

“The Slain Lamb” by Robert Roberts

Dissected by Edward Turney

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

Preface

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

Foreword

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

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

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

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

First of all Mr. Roberts attacked my 32 questions in “The Christadelphian” for June 1873, suppressing the name of the author. Upon this Bro. Farmer here present asked me if I would see

Mr. Roberts privately, provided I was willing. I said yes, I should like to see him privately. Then Bro. Farmer arranged with Bro. Sulley to go at once to Birmingham with the object of bringing about this interview.

What message did Bro. Sulley bring back? Listen;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Within a day Mr. Roberts had written “The Slain Lamb” in response to Turney’s lecture and it is necessary here to note that the publishers of “The Slain Lamb” have been so embarrassed by it that sections have been deleted and alterations made. However, this “dissection” of Robert Roberts lecture has resulted from the original article, and it shows the outworkings of the righteous anger of Edward Turney, knowing he had the truth of the Scriptures on his side, continuing to do battle though refused public debate or discussion with Mr.Roberts.

The Lecture entitled

"The Slain Lamb"

by

Robert Roberts

Dissected

by

Edward Turney

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

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

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

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

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

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

Paragraph 4 opens thus: “The question, as a whole, is a difficult question, for one reason; it has to do with God’s view of the case.” “The case” is that of redemption, and if it is difficult to see through, God is made responsible for the difficulty, and the consequences arising out of it; but if it is simple, easy, plain, and intelligible to an unlettered teachable mind, then Brother Roberts has quite misunderstood “the case.” The real difficulty, and it is insuperable, is to make Brother Roberts’ case plain and convincing to his own mind. Do what you will with it, his reason, his sense of justice and mercy remain unsatisfied; and feeling this, he sets out by saying, “The question as a whole, is a difficult question,” and struggles into a “break down” to explain it. But the “one reason” he assigns for this difficulty is fatal to his position - viz. that “it has to do with God’s view of the case.” Now, if man had been left to propound a scheme of redemption the case would have been difficult indeed. This may be seen by the fruitless efforts of those holy men before the birth of Christ “to look into it;” but now we have a Revelation of the mystery the question is no longer difficult, but plain. The New Testament record of the birth, sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ are on a level with the minds of “the poor to whom the Gospel is preached.” And this is still more largely true of those poor who delight to study “the record God has given of His Son.” “These things” are said to have been written “that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and believing ye might have life through His Name.” God has condescended to make “the way so simple that a wayfaring man, though a fool (in worldly wisdom) cannot err therein.” Brother Roberts’ notion makes the knowledge of redemption harder of attainment than the summit of Parnassus; and thus convicts him, while professedly a teacher of the unwise, of profound ignorance of that perfect wisdom by which the Almighty has been able to speak to the poorest of His children. God’s paths are straight, not crooked; those who walk in them, walk in the light, not in darkness; it is only the wicked who accuse God of being a hard master, and of strewing their path with difficulties too hard to overcome.

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

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

Paragraph 5. Here Brother Roberts says; “I employ the aid of a chart, not because I think it proves anything it cannot demonstrate.” This being admitted, any conclusion established by reference to the chart is not worthy of notice. But Paragraph 34 shows that Brother Roberts put his

chart to this very use. Not being able to explain in words, either human or Divine, "how Jesus could be Sinful Flesh, and yet sinless," he pointed to the "central sun" at the top of his chart, and exclaimed, "That is my explanation, brothers; that is my explanation!" It is to be presumed, however, that some of the said "brothers" would hardly recognize that as a satisfactory "explanation," although they were domineeringly told that it was "Paul's explanation," and that "God did it." There must be some blunder here, either in the weakness of the moment, or else in somebody's weakness; we are not aware that Paul ever used that "pointer," and that "sun," or anything like them, to make his "explanation" of the plan of redemption.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

while as to His nature it was human “for the suffering of death.” But this weakness is of a very different sort from that sinful weakness which Brother Roberts finds in the flesh of Christ.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

of Adam is supposed to be? Alas! alas! If this is the “irresistible” argument for a Filthy Son of God.

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

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

Proposition: “The flesh of Jesus Christ was full of sin.”
Proof: “He shall give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee.”

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

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

Proposition: “The flesh of Jesus Christ was full of sin.”
Proof: “Into thy hands I commit my spirit.”

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

Proposition: “The flesh of Jesus Christ was full of sin.”
Proof: “The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up”!

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

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

Proposition: “The flesh of Jesus was full of sin.”
Proof: “Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein, and his bishopric let another man take.”

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

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

Proposition: “The flesh of Jesus was full of sin.”
Proof: “For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my

face; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

misrepresented Brother Roberts' position, we will give his own words; "I will show before I have done... that that which stands in the way of our resurrection by nature is not our hereditary mortality in Adam, but our personal offences" (paragraph 15, "The Christadelphian" page 440).

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

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

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

Paragraph 19. Offers nothing for comment.

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

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

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

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

Paragraph 22. The exposure of one sentence in this section will reduce the whole to chaff. Brother Roberts says, "God will keep no man in the grave because of Adam's sin, if he himself be individually righteous." The nonsense of this utterance may be illustrated in the following manner:- "No man will be drowned if he keeps out of the water." The absurdity of Brother Roberts' speech is seen by inquiring what righteousness is? It is something indispensable to salvation - what is it? Brother Roberts speaks now as though it were conceivably possible for a man of himself to be righteous. If he had not trammelled his Scripture intelligence with bitter prejudice, he would have told his "brothers" that all men are naked before God through Adam's offence; that, however good their actions, however pure their motives, unless they have on, or are related to, God's righteousness, they must perish. He speaks now as though a man might be righteous without Christ. Christ is God's righteousness to all men, both Jew and Gentile; whether as an object of hope before He appeared, or of faith and obedience after His resurrection. Without Christ no man can be righteous before God unto eternal life. And if not, then without the blood of Christ no son of Adam can rise from the dead to die no more. If what Brother Roberts here teaches were true, then the blood of Christ might be shed in vain, and resurrection might come through "works of righteousness which we have done." This is one of the saddest and silliest sentences in the whole lecture.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Paragraph 30 contains nothing to object to.

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

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

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

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

Paragraph 35. "Elymas the sorcerer," and the "subtle hypocrites" who confronted Jesus, are insufficient to portray our iniquities in ventilating what we believe to be the "the truth as it is in Jesus." Brother Roberts has found us worthy of still worse company, if such were possible. What is the offence which, in his estimation, is enough to send us down quick into the pit? What is the

crime which has earned us a grave with Korah, Dathan and Abiram? Listen, O heavens, and give ear, O earth. Brother Roberts declares that God made man too weak to keep His law, and then condemned him for not keeping it. God gave Christ that power which He would not give to Adam, and blessed Christ for using it. We venture to ask him to show us the justice of God in this. Herein we discern our fate; fire is already gone out, and will burn to the lowest hell! "It is not," says one who can look below the surface, "It is not the question of a child of God."

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

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

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

Paragraph 39. Before a man takes Paul's high stand he should be quite sure that he is his equal in knowledge; to say nothing of Divine inspiration. "The remaining part of the chart will be intelligible at a glance," says brother Roberts. Now we string ourselves up to discover the intelligibility of the next statement. "The resurrection of the offered body of Christ was the Father's work, as you know, and therefore a stream of light connects the central sun with that event." Now, on this point, as on others, we say, again, that if Brother Roberts will prove, either in Paul's words or in any words of Scripture, that Christ's body was offered before He rose from the dead, we will cease our contention. We maintain that Christ's body was offered once, and that once was in the most Holy Place - that is, "heaven itself" (Hebrews 9:11,12,24-26). "A stream of light," says Brother Roberts, "shows this on the chart." We say all the accumulated starlight and sunlight of the universe cannot prove it true. The priest under the law could not on the great day of Atonement offer outside the holy place. He entered there to offer by means of the blood shed outside. So, also, Christ slain on the Cross, entered the most holy heavenly by means of His own blood.

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

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

Imputed Falsehoods

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

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

Edward Turney.