

A REVIEW OF “THE SLAIN LAMB”

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)

A REVIEW OF “THE SLAIN LAMB”

By

F.J.PEARCE

“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 “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 begettal 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 any one 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 subtlety 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.