason for this when God could have raised up any one to lead His people out of bondage. We say, not so, because everyone else in Israel was in bondage. They were slaves to the Egyptians just as Adam and his descendants were slaves to Sin. No one in bondage would have fulfilled the type except for Moses who had been made free through Divine providence; God raised up a “free” Moses for His purpose of leading His people Israel out of bondage. Even as He chose a “free” Christ to lead His people out of the bondage to Sin.

These facts we deduce from Scripture and find no Scripture contrary to them.

Robert Roberts view of “Free Life.”

But Robert Roberts says that “Free Life is a myth.” Here are his words quoted from “The Slain Lamb;” - early on in his lecture he says:-

“I will tonight, place the theory of the truth side by side with the theory of this error, and I will explain the theory of the truth in the language of the Spirit; and I will shew wherein the language of the Spirit is destructive of the language - the artificial and carnal language - which this Renunciationist heresy is incessantly compelled to employ in defining its principles.”

Later on, not yet having “placed the theory of the truth side by side with the theory of this error,” he says,

“in order that you may see that Jesus, in the days of His flesh, inherited and experienced all the results and feelings that have come by Adam's transgression: from which I will argue and prove otherwise my argument, that this inheritance extended to mortality itself, and that “free life,” so called, is a myth... I wish to establish, link by link, all my evidence, as I will undertake to destroy, link by link, the whole chain of sophistry by the which the minds of the brethren are being bewitched and turned aside from the truth.”

Again, further on, we are still waiting for him to “establish link by link all my evidence,” he says,

“I will shew you before I am done, that He had not a free life, but bore our condemnation in his own person, as much as any of us, necessitating His death before He could be purified from the curse. This free life is a thing you do not read of in the Scriptures; it is a mere invention; a plausible thing, but a gratuitous thing; an unproved assumption which is made the starting point of the train of reasoning by which it is attempted to establish this heresy.”

And yet again, now half way through his lecture, not yet having shown us anything but still boasting “I will shew you before I am done, that Jesus had not a free life, he says,

“I will endeavour to make manifest the most unscriptural, the most carnal, and the most untrue and mischievous character of the new philosophy, with which it is now attempted to inoculate the brethren on the subject of “the flesh”,

And so eventually and at last after an arduous period of preparation we come to the time when Robert Roberts is about to place before us “the theory of the truth in the language of the Spirit” and “prove that free life, so called, is a myth” and “to establish link by link” all his evidence to “shew Jesus had not a free life,” and we anticipate the deliverance of some awesome argument with great expectation and now the time of birth has arrived - and what do we see? - we witness a still-born argument, useless and lifeless as could be, for his conclusion is:~

“Well, if there had been a Jew who had kept the law in all things, having done the will of the Father from the very beginning of life to the end of his life, he would have been in the very position of the Lord Jesus Himself; it would then have been in his power, by dying, to cleanse himself from the Adamic condemnation, and his righteousness would have caused his resurrection from the dead. It is by the righteousness of one that resurrection has come (Romans 5:18, 1 Corinthians 15:21); it is not by the “free life” of one. “Free Life” is a myth; and invention of the new heresy...”

This is the concept of a novice, not having properly considered his subject. We surely expect better from one of the Founding Fathers and a Pioneer of the Christadelphian Denomination. Where in his appeal to Scripture do we find support for his views, let alone unassailable proof of them? His references to both Romans 5:18 and 1 Corinthians 15:21 are misused.

The previous evening Edward Turney, in his lecture “The Sacrifice of Christ,” had said “Now brethren, there are two things required of the last Adam; one was that He should run His probation after a perfect manner; the other that He should lay down His life for us. I am utterly unable to see how He could lay down a life He did not possess. If His is lost or forfeit as ours is at birth He did not possess it free, and as His natural life was the price to be paid He had in that case nothing to pay with.”

We consider this subject is of the greatest importance to every disciple because, as Ernest Brady explained in his booklet “The Great Mystery of the Christian Religion,” “Those who have sought to explain His (Christ's) death as a vicarious punishment or as the destruction of a sinful nature have done both Him and His Father a grievous wrong. Him because if His death was in any sense necessary for His own deliverance it could not have been a sacrifice on behalf of others, and God because it would be totally unjust to punish the innocent in order that the guilty might go free.”

Brother Russell Gregory.

Further notes and observations

The Review of Robert Robert's book "The Slain Lamb" is a thorough, in-depth analysis of Robert Roberts work. We see as we progress through it that Robert Roberts is a falsifier of Edward Turney's teachings, his purpose being to beguile his readers into believing E.Turney didn't know what he was talking about with regard to understanding Scripture while he, Roberts, has all the answers. We see how time and again R.Roberts, instead of facing honestly what Edward Turney contended for, side-stepped Turney's argument and "set up skittles in order to knock them down again" while Edward Turney's arguments remain untouched.

This strategy of R.Roberts is dishonourable yet its results can be seen in Christadelphian articles on the Atonement to this day, where so many writers imagine they are combating Renunciationist beliefs when in fact they are wide of the mark. It is to the shame of Christadelphian leaders who have followed R.Roberts' so blindly.

What we are endeavouring to do is help others see the truth of Scripture teachings by proving all things. Jesus said, "But the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John 4:23, 24). How we wish Christadelphian leaders would show to us where they believe we are in error and we will gladly reason things out together, for the sake of everyone's lasting peace and joy.

In considering the letter printed above from a Christadelphian agreeing, largely with what we are teaching and asking for more information, it is interesting to note how the understanding of these matters comes to people in different ways. Brother Eric Cave wrote in his "The Divine Plan" on page 15, that up to that time he had

"never met a member of this (Nazarene) fellowship, nor corresponded with them, or received any literature from them. His only knowledge of their beliefs came from the occasional mention of their "clean flesh heresy" in Christadelphian magazines. He began to make enquiries when he was accused of teaching their doctrine in April 1997..."

We rejoice that he now knows "that no child is born 'unclean' least of all the child that God sent to be a propitiation for our sins. Even though the writer has arrived at that conclusion from a different starting point"

Whatever one's starting point it is our desire to be helpful and supportive especially as we know from personal experience how devastating it can be to be disfellowshipped. The Christadelphian community have through long practice devised an impenetrable system of intolerance, refusing discussion and demanding that the offender recants or goes. The alternative, which I was offered, of keeping complete silence about ones glorious discovery of truth is virtually impossible and designed to prevent others from finding it also.
