

The Christadelphian Lamp

"Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." - Ps. cxix., 105.

Vol. 1.

DECEMBER, 1873.

No. 2.

Contents

Page 1	The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel	Editor
Page 6	The Lecture "The Slain Lamb" Dissected	Editor
Page 10	Contradictions	Compiled
Page 14	"Questions and Questions" considered (Continued)	Editor
Page 17	The Signs of The Times	
Page 18	Intelligence	

The life of Jesus was free because it came from an uncondemned source, whereas our lives were forfeited as coming from a condemned source; our Lord was thereby enabled "to give up His life a ransom for us," and "deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

**"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God:
because many false prophets are gone out into the world."**

1 John 4:1

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET EZEKIEL. (INTRODUCTORY.)

Of the author of this remarkable book very little is known. He does not seem to have made any biographical allusion to himself beyond what we find in his first chapter at the third verse, where we learn that he was a member of the sacerdotal line, and son of Buzi. The author of the Lives of the Prophets asserts that Ezekiel was born at a place called Sarera. He informs us himself that he was carried away in the captivity of Jehoiachin (Eze. i. 2), which was eight years after his brother prophet Daniel, who went away to Babylon in the third of Jehoiakim (Dan. i. 1). The Jews were scattered over a wide tract of country. Ezekiel and those captives who went with him were stationed at Tel-abib on the river Chebar, a tributary of the Euphrates, near Carchemish, about two hundred miles to the north of Babylon. There is some doubt whether the river Chebar, where the Jewish captives dwelt, has been clearly identified with the Khaborn of the Arabs, which is the Chebar or Chabaras of the Greeks, which flows through the rich plains of Mesopotamia (where in early spring the earth is gorgeously arrayed with flowers of every hue, running in broad bands of yellow, red, and blue, which dye the limbs of the animals in chase), and forms a confluence with the Great River, as before stated; or whether it is another river of the same name rising in the mountains of Kurdistan, and joining the Tigris above Mosul.

The heavy tearful eyes of his captive brethren possessed no clairvoyance; they saw nought but their own woes; their ears were dull save to each other's groans, and the voice of the oppressor; while to our young seer,*see footnote "the heavens were opened." It was here, at Telabib, that our divine bard beheld his dazzling visions of Elohim, and heard the heavenly thunder, and mighty roar of wings, like the sound of rolling waters, as the chariot of the cherubim, with feathered canopy o'erarched by firmament of "terrible crystal," accompanied by a fiery cloud, and crowned with the prismatic bow, "ran and returned."

It is this and other visions that have been and still are confessed to be, the Gordian Knot of Ezekiel's Book. His Gogue and Magogue, and his Temple, have found crowds of commentators, but none, they themselves confess, who can justly claim to have given the meaning. This seems applicable to ancient and modern writers, Jew and Gentile. The Jews considered him inexplicable. There is a tradition that the Rabbins held a consultation whether they should admit Ezekiel into the sacred canon. And it was likely to be, carried in the negative, when Rabbi Ananias rose up and said he would undertake to remove every difficulty from the account of Jehovah's chariot (chap. i.), which is confessedly the most difficult part in the whole book. His proposal was received; and to assist him in his work, and that he might complete it to his credit, they furnished him with three hundred barrels of oil to light his lamp during the time he might be employed in the study of this part of his subject! This extravagant grant proved at once the conviction the Rabbins had of the difficulty of the work; and it is not even intimated that Rabbi Ananias succeeded in any tolerable degree, if indeed he undertook the task; and they believe that to this hour, the chariot mentioned in chap. i., and the account of the temple described at the conclusion of the book have not been explained.

We promise nothing; nevertheless we do not think it good philosophy to imitate the apparent prudence of some writers, and say nothing at all, because so much of what their predecessors have written gives but little satisfaction. This shall not deter us from patiently investigating the prophecy for ourselves, and presenting what we find to the judgment of the reader.

Foreign critics have made elaborate comparisons between Ezekiel's Book and those of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and some others of the prophets, to none of whom they deem him inferior in many respects as a poet. "A generally acknowledged character of Ezekiel is," says Eichhorn, "that he minutely distinguishes everything in its smallest parts. What the more ancient prophets brought together in one single picture, and to which they only alluded, and what they explained with the accustomed brevity, and showed only from one side, that he explains and unfolds formally, and represents from all possible sides."

Whether the very learned Eichhorn understood Ezekiel or not, these observations indicate that he possessed a minute acquaintance with the prophets. The just penetration of his remarks must immediately strike every careful reader of the prophetic writings. For example: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Zechariah, have all spoken in general terms and mostly under the obscure dress of allegory of the hostility to Israel and ultimate overthrow by Messiah of an Assyrian power. Isaiah presents his under the image of "the sour grape ripening in the flower," whose sprigs and branches are cut off with pruning hooks, and left "winter and summer to the fowls of the mountains and beasts of the earth." And almost equally in need of divine elucidation do we find the allusions of the other inspired writers to this subject. This seems to be a characteristic trait of the prophets; what one hints at another amplifies; what might mar, if detailed, the description of one, is in perfect unison with the programme of another, and thus it should seem that the bible must be its own interpreter. "The sour grape" of Isaiah (xviii. 5), when explained by Ezekiel unfolds itself in all that historical minutiae of the "mighty army of the north quarters." The Assyrian of Zechariah answers to the Palestinian invader of our prophet; and the house on the top of the mountains seen by the son of Amoz, was detailed both in plan and in service by the son of Buzi.

As we have said, it is the things seen, not the diction in which it is portrayed that has so sorely perplexed professional exegesis. Divinity teachers aver that the language of Ezekiel is indeed clear, and vehement by repetition, in which he peculiarly abounds. With precision he has told us what he saw when the hand of the Lord was upon him; but, say our own learned guides, the significance of it we have "none understood." Not even identity with a prophet himself in such a case can be a source of comfort, but rather tends to "mourning." But it may be doubted whether, like the beloved exile of Patmos, many have "wept much" at their inability to understand these "visions of Elohim."

But to return a moment to Eichhorn and the learned of the same feather, we are much pained, after reading their acute balancings of prophet with prophet, after dwelling with pleasure upon their appreciation of "the higher poetry" of "the visions of Elohim," and the matchless flight of imagination, we repeat that we are much pained to find their conclusions tinged, as Shakespeare says, with that "faint praise" which does anything but bless. The curtain of doubt is drawn over the power of inspiration, and we are left to place the prophets in the society of Homer, of Euripides, of Virgil, and perhaps of Milton; while it seems but a feeble retort to appeal to the clear commanding voice of facts, and make the standing

evidence of fulfilled prediction. In this the great and impassable gulf is seen that separates human from divine poetry. A Cowper may observe and sketch what lies in sight in home, or field with the faithfulness and even the finish of painting by sun-light; a Dante may track the dark labyrinths of the human soul and image every passion in the light of day; a Milton may depict the blissful home of a Lost Paradise, and even foreshadow a "Paradise Regained," but to strike off sheets of this world's history centuries in advance, and to pen much of the history of "the world to come," was left to the school of the true prophets whose fire burns before the eternal throne, whose foresight is divine. We agree fully with Clarke, who says that, "The prophecy was delivered that it might be understood and be profitable;" but when he adds that, "no doubt it was fully apprehended by those to whom it was originally given," we feel an inclination to refuse our concurrence; for it seems to have been a peculiar mark of prophetic vision that "at the end it should speak."

[***footnote:** Ezekiel is supposed to have been about thirty.]

PART I.

"In the fifth day of the month, which was the fifth year of Jehoiachin's captivity, the word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel the priest, the son of Buzi, in the land of the Chaldeans, by the river Chebar, and the hand of the Lord was there upon him." This was in the thirtieth year from some unspecified event. The Chaldee paraphrase runs thus, "And it came to pass in thirty years after the high priest Hilkiah had found the book of the law." Calmet says, "This was in the twelfth year of Josiah's reign. The thirtieth year computed as above comes to the fourth year of the captivity of Jeconiah." This was about one year before "the heavens were opened "to the prophet's inner sight, and he beheld a vision wonderfully similar to that seen by John 680 years afterwards, while looking through a door opened in heaven." (Rev. iv. 1.)

Ezekiel's ears were saluted with a "noise as of great waters, as the voice of the Almighty - or Mighty Ones - the voice of speech, as the noise of an host." (Chap. i. 24.) John, having obeyed the trumpet call, "which said, Come up hither," heard "thunderings and voices." (Rev. iv. 5.) The sights also, as well as the sounds, witnessed by these prophets possessed a close resemblance. The former beheld "four living ones, and this was their appearance; they had the likeness of a man." (Ezekiel i. 5.) "As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion on the right side; and they four had the face of an ox on the left side; and they four also had the face of an eagle." (Verse 10.) The latter saw that "the first living one (ζωον) was like a lion, and the second like a calf (or ox, μοσχῦς), the same word as in lxx. of Ezekiel), and the third living one had a face as a man, and the fourth living one was like a flying eagle." (Revelations iv. 7.) Thus far one photograph would suit both subjects. John remarks that each of the living ones which he saw had six wings. This particular corresponds to Isaiah's six-winged seraphim, but Ezekiel does not specify more than four wings to each of the living ones seen by him. We are not able to account for this difference, nor to say whether it is owing to a fault in the text of Ezekiel, which critics affirm to be more unsettled than the text of any book of scripture. On this De Rossi writes: "That there is so much inconsistency and variation in the MS.S., especially in the suffixed pronouns, that I was weary of my labour; and I could more truly say of the whole book of Ezekiel than Norzius did relative to one passage in Zechariah, who, bitterly complaining of the many various readings he met with, said, ' My soul was perplexed with them, and I turned away my face from them.' "

Perhaps it may not be altogether unwarrantable to assume the existence of another pair, making six wings, on the Ezekiel cherubim; for the prophet says, "their wings were straight, the one toward the other (hence the feathered canopy we spoke of), everyone had two, which covered on this side, and everyone had two which covered on that side, their bodies." We naturally suppose that as these four wings were fixed, the first two for a covering for the chariot, and the second for a covering to the bodies of the cherubim, they would need other two for flight. Some support may be supposed to exist for this view in the twenty-fifth verse: "And there was a voice from the firmament, that was over their heads, when they stood they let down, their wings." It has been thought, however, that no flapping action of the cherubic wings impelled their flight, but in conformity with a pagan tradition that the gods glide without such motion, so they floated through the air, and that the noise of their wings was caused by the air pressing against them in their rapid course. But all this may be nothing better than fancy. It is certain that Isaiah's seraphim flew in the manner of a bird - "with twain he did fly." (Chap. vi. 2.) Motion of wings, therefore, is nothing contrary to what is stated. John omits some appendages in his vision, which Ezekiel makes very prominent, yet the main likeness of the two visions strongly suggests that they are the same radically, certain elements being absent or present, in accordance with the respective periods and occupations in which the agents symbolized are engaged. John's seraphic quaternion are clearly employed in peace, they, circling the Almighty's throne, are pouring forth praises of gratitude for victories gained and favours

received. "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come. And when those living ones give glory and thanks, to Him that sat on the throne who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before Him that sat on the throne, and worship Him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."

In this scene of homage and ascription, swift-speeding wheels of dreadful height, feet sparkling like burnished brass, coals of fire emitting blinding flashes of forked lightning, would all have been at variance with the decorum of the symbol. These appear on the same groundwork in another scene, and at a different stage of action.

We picture the chariot of the cherubim as a four-square car, with four wheels of gigantic height; at each of the four corners of the chariot stands one Living One, having four faces, of a man, of a lion, of an ox, and of an eagle. Two wings from each of these being extended would form a canopy to the chariot, like a roof of fans; the other two would partially conceal their bodies; and, as we have before inferred, the remaining two would constitute the propelling power. Such a chariot would present an astonishing appearance to the beholder. In moving away from him, as, "it ran" at right angles to the line of vision, the wheels on the off side would give to those on the near side the appearance described by the prophet, of a wheel in the middle of a wheel. While as "it returned" towards him, its immense height, the increasing noise of its wings, and the great diameter of its wheels, would indeed be "dreadful" to behold. To all this is to be added the dazzling brightness of its aspect, the continual flashing of its fiery lamps, the whirlwind roar, and the deep detonating roll of thunder, all contrasted with a pellucid firmament above, like a well-cut crystal, spanned over in peaceful majesty, by the rainbow, under which, and upon a throne, was the likeness as the appearance of a man. The profound terror of this vision would doubtless be increased by the immense size, the probable mountain-like dimensions of the moving camp.

To explain the Ezekiel wheel, many attempts have been made: models have been formed of wheels intersecting each other at right angles, but they have not been working models; some have supposed the chariot to be fitted with three wheels, to answer to the singular appearance, but the vision gives four wheels going at once, which we understand to be meant by "they went upon their four sides."

Another feature, not mentioned heretofore, is the eyes of which the rings of the wheels, or as in chap. x., their whole body, backs, hands, wings, and wheels, were full. These, when the chariot was in rapid motion, would, upon the wheels, appear like four bands, or, on the body of the car, one mass, of light, but when it stood, the individual eyes would appear again. In all symbology, the eye, we believe, signifies intelligence, and sometimes is the sign for omniscience. Christ, to whom all power has been given, is represented in the Book of Revelation by a lamb having seven eyes.

Having gone over Jehovah's chariot in detail, we now come to ask what is its meaning? Who are the agents figured by its symbols? And what is their work? In a system of theology and redemption, which carries its disciples beyond the stars, where all to us may be not inaptly described as Dreamland, how shall we seize any facts, how grasp any anchorage whereon to frame a theory for the interpretation of such a vision? We have no fixed data of any scheme to be worked out there. To what purpose could our lightning chariot run to and fro among the million suns of space? Besides, it is implied that the chief part of its going is upon the earth. We read that it is sometimes lifted up from the earth, then that it stood. To look heavenward for a key to the riddle, seems to us like looking for the living among the dead.

One expositor thinks the whole vision may refer to Nebuchadnezzar; he says, "I have endeavoured to explain these appearances as correctly as possible; to show their forms, positions, colours, &c. But who can explain their meaning? We have conjectures in abundance; and can it be of any use to mankind to increase the number of those conjectures? I think not. I doubt whether the whole does not point out the state of the Jews, who were about to be subdued by Nebuchadnezzar, and carried into captivity. And I am inclined to think that the 'living creatures, wheels, fires, whirlwinds,' &c, which are introduced here, point out, emblematically, the various means, sword, fire, pestilence, famine, &c., which were employed in their destruction."

Against this view there seems to be one general and conclusive objection. After his account of the vision in the first chapter, the prophet says, "this was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord." But the view just mentioned would seem to make the vision the glory of the King of Babylon. In chap. x. Ezekiel rehearses the same vision, and is careful to state, "this is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel; and I knew that they were the cherubim." (Verse 20.) The "Living One" of many, from chap. x., is manifestly the rightful occupant of Jehovah's house in Jerusalem, but the most that can be said of the Babylonian king is that he was a wicked servant in God's hand to execute righteous retribution upon Israel, and also upon other races. For these considerations we feel justified in discarding this notion in toto.

But while the evidence adduced warrants a rejection of the foregoing theory, we would not pass from it without submitting other examples for confirmation. The general plan employed by God when he directs our attention, by symbol, to human powers, seems to be this: He chooses those very symbols, signs, and heraldic marks or devices by which the powers or nations to be spoken of are universally known. Thus, the Eagle-winged Lion stood for Nineveh; the Goat for Greece; the Crocodile for Egypt; the Ram for Persia; the Dragon and the Horse for Rome. In all the Deity's emblems of the Chaldean power we find nothing resembling the chariot of the cherubim. It is true that the architecture of Nimroud displays figures composed of some of the animals, or parts of animals, seen on the cherubic car. There are for example, sculptures of winged bulls, eagle-headed men human figures with wings, and in others we have lions, but in none is the combination, nor indeed some of the parts, found in the chariot of Ezekiel. It is not the absence of the chariot from Babylonian heraldry alone that is conspicuous, but, so far as we know, from the heraldry of all other nations, save one.

It is in the Holy Nation that we discover an identity with this imposing, extraordinary, and terrible phenomenon. In "the pattern of all that he had by the spirit" (1 Chron. xxviii. 12) David gave to Solomon" gold for the pattern of the chariot of the cherubim, that spread out their wings and covered the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord. All this, said David, the Lord made me understand in writing by His hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern." (Verses 18-19.) This chariot consisted of an oblong chest, covered with a lid, at each end of which stood a winged figure with four faces, of a lion, a man, an ox, and an eagle; so arranged that all four looked down upon the lid of the chest, at whose sides were four rings, supporting two staves for transit. These faces symbolized the Divine face or presence. In the Lxx. the shew bread is styled ὁ ἄρτος του προσωπου, the bread of the face. These are "the same faces which," says Ezekiel, "I saw by the river of Chebar." (Chap. x. 22.)

Three of these faces are specified as the standards of the Israelitish camp, and though not stated, we believe, it is highly probable that the fourth, namely, the eagle, was a standard also. This vast encampment, composed of four camps, is thus described by the Jewish historian: "When they set up the Tabernacle they received into the midst of their camp three of the tribes pitching their tents on each side of it, and roads were cut through the midst of these tents. It was like a well-appointed market, and everything was there ready for sale in due order; and all sorts of artificers were in the shops; and it resembled nothing so much as a city that was sometimes moveable, and sometimes fixed." The camp of Judah was known by the Lion; next, that of Reuben by a Man; of Ephraim, by an Ox; and it should seem that the symbol of the camp of Dan was an Eagle. It will be observed that, like the chariot which Ezekiel beheld, this camp moved and stood, it "ran and returned at the bidding of the Spirit. Precisely as our prophet states of "the living creatures," so was it of the four camps of the Hebrews. Withersoever the Spirit was to go, they went" (chap. i. 20); or as we read in Numbers, "At the commandment of the Lord the children of Israel journeyed, and at the commandment of the Lord they pitched, (ix. 18.)

The next accompanying resemblance of these two grand sights, was the cloud. In like manner as "the cloud abode upon the Tabernacle" (Numb. ix. 18) and moved over and along with it as it journeyed, so the Ezekiel chariot was attended by "a great cloud" (chap. i. 4) which, when he saw the vision on Mount Zion - though in bodily presence at Telabib on the Chebar - he says, "the cloud filled the house," (chap. x. 4.) The appearance also of the two clouds, from the description we have of them, must have been very much alike. Ezekiel observed that the "great cloud" which impended o'er the Living Creature had "a brightness about it," which was the case with the cloud that guided Israel's march: it gave light by night, and veiled the sun by day. In connexion with each there was likewise a human form - with the first, the angel in whom Jehovah had put his name; with the last, "the likeness as the appearance of a man" (Eze. i. 26). The affinity, if not identity, of this "appearance" with that of the Angel is observed in the statement that, "This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord," verse 28. The Ezekiel chariot was full of eyes. As a symbol of intelligence an eye would represent a man. The camp of the Hebrews was literally full of eyes. Now, though the principal parts of these two scenes are exactly similar, supporting the belief that they are fundamentally the same, there are some features in the one not mentioned in the other, and these differences seem to be such as would be accounted for by the superiority of the spiritual over the natural. The camp of Israel was the natural; the camp of Ezekiel and John, the spiritual. The camp of Israel was a type or imperfect pattern of that Tabernacle which is to be the future habitation of the Eternal Spirit when he shall dwell with men. But the root of all is Israel. They are the holy root; the squares and numbers belong originally to them; they are, as Paul says, "patterns of things in the heavens."

In conclusion. From the fourth and fifth of Revelations it cannot be doubted that the camp of the four Living Ones includes, if it does not exclusively consist of, the glorified saints selected from all nations, tongues, and peoples. A subordinate element of this camp is probably the tribes of the natural Israel. This may have been intended by "the wheels" of Ezekiel's car, and likewise alluded to by the shooting

lightnings therefrom. For in the future conquests of the nations by Israel, "Ephraim," says Zechariah, "as Jehovah's arrow shall go forth like lightning," ix. 14. But inasmuch as we have shown that Ezekiel and John treat of the same subject under the same imagery, and that it is indubitably certain that John depicts the camp of the redeemed under the Lion of the tribe of Judah, it follows that this is the meaning of the Ezekiel chariot, and the same analogy subsisting betwixt John's camp and that of Moses, is, of course, to be observed between Ezekiel and the camp of John. The popular theory of post-mortem migration beyond the skies, seems to us to be the chief obstacle in the way of giving the meaning of the Ezekiel chariot. It may appear almost insuperable that of the hundreds, perhaps thousands of writers who have handled the vision none have satisfactorily explained it, and they do not hesitate to tell us so; but here it must be remarked that all these, probably without exception, at all events among the Gentiles, have been staunch advocates of the above named theory. This alone is, we believe, sufficient to account for their failure.

- EDITOR.

(To be continued.)

THE LECTURE ENTITLED "THE SLAIN LAMB" DISSECTED.

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. Bro. Roberts may sit on that 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 Bro. 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 II. Bro. 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 sea side, we took advantage of the opportunity to come and lay our clever fallacies before" the meeting at 71 Belgrave Road. If Bro. 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 III. This admits that he (Bro. Roberts) "was goaded into a breach of 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 IV 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 Bro. Roberts has quite misunderstood "the case." The real difficulty, and it is insuperable, is to make Bro. 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." Bro. 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 strewn 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 it cannot express itself in the words which the Holy Spirit teacheth, but is obliged continually to employ invented phrases." Those who use invented phrases and coined words continually shew 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 V. - Here Bro. 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 XXXIV shows that Bro. 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 recognise 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 Bro. Roberts told his "brothers" that we had employed our chart not to explain, but "to dazzle their eyes, and to sorcerise 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 Bro. Roberts on account of his bodily affliction, we hope that under the cooling influences of hydropathic treatment his brain will cease to give off such wild and unsound asseverations.

Paragraph VI 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 VII. - This is the happy but rare exception. It appears scriptural enough.

To paragraph VIII. we gladly consent. It is of the highest importance that we should recognise 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 IX. is conspicuously bad. It debases its authors 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 X. - 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. Bro. Roberts says there is no parallel but "a great difference." He then shews 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, p. 216.)

How does Bro. 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 Bro. 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 Him, 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 ever had 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 is weakness of a very different sort from that sinful weakness which Bro. 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 humane qualities came to him after transgression, so that he was more amiable and humane as a sinner than a just person! But Bro. Roberts says "he proposes to strengthen this beyond the power of resistance." This strengthening is to come from the Psalms; all the "strength" we have hitherto seen from quoting 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 emphasised 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." Bro. 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 a 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. Bro. 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 multitude? 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 "brothers" - "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 Bro. Roberts' position becomes more painfully manifest. He next quotes from the Heb. i. 8, 10, and then proceeds to address his "brothers" 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 Heb. i. 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 in 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 XI. - 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 XII. is but a continuation of talk on the false alarm raised in paragraph XI.

In paragraph XIII. Bro. 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 Bro. R. 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 Bro. Roberts' first reference - Matt, xxi., 42 (Psalm cxviii.) 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. Bro. R. 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 Bro. R. 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, Matt. xxviii. 25 (Psalm xxii.) 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 xxii. we know not. Bro. Roberts promised faithfully to shew 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 "Heb. ii. 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 Bro. 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 should recommend Bro Roberts to issue a treatise on logic by 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 iv. 10. (Ps. xci.)" "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 xxiii. 46. (Ps. xxxi.)” 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 ii. 17. (Ps. Ixix.)” “he 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 this not a good specimen of the reductio ad absurdum?

But Bro. Roberts is determined we shall be amused by his incongruities. “Acts i. 20. (Ps. cix.)” “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 Bro. Roberts’ new system of reasoning.

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

Proof. Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein, and his bishopric let another 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 ii. 25. (Psalm xvi.)” We cut this short.

Proposition. The flesh of Jesus Christ 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.

- EDITOR
(To be continued.)

CONTRADICTIONS.

We submit the following analysis of various statements, as proof that our opponents neither understand themselves nor each other on several subjects.

Bro. Roberts contradicts himself.

YEA	NAY
If Jesus came in the flesh, He was under condemnation,* ⁽¹⁾ for the nature He inherited was a condemned one. The sentence of death ran in the blood which He inherited from Adam through Mary. He was, therefore, “in the days of His flesh,” as much under its power as those He came to save. This conclusion follows from the testimony that He was a man; it would stand secure upon that foundation alone. – Ambassador, March, 1869, p. 83.	When, therefore, we realise the fact that Divine power (directly wielded by the Holy Spirit) was the energy which incepted His being, we are enabled to see that the type and texture of His being, though developed from the flesh of Mary, were something far above what falls to the lot of the mere children of men; and we shall find that this is one of the secrets of his sinlessness.- Ambassador, March, 1869, p. 86.

<p>‘It is testified that He was “made sin for us.” As he was not of sinful character, this could only apply to His physical nature, which, drawn from the veins of Mary, was “made sin.” - Ambassador, March, 1869, p. 83.</p> <p>Sin could not be “condemned in the flesh,” if the flesh under the dominion of sin was not the subject of operation. This has reference to nature. - Ambassador, March, 1869, pp. 83, 84.</p> <p>The idea “that He (Jesus) was of the same nature as Adam before his fall” is equally untenable, in the sense in which it is put forward. His nature was developed from Mary, and partook of the qualities of that nature. If therefore Christ was of the same nature as Adam before his fall, so must Mary’s have been. The fact is that both were of the flesh of sin. - Ambassador, March, 1869, p. 85. (Jesus was) clothed with the condemned nature of our sinful race. - Ambassador, March, 1869, p. 84.</p> <p>In His actual nature, He (Jesus) was the flesh and blood of Adam. ... He was the condemned nature of man. That nature was historically a sinner, and under the dominion of sin, as regarded both moral condition and everlasting destiny. Therefore, it could be said that Jesus, though without sin, was made sin. On the other hand, because the mortal nature He bore was a nature inheriting condemnation, that condemnation could come upon Him (though Himself sinless) without any violation of God’s methods in the case. - Ambassador, Aug-1869, p. 242. As it “ran in the blood,” “made sin,” etc., - Ambassador, 1869, Aug., p. 242. * (2)</p> <p>Though sentence of death, appertained to his physical nature, and was necessarily transmitted in his blood, to every being resulting from the propagation of his own species. - Ambassador, August, 1869, p. 243.</p> <p>“A witness of truth cannot be shaken or made to contradict himself, but courts the most stringent test that can be applied.” See Christadelphian for Nov., inside the cover, under the heading “Categorical Discussions.”</p>	<p>The phrase, “sin in the flesh,” is metonymical. It is not expressive of a literal element or principle pervading, the physical organisation. – Ambassador, March, 1869, p. 85.</p> <p>There is no such thing as essential evil or sin. - Ambassador, March, 1869, p. 85.</p> <p>Our friend imagines there was a change in the nature of Adam when he became disobedient. There is no evidence of this whatever, and the presumption and evidence are entirely the contrary way. There was a change in Adam’s relation to his Maker, but not in the nature of his organization. What are the facts? He was formed from the dust a “living soul,” or natural body. His mental constitution gave him moral relation to God. He was given a law to observe: the law he disobeyed, and sentence was passed that he (the disobedient living soul) should return to mother earth. What was the difference between his position before disobedience and his position after? Simply this: that in the one case he was a living soul or natural body in probation for immortality; and in the other he was a living soul or natural body under sentence of death. He was a living soul or natural body in both cases. - Ambassador, March, 1869, p. 85.</p> <p>This deranged condition of nature (resulting from Adam’s disobedience) is in us the cause of sin, and, therefore, metonymically, may be expressed as sin, but literally and in itself it is not sin; this derangement did not exist in Christ. The intervention of Divine paternity rectified the disturbed conditions, else He, like us, would have been, a sinner. [This is a mortal stab from his own hand, and confirms our doctrine.- ED. Christadelphian Lamp.</p> <p>Adam, before transgression, though a living soul (or natural body, 1 Cor. xv, 44-5), was not necessarily destined to die, as obedience would have ended in life immortal. After transgression, his relation to destiny was changed. Death (by sentence) was constituted the inevitable upshot of his career. He was, therefore, in a new condition as regarded the future, though not in a new condition as regarded the actual state of his nature. In actual nature, he was a corruptible groundling before sentence, and a corruptible groundling after</p>
--	--

<p>[In the above extract Bro. Roberts convicts himself out of his own mouth of not being a witness of truth, for his own writings abound with contradictions as we are now showing. - Ed]</p>	<p>sentence, but there was a difference: before sentence, ultimate immortality was possible; after sentence, death was a certainty. This change in the destiny lying before him, was the result of sin. That is, his disobedience evoked from God a decree of ultimate dissolution. This was the sentence of death, which though effecting no change as regards his constitution at the moment it was pronounced, determined a great physical fact concerning his future experience, viz., that immortality, by change to spirit nature, was impossible, and decay and disease inevitable *(3) - Ambassador, Aug. 1869, p. 243. [This fully sustains our teaching – Ed.]</p>
<p>And sin (in the results it evokes from the mind of God) re-acts upon the flesh in bringing upon it a condition it a condition in which it is mortal and physically impure. – Ambassador, August, 1869, page 243.</p>	<p>Again, “it(sin in the flesh) is not expressive of a literal element or principle pervading the physical organization,” but of the impulses which lead to sin – Ambassador Aug. 1869, p. 243</p>
<p>The “Christ-power” has no reference to the character or individuality of Jesus Christ, our Elder Brother, who learned obedience by the things that he suffered, but to the power that was before Him, and of which he was the incarnation*(4) Who is the Eternal Christ-power ? Why, the Father, who is Spirit, and everywhere present. – Christadelphian, October, 1869, p. 305.</p>	<p>What determined His (Jesus’) character and gave Him His power? That to which He owed His existence, which was the eternal power of the Father exerted by the Spirit. – Christadelphian, October, 1869, pp. 305-6 *(5) Jesus was THE PERSONAL EMBODIMENT of that word. - Christadelphian, August, 1873, p. 348.</p>
<p>The substance of Christ was flesh and blood, of Adamic stock, identical with that of “the children” He came to redeem. - Christadelphian, March, 1872, p. 138.</p>	<p>But this child (Jesus) had wisdom from the beginning. Wisdom was its starting point. It grew in wisdom; it never sinned; at twelve it knew its Father and its mission, and devoted Himself to His work – a knowledge intuitively derived from the Spirit that guided him from His mother’s womb (Ps. xxii. 9, 10; lxxi. 6); for such a knowledge, with such results at such an age, would have been an impossibility with a merely human brain. - Christadelphian, October, 1869, p. 304.</p>
<p>Jesus, as the son of man, is as much included in the posterity of Adam as His brethren. - Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 316.</p>	
<p>Every one having knowledge is aware that in foetal life, the child’s life is the mother’s life, ministered by her blood through the umbilical cord. - Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 319.</p>	<p>Jesus (was) developed from a divine germ.*(6) - Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 319</p>
<p>Was Jesus in Adam in the sense of being Adam’s son? Yes. Though the son of God (by the Spirit) he was the son of man (Adam) by Mary partaking of the very nature transmitted from Adam through David and Mary. - Christadelphian, July 1873, p. 318.</p>	<p>“Had He (Jesus) personally established a claim to life?” The answer is undoubtedly, for where Adam had disobeyed, Jesus had accomplished obedience, and “as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall man be made righteous.”</p>
<p>The body of Christ then was not under condemnation? Certainly it was; just as much as</p>	<p>If it be asked, could He have given it (His life) for the sins of the world if it had not been His own (in</p>

<p>Mary's from which it was formed. As the seed of David according to the flesh, it was weak and mortal. - Christadelphian, July, 1873. p. 319.</p> <p>Physically, He (Jesus) was as much involved in Adam's transgressions* as they (His brethren), for He inherited Adam's nature from Mary's blood, in which Adam's life existed, for the life of all flesh is in the blood thereof. But the purpose of God was by Himself to raise up a sinless character, who should, in the very nature under condemnation, suffer the condemnation of sin in the flesh by death, and thereafter rise again with life for offer to all of the condemned race who should believe and obey him.- Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 316.</p> <p>In offering Himself, did Christ offer for His own, sins? – It depends upon what is meant. Jesus had no personal offences to offer for. Nevertheless, as antitype of the high priest, who “offered first for his own sins, and then for the people's,” there must have been a sense in which he did so, even as Paul says,</p> <p>“THIS He did once when He offered up Himself.” The sense in which He did so is obvious in the light of the foregoing answers that the body offered on Calvary, being the nature that transgressed and was condemned in Eden, was offered under a condemnation that affected both itself and those for whom the sacrifice was made. - Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 321.</p> <p>Jesus, as the son of man, is as much included in the posterity of Adam as His brethren. - Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 316.</p> <p>In Adam, mankind were involved in sin and death. - Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 317.</p>	<p>the earned sense),*(7) the answer is, He might have given it, but it would have been of no avail, because the law of sin would have condemned Him personally, and barred the way to His resurrection, in which case Paul says, Christ would have died in vain. (1 Cor. Xv. 17). – The Christadelphian July 1873, p 319.</p> <p>Had Christ owed his paternity to Adam through Joseph, what would have been the consequence? - He would have been a mere man and a transgressor, and of no more value to us than any other interesting friend.</p> <p>How would this constitutional sin have affected Christ? - Answered above. (He would have been a mere man, &c.)</p> <p>In that case could He have laid down His life for His friends? - He might have laid it down, but He could not have taken it up, and herein would have lain the failure, for “if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, and ye are yet in your sins.- Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 321.*(8)</p> <p>Had Christ been under the penalty of death on account of Adam's transgression, could He have risen from the dead? – God raised Him from the dead, after suffering for sin, because He was without sin. If the suggestion contained in the question had any force, it would prove that Christ never could have been raised at all; for if the one offence of Adam could have prevailed to keep Jesus in the grave, what shall we say to “the iniquities of us all,” which God “laid upon Him?” - Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 321.</p> <p>What would have been the consequence had Christ died a natural death? - Without doubt, had the will of God been so, his resurrection would have followed immediately, and our salvation equally secured; for the triumph lay here, that He rose after dying for sin. - Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 322. ZETA.</p>
--	--

Footnotes:-

- (1). Was Adam under condemnation when created? - Editor, Christadelphian Lamp.
- (2). The extracts from the Ambassador of August, 1869, are replies to objections raised against the article entitled “The Relation of Jesus to The Law of Sin and Death” which appeared in the Ambassador for March of the same year.
- (3). If Jesus inherited Adam's condemnation, was he not in the same condition as regarded immortality?
- (4). To what had the incarnation “reference?”
- (5). The extracts from The Christadelphian for October 1869 pp. 304-306 are in answer to R.R. who desired “to have some explanation of apparent inconsistencies on the subject of the nature of Christ.”

(6). Had Jesus two lives?

(7) What is the import of these words - "in the earned sense?" I understand the Editor (of Christadelphian) to mean that Jesus by perfect obedience earned life and then laid it down. Now what life did He earn? Surely not His natural life: that He received, as every child does, from His Father. I understand that the life Jesus earned was eternal life. If therefore He laid down His "in the earned sense" then He laid down His eternal life! - An answer to "The Sacrifice of Christ" by Edward Turney, vide p.8

(8). According to this Christ, as son of Adam through Mary could rise again, but as son of Adam through Joseph, He could not rise again, though in both cases He is made a "constitutional" sinner. "In Adam all die" (1 Corinthians xv., 22). We say this: God having bestowed a free life on Jesus, which He did not forfeit by disobedience, He laid down that life for us. But if this life had been Adam's life, as it must be if derived from Mary, it would have been forfeited; then indeed Jesus could not have risen. - An answer to "The Sacrifice of Christ," by Edward Turney, vide p. 13.

(To be continued.)

"QUESTIONS AND QUESTIONS" CONSIDERED.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 14.)

1). It is written, that "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of GOD; TO CONFIRM THE PROMISES MADE UNTO THE FATHERS." Romans xv. 8.

It is further written, that he is the mediator of the new covenant, that BY MEANS OF DEATH. . . they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance; for where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator." Confirmatory of these declarations, Jesus, at the last supper, in handing the wine to His disciples, said, "This is the New Testament IN MY BLOOD." - (Luke xxii. 20.) Query: Could the covenants of promise have been brought into force without the death of Jesus the testator?

2). If not, how could Jesus, without dying, have obtained His portion of the covenant? Seeing the promises (to Abraham) were "to thee and to THY SEED." "Which," says Paul, (Gal. iii. 16) "is CHRIST;" and the promise to David was, "I will establish the throne of His Kingdom for ever." - 2 Sam. vii. 13.

3). Jesus being included in the covenants of promise, and the covenants being of no force without His death, did He not in this sense, in dying, die for Himself, as well as for all others interested therein?

4). Jesus tells us (John x. 18) that He had received a commandment from the Father to lay down His life, by submitting to be crucified. If Jesus had disobeyed this command would He not have committed sin. If so, could He have been saved? How was it possible, then, that He could "enter eternal life alone?"

The apparent force of these four questions is derived entirely from that part of the proposition which, in our last notice, we showed was false. The covenants of promise could not have been ratified but by the death of Jesus. Does the recognition of this cardinal truth impair our position? In no wise, to those who understand it; and to those who do not, we shall endeavour to make it irresistibly plain.

We say, then, looking at Jesus alone; looking at Him as a second Adam; leaving out of view the sacrificial death indispensable for His brethren, it does not appear that there would be any need for Him to have died, much less to have died a violent death. For where there is no sin, there is no death; and we challenge our opponents to produce a line of scripture to prove that Jesus was a sinner by birth.

As the blessings of the covenant lay beyond the grave, Jesus must die to obtain them; but the cause of His death was not in Himself but in us. As the prophet saith, "Messiah shall be cut off, but not for Himself? Jesus shed His blood for sinners. Was Jesus a sinner? If so, then sinners can save sinners.

As regards question 4, we say, that had Jesus refused to die on the cross He would have been guilty of sin. But did the Father command Him to lay down his life for Himself or for the world? Individually considered, he might have entered eternal life alone, for he was absolutely sinless.

Questions 45-51 have no application to our view, we therefore pass them by, remarking that they serve to show one of two things; either that the author of them is ignorant of our position, or else he is without scruple at putting into our lips that which he knows we do not teach. The spirit which runs through these 85 questions savours very strongly of that shewn by low class lawyers, who delight in bewildering the witness instead of getting at the truth of the matter. But while such creatures sometimes confuse the ignorant, they never fail to secure for themselves the contempt of sensible and honourable men.

With respect to the law as a shadow, it must be borne in mind that it was not the very image of the things.” But some persons are so eager to make it the very image, that there is nothing, however minute, but they search for its antitype. The furniture under the tabernacle and the tabernacle also were legally defiled by contact with persons who were legally unclean: that was the reason why they were sanctified. But those things did not typify Christ while they were unsanctified. If an altar was touched with the tool of a workman it was polluted, and if Christ had been “full of sin” he would have been polluted too. All the sanctified things foreshadow the necessity, not for Christ to come into the world unclean, but free from sin. He was born a “holy thing,” that is, he was sanctified. Nearly all things under the law were purged with blood; but it was with the blood of a clean, a spotless victim; not with a victim “wholly unclean,” as Bro. Roberts says. The victim was not purged with its own blood, but its blood purged the worshippers; so Christ is nowhere said to have purged His own sins, but always ours. Many of the things under the law could not be used before they were cleansed, but when was there a moment of time that Jesus was unsanctified?

All the victims offered under the law and before the law, were required to be clean. In Genesis viii. 20, we read, “And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar.” But the condemnation theory makes the Almighty break His own laws in giving an unclean son to die for sins.

The Mosaic law concerning altars shows the need for the great Christ-Altar to be absolutely “undefiled and separate from sinners.” A defiled altar defiles all that touches it; but an undefiled altar sanctifies. “If thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone, for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it. Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon.” - Ex. xx. 25-26.

The undoubted teaching of this language as regards Christ is, that He was not to be polluted by human intervention. If you make Him a son of Adam, you make Him a sinner born. And to affirm that “His paternity” is from Adam, is quite as bad as to say that he was begotten by Joseph. He who cannot see this must be blind indeed.

But this is what Bro. Roberts asserts in question 21, “Does not Luke carry his paternity back to Adam?” Paternity is fatherhood. This question therefore implies that Adam was the father of Christ! Is it not monstrous and absurd? The editor of the Christadelphian will not easily persuade his judgment to allow that Christ was begotten by two father! To charge Luke with this folly is unpardonable. The reference given in proof is Luke iii. 31. This must be a mistake. It proves nothing to the point. But what does Luke say? “And Jesus Himself began to be about thirty years of age (AS WAS SUPPOSED) the son of Joseph, which (that is, Joseph) was the son of Heli.” This unmasks the miserable trickery and pettifogging lawyer-like style of handling evidence.

If Jesus was only the supposed son of Joseph, how could He be the real son of Adam? But if He were the real son of Adam then He had a man, and not God, for His Father. This is blasphemy pure and simple. Bro. Roberts says, “his sonship to Adam through Mary is unquestionable.” This is equivalent to saying that Mary could not have a son by the Holy Spirit. Jesus is nowhere in the scriptures styled the son of Adam. His flesh was the same as Adam’s, but Adam was not His father. To say that His “paternity” was from Adam, is to deny the scripture, which says “He was not born of blood nor of the will of the flesh”

Question 83 will justify the sharpness of our rebuke, and cap the climax with the word CONTEMPTIBLE.

83. Paul says of Christ, “it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.” (Heb. viii. 3.) You say of your Christ, that He was under no necessity to offer Himself; but might have refused to die, and entered into eternal life alone. Is it not clear that your Christ is not Paul’s Christ, with whom it was a necessity that he should offer up Himself, for the purging of His own nature, first, from the uncleanness of death, that having by His own blood obtained eternal redemption (Heb. ix. 12), He might be able afterwards to save to the uttermost, them that come unto God by Him? (Heb. vii. 25.) “You say of your Christ that He was under no necessity to offer Himself.” No, no, Mr. Editor. We say, He had no need to offer FOR Himself; but with Paul, we say, that He did “offer Himself for us.” O Socrates, Socrates, where is thy method of finding out truth! In saying what Paul said, it is reasonable to judge that His Christ is the same as ours. But he who says what Paul has not said cannot claim Paul’s Christ as his. Brethren, behold this man in the person of one of “prolonged spiritual education!”

“It was a necessity that Paul’s Christ should offer up Himself for the purging of His OWN NATURE.”

This is a fit epitaph for condemnationism. If Bro. Roberts will prove this statement in Paul’s words, or any verse from scripture, we will give up the contest for an undefiled Lamb of God. But as he has

inserted "Heb. ix., 12," as though it proved this oracular utterance, we will be at the trouble of transcribing that verse, and will honour it with the honours of emphasis.

"Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."

Let the student now take up his spiritual microscope and try if he can discover the idea, we will not say the words that Christ "offered Himself FOR THE PURGING OF His OWN NATURE." We think any man who can see this in the verse, ought to apply for a little eye salve and anoint his eyes that he may see.

It is not surprising that a man who ignores his opponent's answers and persists in repeating his own questions, should have written the marvellous Eighty-five, where two would have done quite as much service. 1st. IS FLESH FULL OF SIN? 2nd. WAS JESUS UNDER ADAM'S SENTENCE OF DEATH?

Once more, in answer to "uncleanness imparting bodies of those beasts burnt without the camp," we present what we said before the Editor's face in our Birmingham Lecture. Let him disprove it!

Now, then, I come to another point. The pamphlet I hold in my hand is by our brother Mr. Roberts, and is entitled, "A Review of Bro. Tumey's Answer to the Sacrifice of Christ." In it he positively affirms that the types were "wholly unclean." This I wholly deny. Now, then, for proof. He says: "Again," Paul writes, "the bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin are burnt without the camp. Wherefore Jesus, also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate? (Heb. xiii. 2.) Here is a parallel between the burnt bullocks as a type, and the slain body of Jesus as the antitype. Now, let us mark the facts connected with the "bodies of those beasts" in their significance with regard to the body of Christ. "Speak unto the children of Israel that they bring thee a red heifer without spot, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke. And ye shall give her unto Eleazer, the priest, that he may bring her forth without the camp, and one shall slay her before his face. . . And one shall burn the heifer in his sight; her skin, her flesh, and her blood, with her dung, shall he burn; and the priest shall take cedar wood, and hyssop, and scarlet, and cast it into the midst of the burning of the heifer. Then the priest shall wash his clothes, and shall bathe his flesh in water, and afterwards he shall come into the camp, and the priest shall be unclean until the evening. And he that burneth her shall be unclean until the even. . . . It is a purification for sin. He that gathereth the ashes of the heifer shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even." Everyone who had to do with "the bodies of those beasts burnt without the camp" (for the purification of sins) contracted uncleanness by contact with the bodies.

Now, the type being so wholly unclean, what is the uncleanness of the antitype? The heifer was without spot, and had never been put under yoke, pointing to the sinlessness of Christ, and of the fact that He was brought into the world for the service of God alone; but what counterpart had the uncleanness? The answer is found in the fact that He was of "the seed of Abraham," the flesh of David - the sin nature of the condemned Adam for the condemnation of sin in the flesh. The condemnation rested upon Him, which was the uncleanness, and this Atypical uncleanness of that "one great offering" could only be cleansed after the example of the type by death and burning; the burning being the change effected by the spirit on the risen body of the Lord after His death for sin. The new theory contains no parallel to this uncleanness of the typical bodies of those beasts burnt without the camp"

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

"This uncleanness," writes Bro. Roberts, "could only be cleansed after the example of the type - by death and burning; the burning being the change effected by the spirit on the risen body of the Lord after His death for sin." Where is the proof for this idea? Bro. Roberts gives none. What in the world does he mean by cleansing Jesus "after the example of the type?" Will he show us when and where the typical victim was cleansed? He says by burning. Did burning the bullock cleanse the bullock? If cleansing be the same as destroying, then perhaps the bullock was cleansed. But I should like Bro. Roberts to show us the bullock after he had been thus cleansed. The truth is, brethren, he does not know what, he is talking about. If Jesus must be "cleansed" after such a fashion, then He is not alive now, but was reduced to ashes eighteen centuries ago. I think we may call this a "burning" argument which utterly devours the position maintained by Bro. Roberts, and leaves him "neither root nor branch" - neither type nor antitype. How long will he wallow himself in the ashes!

Further. Having informed us that "the type was wholly unclean," Bro. Roberts in his very next line says, "the heifer was without spot," and this spotlessness pointed to "the sinlessness of Christ." Is not this

another strange contradiction? If the heifer were “wholly unclean,” as he has just stated, I want to know what was the nature of that uncleanness? The heifer was not a moral animal like man. It had no moral character, and certainly, therefore, was not morally unclean. Well, was the heifer physically unclean? Certainly not. It was without spot or blemish. The slightest disease, lameness, or deformity would have rendered it quite unfit for an offering. If therefore the position of Bro. Roberts rests upon types which are “wholly unclean,” and on examination we find them to be wholly clean, where, I ask you, is his standing? He has no standing, and consequently he must fall.

Let us now look at what Bro. Roberts says about the goats. “So with the two goats (Lev. xvi. 15, 21, 26): the one that was burnt without the camp was unclean, necessitating ablution on the part of the man who carried out the body to be burnt, and the one that was allowed to escape alive into the wilderness, as the sin-bearer of the people, imparted uncleanness to the man who let her go.” All this, brethren, is put forward to prove the necessity for the physical nature of Jesus to be unclean. But one little question will reveal the mistake. Were these goats unclean when led up to the priest? Now you see the blunder. If it had been made by a man of short “spiritual education,” there had been some excuse. As it is, I think there is none. The goats, brethren, were perfectly clean, not “wholly unclean.” Now I will show you in Bro. Roberts’ own words how they came to be unclean. “The sins,” says he, “were ceremonially put upon the goats.” Precisely so. But before that ceremony they were free from sin.

If this is so with the type, what are we to look for in the antitype? I answer, a harmonious counterpart. In other words the antitype must be wholly a clean thing before sins are laid upon Him. This is exactly what the Lamb of God was. To lay sins on a sinner would not avail to remove sin. They must be borne by one “mighty to save,” and that mightiness could only consist of absolute sinlessness; for all under sin are” without strength,” and therefore just the reverse of mighty.

I beg to read from the prophet Malachi, in which we shall see the awful consequences of “the type being wholly unclean.” Malachi i., 12, 14; “But ye have profaned it, in that ye say the table of the Lord is polluted, and the fruit thereof, even his meat, is contemptible. Ye said also, behold what a weariness is it, and he have snuffed at it, saith the Lord of Hosts, and ye brought that which was torn, and the lame, and the sick. Thus ye brought an offering; should I accept this of your hand? saith the Lord. But cursed be the deceiver who hath in his flock a male, and voweth and sacrificed unto the Lord a corrupt thing.” If the type had been unclean, you see it would have brought down a heavy curse, and if Jesus had been unclean in the sense of sin being in His flesh, He must have been quite out of harmony with the type.

EDITOR.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE most notable sign that has been seen in the heavens political for some time past is the agitation in France for a Monarchical restoration, which, according to the representations of those who were favourable to it, seemed on the very verge of accomplishment.

But the last manifesto of the Comte de Chambord, and the refusal of the Orleanist Princes to come forward as candidates for the vacant throne, have destroyed the hopes of the Monarchists, and many politicians in France now look upon Monarchy as dead and buried, and a prolongation of the powers of Marshal MacMahon for a longer or shorter term as the only solution of present difficulties. Republicanism, however, cannot long endure in France. The prophetic word standeth sure, and that word necessitates that France should again become a Monarchy, and take the place assigned her as one of the ten kingdoms symbolized by the toes of the Great Image when about to be smitten by the stone. The steps by which this is to be accomplished are not revealed. It may be that France is destined to drift once more into revolution or anarchy ere a king ascends the throne.

Recent events in Spain warn us not to be hasty in forming conclusions. In that country Monarchy had been restored, but not long afterwards was succeeded by a Republic, and is now the arena of contending factions carrying on a desultory warfare, of which, humanly speaking, no one can see the end. In the midst of all this strife and confusion the clerical party is active, fomenting the strife where, by so doing, there is a prospect of regaining their lost power and influence. For this reason they have favoured the cause both of the Comte de Chambord and Don Carlos from their well-known priestly proclivities. There can be no doubt that the Catholic Priesthood is rising in political importance, and is confident of ultimate victory. His “Infallibility” of Rome is reported to have said on a recent occasion that the triumph of the Church was certain. In view of what is written in the 18th chapter of the Book of Revelation, this is all

very significant, for a boastful and defiant attitude on the part of mystical Babylon is the precursor of its final overthrow. Nor are the meetings of the Emperors of Germany and Austria and the King of Italy by any means devoid of political significance. Their talk is of peace, while at the same time they are making gigantic preparations for war. On the whole the political situation is hopeful for the saints who are waiting for the appearing of the Lord from Heaven, and "blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments."

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM. - The following, forwarded to us for publication, we have been obliged to condense for want of space: - The brethren here have been very much agitated on the question of the sacrifice of Christ since Bro. E. Turney gave his published lecture on the subject on August 28th, and those who embraced or favourably regarded his teaching have had to put up with much unbrotherly conduct from Bro. Roberts, who, from the time the "theory" of an "uncondemned Christ" was promulgated from Nottingham, has assailed it and its upholders with exceeding bitterness of spirit. The intention of Bro. Roberts after the lecture referred to was to attack week after week the "uncondemned theory" at the usual meetings for Bible reading in the Athenaeum. He so over-exerted himself, however, in delivering his Lecture on the "Slain Lamb" on the first night of his intended campaign, that he became seriously ill, and was compelled to withdraw altogether from public controversy. Thus incapacitated, he apparently thought no one else capable of defending his view of the Doctrine of Christ, for he requested the ecclesia during his absence not to listen to the enemy, but to wait his return, refreshed to wage the war anew. This advice was strictly followed, for a Bro. wishing to address them on the question, was not listened to on the plea of sympathy for Bro. R. in his illness. In this attitude of waiting, not for the Lord from heaven, but for Bro. R. from his retirement, as the Samson alone competent to assail the Philistines, he had recourse to a ruse which has been designated the Christadelphian "Coup d'etat." This ruse was revealed in a printed circular sent to all the brethren (see last month's Christadelphian), in which, after endeavouring to justify himself for acting contrary to the rules of the ecclesia, he requested all who agreed with him to sign a declaration of withdrawal from certain brethren, to remit the same to him, and to meet him at the Athenaeum on Thursday, Oct. 30th, for the purpose of taking such further steps as might be required. On the Sunday morning after the issuing of this circular Bro. Butler requested the brethren to remain a short time after the meeting, as he wished to address them on a matter of importance. The presiding Bro. on the occasion (C. Smith) remarked that no one need stay unless he liked, and he and many others left instantly on the conclusion of the services. To as many as remained, however, Bro. Butler spoke drawing attention to the unconstitutional character of the plan unfolded in the circular, and showing that, whatever its main object might be, it involved an unlawful seizure of the property and funds of the Ecclesia, and asking them not to tolerate such usurpation of authority by any individual among them. Bro. Hadley attempted a defence of the course pursued by Bro. R., but admitted the impropriety of coming to a final decision without calling a general meeting.

Those who protested against the unrighteous course thus pursued afterwards held a meeting, at which a formal protest was adopted and forwarded to Bro. R. Finding the Declaration he had first drawn up was so vague that almost every brother could sign it, Bro. R. issued another circular for the purpose of presenting a more definite declaration, in which he said he knew exactly what he was about, and those who did not unite with him need fear no injustice. The meeting he had called was, he said, a private meeting, and no one would be admitted to it except those who gave proof of their sympathy with the object contemplated. It will scarcely be credited that when this "private meeting" took place - a meeting from which a large section of the ecclesia was excluded - they began to exercise legislative functions, as if it had been a general meeting of the ecclesia, properly convened.

This private meeting "dissolved the Birmingham Christadelphian body in a legal sense;" this private meeting vested the funds and effects of the ecclesia in Wm. Whitcomb (secretary) and C. Smith (treasurer), "in trust for appropriation as to be directed;" this private meeting ordered an inventory of funds and effects as aforesaid and the transfer of a proportional share of the same (having felt the force of the charges made against them) at the end of three months to those who may re-form themselves as an assembly on the basis of the doctrine that has emanated from Nottingham - "All debts now due being first paid." From the rate at which these debts are being run up, including, as they no doubt will, those incurred by the author of the circulars in exercising his private rights, it is evident the intention is to make the "proportional share" as small as possible. All these decisions affecting the ecclesia in its corporate

capacity were arrived at at this private meeting, and this was called withdrawing “from an assembly whose fellowship has become corrupted.” A printed intimation to the above effect was sent “to those who had not signed the Declaration;” and they otherwise learned that admission to the Lord’s table on the following Sunday would only be by ticket. A number of the excluded, however, determined to present themselves, in order to protest against the unrighteous course above outlined, and went accordingly to the Temperance Hall for that purpose. On arrival they found four of the most stalwart of the brethren at each door leading to the floor, for the purpose of barring entrance. Admission being refused by these special constables, who by this “passive act” of violence manifested their disposition, it was thought best by the excluded to go up into the gallery, and there await the opportune moment for protesting. Barricades had been placed so as to prevent access from the gallery to the floor of the Hall, and the doors were closed and the barricades erected by those who had “withdrawn” themselves at the private meeting from the fellowship of the body hitherto worshipping in the Hall. At the close of the meeting, like an “orthodox” minister, he advised his flock not to wrangle or discuss with the “heretics” anywhere, but to keep entirely away from them, and above all to preserve their tickets. In the afternoon, as many as could be got together, assembled in the house of Bro. Rayer, when the majority decided to abandon the weekly protest; those present numbering twenty-three, constituted themselves an ecclesia, and arranged for a meeting on the following Thursday, for its consolidation.

LONDON. - The discussion between Brethren Handley and Andrew took place on Monday and Tuesday evenings, Nov. 3rd and 4th, and occupied about two hours each night. Nothing untoward occurred until the close, when there was an altercation as to the mode of conducting the discussion in Maldon. Bro. Handley contending for the necessity of admitting the public, and Bro. Andrew being as strongly opposed to it. It was ultimately decided that the first arrangement, which was to discuss before the ecclesia only, should be carried out. Of the discussion itself it is needless to say much, and our space is very limited. No fresh arguments were adduced. On the side of Bro. Andrew they were very similar to those already brought forward in the Christadelphian, and which entirely fail to prove the point at issue. There was one statement made by him which Bro. Handley expressed himself unable to comprehend, namely, that Jesus was the Son of God physically. It arose from Bro. Handley contending that what we became by adoption, that is, sons of God, free from the law of sin and death; Jesus was by birth. Bro. Andrew accepted this proposition, but perceiving probably that he had admitted too much, took refuge in the strange statement above alluded to, that Jesus was the Son of God physically. The shocking perversion of Scripture by his opponent in reference to passages quoted from Rom. 7 and Heb. 5, was clearly pointed out by Bro. Handley. In his concluding speech Bro. Andrew compared the present state of things among the Brethren to what occurred in the first century, in which their faith was being put to the test, not by a literal but by a sort of spiritual persecution, and warned them not to be misled by it. The false charge of denying that Jesus came in “mortal flesh” was again brought forward, proving one of two things, either that Bro. Andrew misunderstands his opponents, or wilfully misrepresents them. It is quite evident there are many blindly following a leader, who take sides on a question they very imperfectly understand. Such may serve to swell the ranks of a party, but are otherwise of no account whatever. Their proper position at present would be that of neutrals in the controversy.

STOURBRIDGE. - Bro F. N. Turney, writing November 14th, has the pleasure to announce that the Truth is progressing in the place, and records four additions to their number, namely: Herbert Hammond, Jane and Charlotte Hewitt, and John Hope. The attendance on Sunday evenings, is on the increase, and there are several interested inquirers. We are all, he says, of one mind, and rejoicing in the light of the Truth, as now understood among us