

# The Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 1.

JANUARY 1874

No. 3.

---

## CONTENTS

Page 2	Thoughts on The Plagues of Egypt	Editor
Page 5	Letter to The Editor	John Glover
Page 7	Missing The Point	Editor
Page 8	Dr Thomas and Bro. Roberts	Editor
Page 9	Bro. Hodgkinson's "Quotation"	Editor
Page 9	Remarks on Keeping The Law	'Truth Trier'
Page 9	The Nature of Jesus The Christ in Relation to Romans VIII. 2	
Page 13	"The Slain Lamb" Dissected	Editor
Page 17	Who Can Reconcile These Things?	
Page 19	Intelligence	

-----

The High Priest thought it expedient that "one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not," and it was not for that nation only, but also, "that He should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad." This then was the purpose for which Jesus died and presented Himself at the altar when His hour was come.

-----

*"We know that we have passed  
from death unto life,  
because we love the brethren.  
He that loveth not his brother  
abideth in death."*

*1 John 3:14.*

# THOUGHTS ON THE PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

THE mode of proceeding chosen by the Almighty for the deliverance of Israel by Moses suggests this inference: that it is needful to display miraculous power in order to convince mankind of divine interposition in their behalf. Pharaoh took this view, and his request was provided for by Jehovah. "When Pharaoh shall speak unto you, saying, shew a miracle for you: then thou shalt say unto Aaron, take thy rod, and cast it before Pharaoh, and it shall become a serpent."

Any occurrence which is beyond human skill to bring about may be regarded as miraculous from the fact of its being unusual, and not miraculous from the fact of its being common. If Moses could have performed no greater things than the Egyptian magicians, or wise men, neither Pharaoh nor Israel would have been convinced of "the finger of God" in their work. While the magi were able to imitate Moses' wonders, no progress was made; but it was after all their arts had been completely exhausted, and proved to be only so many clever, or scientific feats, or tricks of jugglery, that the authority of Moses and Aaron grew into a grand motive power for the achievement of their claims. Pharaoh was reluctantly compelled to admit the superiority of their deeds to those of his wizards, and begged for Moses to intercede for him to the God of the Hebrews.

The design of Omnipotence was now developing itself to the most ordinary intelligence: "against all the gods of Egypt will I execute judgment: I am the Lord." Jehovah was determined to convince the worshippers of the gods of Egypt that they were no gods; that they could neither see, nor hear, nor walk; and that there was no breath in them. The father-in-law of Moses was evidently convinced of the infinite power of that God from whom his son-in-law declared he had a mission. "And Jethro said, Blessed be the Lord, who hath delivered you out of the hand of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of Pharaoh. Now I know that the Lord is greater than all gods, for in the thing wherein they dealt proudly, He was above them."

In this manner the Almighty commands the acknowledgement of Himself on the part of His most stubborn and rebellious creatures. The confession, of the king of Babylon, after he returned from herding with the beasts of the field, furnishes another striking proof of this view. "And at the end of the days, I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted up mine eyes unto heaven, and mine understanding returned unto me; and I blessed the Most High; and I praised and honoured Him that liveth for ever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and His kingdom is from generation to generation: and all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing: and He doeth according to His "will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest Thou? Now, I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise, and extol, and honour, the King of Heaven, all whose works are truth, and His ways judgment: and those that walk in pride He is able to abase."

The necessity for miracles being established, their adaptedness to particular circumstances would appear to follow. The manifestation of power must be governed, so to speak, by the object to be attained. The Divine purpose on Egypt was to bring their gods and those who trusted them into contempt in the eyes of enslaved Israel. The Hebrew, in hard bondage, might retain some faint recollection of the God of Abraham; but he had seen no display of His mighty power, whereas of the seeming magnitude of the strength of the gods of Pharaoh he was only too cognisant. Now, when Moses and Aaron, in the name of the God of Israel, should be able to exhibit signs and wonders, which not only exceeded those performed by the magicians in the name of their gods, but actually destroyed what they produced, the conviction that strength belongeth unto God would of necessity ensue. Jehovah did not think proper to shew forth His infinite power at one stroke. He proceeded, with His accustomed deliberation and dignity, step by step, to afford ample opportunity for His enemies to put forth all their energies, and also for repentance on the part of such as might be convinced before the final shaft was hurled. The wisdom, patience, and goodness, of God, are clearly seen in these trials of strength against the gods of the heathen.

At length the day arrived for the Almighty's Deputy and his brother Aaron, whom Jehovah had appointed to be his prophet, to go into the presence of the King of Egypt. We easily picture these simple, venerable messengers, standing on the pavement of one of these gigantic palaces for which Egypt was so celebrated. Having delivered their message, the monarch demands their credentials. He knew not the God of Israel. Who was He that he, the great king of Egypt, should obey Him? "Shew a miracle for you," that I may believe the truth of your story. Then Moses turned to his brother, and bid him throw down the rod he held in his hand at the foot of Pharaoh, and immediately the rod became a living serpent! This must convince the king that his visitors were no impostors? No, he called for the magicians, who imitated this miracle by casting down their rods, which to all appearance became serpents. But we know it is not in man's power to create; he can kill, but he cannot make alive. The rods of the magi were probably trained

serpents. For a moment Moses would appear defeated, and the incredulity of Pharaoh would be increased. His heart was hardened. But instantly "Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods." This was not enough; other trials must be made. Nevertheless, to an observant mind a great blow had been struck against one of the gods of Egypt. Serpents were worshipped by the Egyptians, and the instantaneous devouring of them by that which just before was a mere staff of wood, might have intimated to the most hardened idolater that his serpent-god had no power to deliver either himself or those who put their trust in him. The need for other proofs only evidences the unutterable degradation to which this great people of antiquity were sunk.

Jehovah then said to Moses, "Get thee unto Pharaoh in the morning: Lo, he goeth out unto the water; and thou shall stand by the rivers' brink against he come, and the rod which was turned to a serpent shalt thou take in thine hand. The Nile was one of the principal deities of Egypt. The inhabitants regarded it with a profound religious reverence. As the Ganges is to this day held sacred by the Hindu's, so the river Nile, and the fish in its waters were objects of devotion. The king had most likely gone to the river to worship and to bathe. The water was also drunk by the inhabitants, who believed that it possessed great powers to heal diseases of the body. The Nile was believed to have the power of watering the whole valley on both its banks, without any aid from the elements. To pollute the whole river and its tributaries, by transmuting their waters into blood, making them totally undrinkable, was therefore a heavy blow aimed at one of their supreme objects of worship. The following interesting paragraph is from Boothroyd's notes:-

"According to Maillet and other travellers, the water of the Nile, when pure, is commonly pleasant and wholesome; while that found in the wells is detestable. It is common on the rising of the river for the Nile-water to run red, and become unwholesome; and hence Michaelis, Dathe, and others, contend that its waters were not really turned into blood, but became of a 'blood-red colour; and that the miracle consisted in the circumstance of the river rising at an unusual season of the year at the command of Moses. If the miracle consisted in this unusual overflow of the Nile, from rains descending at an unusual season in Abyssinia, when the rains ceased the water would gradually become pure; and this is not improbable, as we do not read of any application from Pharaoh to remove this plague. Whether the waters were turned into real blood or not, they were corrupted so that they could not be drunk. This plague on the river which the Egyptians worshipped, and into which they had cast many of the Hebrew male children, was designed to show the folly of their worship, and to punish them for their past cruelty. But to part of this conjecture there seems to be this objection, that the reddening of the water at an unusual period, if not different from that produced by the periodical rise of the Nile, would not account for the destruction of its fish, and for the smell emitted by it."

The plague of frogs confirmed the first stroke of vengeance, and ought to have been to the minds of the witnesses another evidence against the wickedness of worship-ping the Nile. The power of the true God polluted their idol, and made it a source of pollution and distress to its votaries.

The plague of lice was still more revolting than that of the frogs. Swarming in myriads everywhere; upon the persons of all alike, young and old, rich and poor, the king and the meanest slave. Decent humanity shudders at the presence of one of these loathsome insects; but the very dust of the land of Egypt became a living, creeping, mass, covering man and beast. The magicians essayed to produce the like, "but they could not;" and such was the severity of the scourge that even they were forced to confess unto Pharaoh, "This is the finger of God." Upon this plague Gleig remarks: "Now, if it be remembered that no one could approach the altars of Egypt upon whom so impure an insect harboured, and that the priests, to guard against the slightest risk of contamination, wore only linen garments, and shaved their heads and bodies every day, (Herodotus says every third day) the severity of this miracle as a judgment on Egyptian idolatry may be imagined." The writers say the original word, translated "lice," should be rendered "gnat," and that the sort of gnat spoken of was the mosquito. In either case the intensity of the pest would be dreadful.

The wizards were now eclipsed, exposed, disgraced, and forced to cry for help to the despised representatives of the slaves of their proud and hardened master; but the plague increased in severity as they increased in number. Morning by morning Pharaoh went down to the Nile to wash and worship. Moses was waiting on the bank with another fearful curse, as soon as his message from heaven had been repeated. Pharaoh was still obstinate. The word went forth, and immediately the land swarmed with more noisome insects. Our version says "swarms of flies." Beelzebub, or the Fly-god, was an Egyptian deity, and this plague would seem to have been sent to destroy all faith in that object of religious worship. Some critics contend that a very ferocious kind of beetle is meant in this passage. A powerful insect with jaws and teeth, that not only bites the human race, but also devours books, plants, and whatever it comes in contact with. The English version of the Psalms says, "He sent divers sorts of flies among them, which devoured them."

The next judgment was inflicted upon the cattle and beasts of the field. When we call to mind the popularity of religious devotion paid to various kinds of beasts and birds in Egypt, it is plain that the wrath of this vial was directed against that brutalizing custom. But even after this the Israelites had not lost their affection for the brute gods of their taskmasters. Moses had no sooner gone up to Sinai than they remembered their old idol, the sacred bull, Apis, and freely stripped off their jewels from which Aaron cast a calf, and, when rebuked by Moses, he replied in the style of an idolater, They gave the gold to me, and I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf. The bull, ram, heifer, goat, hawk, crocodile, and many other animals were worshipped by the Egyptians, and the worship of these beasts had the effect of lowering the habits of their devotees to the level of their own.

The fitness of the plagues to the Almighty's design in sending them becomes no less apparent as we proceed with their consideration. The horrifying practice of propitiating the gods by the sacrifice of human victims was in vogue among the Egyptians. Milton's lines to Moloch are appropriate to the Evil Principle or Typhon, worshipped by the Egyptians:

Moloch, 'horrid king !  
Besmeared with blood of human sacrifice  
and parents' tears.

On several altars human victims were burnt alive, and the practice was to take a handful of the burnt ashes and cast them into the air, so that the wrath of the Evil Principle might be appeased in every quarter where ashes might be wafted by the winds. "And the Lord said unto Moses and unto Aaron, Take to you handfuls of ashes of the furnace, and let Moses sprinkle it toward the heaven in the sight of Pharaoh, and it shall become small dust in all the land of Egypt, and shall be a boil breaking forth with blains upon man and upon beast. And the magicians could not stand before Moses because of the boils, for the boil was upon the magicians, and upon all the Egyptians." Thus the means by which these idolaters sought to avert calamity were turned into weapons for tormenting them almost beyond description. What a terrible denunciation of their inhuman rites!

Next followed the fiery-hail. In Egypt rain is seldom seen; the overflow of the Nile is the grand substitute. The sky is generally clear, and the atmosphere calm. We, with whom hail is quite common, can form no just conception of the effect on the Egyptians at the sight of such phenomena - large hail mingled with fire, probably lightning, sweeping before it man and beast, and blasting the produce of the soil. This plague, like the rest, was strictly confined to the lands occupied by the Egyptians, while the land of Goshen, where Israel dwelt, was entirely exempt. But Pharaoh's heart was still hardened; and "when he saw that the rain, and the hail, and the thunders were ceased he sinned yet more, he and his servants."

"And the Lord said unto Moses, stretch out thine hand over all the land of Egypt for the locusts." And soon was heard on the wings of the night wind a sound like the rushing of waters, and like myriads of horsemen hurrying to battle. God's army was on the march towards the devoted land. When the morning broke, clouds of locusts obscured the sun; and as the invaders slackened their pace to alight upon the trees and the ground, "they covered the face of the whole earth, so that the land was darkened; very grievous were they; before them there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall there be such."

As they browsed upon the herbs, and shrubs, and trees, their noise would resemble the noise of an army foraging. At their aspect Pharaoh was seized with consternation, and "called for Moses and Aaron in haste." It should seem that this blow was aimed at the Egyptian god Serapis, whose province it was to rid the country of this frightful scourge. But Serapis, like Baal, was perhaps asleep, or meditating, or on a journey, at any rate "there was no voice, nor any that answered." It was at the command of Moses that locusts came, and only at his command they departed. Serapis was no god. Pharaoh still rebelled when he saw there was breathing time; "and the anger of the Lord was not turned away, hut his hand was stretched out still." Now fell on all the land, except Goshen, total darkness for three days. What could be the significance of this strange condition of the elements? The Egyptians were worshippers of Isis and Osiris, the supposed representatives of the sun and moon. The business of these gods, therefore, was to see to day and night; and to these was attributed the light of the sun, moon, and stars. The thick darkness which brooded over all for three days and nights was demonstrative proof that Isis and Osiris had no power to send one single ray through the deep and universal gloom; like all the gods previously challenged they were proved, beyond the possibility of a doubt, to be utterly helpless, and consequently unworthy of any attention. People who hold tolerably clear views of the true God, and who have not known idolatry, cannot realize to themselves the impression this miracle would make on the senses of the Egyptians and the Israelites. The fear and dread of the one people could only be equalled by the hope and confidence of the other.

The vail of night was lifted; the light returned; and Pharaoh's heart was not changed. Now came the final calamity, save that which sank them all like lead to the bottom of the sea. Life was now to go for

life. The Egyptians tried to hinder the increase of Israel by slaying their male children at birth; and now the God of Israel was about to mete out righteous retribution. Having directed Moses to protect the Israelites by drops of blood sprinkled on their door posts - what a striking picture would this present! - He sent the angel of death in the stillness of the night, when all the land was wrapped in sleep, to breathe a mortal blast on every first-born child, "from the first-born of Pharaoh, to the first-born of the maid-servant that was behind the mill, and the first-born of beasts. And there was a great cry in Egypt, for there was not a house where there was not one dead." Poet and painter have vied in depicting the horrors of that night, but our minds are incapable of rising to an adequate sense of the woeful scene.

Such then appear to be the adaptation of the plagues of Egypt, in which we not only observe the burning wrath of jealous Omnipotence, but we may also trace the justice, mercy, and long suffering of our heavenly Father.

EDITOR.

---

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

DEAR BRO. TURNEY, - I greatly rejoice that you have commenced a monthly periodical. There is a pressing necessity for it. Bro. Roberts, in the October Christadelphian, seems to think that he has fought the battle, won the victory, and has nothing to do but to quietly retire with flying colours. I have no doubt, however, but that he will find the battle has only just commenced. Judging from what is being advanced, it seems as if the shades of moral darkness are falling so fast around us, that it is high time the Christadelphian Lamp began to shed its light. I have no doubt, but it will tend to dissipate the darkness somewhat. I have subjoined a few criticisms on a portion of Bro. Roberts' "Review" for insertion in the Lamp, that is, if you can find space and deem them worthy.

The subject of the criticisms commences at the bottom of the 11th page, beginning with the words "For instance, he tells us."

Bro. Roberts has written this to prove that sin was in the flesh of Christ! But does it prove this? If it does, it also proves that healing power, royalty, and righteousness were in His flesh.

Is Bro. Roberts prepared to accept all this? Whether he is or not, it is all involved in his own reasoning.

But the truth is, that whilst the vail of the sanctuary was representative of His flesh, the colours did not represent what was in His flesh, but certain things in relation thereto. The "Blue," that His flesh would receive stripes whereby His people may be healed; the "Purple," His royal descent according to the flesh and future kingship; the "Scarlet," that His flesh - His body - would be offered as a sacrifice for sin - that from thence blood would be made to flow for the remission of sins; the "fine twined linen," that in the flesh He would develop a righteous character.

The scriptures are beautifully consistent; but when a person foists a false interpretation upon them in order to bolster up a lame theory, confusion is the inevitable result. It is as absurd to speak of sin being in His flesh, as to speak of healing powers, royalty, and righteousness being in His flesh.

Glaring discrepancies are involved in Bro. Roberts' interpretation of the type and antitype respecting the bodies of those beasts, and the one great offering."

The type was without blemish and without spot before being offered. The antitype was only without blemish of a certain kind, namely, that of actual transgression. Jehovah has said by His prophet, Malachi ii. 14, "Cursed be the deceiver which hath in his flock a male, and voweth and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing;" . . . and yet the Lamb of His own providing was so deeply stained that the stains were incorporated in His very nature! The type was unclean after being offered, imparting uncleanness to all who touched it; the antitype was clean after being offered, having been purified by dying. Mark the difference. Type, clean before, unclean afterwards; the antitype unclean before, and clean afterwards. Contrast, instead of similarity! The bodies of the beasts were so unclean after being offered, that any who touched them were unclean until the evening, and yet they had also been purified by dying, so that they were both clean and unclean at the same time! The heifer was cleansed by burning, and yet it is written that he that "gathereth the ashes of the heifer shall be unclean until the evening." Jesus was cleansed from the antitypical uncleanness of the Adamic condemnation by His death, that is, death cleansed Him from the uncleanness of the sentence of death (for the sentence was the condemnation).

Jesus having been purified by dying was afterwards purified by burning (that is, by change from flesh to spirit nature). Purified when already pure, and purified from the same uncleanness by an opposite means of purification; first, by succumbing to death, and secondly, by being swallowed up of life.

Truly, we may ask, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?"

Jesus was cleansed by dying!! Yes, even He whose blood was shed for the cleansing of others! How is it, then, that we cannot be cleansed by dying, and so not need a sacrifice? If dying could cleanse from one sin, why not from many? What a novel mode of purification to be sure! Wherever does the bible teach so strange a doctrine? What was there, to be cleansed after life was gone? O, perhaps, he means His immortal soul. Perhaps so. They had better ask him. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Whilst Bro. Roberts maintains that Jesus was cleansed by dying, he should not go on to charge those who differ from him with teaching that which verges on immortal-soulism. Surely, they have never come so near that Papistical doctrine as himself. A question which still remains for Bro. Roberts to answer is this: When and how was Jesus cleansed from the uncleanness of His constitutional sin? In the October Christadelphian he seems to flatter himself with the idea that he has already achieved the victory in this contest, and has nothing to do now but to retire with flying colours. I hope, however, that he will answer this question before he thinks of retiring in triumph.

### **Another Interpretation of the Burning of the Heifer.**

The animal having been made a sin-bearer was reputed wholly unclean, and therefore had to be burnt, to teach that sin is that unclean thing from which God's people must be purified - that part of the purifying process is a burning one - 1 Peter i. 7, - "That the trial of your faith being much more precious than gold though it be tried with fire."

That God has decreed the ultimate and final extermination of sinners from the earth, Malachi iv. 1, - "For, behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, all that do wickedly shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."

Also, that the earth itself shall be purified from all the effects of sin. "And there shall be no more curse" (Rev. xxii. 3). There has been, and still is, a great deal of controversial dust flying about, calculated to obscure people's mental vision, namely, the use of such expressions as, condemned nature, condemned life, condemned flesh, mortal flesh, sin nature, etc. I believe, however, that the dust has almost, if not altogether, subsided on one side, but it still keeps blowing over from the Athenaeum Rooms. I wish Bro. Roberts would not create such a terrible dust, people can scarcely see where they are: it is almost enough to blind one. Why doesn't he express himself in harmony with scripture language? He is very ready to complain that his opponents do not, but no one fails in this so much as he does himself.

There are no such expressions to be found in the bible, and that for a very good reason; because they are misleading, and calculated to convey a false impression - to lead people to think that sin and condemnation are qualities of the flesh, properties of man's nature; which is totally false. Sin is the transgression of the law (1 John iii. 4). Condemnation exists as a purpose in the mind of the Deity, its sentence is recorded in the scriptures. It is a term expressive of man's destiny; consequent upon transgression, and not of any change which his physical nature has undergone. We shall see more clearly when the dust has settled a little. Adam did not become corruptible, nor yet sin-nature, by sinning. He simply became mortal. Whilst in the Garden he had free access to that which was calculated to check the principle of dissolution already existent within him; and to prevent the feeling of weakness, pain, and infirmity. Therefore, when it became the purpose of the Deity that he should experience these things, all that was needful was to pronounce the sentence, turn him out of the Garden, and bar his way to the Tree of Life, his nature remaining the same, but differently situated. That Jesus experienced weakness, pain, and infirmity, is no proof that He was born under the Adamic condemnation; it only proves that He was born outside the garden of Eden; neither does His being born outside the garden of Eden prove that He was under condemnation, for if it did, it would prove that Adam could not be under it whilst inside the Garden. That which proves too much proves nothing. Being born outside the Garden of Eden could not of itself determine the relation which Jesus sustained to the Deity, and it depended entirely on that relation whether the life which He possessed through a corruptible body should terminate in death, or whether it should be the introduction to a higher life. This is undeniable, from the fact that the very same principle obtained with respect to the first Adam. That He sustained altogether a different relation to what we sustain, is evident from the following testimony: - "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. vi. 23). "In Him (Jesus) is no sin" (1 John ii. 5). What follows, no sin, no death, except for us. Who then will dare to assert that Jesus died for Himself, and atoned for His own sin. Such assertions are flat contradictions of plain apostolic

testimony. "Let God be true, though every man a liar." "A wise man will hear, and will increase learning, and a man of understanding shall attain unto wise counsels," Prov. i. 5.

"Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me (Paul) in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." - 2 Tim. i. 18.

JOHN GLOVER.

---

## MISSING THE POINT.

In the Christadelphian for November, page 520, is a notice headed "To the Point." It may be judged from the style of this piece that the author thought it to be of the weighty and conclusive order. "Who will contradict it?" he cries, like Goliath of Gath. We answer, that it is already contradicted by the word of God. The Editor affirms that "when the apostles spoke of the flesh they meant mortal flesh of men." We must pause to consider. If we too hastily admit Bro. Roberts's proposition, we shall perhaps be led to his conclusion. Is it true, then, that when the apostles spoke of the flesh, they always meant the mortal flesh of men? We think every reader of "To the Point" will understand that, by this leading proposition, Bro. Roberts means to say that whenever the apostles speak of human flesh they mean flesh under sentence of death, or, as he phrases it elsewhere in contradiction to his own teaching on the subject, flesh-full of sin. It is in this sense of his question, we say, first the scriptures contradict it.

The piece before us is not concerned with every passage in which the apostles speak of the flesh; it is concerned with certain verses in John's epistles. In these John does not use the word the before the word flesh. Both in his first and second epistles he omits the article, and says, 'in flesh.' John did not do this by accident. Three times over he employs this form of words. True, the authorised English version reads "in the flesh." Perhaps Bro. Roberts will discover that here, as in Rom. viii. 3, it is a question of idiom! An idiom is a particular mode of speech; a form of words in one language which will not make sense, if translated by the same words into another language. But it is not so either with Rom. viii. 3., or with the verses in John.

In order to understand a particular phrase, regard must be had to the context, and the subject against or in favour of which the phrase is used. In Rom. vii. 5, viii. 8,9, Paul, speaking of the lusts of the flesh, and of the law of Moses which was "a carnal ordinance," employs the words "in the flesh" and "in flesh"; but anyone may see that he is not speaking of literal "mortal flesh;" for how could he say to the Roman believers "when we were in the flesh"? And again, "But ye are not "in flesh"? Well, then, here in the second place are several texts in which the apostle spoke of "the flesh" and of "flesh," when nothing, we think, is plainer than that he did not mean "mortal flesh of men."

When it is desired to investigate a subject by the process of question and answer, all the questions must be fair and pointed. They must not include what is not needful, nor must they omit what is. A judge sometimes reminds counsel that his question is unfair; sometimes he will say, I think you ought not to put your question in that form. A competent judge would do likewise with respect to Bro. Roberts's proposition that "the flesh" always means "mortal flesh of men." It is clear from what goes before, that such is not always its meaning, and it is also clear that John did not use the words "the flesh," or "in the flesh," but "in flesh." Bro Roberts has great faith in "the Socratic method." There is no reason to dislike it when properly employed; but from what we know of Socrates, we do not think he would have been so mean and unstraightforward as to ask a grossly unfair question, or to put forward a misleading proposition.

The beloved apostle's denunciation of certain antichrists, for there were divers sorts, can only be understood in a clear and critical manner through an acquaintance with the doctrines they held. A periodical, professing a rigid critical accuracy in regard to matters of faith "Eighteen hundred years ago," ought certainly to have someone on its staff, either editor or contributor, sufficiently well read to enable it to fulfil its high promise.

Standard works, on ecclesiastical history, bring us face to face with the antichrist protested against so forcibly by John. They make us acquainted with a powerful sect flourishing in John's time and long afterwards, who denied absolutely that Christ came in flesh of any kind whatever. It was not with them a question at all of "mortal flesh of men," or flesh of angels, or any other sort. Their belief was a denial of all flesh in the matter. They did not profess to define what the substance of the body of the Lord was, they denied that it was a substance at all. The following citation, kindly sent to us some months ago by a friend of the truth, will help to make the subject plain and interesting:

“The Docetes and Cerinthian heretics who lived in the time of John, maintained that the pure Word was the Christ, the Son of God, abstracted from and independent of all humanity. The Docetes maintained that the Sagas assumed the outward shape and visible appearance of a mortal, but they denied that He was clothed with a real body, or that He suffered really, believing that He was altogether an airy immaterial phantom, who, instead of issuing from the womb of the virgin, descended on the banks of the Jordan in the form of perfect manhood, and seemed to expire on the cross, and after three days to rise from the dead.

“Now as the man Jesus, and no other, was the Son which the Docetes and Cerinthians denied, the Docetes and Cerinthians denied the Son; and as God was the Father in respect to the Son, in no other way than in begetting the man Jesus, they denied the Father; and this was the spirit of antichrist, or the sort of doctrine antichrist was to teach “- The Theory of Prophecy, by Alfred Addis, B.A.

We trust this will be sufficient to show to any person of sense and impartiality that the Editor of the Christadelphian did not understand his subject, and that if he had understood it, and honestly handled it, he would have directed his hot anathemas, not to those who with the apostle abhor the doctrine of Docetian and Cerinthian antichrists, but “to the point.”

Editor

---

## **DR. THOMAS AND BRO. ROBERTS.**

**Concerning the writings of Dr. Thomas, Bro. Roberts, on page 564 Christadelphian,**

“There is but one safe position, and in that we mean, by the favour of God, to entrench ourselves “for better or for worse,” viz., the whole truth as brought to light by Dr Thomas.

What will Christadelphians as a body, and independent thinkers generally say to this dogma of human infallibility? Those who knew Dr. Thomas well, will probably regard it as a disgrace, which were he alive, he would be the first to cast off. As to people of common sense on the outskirts of our cause, will they not conclude that some of us are enslaved by the idolatry of humanity? Here we have an emphatic declaration, that to depart in any way from the things taught by Dr Thomas, imperils our salvation! We should like the editor of the Christadelphian to speak with more precision in this matter. We should like him to tell us what things; for as our own columns have shown, Bro. Roberts himself is in grievous contradiction to the Doctor in many things. Besides this, he is guilty of tampering with the Doctor’s writings, and plainly tells his readers that the Doctor was formerly in the habit of using “equivocal language,” but that he “avoided” such language “in his later writings.” We further remark that this “equivocal language” is upon the present subject of controversy. See Christadelphian cover, Notes, F.R.S. Now, what will be inferred from these facts?

1. That Bro. Roberts professes to stand entirely on the Doctor’s teaching.
2. While professing this he is greatly at variance with the Doctor.
3. That the full text of the Doctor’s works he dares not reproduce on the present question.
4. That he assumes to interpret the Doctors meaning for the brethren, but refuses to present the whole of the Doctor’s words.

These tactics are tactics of a strongly biased mind; of a mind that shrinks from the full light, and the obvious conclusions of the statements on which it professes to rest its faith; and worst of all, while trying to sustain popularity on professed absolute confidence in the Doctor, insinuates unwittingly that on some matters the Doctor has contradicted himself.

But the Doctor’s writings are not exclusively in the hands of Bro. Roberts; he may therefore expect fair and unflinching comparisons. The Doctor is neither the first nor the last man who has contradicted himself. This is common to all men who write much; and every man who writes on a subject which he has not fully mastered, will soon be found to be on both sides of it. Whether this is so, and to what extent, we have no need to say. Let those who read our periodical pay attention to the contributions of our correspondent “Zeta,” on this subject, and they will be at no loss to decide for themselves.

Editor.

## **BRO. F. HODGKINSON'S "QUOTATION."**

"I add," says Bro. Hodgkinson, Cn. p. 555 "one quotation to the heap of testimony which I have not noticed in the argument. Paul tells us that it is appointed unto men once to die. Heb. ix. 27. Was Jesus a man? If he was a man he was appointed unto death. This is short and easy of digestion to a dainty soul."

We reply: Some things which easily pass into the stomach are not 'easy of digestion.' The more "dainty" the soul, the greater the difficulty. Where is the flaw in Bro. Hodgkinson's bit of logic? Let us see. Is man appointed to die because he is man; or because he is a sinner? If because he is a man, then Adam was at first appointed to die. But that is not true. Life was offered to him, but by his sins death came. It was then not because he was a man, but because he was a sinner that death entered the world. Therefore Jesus, though a man, was not under sentence to die. The Eden sentence only falls on sinners. If Bro. Hodgkinson says Jesus was under that sentence, let him prove Jesus to be a sinner, and we will believe him. Adam was a man as much before as after the fall. The appointment of Jesus to die was not a natural or inherited appointment, but a sacrificial one, and for this to be efficient, He Himself must be "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." A spotless sin offering on whom the sins of the world were divinely laid.

Notwithstanding all the calumny heaped on us, we are desirous above measure that all the brethren should see this glorious truth.

Editor

---

## **REMARKS ON THE KEEPING OF THE LAW.**

What becomes of "the self-evident truth" maintained by the Editor of the Christadelphian? (No. for October, 1873, p. 477) that "a law had been given that the flesh" could not keep – that "the flesh" was "incapable of what was required," in view of Stephen's charge against his Jewish brethren, recorded Acts vii. 53. He emphasizes his words, and makes the accusation more serious by reminding them that they had "received the law by the disposition of angels;" and yet they had "not kept it." This plain declaration involves "the self-evident truth" that they had power to keep it, and were consequently guilty; for it would be as absurd as unjust to arraign people for transgression of "a law," which, through "the weakness of the flesh," they were incapable of observing. Further, the proposition in question casts upon the Almighty, the Merciful One; the grave impeachment of mocking and afflicting Israel, by pains and penalties, for violations of the law – His own law, while, by the very nature He had given them, obedience was rendered an impossibility. Can such a thought be tolerated? "Is there unrighteousness with God?" "Yea, let God be true, though every man a liar;" proved false in doctrine, and have to brave the renunciation of his former opinions or prejudices without reserve. James v. 16. Rom. iii. 4.

TRUTH TRIER.

---

## **THE NATURE OF JESUS THE CHRIST IN RELATION TO ROMANS VIII. 2.**

"For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."  
(Issued by the Christadelphian Ecclesia, Tranent, Scotland, April, 1869.)

I need not say how much I appreciate the thorough way in which you have gone into the subject, and the candid manner in which, you have stated our position in reference to the doctrine in question. You notice that you have not changed your mind on that point since you gave up the "isms" of the old lady and her profligate youngsters. That may be perfectly true, and still it may be necessary that some little change should take place. Indeed, I cannot see how it can be otherwise with you or any, who, like you, make the word the man of your counsel. We may not like the word change, but still after all it is an honest word and it would save us (if we would acknowledge its meaning) a great deal of useless philosophising, which only seems to darken the subject we seek to explain (and this is especially true when it is a question of Revelation). All things concerning the purpose of the Deity are so closely linked together that our point

cannot be interpreted by itself. And since our knowledge concerning the things of the Deity in the Christ is limited, we must of necessity undergo a change when we grow in knowledge. Now, this is what I understand has been both your experience and mine in reference to those things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Anointed. Our knowledge concerning these things (limited as it is) is sufficient to constitute a basis of fellowship; at least I have understood so for a long time. The doctrine of the humanity of our Lord Jesus ranks first in the oracles of God; and hence the necessity of understanding this truth concerning Jesus. It lies at the foundation, and is the foundation, of "the great salvation." There is no difference of opinion between us, as to the fact that Jesus did come in the flesh; so that we are saved from that absurd theory that is being propounded, that not to believe in "sinful, flesh" in relation to Jesus is to deny that Jesus has come in the flesh. Our positions in reference to this matter are clearly understood by us. It is not the question of flesh that we differ about, but the relation that He (Jesus) bore to the law of sin and death, as it, now reigns over all who are in the first man. Our positions are not mystical; it is simply a question of law, and that of God's, which is not difficult to understand. It is asserted that Jesus was included in that sentence, "Dust thou art, and unto dust, shalt thou return;" but to this I demur, and wait for proof. The passages you pointed out to me I have considered, and the burden of proof contained in them confirms me in the opinion that Jesus was not included in the sentence pronounced against Adam, and the whole circumstances of the case demand (at least to my mind) that He should be free born. I have thought this ever since I renounced Trinitarianism. Since that time I have believed in Jesus, anointed as the second man brought into the world, by the will of the Deity, and put under the law of obedience for life; and his faithfulness thereto is given as a reason, of his exaltation to "the right hand of the Majesty on high" and thus being made so much better than the angels, "as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." This is He of whom it is written, "The seed of the woman," etc. The son promised to the father, begotten by the power of the Deity, born of a virgin, a holy (or whole) thing "who came not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man but of God." I hold then that Deity is the Father of Jesus, and not Adam. He was son of man in the same sense that Adam was son of man, both being sons of God by creation. Jesus recognizes no father but God, hence he says, "My father worketh hitherto, and I work;" "I came not to do mine own will," etc. He was to be honoured as the Father; He was given to have life in Himself as the Father had life in Himself; He had power to raise the dead as the Father; He was the Living Bread which came down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. His word, being the word of the Deity, is Spirit and life. The man who keeps His saying "shall never see death," In this was the grace of God manifested, by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Anointed, who hath abolished death and brought life etc. This is the end for which Jesus came in a nature a little lower than the angels. The angelic nature being deathless, and it being through death that death was to be abolished, He must appear in a nature suitable to the work given Him to do; hence, He appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh. But no one would suppose (unless pressed by this theory) that to be in the likeness of a thing was to be the thing itself. We never think of a likeness being the thing itself, and why depart from the common-sense rule in reference to this very important matter? I am convinced nothing but a false theory would necessitate such an inference, as that the likeness in this case constitutes the thing itself. The very necessity of the case demands that it should not be so. The purpose for which God sent forth His Son, was to condemn sin in the flesh. How? By His offering Himself a sacrifice for sin, and not of sin, as this "sinful flesh" theory demands. No, Paul put it thus: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus. . . For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Thus, then, we discover two laws in operation. Paul had passed from the law in the first man, into the law of the second man; or, in other words, "we have passed from death unto life" (1 John iii. 14) is again referred to as proof of this doctrine. It is written of the law when the fulness of time was come, "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman." The question comes to be, What law is it that is spoken of? The statement, we think, bears its stamp so distinctly that we need be at no loss to know what law it is. It bears the Mosaic stamp so perceptibly, that we do not need to take a second thought about the matter. It was that same law in which it was written, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree," "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." He was thus "made sin who knew no sin, that we," etc. The Law of Moses was the law under which the Messiah came. But the keeping of that law could not give eternal life: "It was added because of transgressions, until," etc., "The law was our schoolmaster," etc. It was not the keeping of that law that gave eternal life, for then many others could have attained to it, Zacharias and his wife were both "righteous (Mosaically) before God walking," etc., "and a host of others of whom the world was not worthy." But there was another law that preceded the Law of Moses, that is, the law given in Eden. That law was the law of obedience. The second Adam came under that law as well as the first; the first man failed to keep it, the second failed not. He kept it and made himself honourable. The first and last Adams were put under the same law, that is, the law of

obedience, but the results were very different. But it is maintained that the last was involved in the failure of the first. That I do not believe. The law they came under was not the law of death, but of obedience, and, in my humble judgment, it is nonsense to speak of a condemned thing being put under law to redeem itself, or others in like condemnation. The law of the spirit of life which was in Christ Jesus was the law of obedience. In all things, therefore, you will see, that while I do not believe that Jesus was constituted a sinner by the first man's disobedience, still I do not, believe that Jesus could, according to the law of obedience, have kept His life; for it was written in that law which He was under – "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build ... Messiah shall be cut off, but not for Himself." It was written, "Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered;" "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised," etc.; "He was numbered with the transgressors, and He bore the sin of many." He was the man of whom Moses wrote that was slain by Simeon and Levi. He was the man whose soul was not left in hell, the "Holy One who did not see corruption. His heel must be bruised. The law of obedience left Him no choice as to His drinking the cup given Him by the Father. It was a dark hour for Him, an hour of trial such as had never been before, and never will be again, for Deity to forsake His Holy One He therefore prayed, "O, my Father, if it be possible," etc.; he prayed a second time, saying, "O my Father, if this cup," etc.; he prayed a third time, saying the same words. But there was no release. It was the Father's will. He gave him the law, and it must be honoured. He came to do the will of God. If he had failed in this He would then have had His own life taken away for His own' sin, instead of it being poured out as an offering for the sin of others. He must needs fulfil all things which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Himself. When His disciples understood this, that Christ must needs suffer, and enter into glory, then they understood the scripture; and I am strongly of opinion that the measure of our understanding this matter is the measure of our understanding the scriptures.

He died, then, under the law of obedience, and not under the law of sin, as Adam the first did. He died under the law of righteousness and life that that same law might be fulfilled "in us who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." In this we have not the righteousness of Christ imputed to us. He had no superabundant righteousness to dispose of. He did neither more nor less than that law required of Him that He was under. The righteousness of Christ is not the righteousness imputed to us, but the righteousness of God, "which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe" the Gospel, this righteousness being witnessed by the law and the prophets. Abraham received a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had, being yet uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also, who walk in the steps of that faith which was counted unto Him for righteousness. "This faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Many are going about to establish their own righteousness, being ignorant of God's righteousness. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth." The righteousness that is of faith speaketh on this wise, "Say not," etc. But what saith it? "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth," etc. I need not say that the faith that is imputed for righteousness is a belief in the Gospel which concerns the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus anointed. I am anxious that we should understand this doctrine of righteousness, and that is the reason I have noticed it so fully; because there is a tendency in human nature to Judaize, that is ending in the flesh what has been begun in the Spirit. Jesus attained unto the righteousness of God by a perfect obedience in all things, even to the death of the Cross. This was the basis of His exaltation. We attain unto the righteousness of God by a receiving of Him who was not born of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. We thus receive power to become the sons of God and partakers of his righteousness or holiness, and therefore justified from all things which could not be attained unto on any principle of law-keeping, because of our being condemned already before we could (supposing we had been able) keep the law given, and besides it is in the light of this doctrine that we know Christ.

You refer to Hebrews iv. 15, as a further proof of Jesus being under the law of sin and death, "For we have not an High Priest that cannot be touched," etc. I ask what proof is here that Jesus was under the law of sin and death? Is it His being touched with the feeling of our infirmities?" Is such a feeling sin? If so, I am not aware where the law is recorded. Sin is the transgression of law, but a law unwritten is no law, and therefore cannot be broken. Is it in His being tempted in all points like as we are? If being tempted is sin, then Adam was a sinner before he transgressed, for he was tempted before he disobeyed the law of life, which brought death. We conceive the two Adams were in a like position, that is, under the law of temptation or trial. The first being tempted, sinned, the second being tempted, sinned not. He resisted the devil at all points, and overcame even in the nature of the first man. This is wherein the glory of the life of the Christ is given us, that we should follow His steps. That theory of making Him more than man, by His being the son of God, is fatal to the doctrine of example and obedience as given us by Him who endured

“the contradiction of sinners against Himself.” “He endured the Cross, despising the shame.” This is set before us as an example, but if He did such things in virtue of His parentage (and His father was God), then I fail to see how His example can be an example to us, who have fathers in the flesh. This theory is fatal to the doctrine of example and obedience (in a doctrinal view), and besides, it is fatal to all those words of comfort and consolation that are based on the fact that we are “bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh” who was tempted in all points, like as we are yet without sin,” and such an one became us, who is “holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners,” “and (now) made higher than the heavens.” This scripture then proves to my mind that Jesus is one with us in nature, and that He was tempted but sinned not, and it is in the light of this scripture, and many others, that we can see the truth contained in that other scripture referred to, Heb. vii. 27. “Who needeth not daily, as other High Priests,” etc. It is inferred from this passage that the antitypical High Priest made after the power of an endless life, shall be under the necessity of providing and offering, first, for his own sins and then for the people’s, according to the type. This sort of reasoning is very common in our day, but if it is sound then it just amounts to this, that the shadow is as good as the substance, or the type the antitype, and thus reduces everything to confusion and nonsense. “The law,” says the Apostle, “was a shadow of good things to come,” and not “the very image of the things;” All this must be reversed in order that the priest, after the order of Melchisedec, may be made a sinner, like all who have ministered “after the law of a carnal commandment.” Truly, if this be the case, “the latter end is worse than the first.” What does the Apostle say on the point, “Moreover, brethren . . . I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.” “He was delivered for our offences.” “He bore our sins in His own body on the tree.” The scriptures are full of this testimony, but where do we find that Christ died for His own sins? Such a thought, we venture to affirm, is not to be found in the scriptures, and therefore we feel bound to lay aside the dogma of sin in relation to Jesus, or the theory “that He had first to offer for His own sins on the altar of a broken law.” Then for the people He could not make a sacrifice of that which was not His own; but according to this theory He had no life to offer. It is perfect nonsense to speak of a person making a sacrifice in giving that which is not his own “on the altar of a broken law,” and if Jesus was a sinner in the Adamic sense, then it claimed His life, and He had not two lives. Then He had no life to sacrifice to a broken law. It was His own, and much less had He a life to pour out as an offering for sin, on the altar of Deity on which we have been accustomed to think, the offering of Himself without fault to God and not to devils (as this theory of the altar of a broken law teaches) was made. Perfection in all things was essential in the antitypical High Priest, for he had no offering but one to make, and without one offering all the offerings typified in the law, as revealed in the scriptures were perfected, when He cried aloud unto His Father, “into Thy hands I commit my spirit” (or delivered up His life). If He was unclean in virtue of His nature being flesh, then He, as all others who had ministered at the altar, must be cleansed before entering into the holy place, and I ask then was it through the shedding of blood that He was cleansed and fitted to enter in and have fellowship with God? When He said, “Thou hearest me always,” surely no one would say so. He had access unto the Father outside of the Priest, and how? Because “He had clean hands and a pure heart.” He could seek to be judged according to the righteousness of Deity and rewarded according to His own righteousness. He required no Priest to do service for Him at the altar, and good that it was so, for no one could have been found to minister for Him in the holy place. The High Priest thought “it expedient that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not,” and not for that nation only, but also, “that He should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.” This then was the purpose for which He died and presented Himself at the altar when His hour was come. I am convinced that this doctrine of “His flesh being full of sin” has no proof in the scriptures. They tell me that no sin was in Him, that He did no sin; He was separate from sinners, the first-born of every creature - the head of the new creation. This is according to the eternal purpose of the Deity. For by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones,” etc. It pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell (Heb. ii. 14. 16) is adduced as further proof of this doctrine of “sinful flesh.” Forasmuch then as the children (given him) are partakers,” etc. For verily he took not on Him the nature of angels, but of the seed of Abraham He took hold. Who are they? They are the children of God by the faith of Him the Christ who is the Father of us all. It is such whose sins are forgiven that He taketh hold of; they are the children given Him by the Father.

(To be continued.)

# **THE LECTURE ON “THE SLAIN LAMB” DISSECTED.**

**(Continued from December 1873, page 10.)**

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

1. Adam was son of God: so was Jesus.
2. Adam was made a living soul capable of death: so was Jesus.
3. Adam was human nature, or “flesh and blood:” so was Jesus.
4. Adam was formed of the dust: Jesus of flesh which sprang out of dust.
5. God must have taught Adam, for there was no other teacher: Jesus “heard and learned” of His Father.
6. Adam received a law of obedience from God: Jesus came to do His Father’s will.
7. Adam was put “on trial for immortality:” Jesus conquered through obedience under trial.
8. Adam’s desires tempted him to sin: Jesus suffered being tempted.
9. Adam’s nature and impulses were those common to all men; Jesus “was tried in all points like His brethren.”
10. Adam was born lord of the creation: Jesus was born King of all the earth.
11. Adam’s temptation had relation to eating: Jesus was tempted to make bread out of stones.
12. Upon Adam’s conduct depended the future happiness of his children: upon the obedience of Jesus depended the salvation of those He came to save.”
13. Our relation to Adam involves us in real death: our relation to Jesus in figurative death.
14. Adam died through his own sin: Jesus “tasted death for every man” who sinned in Adam.
15. By one man’s (Adam’s) disobedience many were made sinners: by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.
16. Adam “was appointed to suffer,” for in all trial there is suffering: Jesus suffered by the trials of His faith, besides the suffering of death.
17. Adam was simply innocent until he received God’s law: Jesus was innocent until he reached the age to know good and evil.
18. Adam was a man of character while he obeyed: Jesus perfected His character by perfect obedience.
19. Adam was the father of the old creation: Jesus is the founder of the new.
20. The old creation began in “flesh and blood” under obedience: the new creation began in Jesus, who was tried in and by our nature.
21. The old creation closes in death through sin: the new creation attains to life through righteousness.
22. If there is “entire dissimilarity,” how then does Paul style “Adam the figure of Him who was to come.”

Mark, Bro. Roberts says in Question 70 that the second Adamship of Jesus did not begin till he became immortal.

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

Paragraph XV - Here Bro. Roberts invites the audience to look at our diagram, and to notice that by using the word “debt,” to signify that which Jesus paid for our release, we employed “artificial and unscriptural jargon.” To very few persons is a “debt” an “artificial” thing; and if the word may be called “jargon” it is a jargon which most people can understand. But our devout editor has a perfect horror of the “unscriptural.” If “debt” is unscriptural it will not be found in the Scriptures. We have before-times ventured to give the editor this piece of information. But if the word “debt” should be found in the

Scriptures, and particularly if it should be employed in relation to sin and death, how then? The editor has probably read these words: -

“And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us.”

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

Paragraph XVI is unworthy of note as regards our position, except for the false application of that text which says, “death reigned from Adam to Moses even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.” If these words be construed to mean that all men did not sin in Adam, then Paul, who writes, “in whom all sinned” is made a liar. And if it be held that the consequence of that sin was not death to all, the lie is again given to Paul’s teaching - “and so death hath passed on all.” The Apostle has taught that “remission of sins” there is none without the shedding of blood.” Brother Roberts, therefore, in asserting that blood is only needful for personal sins of one’s own committing, makes the apostle a false teacher. Let Bro. Roberts point us to one single text which indicates that a man would be released from death inherited from Adam without the blood of Christ, and we will give up the dispute. That the reader may see we have not misrepresented Bro. Roberts’ position, we will give his own words - “I will show before I have done . . . that that which stands in the way of our resurrection by nature is not our hereditary mortality in Adam, but our personal offences.” - Paragraph XV, Christadelphian, p. 440.

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

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

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

Paragraph XIX offers nothing for comment.

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

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

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

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

Paragraph XXII - The exposure of one sentence in this section will reduce the whole to chaff. Bro. Roberts says, “God will keep no man in the grave because of Adam’s sin, if he himself be individually

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Paragraph XXX. contains nothing to object to.

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

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

of transgressing its lawful bounds, and there is no faculty, when within its bounds, but what is “very good,” for God made them all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Paragraph XXXIX - Before a man takes Paul’s high stand he should be quite sure that he is his equal in knowledge; to say nothing of Divine inspiration. “The remaining part of the chart will be intelligible at a glance,” says Bro. Roberts. Now we string ourselves up to discover the intelligibility of the next statement. “The resurrection of the offered body of Christ was the Father’s work, as you know, and therefore a stream of light connects the central sun with that event.” Now, on this point, as on others, we say, again, that if Bro. Roberts will prove, either in Paul’s words or in any words of Scripture, that Christ’s body was offered before He rose from the dead, we will cease our contention. We maintain that Christ’s body was offered once, and that once was in the most holy place - that is, “heaven itself.” (Heb. ix. 11, 12, 24-26). “A stream of light,” says Bro. Roberts, “shews this on his chart.” We say all the accumulated star-light and sun-light of the universe cannot prove it true. The priest under the law could not on the great day of atonement offer outside the holy place. He entered there to offer by means of the blood shed outside. So, also, Christ, slain on the cross, entered the most holy heavenly by means of His own blood. There He offered Himself. He who talks of the “resurrection of the offered body of Christ,” says, in effect, that Christ was raised from the dead after His ascension!

In conclusion, Paragraphs XL. to XLIV are undeserving of detailed criticism: personal vituperation is their “trade mark.” We close our dissection of this lecture on The Slain Lamb by giving a list of the falsehoods in doctrine which in this controversy Bro. Roberts has tried to put into our mouths.

**IMPUTED FALSEHOODS.**

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

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

EDITOR.

**WHO CAN RECONCILE THESE THINGS?**

**By A. B. C.**

**YEA**

**NAY**

<p>It (sin) represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh “which has the power of death,” and it is called sin, because the development or fixation of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled “sinful flesh,” “that is, flesh full of sin, so that sin in the sacred style came to stand for the substance called man. – Elpis Israel, p. 113.</p> <p>I teach that Jesus Christ, when upon earth, was Deity manifested in sinful flesh, for the condemnation of sin, in the *nature that sinned in Eden. - Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, Oct. 1869, p. 286.</p> <p>Me wash from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin! For I acknowledge my transgressions, and before me ever is my sin. - Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, Aug. 1873, p. 338.</p>	<p>Our flesh is the same as Adam’s before he sinned, only the worse for wear; for Paul says that we sinned in him, and he was sinless before he sinned: and we were as much in his loins when he was sinless, as in the act of sinning. His flesh undefiled by sin is constitutionally the same as the flesh of his posterity legally denied thereby. - Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, August 1869, p. 216.</p> <p>Psalm li. 2, My sin, i.e., the sin for which I am to be an offering,* - Christadelphian, Aug. 1873, p. 338. The guiltless Messiah.- Phanerosis, p. 53.</p>
--	---

<p>‘Gainst thee, thee only, have I sinn’d, and in thy sight this evil done; so that thou’rt in thy sentence just, and upright in thy judgment too. - Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, Aug. 1873, p. 338.</p> <p>Psalm li. 5. In sin, i.e., He (Messiah) was to be born of the woman, a quality of the accidental constitution of whose nature is sin. - Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, August, 1873, p. 338.</p> <p>This body which descended from David “according to the fleas,” was the sacrificial victim offered by the Eternal Spirit (Heb. ix., 14). If David’s flesh were immaculate, this victim, descended from him, might be spotless; but, in that event, it would not have answered for the annulling and condemnation of sin in the flesh that sinned. (Rom. viii., 3.) - Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, July, 1878, p. 823.</p> <p>. . . Jesus Christ came in the flesh, in the sort of flesh with which Paul was afflicted when he exclaimed, “O, wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” (Rom. vii., 11, 24.) - -Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, July, 1878, p. 833.</p> <p>If anyone say that Jesus Christ did not come in the flesh common to us all, the apostle John saith, that that spirit or teacher in not of God (1 John iv .8). - Dr, Thomas, Christadelphian, July, 1873, p. 823.</p> <p>The Son of Man born out of the flesh was flesh - mortal blood and flesh. - Phanerosis, p. 44.</p> <p>Sin, I say, is a synonym for human nature, Hence the flesh is invariably regarded as unclean . . . This view of sin in the flesh is enlightening in the things concerning Jesus . . . Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus, if it had not existed there.</p>	<p>Psalm li. 4. Thee only; - this shows the strict applicability of this psalm to the Messiah, who never sinned against any man: this can be said of none but of Him. * - Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, Aug. 1873, p. 338.</p> <p>Jesus . . . was son of the Deity by creation, and the son of man by the flesh developed from Mary . . . without human intervention. Hence His flesh was the same flesh as the First Adam with whom ours is identical. - Dr. Thomas, Christadelphian, August, 1873, p. 363.</p> <p>Such (son of God and son of man) was the babe Jesus in preparation for the sacrificial man. His germination was irrespective of the lust of the flesh, the propensity excited in the first Adam by his guilty companion, and of which Cain was the fruit. In this particular the generation of Jesus was different from that of all other men. If Joseph had been his father, he would have been born of blood, of the will of the flesh, and of man, instead of the Spirit. – Eureka, vol. 1 pp. 276,277</p> <p>Jesus had no human father, but was created by the Spirit, as independently of the will of the flesh as Adam, the beginning of the animal creation of the Deity was before him. – Eureka, vol. i., p. 406</p> <p>They (Nicodemus and his contemporaries) did not perceive that Jesus was “a body prepared” by special-creation. – Phanerosis, p. 44</p> <p>Thus “Logos became flesh, and dwelt among us,” says John, “and we beheld His glory, glory as of an only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.” . . . Now, Theos was the Logos, says John, that is, Deity was the Word, and this Word became flesh in the manner testified. Was the product, therefore, not Deity? Did the unity of spirit with flesh annihilate that spirit, and leave only flesh? Was the holy thong born a mere son of Adam?</p>
--	---

**Footnotes:-**

- 1). Was the nature that sinned in Eden sinful? The first paragraph says it was “sinless.”- Editor.
- 2). That is our sin laid on him.- Editor.
- 3). According to these statements, Messiah, though He “never sinned against any man,” was a sinner against God.

(To be continued.)

## INTELLIGENCE.

**BIRMINGHAM.** - Through the necessary condensation (for want of space) of the Birmingham Intelligence forwarded last month, several facts were omitted which further exhibit the animus of some at least of the members of the ecclesia worshipping in the Temperance Hall. As already stated, on the first Sunday subsequent to the coup d'état, a number of the excluded presented themselves at the meeting place for the purpose of protesting against the unrighteous procedure of the preceding Thursday, and on being refused admission to the floor by the "special constables" of the ecclesia placed there for the purpose, they went into the gallery and awaited the opportune moment, when two of them rose and publicly protested. They also declared their intention of continuing their protest from time to time till justice had been conceded them. Bro. Roberts, in reply, stated that his object, in the course he had pursued, had been peace, and he intimated that if the protestations were continued, as threatened, he would call in the aid of the police! One or two of the brethren excluded were in favour of testing his right to do this, but it was decided by the majority to cease further public protestation. The "specials," however, were kept at their posts for several weeks in view of eventualities. The statement contained in the December Christadelphian that "a goodly number of those who refrained from taking part in the withdrawal hold the truth themselves, but are not yet clear as to parting with the fellowship of those who reject it," is a misrepresentation. A few, not "a goodly number," refrained from taking part in the withdrawal (though still retaining the old theory of Christ); not, however, for the cause stated in any one instance, but simply because they could not give their countenance to the irregular, unconstitutional, and unrighteous mode in which the withdrawal, alias expulsion, had been enacted. And a number of brethren and sisters, who were entrapped into acquiescence in the withdrawal, have since admitted their ignorance of the real object contemplated by the chief actor in the drama. Several of them are beginning to perceive more clearly the points in the controversy, and how much they have been deceived in regard to them.

Another fact, shewing the petty tricks to which our opponents will resort to stifle discussion on the now vexed question may be mentioned. For a long time a Bible-class, open to all comers, had been held on Sunday afternoons in a room behind the Temperance Hall, and on the Sunday previous to the exclusion a very interesting meeting was held for the discussion of the moot point now so prominent, upholders of each theory being present asking and answering questions. The utmost good feeling was maintained, and an almost general wish was expressed that the discussion should be continued on the following Sunday. In the interim, however, the great plot was hatched, and its result fulminated; and when the next Sunday arrived it was found that the enemy had been "wise in their generation." The class-room had been taken possession of, and the Bible class removed to Bro. Roberts private office at the Athenaeum, into which none were desired to enter who had not the mark on their foreheads. So much for their desire for free discussion! Since their expulsion, the "Noncondemnationists" have taken a convenient room at No. 16, Broad Street, Islington, where morning services have since been conducted, and where there is every prospect of a goodly number rallying for the support of the truth.

When this appears in print a Christmas tea-meeting will have been held in the new room, where Bro. Handley has been invited to attend, and aid in the building up of the ecclesia. The Athenaeum, which Bro. Roberts refused to let for Bro. E. Turney's lecturers now let on Sunday evenings to the Spiritualists, a leader of whom dropped down dead in the midst of his anti-scriptural utterances a few Sundays ago. So much for consistency. - [We are indebted for the above to Bro. Butler.] EDINBRO'. - Brother Ellis, writing from this city a few days since, states that the brethren generally were well disposed to listen to his arguments on the subject of the present controversy. A long discussion had been held between him and Bro. Charles Smith, commencing with half-hour speeches, and then with quarter-hour speeches, alternately. Bro. Ellis does not furnish any details, but remarks that his opponent tried to maintain his position by quotations from the Psalms, and was much "put about." Another brother, writing to the Editor from the same place, says, "The subject ('The Sacrifice of Christ'), is attracting some attention amongst our brethren, and I think I may say they rejoice in your step. I do not agree with all that is said, but it is music to the ear to hear our Master spoken of as the Holy One, rather than associated personally with sin. There is something awfully repugnant in it. How could it be said He was made sin for us who knew no sin, if He were just like us in respect to sin? He knew no sin in His flesh, or in His life. He was separate from sinners. We must twist the Scriptures if we want to make Him out as sinful, defiled, and joined to sinners. I hope you will not, however, fall into any of the errors which have characterised the Christadelphian. Be patient of your brethren, be just, be truthful, be honest, and your endeavours will be blessed of God."

**LEICESTER.** - In keeping the unity of the Spirit, we have been compelled to withdraw from those denying the truth concerning the Christ, and for the present have returned to the room we originally occupied for the breaking of bread. In addition to the 12 names attached to the withdrawal, we are pleased to state that at the commencement of the controversy, Mr. and Mrs. Duffin, who for two years had been attending our meeting, were immersed into the truth; thus the Leicester Ecclesia of Christadelphians is thinned down to 14 in number, who now meet together on the basis of the Christ having come into the world free from Adamic condemnation. There are two more shortly to be immersed. - Charles Weale.

To the Brethren assembling at Silver Street, Leicester. - We, the undersigned believers of the Truths taught by the Spirit of God, and made known to the children of men in early times through Moses and the Prophets, and in "the last days" by the Son of God and the Apostles, having, after mature consideration and study of the Scriptures, arrived at the conviction, "That Jesus the Christ and Son of the living God, was not brought into the world under condemnation of the death pronounced in Eden upon our first parents for transgression. That the Scriptures nowhere teach the doctrine that He was under that condemnation. That such doctrine is antagonistic to the spirit and tenor of the Scriptures, and is subversive of sundry first principles; that, as He proceeded forth and came from God, He is fittingly described as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world; that He came to 'seek and to save that which was lost;' that He was the 'only begotten of Father full of grace and truth.' That, as He came to give His life a ransom for sinners, we say, that in view of these and innumerable other kindred testimonies, it is impossible, without dishonour to God, to His word, to His work of redemption, and to His Son, to hold such a doctrine, or to continue in communion with those who not only hold it but persistently shut out the consideration of it in temperate discussion. We do therefore withdraw from your Ecclesia, on the ground hereinbefore set forth. We entertain no feelings of bitterness or animosity towards any member of your body, on the contrary, we would rejoice to be found with you in the unity of the one spirit, one faith, one Lord, etc. This desirable consummation we know, however, could only be brought about by a patient, honest, and independent scrutiny of the revealed Word. Setting aside personal considerations and irrespective of the decrees or opinions of any man or men, be they however talented or gifted, short of inspiration; to that word, combined in harmony with itself we will ever bow with humility. We desire further to state that we hold ourselves prepared at any time or place to defend our position from the Scriptures, and to prove that your view of Jehovah's Christ (not ours) is "heresy." That you may all shortly come to rejoice in the truth touching the matter in controversy, is the earnest prayer of, Charles Weale, J. C. Brawn, Edwin Lester, Arthur W. Warner, F.M. Lester, M. A. Agnes Lester, M. H. Dodge, B. G. Baker, Annie Lester, Lavina Warner, Louise Lester, Sarah Dodge. Dated, December 11th 1873.

**LONDON.** - Bro. David Brown's MS. on the Nature of the Christ will have early insertion. We extract the following paragraph from a recent letter of his: "I have read with much interest the first No. of the "Lamp." I hope it will be conducted in a spirit of love and of a sound mind for the elucidation of the hidden wisdom of the word, and to give everyone who is able an opportunity of presenting his reasonable ideas on the issues of revelation. I shall endeavour to aid the enterprise, having confidence in Bro. Turney and his co-adjutors, that they will be none otherwise minded than to work a good work for the building up of the saints in their most holy faith without fear or favour." Since the discussion between brethren Handley and Andrew, alluded to in our last number, a division has taken place in the London Ecclesia, resulting in the separation of about a dozen from those assembling in Upper Street, Islington. They expect shortly to obtain a suitable room in which to set forth the Truth.

**MALDON.** - Bro. C. Handley sends a brief report of the discussion between his father and Bro. Andrew, which occupied three nights, two being devoted to discussion, and one to questioning. Bro. Lewin acted as chairman, and in summing up showed the necessity of all looking out for themselves, and not being led by man or party feeling, but by a "Thus saith the Lord" stating further, that henceforward we march under two separate banners, ourselves, under the one declared by Paul that Christ died for our sins. Dan. ix. 26, Isa. liii. &c. Our opponents, under their own inscription, namely, that Christ died for His own sins, being by constitution a sinner. Bro. C. Handley says further, "those holding the truth are more than ever confirmed therein, "There was nothing new advanced save an interpretation of Heb. ii. 16, which Bro. Andrew declared to mean something altogether new, and I think altogether foreign. The word 'He,' there spoken of, Bro. A. says signifies death. Death, taketh not hold, etc. He still adheres to his definition of the Mosaic curse, but says the infringement of the law by Jesus was not transgression, because it was an act of obedience. I hope the discussion may have a good effect on the opposing party, who at all events are not agreed among themselves. My father and Bro. A. were at issue with regard to the applicability of the term Prince in Eze. xlv. 22, to the Messiah, the latter contending it did apply to Him, which, however, he failed to prove. In his questions and answers he flatly contradicted Bro. Roberts, and also the Doctor in his article on the "Doctrine concerning the Tempter," saying that Jesus had in Him evil desires and was

tempted from within, quoting Heb. iv. 15, The meeting was very orderly throughout, though I could not help putting a word in now and again.”

**MUMBLES.** - Bro. Clement writes under date, Nov. 12th, that he is occupied delivering a Course of Lectures on various subjects, which will not be over before February next. Also that he is pledged to go to Neath, where the Brethren have lately taken a room in which they hold a public service every Sunday evening. When these engagements are fulfilled he will have great pleasure in visiting Nottingham.

**NOTTINGHAM.** - There have been six immersions during the present month (December) namely, Thomas George White, son of Sister White, aged 24, lace maker, formerly attending a Wesleyan Chapel; Alice Mary Lewin, sister in the flesh to Bro. Lewin, aged 21; John Lowater Lewin, brother in the flesh to Bro. Lewin; Ellen Godkin, aged 27, daughter of Bro. and Sister Godkin ; Eliza Beck, aged 29, all formerly belonging to the Church of England, and Annie Louisa Smith, sister in the flesh to Bro. Thomas Smith, aged 20, formerly attending a Methodist Chapel, but not a member. The following lectures have been delivered on Sunday evenings to very large audiences since our last report, namely, “The Bible teaching concerning the Devil,” Bro. Ellis. “The Way, the Truth, and the Life,” Bro. Glover. “The Sure Mercies of David,” Bro. F. N. Turney. “Life from the Dead,” Bro. Hayes. “The Rich Man in Hell Torments,” “Christadelphians not Christians,” being an answer to Mr. Govett, of Norwich, both the above by Bro. Handley. Answers to written questions concerning the two previous lectures. Bro. Hayes. “The Hope of Israel,” Bro. F. Lester. The attendance at the Bible Class continues very good, and on the whole the prospects of the truth in this town are encouraging.

**PLYMOUTH.** - Bro. Moore, writing November 14th says: with one exception all the members of the Stoke Ecclesia endorse the Scripture testimony of an uncondemned Christ. I wish all the brethren and sisters could see eye to eye on this sublime topic. How clear the plan of salvation appears through this view. Many passages, which before appeared confused, are now made clear. He mentions spending a pleasant hour with Bro. and Sis. Morgan, and Bro. Ditcher, on the eve of their departure for Canterbury, New Zealand.

**SWINDON.** - Bro. Haines, writing from No. 26, Marlborough road, is desirous the Brotherhood should know that he and those fellowshipping with him are one with Bro. Turney in the present controversy, and rejoice in the knowledge conveyed in the pages of the “Christadelphian Lamp.” He offers the use of a comfortable room to any Bro. who will favour him with a visit.