



A THREE NIGHTS' DISCUSSION

*Was Jesus of
Nazareth the
Messiah?*

R. Roberts / L. Stern

WAS JESUS OF NAZARETH THE MESSIAH ?

A THREE NIGHTS'
DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

MR. ROBERT ROBERTS,

Editor of the "Christadelphian," and

MR. LOUIS STERN,

An Orthodox Jew, of Birmingham,

IN THE TEMPERANCE HALL,

BIRMINGHAM,

On Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday, October 17th, 18th & 19th, 1871.

REV. B. WRIGHT, UNITARIAN MINISTER, IN THE CHAIR.

1 8 7 2 .

A REPRODUCTION OF
AN ORIGINAL EDITION BY

THE
herald press
4011 BOLIVIA HOUSTON, TEXAS 77092

P R E F A C E.

THE following Discussion is published jointly by the disputants, who have revised their speeches as furnished from a shorthand writer's notes.

It originated as follows: On Monday, September 18th, 1871, Mr. Segfried Gratz, a Jew, having embraced the Christadelphian faith, lectured in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham, "on the promises of God, considered from a new and purely Israelitish point of view." The Jews of Birmingham, who were specially invited, attended in moderate numbers, and, at the close of the lecture, one of their number, Mr. Joel Monaet, of Birmingham, challenged Mr. Gratz to public controversy. The challenge was accepted, and a single night's debate (Tuesday, October 3rd) before a crowded house, was the result. At this debate, Mr. Roberts, with the consent of both parties, occupied the chair; and, at the close of the meeting, he expressed his regret that his position precluded him from speaking on the subject. This drew from Mr. Stern, who was present, a proposal for discussion, which resulted in the three nights' discussion herein reported.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

WAS JESUS OF NAZARETH THE MESSIAH?

THREE NIGHTS' DISCUSSION.

The discussion was held in the Temperance Hall, Temple Street, Birmingham, on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, October 17th, 18th and 19th, 1871, between Mr. Robert Roberts and Mr. Louis Stern, both of Birmingham. There was a large and respectable audience each night. The chair was occupied, the three nights, by the Rev. B. Wright, Unitarian minister.

THE CHAIRMAN, in opening the meeting the first night, said, In order that no person might come to a wrong conclusion respecting his presence in the chair : that he had no high opinion of the value of public discussions to those in search of truth. His impression was that truth was best served by writing, as writing did not so much lead to rouse those feelings which were often seen in connection with discussions of that character. After asking a fair hearing for each side, he called upon Mr. Roberts to open the discussion.

MR. ROBERTS: Ladies and gentlemen, my position to-night indicates that I do not altogether share the sentiments of the Chairman as to the utility of discussion. I agree with him that results of critical value are not to be arrived at in the course of controversy for any number of nights, but I think the stimulus given to the minds of listeners in the direction of the question agitated, tends much to subsequent interest and attention to the subject, and, therefore, indirectly, is ultimately of great value. Therefore I have willingly accepted the challenge given to me by Mr. Stern, believing that the great truth embodied in the proposition of to-night will obtain more attention when canvassed by controversy, than even if expounded in a lecture. However, letting that pass, I address myself to the duty that devolves upon me, which is to maintain that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. That

affirmation embodies an issue that is exceedingly simple and convenient for discussion. We both agree, I presume, as to the two principal ideas that go to make up the proposition; we both agree as to what is meant by "Jesus of Nazareth," historically at all events; that he was an actual personage who appeared among the Jews 1800 years ago. From Mr. Stern's character as an orthodox Jew, I am justified in presuming that we are also agreed as to the idea represented by the term "Messiah;" a Jewish expectation of now almost untold centuries, that a certain great personage would arise among them who would be their ruler, their king, their head, their leader, who would re-establish their ancient commonwealth, and give them universal dominion in the erecting of a universal empire upon the basis of the Jewish nationality restored. Agreeing on these abstract points, the issue is simply this: was the one, the other? was Jesus of Nazareth that personage? Mr. Stern says No, I say Yes; and I will proceed to give substantial reasons for that answer.

My first reason is, that he appeared at the time when according to the prophets of the Jewish nation the Messiah of Israel ought to have appeared. I refer you to a prophecy of Daniel (ix. 24-25), which I will read:—

"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins,

and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, UNTO THE MESSIAH THE PRINCE, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."

I assume it as a point conceded on all hands, and that, therefore, needs not to be discussed in connection with this controversy, that these seventy weeks are the symbolic equivalent of 490 years, upon the principle that in prophetic-symbolic usage, a day stands for a year, of which you will find a distinct and unquestionable illustration in the fourth chapter of Ezekiel, to which I will not now refer you more particularly. Seventy weeks multiplied by 7, (the number of days in a week) give a total of 490; and, therefore, presuming that Mr. Stern, in common with the Jews in general, (and he will be at issue with his own brethren if it is otherwise, and the professing Christian community also) accepts the seventy weeks as symbolic of a period of 490 years; we have only to find out the commencement of the period, to ascertain the time when the Messiah ought to have appeared. The question is, what is the starting point of the period? The answer is as plain as could be desired: "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem;" to understand which, we have to remember that at the time these words were addressed to Daniel, the Jews were in captivity in Babylon, where Daniel himself was at the time he received the vision. Jerusalem was lying in waste and desolation. The time had arrived for the fulfilment of the prophecy of Jeremiah (which I presume Mr. Stern will not question,) that at the close of seventy years, Israel should be restored to their land. In view of these facts, the definition is an intelligible definition. From the issue of the edict that was to effect the re-building of the ruined city of Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince, there should elapse a total period of 490 years, divided into three minor parts of 7, 62, and 1, with references to leading historical events that were to mark the interval. It comes to be a matter of simple historic enquiry as to when the edict was issued, and we find our answer within the two boards

of the Bible. We find the issue of the edict recorded in Nehemiah ii. There we are told that Nehemiah, who was cupbearer to Artaxerxes, the Persian king, was sad in the royal presence, and to the question put to him why he was sad, he answered thus (third verse):—

"Let the king live for ever: why should not my countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my fathers' sepulchres, lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire? Then the king said unto me, For what dost thou make request? So I prayed to the God of heaven. And I said unto the king, if it please the king, and if thy servant have found favour in thy sight, that thou wouldest send me unto Judah, unto the city of my fathers' sepulchres, THAT I MAY BUILD IT."

Thereupon the king gave orders for Nehemiah's wish to be granted. He placed a military escort at his disposal, as appears from verse 9, and issued an official direction to the men in authority in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, to assist Nehemiah in the execution of the work. I am not unaware that previous to this, Ezra had co-operated with the Jews under an edict of Cyrus, for the re-building of the Temple, but the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem itself, transpired in the days of Nehemiah, who received and executed that order. The question is what was the date of that order? Chronologists are agreed that the date was before Christ 456 and a fraction. How old was Christ when he died? Thirty-three and a fraction. Add thirty-three and a fraction to 456 and a fraction, and what is the result? 490 years—the very period defined in Daniel.

I, therefore, put forward, as the first reason for maintaining that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, the fact that he appeared at the precise period required by the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks. The Jews themselves expected the appearance of their Messiah at that time. For this, we have the testimony of Josephus, who says that the Jews believed that that was the time when one of the Jewish nation should rise up to carry out the purpose declared in the prophets. His words, which will be found in his 7th book, 31st chapter, are as follow:

"That which chiefly excited them (the Jews) to war, was an ambiguous prophecy, THAT AT THAT TIME, someone within their country should arise that should obtain the empire of the whole world. This they had received, that it was spoken by one of their nation."

Here we have testimony of an historian whom I presume Mr. Stern will not call in question, that the Jewish nation were in expectation of the Messiah's appearance, because of a prophecy which fixed upon THAT TIME as the period of his appearing. His testimony is confirmed by what we read in the New Testament, that at that time "all men were musing in their hearts whether John the Baptist were the Messiah or not." How do the Jews account for this national expectancy 1800 years ago, on their theory that the Messiah did not appear? There are many strange and conflicting explanations on their part. They do not agree amongst themselves. Their explanations, ancient and modern, illustrate the straits to which their rejection of Jesus reduces them.

Buxtorf says "That the greater part of the modern Rabbins believe that the Messiah has been come a good while, but keeps himself concealed because of the sins of the Jews."

Jarchi affirms that "The Hebrews believed the Messiah was born on the day of the destruction of Jerusalem."

Talmudists—that he is in Rome.

"A great number believe he is not yet come, but strangely divided as to the time and circumstance of his appearing."

So you see Mr. Stern's own nation are divided in the most extraordinary manner in their methods of accounting for the non-appearance of the Messiah, in harmony with the prophet Daniel, whose prophecy requires that he ought to have appeared 1800 years ago. The Jewish writers referred to in the extracts I have read, recognise the fact that the time fixed in the prophets, arrived ages ago; they deny that Jesus, who appeared exactly at that time, is he; they cannot point to anyone else as answering to the requirements of the prophecy. Hence the dilemma which they make such extraordinary efforts to get out of.

But, according to the proposition I have to maintain, there is no difficulty. The Messiah did appear, and Jesus of Nazareth was he, which proposition I proceed to elaborate a little more in detail.

I contend in the next place that Jesus of Nazareth answers to all the signs by which it is possible for the Jews to identify their Messiah. I should like Mr. Stern to let us know upon what principle the Jews are to tell their Messiah when he appears. I presume

it would be upon the principle of his correspondence to the things declared in the prophets. If that is not the principle, there is no principle. But that is the principle undoubtedly, and therefore it gives me a basis for this argument, that in every material and immaterial particular, Jesus of Nazareth answered to the features and peculiarities that were to characterize the Messiah to be sent to Israel, and that, therefore, he was he.

The first of these is, that the Messiah was to be the Son of David. Jesus was the Son of David. This is capable of unanswerable demonstration, but I will not at this stage say all that can be said on this point. I produce the genealogies of Matthew and Luke as *prima facie* evidences, leaving Mr. Stern to deal with them. When he attempts to disprove them, I will follow and answer his arguments, and embrace the opportunity of unfolding a few things on the subject that may not be present to his mind. The genealogies upon their own face are evidence of Christ's descent from David. I will so far anticipate objection to them, as to suppose the remark that Matthew's genealogy is not Luke's genealogy. That is a fact. What is the explanation of the fact? Jesus had a mother, and a legal but not a natural human father. If he was to be the seed of David, it was necessary he should be shewn to be such by both lines. One therefore is the line of Mary and the other that of Joseph. I must briefly indicate the principle upon which the conclusion is arrived at that one is the genealogical descent of Mary and the other of Joseph. In the first place, they are *different lines*. This will be admitted by all. The lines agree from Abraham down to the family of David (Matthew's not going farther back than Abraham), the identity can only be shewn from that point. At David, the lines diverge; you find that one line descends through Nathan, the son of David, and the other line descends through Solomon. With the exception of one point of apparent casual contact, the two lines keep distinct until the days of Jesus. Therefore it cannot be denied they are two distinct lines. The next question is, were they both received among the early Christians? They undoubtedly were, for although doubt has been thrown on the genuineness of the genealogy of Matthew, it is because it is

omitted from one or two early manuscripts. The bulk of evidence is in its favour, for where there are one or two manuscripts that lack Matthew's genealogy, there are many in which it appears, upon which the argument may be briefly stated thus: It is far more likely that the genealogy was omitted from one or two manuscripts for sinister reasons, than added to a great number in the private possession of those who had means of ascertaining the genuineness of the documents. In fact the latter is an impossible supposition, for the imposture would have been detected in a moment. This matter may be considered to be finally settled by Tischendorf's discovery, in the convent of Sinai, of the most ancient manuscript yet known. This manuscript contains Matthew's genealogy. It is indisputable that the two genealogies were accepted by the first Christians. If so, how can we imagine that they were both the actual genealogy of Joseph? Would they have received and recognised two contradictory accounts of so important a matter? Inconceivable! They received both, because both were separately true; the one setting forth Mary's descent and the other Joseph's. If it be asked why Mary's name is not given, my answer is the answer that Mr. Monnet gave to Mr. Gratz the other night, for a different purpose. He said it was a rule among the Jews not to insert the names of females in the genealogies, which is probably the reason why Mary's name does not appear. Where a female is nevertheless an essential link, she appears by her husband as Mary does in the genealogy of Luke. There is no violation of propriety in this, for Joseph, as the husband of Mary, was "a son-in-law of Heli," Mary's father. A difference is observable between the two genealogies in this respect: that is, as to the mode in which they are drawn out. In Matthew, it is said "Abraham begat Isaac, Isaac begat Jacob," and so on, but in Luke it does not employ the term "begat," a form of speech which would have been incompatible with putative sonship, legal or imputed sonship. It begins as follows: "Jesus began to be about thirty years of age, being as was supposed the son of Joseph, which was (the son) of Heli." "Son of" is not in the original. I admit that idiomatically it is implied, and therefore properly inserted in the English translation. Nevertheless, it is a form of speech which

does not affirm that Joseph was the natural son of Heli. It is a form of putting it that admits of Joseph being called the son of Heli, although he was the son of Jacob, being son-in-law to Heli, through marriage with his daughter Mary. Jewish rules did not admit of Mary appearing except in this way. I will leave that subject at present, reserving further arguments until Mr. Stern shall have stated his objections to the genealogies. But I proceed to remark that the proof of Jesus being the son of David is by no means confined to this genealogy. I rely greatly upon this fact, that the question of whether Jesus was the son of David was never raised until modern times; that in the first century, when there was access to the public registers—when, if Christ was not the son of David, it could have been proved while the temple yet stood and whilst Mary's genealogy and Joseph's were in existence—the point was never raised at all. Do you think Christ's enemies who crucified him, would not have been glad to seize upon so fatal an objection to his claims, if they could have done so? In his own day, it was the general repute that he was the son of David, both among the common people and amongst those who had an opportunity of being critically certain. First, as to the common belief, I quote the following passages:—

Matt. ix. 27: "And when Jesus departed thence, two blind men followed him, crying and saying, *thou Son of David*, have mercy on us."

Matt. xii. 23: "All the people were amazed and said, Is not this *the son of David*?"

Matt. xv. 22: "And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy upon me, O Lord, *thou son of David*."

Matt. xx. 30: "And, behold, two blind men sitting by the way side, when they heard that Jesus passed by, cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, *thou son of David*."

Matt. xxi. 9-11: "And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest. And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this? And the multitude said, this is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth, of Galilee."

And at the fifteenth verse it says, "When the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and

the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the son of David, they were sore displeased." This proves two things, first that the popular impression was that he was the son of David, and second, that the popular impression was brought under the cognition of the scribes and pharisees; and they never challenged it, although they had the power of disproving it, if Jesus were not the son of David. The objection is only now raised in these remote times, when it is possible to raise it without incurring that authoritative contradiction, which could have been given in the day when the public documentary evidence existed in the temple.

But I give you better authority than popular impression. I give you the authority of a priest who waited on his office in the temple. I do not suppose Mr. Stern will dispute that Zachariah was of "the course of Abia." In that position of access to the public archives then, we find him saying "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of His servant David, as He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets which have been since the world began." Remember these are the words of a priest in the temple, having a distinct and intimate relation to the records of genealogy, which either confirmed or destroyed the impression concerning the origin or extraction of Jesus. And I say that if a man in that position confirms the popular impression that Jesus belongs to the house of David, it would require far stronger argument than any person living in the nineteenth century can produce to shake belief in the well-foundedness of that impression ("Time" called).

MR. STERN: Mr. Chairman and friends. Before I commence to answer Mr. Roberts, I beg you will listen to a few remarks that I have to make with regard to my position here to-night. In the first place, I am not here to-night as representative of any body of Jews in Birmingham or in any other place. I have undertaken the subject entirely on my own responsibility, and if I am defeated in this discussion, it must not go forth that Judaism has been defeated by Christianity. It will then only be the defeat of one man, who holds that Jesus of Nazareth was not the Messiah, against

another man who held that he was. I may also say that this discussion is not approved by the Jews in Birmingham, especially by the English portion of them, for reasons best known to themselves. One of the principal reasons is they are afraid this discussion may cause ill-feeling between Jews and Christians. I am not of that opinion myself: I have entirely a different opinion of an English audience. But suppose it was to cause ill-feeling (I am only taking it as a supposition, for I am sure it will not)—supposing it was, what then? I would far rather cause ill-feeling and have the truth on my side, than live in a state of bias all my life with falsehood and error. Some of the Jews of Birmingham have gone so far as to assert that I am in league with the Missionary Society, that I have got this discussion up for the purpose of exposing Judaism. I am quite serious on this subject. These statements have really been made. I publicly contradict these statements. I am not in any way connected with any missionary society; and whoever has said so has told a falsehood. And I hope that my opponent will say that I am not in any way in league with him, for any such vile purpose. If I had anything to say against Judaism, I should certainly come forward like a man, and give my opponents a chance of replying to me. Now, I am announced on the placard as an orthodox Jew; and so I am, but I am not so orthodox as to come here and say that, simply because I am a Jew, all the truth lies on my side and all the error on the side of those who are opposed to Judaism. I believe that among the hundreds of millions of people who inhabit this globe, there will be found some at least, as noble and as courageous. Some of the greatest intellects have been found outside Judaism, and it would be the height of impertinence on my part, to come here and say that, being a Jew, I hold the whole truth, and that no one else has a right to express any opinion different to mine. I have come here to-night to receive information as well as discuss the question before us.

With these few remarks I wish now to endeavour to answer Mr. Roberts. You need not be surprised if this discussion should lead me to embrace Christianity, but I must say that if it is his object, he must bring forward sounder arguments than he has used in his first speech. You have given Mr. Roberts

earnest attention in all that he has said. I am sure he has said a good many and some very startling things. He says (if I understand him right), he believes in Judaism, and I believe he even says that he is a Jew. If it will give him any pleasure, I hope he will live long enough to enjoy it. I won't begrudge it him. But there is certainly this difference between us: Mr. Roberts is here as a Jew with Jesus as his saviour: I stand here as a Jew without Jesus as my saviour. As being "in Jesus" implies a belief in Christ, I hope he will pardon me if I sometimes class him among the ordinary Christians. He maintains that Jesus appeared exactly according to Daniel, consequently he must be the Messiah. If he did appear according to Daniel he *must be* the Messiah, but let us examine what Daniel says:

"Whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he informed me and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy."

You have heard what I have read. This is the same quotation Mr. Roberts read, but it doesn't exactly agree with me the same as with him. Oh! says Mr. Roberts, you mustn't take the seventy weeks as seventy weeks; instead of representing weeks of days, you must take them to represent weeks of years: seventy times seven years. This is a most startling assertion, and I am perfectly satisfied, if this is the case, that it will really settle the question, and I am sure that if it is so, it is a great pity that we hadn't a Mr. Roberts long before now. Now sir, I hold that words have no meaning except as conveying thoughts of one individual to another; that is to say, if I have a thought which I wish to convey to any other person, I either learn their language or get them to learn mine. The tongue becomes the mould of the thought, and after the words are

expressed, the party who is addressed does not alone hear the words, but he can almost see them as well: they are shaped before him. If seventy weeks should here mean weeks of years, see what a position we should be placed in. In the first place, how should we understand when anyone was conversing with us? This is a revelation from God to man. God, having a thought, wished man to know it, and through Daniel sends a messenger who is to say something to the people, so that no doubt they should understand him; but Mr. Roberts says it doesn't mean what was really said. Why I should not be here at all to-night if I could attribute such puerilities, cruelties, to the supreme power. The word God to me represents all that is good, and all that is good can include nothing bad; and it would be a very bad action, I hold, for a supreme being to speak to any of His people in a language they could not understand. But Mr. Roberts refers me to the New Testament to prove his statements. Well, I have told him before; I have announced it; and you have perceived by the placards that I am a Jew. Mr. Roberts knows very well that the New Testament is looked upon by the Jews as an immoral book. We are allowed to read any book almost, but it is positively looked upon as a sin to have the New Testament in our possession. We are even allowed to read the *Mysteries of the Court in London*, but not the New Testament. Still he refers me to it, I may as well tell him that as a Jew I look upon the New Testament as a compilation of falsehood and forgeries; and I will not alone *say* this, but I will bring you one of your greatest authorities in the church to *prove* my statement, Dr. Mosheim. But I shall not enter into this now, for I may not have time to finish the subject. But I will say this, to me, as a Jew, I do not understand how a man can be born without a father. My opponent may try to explain it and cloak it over as much as he likes; he can use his eloquence as much as it is possible. Although I am willing to accept any reasonable explanation; but when I say that, it must be reasonable to me, mind, not to my opponent. But I hold this to be quite unreasonable. I should like to go into the matter, but I do not feel equal to the task before a mixed audience like the one we have here to-night. Privately I have no objection to discuss the matter with Mr. Roberts, but I do not consider

it a fit subject for this audience. I think words would have to be used that would not be very soothing; at least to the gentler sex who are present. I am sure I have too much respect for the ladies to bring the slightest blush of shame upon their countenances. But what does he tell me about Jesus? He refers me to Saint Matthew, and from him I am to gather the genealogy of Jesus through Joseph. As I understand it, the book of Matthew begins: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." Now is this the book of the generation of Jesus Christ? If Mr. Roberts earnestly refers me to this I hope he will abide by it; and before I discuss it, I wish him to tell me before this audience that he will abide by this genealogy. It is no use telling me that there is another one, if that contradicts this. When we are talking about this book, we are not talking about the ordinary subjects of the day. We are not talking about penny-a-liners, about books written in 1871; we are talking about what is believed to be an inspired book, which is supposed to have been written by the apostles, who, some of them at least, were along with Jesus when he was alive. Inspiration means this: that whether a person be present or not, he can describe everything minutely and accurately, so that there can be no mistake whatever about it. Take Moses for instance, he could write down everything that had occurred for hundreds and thousands of years before his time. But what are we to say of men who are supposed to be inspired by the same power, and yet so contradict each other. But before I undertake to discuss the subject, I wish Mr. Roberts to say distinctly whether he will abide by the genealogy of Matthew? (Mr. Roberts: yes.) And I wish to ask by whom, to whom, when, and in what language were St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke and St. John written? Where are your originals? Produce them. Where are your manuscripts? Produce them. If they are not to be found, please tell me what has become of them, and let us have some idea whether there is any hope of ever obtaining them again. I am afraid my friend will not be able to produce these originals, for I stand here and publicly declare the originals never were in existence. There never were any. No one dares come here and declare in 1871 that there ever were originals.

There is no authority. No records can be gone to. We cannot go farther back than the second century. How can we rely upon them? I think the only reliance would be that whatever parties wrote them, they were never inspired by God to do so. For on such an important and serious subject as this, at least they should be all alike, at least they should not all contradict each other in the most important points. But, what do we find? Mr. Roberts can hardly quote two passages in the book that will agree with each other; and I am quite certain the Old Testament contradicts the New, although he jumps from one to the other and says they agree. I hope Mr. Roberts will answer the questions I have put to him, before he proceeds with any other matter.

MR. ROBERTS: I should think it unnecessary for me to make any pledge on the subject referred to by Mr. Stern; but if it is any satisfaction to him, I will say that certainly he is not in league with me in any sense. The challenge is entirely *bona fide*, both as regards the giving and the accepting. Having said thus much, I address myself to his arguments. He asked me where the originals of the New Testament are. I presume he believes in the writings of Moses, and I ask him if he is prepared to say where the originals of those writings are? I know he cannot: yet he believes in Moses, whence I argue that he cannot logically object to my belief in the New Testament, on the ground that I cannot produce the very documents written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, and others. There are certain obvious and universally recognised principles on which documents are received as authentic, though the originals are absent. The literary world believes in the writings of Herodotus and other ancient writers, although the originals are not in existence. The absence of the originals is no evidence against their genuineness. If it is, Mr. Stern must not believe in Moses: but he does. He does so on the generally-accepted rules of evidence referred to—rules that do not depend upon the arbitrary maxims of the schools, but are based upon natural laws of evidence, that enable us to lay hold with absolute confidence upon certain documents as written at certain times by certain men, although we are not in possession of the originals.

The people contemporary with the production of a thing, have knowledge of the inception of that thing, and if among them obtains a certain universal reputation upon evidence which they are in a position to judge of as to its truthfulness, such as the authorship of a book, that reputation is evidence to after posterity. If a book produced in Birmingham passes current among those who have opportunities of knowing the facts of the case, as the production of a certain individual, and the authorship is not questioned, succeeding generations are justified in receiving that generally-accepted reputation or impression as evidence of the authorship. When in addition to this uncontradicted reputation, the internal evidence of the work itself accords with the outside reputation, the evidence is of a character that can never be overturned. And it will be my duty in the course of this discussion to shew that the New Testament is supported by this class of evidence, and that the evidence is collaterally strengthened in many ways; evidence which is certainly not to be disposed of by the sweeping assertions which Mr. Stern has made. It is not sufficient for him to say that the New Testament is a forgery. Let him *shew* it. I *deny* that it is a forgery. I am prepared to prove not only its authorship, but that every part of it agrees with every other part, and not only so, but that in its entirety, the New Testament agrees with every part of the Old Testament. To start with, I put forward the book. It is *prima facie* evidence of itself. When Mr. Stern brings evidence of forgery, I will go into it. At present my assertion must go for what it is worth, as against his assertion.

Mr. Stern speaks of Jesus having no father. This is a misrepresentation: Jesus had a Father. That Father was the Father of Adam. How did Adam come upon the scene? Was there not a divine Father? Do not Mr. Stern's own writings say "Have we not all one Father?" Is that not the God of his nation? It is; and if the God of his nation could be the father of Adam, and he could find no difficulty in receiving that, why should there be a difficulty in the God of his nation being the father of Jesus? Abstractly there need be no difficulty whatever.

I proceed to prove that it is even so, that the God of his nation was the father of Jesus, and that therefore Jesus

does not present the ludicrous instance depicted by Mr. Stern, of a man without a father. Mr. Stern speaks as if I referred to the New Testament for proof of my argument of the seventy weeks; and because he denies the New Testament, he thinks the argument is gone. This is altogether a mistake. I rely first upon the historical fact which he will not question, that Jesus of Nazareth appeared 1800 years ago. I next point to the fact that this admitted date of his appearance coincides with the period fixed by the prophecy of the seventy weeks for the appearance of the Messiah. This argument is strong. The difficulty for him is great, and to get out of that difficulty he certainly resorts to extraordinary tactics. He says the weeks are literal weeks. Does this help him out of his difficulty? It only makes the difficulty greater, for if his argument is sincere, the Messiah ought to have appeared about 450 years before the crucifixion of Jesus. Did the Messiah appear at the end of seventy literal weeks? No! Mr. Stern will tell you that the Messiah has not yet appeared at all. No Messiah appeared seventy weeks after the mission of Nehemiah to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, but there did appear 490 (or seventy weeks of) years after that date, Jesus of Nazareth, who claimed to be the Messiah, and who gave such irresistible evidence, that thousands of Jews, as Mr. Stern is bound to admit, accepted him, and preached the fame of him to other nations: as one result of which we have a gigantic political system all over Europe, which bears the name of Christ on all its records.

Is it so that seventy weeks do not mean seventy weeks of years? Is Mr. Stern seriously prepared to abide by his assertions that Daniel always means literally what he says? (MR. STERN: Hear, hear.) Very well, let us look at another part of Daniel. In the 8th chapter of that book, we have another prophecy, in which a period of time is defined. At the 8th verse we read that:

"The he goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn (between his eyes) was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven. And out of one of them came forth a little horn. And it waxed exceeding great towards the south, and towards the east, and towards the pleasant land, and it (the little horn of the goat), waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down

some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them."

Is this a description of literal events that were to take place? Was a little horny substance coming out of the head of a beast, to stamp the stars under its feet? (Mr. STERN: Yes; if it wasn't a little horn, I don't know what Daniel meant). We have the matter explained. That goat was the symbol of the Grecian power, and the horns refer to the subdivisions of that power, as we read in verses 21 and following: "The rough goat is the king, or kingdom of Greece; and the great horn between his eyes is the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation." Then we read of a certain little horn budding out of one of the four, representing the Roman power which should make its appearance in one of the four divisions of the Grecian empire. In connection with the movements of that little horn we have a definition of time, 13th verse:

"Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

I ought to have said that the vision, as a whole, as you will see by reading the chapter through, represented the prevalence of the Persian, Grecian and Roman powers over the Jewish polity. Out of one of the four divisions of the Grecian empire, according to what we find at the close of this chapter, appeared the Roman power, concerning which it is said at the 24th verse:

"And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and SHALL DESTROY THE MIGHTY AND THE HOLY PEOPLE."

What power has destroyed the Jewish nation? The Roman. Now, here is a question. Over what length of time does this vision extend, which began with the appearance of a ram representing the kingdom of Media and Persia, and ending with the indefinite triumph of a power appearing first in Grecian territory? Mark the answer which will be found at the 14th verse: "Unto two thousand and three hundred DAYS; then

shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Now the period of time from the appearance of the Medo-Persian empire, to the destruction of the Jewish nation by Rome (which is a mere fragment of the period covered by the vision), was over 600 years—six centuries. But the length of the vision is defined as 2,300 days, and if literal days, less than seven years. According to Mr. Stern's way of treating the seventy weeks, this is the fact. According to him, we are to read this prophecy thus: Persia will arise, Greece will arise, Rome will arise and tread the Jewish people under their feet, *all in seven years!* This shows the absurdity of his argument. The period is spread out before us in history. We can look back to that long dismal, black vista of years, and we can see the Jews trampled under foot for more than 2,000 years. We are living at the expiration of that period, when the sanctuary shall be cleansed. History tells us that the 2,300 days were significant of years. Mr. Stern himself will be obliged to admit it. He is obliged, in the case of the seventy weeks, to resort to quibble to get out of the facts which tell so fatally against his rejection of Jesus of Nazareth.

I will now resume the chain of evidence which I was proceeding to trace when called to time. I was producing evidence that Jesus was the seed of David. I next produce the case of Paul. It is impossible upon the principles of honest criticism to deny the historic reality of the apostle Paul: and I don't know that in all the efforts of scepticism I ever heard of the attempt being made. It is a moral impossibility that such letters as bear his name could be produced either by an impostor or a fiction writer. I presume Mr. Stern will not deny that Paul was a Jew—a man brought up in Jerusalem, at the feet of Gamaliel—who stood in friendly relation to the head quarters of the Jewish opinions—who was acquainted with the public genealogies. Now, with all these means of information at his command, Paul says in Rom. i. 3: "Jesus Christ our Lord was made of the seed of David according to the flesh," and he repeats the statement in 2nd Timothy ii. 8; he says: "Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead according to my gospel." Last of all, we have the evidence of Jesus himself in whose resurrection Paul, though a bitter rejecter, like Mr. Stern, came

to believe, through a personal interview. This very personage proclaims himself to be of the house of David in the last chapter of Revelations: "I am the root and the *offspring of David.*"

Therefore in respect of the lineal extraction of Jesus, I submit that the evidence is conclusive that in that particular, Jesus of Nazareth answers to the requirements of the prophets.

The next point is that the Messiah was to be born in a certain place. In Micah v. 2, it says:

"Butthoa, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel."

Where was Jesus of Nazareth born? We have the evidence. It is contained in the 2nd of Matthew, where we find that the chief priests and scribes, the head men of Mr. Stern's nation, at that time, were distinctly under the impression that the Messiah was to be born in Bethlehem. I presume Mr. Stern entertains the same notion, though he does not believe the Messiah has yet appeared, that from that now ruined and dilapidated village, the Messiah shall come. In Matthew ii. 1, we read:

"Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, in the days of Herod the king, behold there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews, for we have seen his star in the east, and have come to worship him."

If any one objects to Matthew's authority, we have the authority of Luke, Paul's companion in travel, which you cannot overturn. In Luke ii. 4, we read:

"And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; (because he was of the house and lineage of David.)"

The sixth verse says:

"And so it was that whilst they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn. And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flocks by night. And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid. And the

angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord."

So that the Christ of the New Testament, at all events, answers to the Messiah of Jewish prophecy, in being born at the right time, of the right family, and in the right place.

I come to another point. The Messiah of Jewish expectation was to be born of a virgin. I refer to Isaiah vii. 14, whereat Mr. Stern smiles, for he no doubt thinks I have let myself into a trap; but I have not done so. I am well aware of the difficulties that are thrown against this passage. The passage is:

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

The word for "virgin" is *almak*, which I will contend is a proper distinct substantive for an unmarried female. The rejectors of Jesus say that it means young woman. Well, a virgin is a young woman, so that even supposing they were right, the word does not exclude virginity. But they are not right. This is proved by the fact that in all other places in which the word is used, it is applied in the sense of unmarried females. I will read to you all the cases in which the word occurs, and you shall be the judges whether or not it is used in the sense in which I seek to apply it. In the 24th of Genesis, the "virgin Rebecca goes forth to meet the servant of Abraham." I suppose that Mr. Stern will not deny that Rebecca was a virgin. In Exodus ii. 8, the maid the sister of Moses, who was living with the mother of Moses, went and called the child's mother unto her—that is, to the daughter of Pharaoh who had picked up Moses.

Time being called, Mr. Roberts resumed his seat amid some interruption.

MR. STERN: I do hope you will allow Mr. Roberts a fair hearing, and let him explain those Hebrew words as well as he possibly knows how, whether they be correct or not. If I did not feel in a position to answer all that Mr. Roberts may have to bring forward, I should not have come here, and if you are afraid that I shall not be able to maintain my position I will kindly ask you to retire.

I am perfectly satisfied that I am quite capable of answering all that Mr. Roberts has to say on the subject, and I pray you will leave it to me. Mr. Roberts has taunted me with committing sin in reading the New Testament, or with being ignorant of its contents. I still hold that it really is a sin, not alone to read the New Testament, but for a Jew to have it even in his possession. But I have undertaken this subject for the purpose of getting to the truth of the matter. You must understand that the Jews are continually pestered with a lot of missionaries, who tell us we are blind, when we can see; that we are lame, when we can walk; and deaf and dumb, when we can hear and speak. I consider it is high time for us to come forward and give our opinion on such books, which were written in our language and to us; and I consider that whenever a missionary lays down his gauntlet and gives battle to the Jews, we ought to come forward and give such opinions as we know, and such explanations as we have been brought up to on those words—the Hebrew. There was only one excuse and that was intolerance. We have to-day in England the same liberties as any other creed. There are no thanks due to you. These are due to those who have passed away. The liberty that we enjoy to-day has been very dearly purchased, and I think it would be a pity if the Jews did not come forward to take up such subjects as these. I will admit that I have read the New Testament; that I have committed sin; and I hope the Almighty will forgive me, having done so in my search after truth. Besides, Mr. Roberts would never wish me to come here without having read it. One question he asked me: if seventy weeks do not mean seventy years, how long is the prophecy to last? I acknowledge that I do not know. According to the gospel of Mr. Roberts it means seventy times seven years. Why did not Daniel say so then? Why did not God inspire Daniel to say that seventy weeks means seventy times seven years? He asks me whether "a little horn" means "a little horn?" Well, if a little horn doesn't mean a little horn, I don't know what it does mean. Then to go to Moses to shew the authority of the New Testament! It is part of my task to shew what Messiah we expect (Impatience.) If you are impatient you can take your departure. I will instruct

the door-keeper to return you the money you have paid. (The manifestation of impatience still continuing, the Chairman appealed to the audience to allow each speaker to say what he liked in his own time). My friend says that the Jews have always refused the subject, that we have rejected the Messiah. Well, now if the Jews at the time of Jesus, expected the Messiah, what would be more natural when he did come than that they should have accepted him? But they did reject him, and I consider that is quite sufficient proof that he was not the Messiah. Mr. Roberts, in 1871, comes forward and says he was; the Jews who lived at the time, and understood the Hebrew as well as Mr. Roberts does to-day, proved that he was not. He tells us that the New Testament is sufficient to shew that the gospels cannot be false. It is admitted beyond all doubt that the present New Testament is so bad, that it requires a new New Testament to replace it. There is at present sitting in London, a synod of the greatest intellects that the present generation probably can produce, for no other purpose than to revise and replace this New Testament by another one. Why does it want revising? We Jews do not want any revision of ours. We are satisfied with things just as they are. But my friend says that until I prove the discrepancies and the things which contradict each other in the New Testament, he will not answer my statement. Well, I will just see if I cannot quote one or two. One law which I quote from our Bible, is this: "Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." I believe that is a law which everyone of you would be willing to accept, and would uphold, and would like everyone to obey. Now, supposing I am to embrace Christianity, what then? Before I can embrace Christianity I am told this: "If any man come to me and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." There is another law: "Thou shalt not kill;" but the New Testament says: Luke xix 27 "But those mine enemies (these are Christ's words), which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay *them* before me." Well now that is enough for the present to show me that they don't agree with what is in the Old Testament. I

have only made two quotations. I will now proceed to the 47th of Isaiah. My friend says that in that chapter he finds a statement made, which proves that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. Well, now I dare say that most of you are acquainted with this part, but it so happens that he has quoted just a few words in the centre of the sentence, leaving out the context. Now with your permission I will just read the beginning of it.

"And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah king of Judah, that Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem to war against it, but could not prevail against it. And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim. And his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. Then said the Lord unto Isaiah, go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shear-jashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field; and say unto him, Take heed, and be quiet; fear not, neither be faint-hearted, for the two tails of these smoking fire-brands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah. Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah have taken evil council against thee, saying, Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal: thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass. For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin; and within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people. And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son. If ye will believe, surely ye shall not be established. Moreover the Lord spake again unto Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. And he said, Hear ye now, O house of David; is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign. Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know how to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings."

And so it goes on to the 8th chapter, where it says:

"Take thee a great roll, and write in it with

a man's pen concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz. And I took unto me faithful witnesses to record, Uriah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah. And I went unto the prophetess; and she conceived, and bare a son. Then said the Lord to me, call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz. For before the child shall have knowledge to cry, my father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria."

As far as I can understand this, it seems very intelligible. Ahaz was frightened of two kings who were coming against him, and so Isaiah went to him and said, "Do not be frightened; they won't prevail against you." Ahaz did not believe him.—My time is up.

MR. ROBERTS: I suppose, ladies and gentlemen, that Mr. Stern wishes you to understand that in Isaiah viii., we are to find the fulfilment of the prediction contained in the seventh concerning the birth of Emmanuel, of a virgin. I understand so from his quotation.

MR. STERN: Don't anticipate what I have to say.

MR. ROBERTS: We are told that the prophet went to the prophetess, and the result was the appearance of a child called Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Now names, according to Hebrew practice, are significant of some meaning. That is, they express some fact concerning the child or the circumstances to which it is related. The meaning of Immanuel, for that was to be the name of the child (referred to in chapter vii.), of the virgin, is *God with us*. I presume Mr. Stern will not object to that definition. Now, what is the meaning of Maher-shalal-hash-baz? Is Maher-shalal-hash-baz the equivalent of Immanuel? It is not. It means "In making speed to the spoil, he hasteneth the prey." It was a proper name bestowed with regard to the events predicted in the previous chapter—the desolation of Syria and Ephraim at the hands of the king of Assyria.

Besides, what a curious thing it would be if *almah* in Isaiah vii. 18, didn't mean a virgin—"The Lord himself shall give you a sign"—a marvel, a token, a wonder. Is it a very extraordinary thing that a young woman should have a baby, a married young woman? The idea of God selecting an incident of everyday occurrence as a sign, is sufficiently absurd to bring its own condemnation. The sign which the prophet here says God would give to Ahaz was to be a real sign

and a sign direct from God. The name of Immanuel pointed forward to a flesh-manifestation of God himself in connection with a virgin of the house of David. And if Mr. Stern asks why that was intimated in connection with an immediately-impending local calamity about 700 years before Christ's appearance, my answer is to be found in the promises made to his own fathers. The purpose of God with Israel reaches forward to a definite pre-purposed result, that in Abraham and his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed, and his seed should possess the gate of his enemies. That it is a long-standing promise that the seed of Abraham is to prevail over all enemies, Mr. Stern will admit. Now, here was Ahaz confronted with a great military confederacy threatening the destruction of Israel. We are told that the hearts of the people in Jerusalem were moved like trees shaken by the wind. This crisis is selected as a fitting occasion for the introduction of the promise of a token that God would deliver Israel not only from Rezin and Pekah, but from all enemies on the face of all the earth, in all time succeeding to the deliverance. The token was to be the appearance of a child to be named Immanuel. Immanuel is none else but the Messiah. This is shewn by the connection to which I invite Mr. Stern's attention. There is not only a local application, but a pointing forward to the Messiah himself, if you trace the prophecy through. It culminates in these words:—

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be on his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this."

The concluding declaration of this splendid prediction, that it is a matter in which the zeal of the Lord of hosts is to be the instrument, fittingly tallies with the words "The Lord himself shall give you a sign;" and gives special significance to the bestowal of the name Immanuel upon this marvellous child. But not seeking to dwell unduly on one point, I will just for a moment notice the objections Mr. Stern has brought

forward in disposal of the New Testament. They are just of the character I expected. He quotes "Thou shalt not kill," and contrasts with this the prospective words which Christ employs concerning himself: "Bring them hither and slay them before me." It is really too idle to deserve notice. Does Mr. Stern mean to say that the command not to kill, was to apply in all possible circumstances? If so, how does he understand the stoning of Achan for trespass, or the slaughter of the Canaanites, when Israel crossed the Jordan under Joshua? The command not to kill had to do with ordinary civil relations. It is not inconsistent with the judicial function which the very same law prescribes. So though Christ was under the law of Moses in the days of his flesh, this is not inconsistent with the fact that he is to exercise judicial power in the day of his glory. I should like to know how he reconciles the objection with his own idea of the Messiah. Is it not written of him that he shall slay the wicked?—(Isaiah xi. 4). Now, though Mr. Stern does not believe Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, he must believe that when the Messiah does come, he will "slay the wicked." How then about "thou shalt not kill?" If it is a contradiction against Jesus, it is a contradiction against Moses, against Joshua, and against the Messiah himself, even if Jesus were not he. It is a contradiction which does not exist. The precept not to kill is one regulating private life, but does not interfere with the judicial right to take away life when the general interests call for it. Who calls into question the prerogative of the Queen, in the name of the public well-being, to take away the life of a murderer?

Mr. Stern next introduces a matter which is a little more plausible on the face of it, but no more substantial in reality. Moses says "Honour thy father and thy mother," against which Mr. Stern quotes the saying of Christ, that we are to "hate father and mother." Now, I claim that Christ be allowed to explain himself, and I presume that if Christ were here, as he was once face to face with his antagonists, Mr. Stern would not deny him that privilege. I contend that his employment of "hate" is to be construed in the light of his own teaching. He says that a man must hate his own life. Does Mr. Stern contend that he therefore taught a man to commit suicide? No. In what sense

were they to hate father and mother, sister and brother, husband and wife? In Matthew x. he says "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth," (Mr. Stern: Hear, hear)—that is, at that time. "I came not to send peace but a sword," and the history of the world since that time has shewn the truth of his words. "I am come to set son against father." How? Let history illustrate. Sons who received Christ were estranged from fathers who did not receive him. They could only retain their friendship by denying Christ, but Christ called upon them to hate father rather than let love of father induce them to please father by rejecting him. They were not to love father more than him. He demanded to be put first. His words are "He that loveth father or mother *more than me*, is not worthy of me," and "he that findeth his life shall lose it." Therefore the contradiction Mr. Stern would make out is a contradiction only in appearance, which will only impress those not accustomed to look below the surface. So much for his alleged "contradictions;" and I will undertake to demolish every contradiction that he can possibly bring up, in the same way.

He asks how it is that the people in London are preparing a new version. The answer is so very obvious that it is a wonder it did not occur to Mr. Stern. In the 300 years that have elapsed since the present version was written, certain English words have passed out of use; and it is merely a question for the most part of substituting for obsolete words, words of modern usage. The use of such arguments against the New Testament is evidence either of the want of logical skill on the part of Mr. Stern, or a little want of something else which I need not particularly mention.

He says that because a few Jews rejected Christ, that is sufficient evidence to him that Jesus was not the Messiah. I should like him to define the principle upon which this argument is based. If he could say *every* Jew rejected Jesus, I could understand the argument. If every Jew contemporary with Jesus rejected him, there would certainly be strong ground for Jews of all subsequent ages to take the same attitude; but all Jews did not reject him. Thousands of Jews accepted him; and the subsequent belief in him by the Gentiles, was owing to the activity of Jewish preachers. Will Mr. Stern deny this? He cannot. The

Gentiles accepted Jesus because Jews came out from Jerusalem and declared he was the Messiah. Therefore when talking of the Jews who rejected Jesus, let him not forget the multitudes of Jews who accepted him. Let him try to explain to himself why the believers believed. If he takes the scepticism of a part of the Jewish nation as proof that the Messiah has not come, how does he ask me to deal with the belief of those who believed in him? Let him remember that belief is of more weight than unbelief, for belief is the result of positive reasons: whereas unbelief may be the mere result of ignorance of evidence that exists. Those who were farthest from the evidence were those who rejected him; the Scribes and Pharisees, who stood apart in an attitude of hostility, stung to the quick by Christ's denunciation; for he told them to their faces that they merely appeared righteous, but inwardly they were like the beautiful graves that contained rottenness and dead men's bones. It is no wonder that the Scribes and Pharisees rejected him and that the nation under their leadership rejected him. Their rejection is no evidence against him at all. A large section of the common people heard him gladly, and at one time they wanted to take him by force, and make him a king, but the time had not come, and he took occasion to withdraw from them.—(Time called.)

MR. STERN: Mr. Roberts commenced by referring to my objection as far as honour thy father and mother is concerned, and in answer to what I advanced he said he must allow Christ to explain himself. Now Christ is represented to say something to the effect that no preference to father or mother must be shewn before him. I believe I understand that. But I have to say that so far as I am concerned, if Christianity really requires me to hate my father or mother, brother or sister, and really requires me to hate my own life before I can accept Jesus to be the Messiah and my Saviour, then I most solemnly declare that I will never hate them. Then my friend says, if I do not believe in the New Testament, I do not believe in the Old. That is very logical I must say. The subject of the discussion is "Was Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah?" Now before I came here, he knew that I believed in the Old and he knew that

I did not believe in the New. What is the use of him telling me that if I do not believe in the New, I do not believe in the Old? We have always believed in the Old and rejected the New; we have always looked upon the New as a compilation of falsehoods and forgeries. But I will reserve this subject for another occasion. I will proceed to Isaiah. My friend asks me, does Mahershalal-hash-baz mean Immanuel? We are not discussing that; we are discussing was Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah or not. I will ask him does Jesus mean Immanuel? Is Jesus the equivalent for Immanuel? He says every name in Hebrew has a meaning. So it has, and among every nation. But he says there is a particular meaning in Immanuel. He says Immanuel means "God with us." Of course it does, but we have got lots of Immanuels among us, and I should consider it would be the height of presumption on my part to assume that God is with us in consequence. He says if "virgin" does not mean a virgin, what does it mean? Well now in the first place I hold that the passage here is not properly translated. You must understand that it was translated by people who had an interest in translating it for themselves. The words spoken by Isaiah to Ahaz were given to Ahaz as a sign during the time that he was there, so that he might not fear those enemies who were coming against him. "The Lord himself shall give you a sign." It would be a very nice sign to tell Ahaz—suppose I were to go to him and say "Don't be frightened; God is with thee; as a proof of which in 700 years' time a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel." That would be a good sign and very comforting to Ahaz, wouldn't it? He must die first to get to know the truth of it. If Ahaz had any reason in him, he would prefer to take the matter in hand and stand and fight the battle out. But my friend made rather a joke of the words spoken by Isaiah. There is nothing very wonderful for a woman to bear a son, but it is certainly beyond my comprehension how she could bear a son without a father. That is unreasonable. But here are words as part of the statement. You must understand that the word (*aalmha*) means a young woman; (*hoo-aalmha*) "that young woman" or "this young woman." There is a young woman—(*hoorou*). She has

already conceived, and she shall bear a son, and his name shall be called Immanuel. He alluded to his own wife, who was then near her confinement, for farther on it says he took witnesses to record and went unto the prophetess, who was then in labour and she had a son. But, says my friend, Mahershalal-hash-baz does not mean Immanuel. But of course it does mean something. It is a matter to explain, and I have come to give my view of the matter. It says that before a child should be three years old, these two firebrands were to be cut off. Now how can any one possibly think that this refers to Jesus who was not born till 700 years later? Well, now Mr. Roberts quotes other places where it means virgin, and I admit that he is quite correct; but even there it is not properly translated. Some words in Hebrew require three, four, five, six, and sometimes seven English words to represent them, and some words could not be translated into English at all. There is the word *bas kol*. If you look at the English translation it is *beth kol*; and perhaps if I were to ask you what it means, you would not be able to tell me though it is in your own translation. But I will prove to you that my friend is so far in error on this point, for although the word *aalmha* can be used for a young woman who is a virgin, where virginity is meant to be particularly expressed, the word *pesceloo* must always be used. I not alone challenge any Hebrew scholar who is here, but any Hebrew scholar from any part, to disprove my statement of this fact. Although I admit the word *hoo-aalmha* can be used as implying a virgin as well as *pesceloo*, yet where the word *pesceloo* is particularly necessary the word *hoo-aalmha* can never be introduced. So much for his argument about the virgin. Let us now see if I cannot find one or two other things that he has said. He says we must not doubt the New Testament doctrine, for the simple reason that it has been accepted by the majority of Christians, and he says we must not go by those who rejected it, but only by those who accepted it. I am prepared to prove to you in the words of Mosheim himself, that the Jews who embraced Christianity in the first century, were the same as those who embrace Christianity to-day. The most ignorant, Mosheim says—but I think I had better read it in his own words:—"Therefore Jesus chose, out of the multitude

that attended his discourses, twelve persons whom he separated from the rest by the name of apostles. These men were illiterate, poor, and of mean extraction, and such alone were truly proper to answer the views of the divine Saviour." I believe that to be correct. I believe that Christianity is only suitable for the most ignorant and most poverty-stricken people, and those of mean extraction; but any men who have intellect at all, and who wish to use their reason, I am perfectly satisfied are not the people to embrace Christianity.

Mr. ROBERTS: The argument to which Mr. Stern has treated you, upon the Hebrew words *atmah* and *bethoolah**, would just be as good in my mouth with regard to the English word "maid" and virgin. The etymology may point more clearly to virginity in one case than the other, but, conventionally (and, after all, it is the usage that determines the meaning of a word) they are both equally strong. The grammatical axioms, upon which Mr. Stern has been working in his argument, have been generated in the controversy that has been carried on for the last 1800 years between Jews and Gentiles. It is, of course, inconvenient to the Jews that the virgin spoken of should really mean a virgin; and so they have whittled it away, until, so far as definition goes, they have got all the meaning out of it. But it avails nothing. So Mr. Stern relies on the collateral bearings of the question. He lays stress on the pronoun "you." He insists that this must be applied to Isaiah's contemporaries. The answer to this is to be found in and is characteristic of the language of God, which illustrates what he Himself says: "As heaven is high above the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts higher than your thoughts." When He says a thing, it has more than an immediate bearing. It extends to the whole scope of the matter. When He says "you," in His communications with Israel, it is a national "you," and not necessarily restricted to the generation to whom it is addressed. We have a notable illustration of this fact in Deut. xviii. 15. Applying the word used to that generation, we should see where Mr. Stern would be landed: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye

shall hearken." This is said concerning the Messiah, by Moses, to the Jews, three thousand years ago. Mr. Stern believes that the Messiah has not yet appeared, and, therefore, God didn't mean His words to apply to that generation, as would appear, by a narrow construction of them, to be the case. This ought to dispose all reasonable men to believe that when God said He would give "them," in Israel's day, a sign, He referred to the nation as a whole.

But Mr. Stern contends that this child was born within a year of the time of the prophecy. Very well; please observe this: "Before the child shall know how to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings!" Therefore, within three years (at the outside) from that time, Ephraim and Syria, should have been broken. How will this agree with the 8th verse of the very same chapter: "The head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezn; and within *three-score and five years* shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people." According to Mr. Stern's construction of the sign of the child, it ought to have been broken within *three* years, because it was to happen before the child should know how to refuse the evil and choose the good. This shows the erroneousness of Mr. Stern's argument. The prophecy can apply to Christ alone, who answered both the local and other circumstances of the case. But, says Mr. Stern, Jesus does not mean Immanuel. It does. What is the derivation of Jesus? Mr. Stern must know well that Jesus is the mere Greek dressing of Yah-hoshua—otherwise Joshua; which means God (Yah), shall save (shuah). Therefore, the name "Jesus" expresses the same doctrine as Emmanuel: viz., that the child so named was God-manifest in the flesh, sojourning with Israel for their salvation. But see how his question recoils upon himself. He says the child referred to is the child whose birth is recorded in the succeeding chapter—Maher-shalal-hash-baz. How is this? How does he reconcile the name Maher-shalal-hash-baz with the predicted name Emmanuel? I have shown the doctrinal identity of Jesus and Immanuel. I ask him to do the same with Maher-shalal-hash-baz.

I shall now proceed with the line of evidence I was pursuing, and which I

* This is the same word as *peseeloo* (used by Mr. Stern), but differently joined, and consequently pronounced differently.

shall pursue more deliberately to-morrow night. When Mr. Stern speaks of the uselessness of quoting the New Testament in which Jews do not believe, he does not understand my argument. My argument is not that they have to believe the things I quote from the New Testament because they are there: I quote these things to show that the matters declared concerning the Messiah, in the Old Testament, are fulfilled in the Messiah presented in the New. If this is established, and the New Testament be proved to be true, my argument is unanswerable. That is the question; and I will say that the evidence of the truthfulness of the New Testament is the biggest gun I have to fire. I will prove that the New Testament is true, and that Jesus rose from the dead. If I prove that, the Messiahship of Jesus is established. My argument, at present, is that Jesus answers to all the characteristics of the Messiah foretold in Moses and the prophets. I have shewn this in three particulars, the time, the place, and the family.

Now I proceed to a fourth. The prophets teach that the Messiah should not be of purely human extraction, but should have God for his father. I refer first to Psalm cxvi. 16, which though not irresistibly to the point, is in harmony with the idea presented in Isaiah vii. The Messiah speaks thus: "Oh Lord, truly I am Thy servant; I am thy servant and *the son of Thine hand-maid*; Thou hast loosed my bonds." By the two taken together, we are reminded of the necessity that Christ should be born a virgin, arising out of the general prediction concerning him to be found in Gen. iii. 17. There he is spoken of under a general figure. "The *seed of the woman* shall bruise thy (the serpent's) head." I ask Mr. Stern to give a reason why the words are not "the seed of the man." The seed of the woman was to be the instrumentality—the means of remedying the evil that came from the woman listening to the lie of the serpent. The woman being the cause of the transgression, in leading Adam astray, was to be the means also of deliverance from the condemnation into which, by her, he came. She was, apart from the man, destined to be the means of the introduction of the Saviour into the world. Hence the designation, "Seed of the Woman." I need not say how completely this is

fulfilled in the birth of Jesus. But how could a child be born of a virgin? The account in Luke and Matthew is a complete answer. In Matthew we read: "that which is conceived in her is *of the Holy Spirit*." In Luke: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall o'ershadow thee. Therefore, that Holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." The womb of the virgin was preter-naturally quickened by the divine energy that formed all things in the beginning, and thus the product was a Son of God, answering to the before-time mysterious predictions of the prophets, which I proceed to continue to quote.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

I ask Mr. Stern to explain how, upon Jewish hypotheses, the Messiah could bear the name of God. Why should he, individually, be described in the language here employed: "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." The New Testament supplies the reason. Jesus of Nazareth, as born of Mary, by the power of the Holy Spirit, was God's offspring, and therefore, naturally, inherited the name of his Father. This is an explanation which the Christian system supplies, and which the Jewish system cannot; for the Jewish system says the Messiah is to be merely a man, merely the son of David. In this connection, I would introduce the argument employed by Jesus himself in controversy with the Jews on the very point. It was an argument they were not able to answer, and which Mr. Stern will not be able to answer. I refer to Matt. xxii. 42, where we read:

"While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, *The Son of David*. He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David call him Lord, how is he then his son? And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions."

I now ask the same question of Mr. Stern. Upon what principle,

agreeable to Jewish genealogy, does David call his son "Lord?" There is an explanation in connection with Jesus of Nazareth which their system cannot afford. Jesus of Nazareth, as the Son of God, is higher than David, though born in the line of David according to the flesh. He is God manifest in the flesh, and, therefore, Lord of David. He says of himself, "I am the root and the offspring of David" (Rev. xii. 16); "The Father who dwelleth in me, he doeth the works."—(John xiv. 10.) He that seeth me, seeth Him that sent me" (John xii. 4-5); "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also."—(John xiv. 9.) Therefore, was Jesus greater than Jonah, greater than Solomon, greater than David; and, therefore, could David say as concerning the power that was his very origin, "He is my Lord;" although he could also say of Jesus as the flesh-medium of that power, "he is my son." This, indeed, is the great mystery solved in the genealogy, which brings me back to a point I omitted to mention. It might be considered a strange thing that the genealogy of Joseph should be given, if Joseph were not the father of Jesus. But you will see that it was necessary; for if Mary were married to one who was not of the house of David, her individuality would be merged in his, her Davidic extraction would have been marred or covered, and the relation of the Messiah to David interfered with. Therefore, it was necessary that the husband of Mary, equally with Mary herself, should be a descendant of David. By this the Messiah, though not begotten of a human father, was, indubitably, David's son.

Then it may be said—and this is another point that I expected Mr. Stern to bring forward; but he has not been quite so sharp as his co-religionist, Mr. Monaet, in the debate with Mr. Gratz—he has not laid hold of the point upon which Mr. Monaet insisted when he asked what relation Jesus was to David, since he can only establish his relation to David through a woman? (Time called.)

Mr. STERN: Mr. Roberts has had something very important to say on a point that I do not seem to have been so sharp upon as another gentleman. I am sorry for that; for however little I say, it brings out the greatest things of Mr. Roberts; but since the matter has

been discussed, and since my Jewish brethren are satisfied that they have got the best of it, I do not see why we need feel disappointed. I am very pleased that we have had the greatest gun-shot. There is, therefore, no more danger—at least it will be fired in the first opening speech of to-morrow night. With regard to his statement of Isaiah to Ahaz, I hold that I have proved, to the satisfaction of this audience, that the word *coalmo* can never be used where the word *peseeloo* is necessary—I say, if I have proved it to your satisfaction—of course, I rely upon your sense of justice for that, for I am perfectly satisfied that you are not all Hebrew scholars, consequently you will have to leave it to a higher authority. If I have proved that, the whole argument of my friend falls to the ground. I have proved that it is a wrong translation, and that it does not really mean what Mr. Roberts would have you believe. I do not care what it does mean. My friend refers me to Genesis, and he made some statement about what sort of Messiah we did expect; if Jesus of Nazareth is not the one, if we expect someone else. I wish it to be plainly understood, and I hope Mr. Roberts will take notice of this, that I have not come here to discuss who our Messiah is to be; I have come here to discuss whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. It has nothing to do with what we expect. There is no doubt that among Jews there are differences of opinion, and I have no objection, on some other occasion, to discuss that subject, but since we are not here for that purpose, I hold it would not be treating the audience in a courteous manner if we discussed it now; for, instead of going on to discuss who was Jesus of Nazareth, I should have to bring forward what we expect. He will certainly puzzle me if he asks me such questions as this. He refers me to Gen. iii. about the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. I don't know whether that has anything to do with Jesus. Surely, he doesn't think that I shall deny that every man is the seed of woman as well as of man. I have no doubt that every one who stands here is of the seed of woman. It certainly is not, as I say for the third time, a subject for me to discuss here. I will leave the matter with what I have said. But what wonderful things he tells us about the seed of the woman, which shall

bruise the serpent's head. I say this is the most intelligible passage that can be read. It is not necessary to call it a prophecy; it is what anyone with any sense at all would see—that the serpent would probably bite the heel of the seed of the woman, and that the seed of the woman would break its head by striking it with a stick; more especially when we know that in eastern countries, where men usually walk without shoes, serpents abound. What is more likely than that a serpent will bite a man's heel, and that the man will turn round and strike it with a stick? Whether that is an argument that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, I will leave to your judgment. My friend said something about the established fact of Jesus having risen. Well now, the only fact that we have about him having risen, is that which is recorded in the New Testament. It seems to me most unreasonable for him to bring such an argument. Supposing you had a prisoner at the bar, accused of theft; if you asked him to explain matters, he would, no doubt, try to excuse himself. A statement is brought forward, which, at the outset of this question, he knew that I not alone doubted, but entirely disbelieved. He brings the New Testament to prove New Testament statements. What has that to do with me? But let us see what these inspired gentlemen, who were with Jesus, say. One of them, after being told that Jesus had risen, would not believe it. I allude to Thomas-a-Didymus. "But" they say "we have seen him and conversed with him." "But that has nothing to do with me," Thomas says, "and unless Jesus appears to me, so that I may put my hand in his side, and put my fingers in the prints of the nails, I shall not believe." This is one of the disciples who was with Jesus at the time. Then my friend says we have got proofs. What proofs have we got? It was not proof enough for Thomas-a-Didymus when the eleven disciples, who were with him, actually saw Jesus; and if he would not take their own words for it, how much more reasonable for me to deny the statement to-day, 1800 years after the event. And look how he was justified in his scepticism; for Jesus was kind enough to appear to him and

say "Reach forth thy hand and touch my side, and put thy fingers in the marks of the nails." Thomas then believed, and if Jesus will appear to me; if Jesus wishes really to save me—you are really in earnest the same as I am at this moment—if Jesus has a desire to save a soul, as some call it—and mine wants saving as well as others—then I beg and pray let him come forth now; let Jesus in 1871 appear to me, so that I may put my hand into his side. (Hissee.) You may hiss as you like; I deny what you believe; I have come prepared to deny it. I have come here with a certain amount of sayings, and, whether you are pleased or not, I shall say them. I demand of you to hear me, in the name of Englishmen—in the name of liberty, for which we have not so much fought as we may have to do: the liberty which has been left by our forefathers, and which many of them purchased with their blood—I say it is reasonable in me to ask it, if Thomas-a-Didymus asked it. Let him come forth that I may put my fingers into the prints of the nails, then I shall believe. And yet, I don't know whether I would even then. Thomas-a-Didymus was with Jesus when he was alive; he would, probably recognise him. I never saw Jesus, and if he were to come, I should not recognise him; and so it would be all the same.

Friends, I thank you for listening to my statement. To-morrow night we shall resume the subject. I have a great deal yet to say, which I will try to say in the most gentle way, so that it shall not hurt your feelings; but, unless you give me liberty of speech so that I may express my opinions freely; if you only allow Mr. Roberts to say what he has got to say, and refuse to concede to me the same privilege, how will you be able to judge between us? We shall not get at the truth. I have come so that we may, once for all, settle this matter. It is quite right for one as well as another to express his opinions freely, and we may, perhaps, at the same time, get to understand one another, and if we get wrong, we may, perhaps, put it right; and who is more likely to do it than ourselves? I thank you kindly for your attention.

SECOND NIGHT,

Wednesday, October 18th, 1871.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the meeting to observe the patience exhibited on the previous evening, while the discussion proceeded.

MR. ROBERTS: Ladies and Gentlemen, after what Mr. Stern said last night, it is impossible to conceive by what sign he is to identify the Messiah when he comes. He said it was no business of his to define these signs; that he was here simply to deny that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. I submit that he misapprehended his duty. It is true he is here to deny that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, but how is he effectively to do this unless he shows that he does not answer to the signs by which the Messiah is to be known? And how can he show this without telling us what those signs are? Any argument short of this, must fail to justify the conviction which he is here to declare. Nay, he went further, and astonished us by saying that if Jesus of Nazareth himself were to re-appear, he is not quite sure that he would believe in him then. (Mr. Stern: Hear, hear.) Upon what ground? Would not his reappearance be evidence of his Messiahship? Mr. Stern says he does not know that he would be able to recognise him. If that would be an obstacle, how is he ever to believe in any Messiah? Has he ever seen his own Messiah? How is he to know him when he appears? If Jesus of Nazareth were to re-appear, that would be evidence that he was the Messiah. (Mr. Stern: No, no.) Mr. Roberts: Mr. Stern says "No." It will belong to the last stage of my plan of evidence, to press home that argument; to enter upon it at present would be to diverge from the plan I have laid down for myself. I, therefore, merely hint at it, and pass on to notice one or two other points. Mr. Stern said that since the disciple Thomas, called Didymus, said, "I will not believe that Jesus of Nazareth is risen, unless I have an opportunity of putting my finger into the marks of the nails, and my hand into his side," he is justified in taking the same position. I admit that this would be so, if Mr. Stern were in the position of Thomas, called Didymus. But Mr. Stern is not in that position. Thomas had no

evidence of the resurrection of Jesus, beyond the assurances of his ten fellow disciples; and considering the circumstances under which it was given, it is no wonder that it didn't carry conviction to the mind of Thomas. These circumstances require to be taken into account. The disciples were not expecting that Jesus would die. They were looking for his triumph over all enemies, and the establishment of his power over all the earth, as a deathless King. When, therefore, instead of this, he was taken prisoner, and actually crucified and buried, it staggered their faith, and drove all their hope in him to the wind. They knew not, as John tells us, the Scripture, that he should rise again from the dead. They were in a state of consternation and bewilderment. Is it a great marvel that in this state of things, Thomas, on hearing the statement of the ten disciples, that Jesus had risen, should say, on the spur of the moment, "After what has happened I will not believe, unless I have the opportunity of satisfying myself?" It was no wonder; it was an exceedingly natural position for him to take. But Mr. Stern's position is very different. Mr. Stern has in his possession, or at least may have, for I do not know whether he has given sufficient attention to the subject to be really in possession of such evidence as, fairly considered, would compel him in believing that which Thomas at the time doubted. He has just precisely the same reason for believing in Jesus, that he has for believing in Moses. I should like Mr. Stern to tell us why he believes in Moses; and I am sure if he give us a reasonable definition, it will be a definition containing a reason for believing in Jesus. And then if he is so very anxious to keep Thomas company, why not keep him company to the end of the chapter? Thomas was a believer in the sequel; and the very fact that he took a sceptical attitude in the first instance, gives the strongest weight to the fact that subsequently he did believe. Indeed, we may accept it almost as a kindness of providence, that there should have been in the company of the disciples one who represented the searching spirit of modern criticism; for a man of the

disposition to be in such circumstances convinced, is a standing argument to the end of the world. I submit, therefore, that Mr. Stern is not justified in using Thomas for a sceptical purpose. Such use cannot be logically sustained at all. Thomas's case is a stronger argument for belief, than the other ten disciples who never doubted. If Mr. Stern uses him to justify doubt, I use him to justify belief.

Mr. Stern says his fathers rejected Jesus of Nazareth, and therefore he is justified. I ask him if he is prepared to stand by that? Didn't his fathers reject and kill the prophets?—Moses himself not excepted, except in the matter of death. Why doesn't Mr. Stern reject them? Moses was rejected by his brethren. When he supposed that they would have understood how that God would, by his hand, deliver them, they said, "Who made thee to be a ruler and a judge over us?" and afterwards, when Moses was on the summit of Sinai, they said, "As for this Moses, we wot not what has become of him," and proposed to appoint a captain over them, to return to Egypt. In fact, if we go through the whole history of Israel, you will find the true prophets were always rejected, and the false ones always listened to. If, then, Mr. Stern rejects Jesus of Nazareth, merely because his fathers did so, is he not logically bound to reject the prophets also? Why does he not say, "Because my fathers rejected Moses and Elijah, and all the prophets, I will do it?"

I will not condescend to notice the remarks with which he favoured you last night, in reply to my citation of the Edenic promise concerning the seed of the woman, beyond saying that it is puerile in the extreme, to suggest that God should deal with so trifling a matter in defining the moral relations of things, as the propensity of the serpent to bite a man's heel. I will rather pass on to the line of argument which I opened last night, and in which I had arrived at the point of applying the prophecy of Isaiah concerning the birth of Immanuel to Jesus. I will now remark that whatever may be said with regard to the prophecy on the score of obscurity, the balance of probability—putting it in the very mildest form—is in favour of the view I have presented. The Messiah of the New Testament answers to the peculiarity of that prophecy exactly, in that he was born of a virgin

of the house of David, and I am fortunately not without good company in applying the prophecy to that fact. Matthew was a Jew; one Jew is at least as good as another. Matthew belonged to a party of Jews, the reality and potency of whose labours for the advancement of the truth, are evidenced even in the present constitution of political society. He was one of a band of men who sealed their testimony with their blood. Mr. Stern says he belonged to a band of illiterate men: so much the better for my argument. How came it that illiterate men moved the world? Illiterate men could never have done that in the capacity of illiterate men merely. There must have been a cause in operation with their illiterateness, to have produced so great a revolution as that which resulted from their efforts. The New Testament account reveals this cause, and gives the only rational explanation of their movement. They were personal witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus. They declared their personal knowledge, and "*God worked with them, confirming their word with signs following.*"—(Mark xvi. 20). This accounts for their perseverance, and their ultimate success. Take away this element, and you take away the explanation of a great historic fact that no man can gainsay. The illiterateness of the apostles, upon which Mr. Stern delights to dwell, I rely upon as in the circumstances, one of the strongest evidences of the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. Well, then, Matthew, one of this band of men, to whom Jesus made the promise that the Spirit should come and guide them into all truth, applies the prophecy of Isaiah in the way I am contending for; and therefore I am in good Jewish company. I refer to Matt. i. 22, where, in recounting the facts connected with the supernatural birth of Christ, Matthew says, "All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord, by the prophet, saying 'Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted, is God with us.'"

There is a necessity not recognised by Mr. Stern and his party, but recorded by everyone of the prophetic writings, why the Messiah should be born, not of the will of man, but by the power of the Holy Spirit. I refer to the names that are bestowed in those writings upon the

Messiah—names which are not intelligible on the supposition that the Messiah was to be a mere man. I proceed to give you a few illustrations of this. In the 24th Psalm, we have this beautiful passage in connection with the Kingly manifestation of the Messiah—"Lift up your heads, oh ye gates, and be ye lifted up ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory?" The 10th verse, "THE LORD OF HOSTS, he is the King of Glory." Upon what principle of Judaism can Messiah be styled "the Lord of Hosts, Jehovah of Armies, their God? Can a mere man be Jehovah? But accept the Messiah of the New Testament and the difficulty is gone. God was manifest in the flesh, by that universal Spirit which radiates from him, and which is the pabulum of all existence; by which the Creator is everywhere present, and by which when He manifests Himself, it is as much Himself as His own personal glory enthroned in heaven. That is the New Testament explanation of this prophetic mystery. I call upon Mr. Stern to give his explanation.

In Psalm xlv. 3, the Messiah is thus addressed:—

"Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously, because of truth, and meekness, and righteousness; and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the King's enemies; whereby the people fall under thee. Thy throne, O God (*Elohim*), is for ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre."

I ask him upon what principle a mere son of David is to be called the *Elohim* of Israel. Then in Isaiah xxiv. 23, we read:—

"The moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients gloriously."

I am one with Mr. Stern in expecting the Messiah to reign in Jerusalem as King—enthroned King of the whole earth, upon the holy hill that God has chosen. But who is it that is here described as "the Lord of Hosts?" Can a mere man, such as the Messiah of Jewish expectation, be called the Lord of Hosts (*Yahweh of Armies*)? The description is exactly applicable to Jesus, for he is Jehoshua—Lord of Hosts—God manifest. Again, in Jer. xxiii. 5, you find this:—

"Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS—Yahweh (*Jehovah*) of Israel, our righteousness."

Upon what principle is that applicable to a mere son of David, such as the Jews expect? It is applicable to a son generated by the spirit from a virgin of David's house. Again, in Hosea xiii. we find another and signal illustration of the same phase. At the 9th verse, it says:—

"I am the Lord thy God, from the land of Egypt. Thou shalt know no God but me . . . O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thine help. *I will be thy King.*"

Where is there a man that can say, "I am the Lord thy God, from the land of Egypt?" In what sense is the uprise of a mere son of David a fulfilment of the promises of God, that HE would be their Messiah; which, in fact, is a prophetic parallel to the memorial name God took upon Himself at the bush—YAHWEH, *I will be*; to which, though in the English version translated "I am," I suppose Mr. Stern will not object. "I will be thine *Elohim*, your Messiah." How? Jesus, the Word made flesh, is the explanation. But how could a mere flesh and blood son of David answer to the description? In Joel iii. 17, we are told:—

"So shall ye know that *I am the Lord your God dwelling in Zion*, my holy mountain: then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more."

In Zeph. iii. 14, we find another illustration of the same feature:—

"Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel, be glad and rejoice with all thy heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord hath taken away thy judgments, He hath cast out thine enemy: the *King of Israel, even the Lord (Jehovah)*, is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more."

Clearly that applies to a time not yet arrived in the experience of Israel. But how can a mere son of David be described as "Jehovah in the midst of Israel?" If a mere son of David could be so described, why not David himself, for surely a father is equal to his son, on the principles before the Jewish mind in the consideration of this question? Let

Mr. Stern find some place in the Holy Writings where David describes himself, or is described by the name Jehovah. I know that this he cannot do. But he is obliged to recognise the fact that that name is applied to David's son—the Messiah. The question is, upon what principle? If the Messiah is a mere son of David—not the root as well as the offspring of David—why is he described by the name of David's God? There is no answer on the Jewish hypothesis; but admit that the Messiah is Son of David's God, as well as Son of David by Mary, and the difficulty vanishes. Then in Zech. ii. 10-12:—

"Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord. And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me unto thee. And the Lord shall inherit Judah, his portion in the Holy Land, and shall choose Jerusalem again."

This is a prediction of Israel's national aggrandisement under their expected Messiah; and on the same subject, in the 14th chapter of the same book, 9th verse, we read, "And the Lord (Jehovah) shall be King over all the earth," which agrees with the doctrine of his manifestation, which I have pointed out.

But further, this personage to come is described as the Son of God even in the Jews' own writings. In Psalm ii. 7, we find the statement,

"The Lord hath said unto me, *Thou art my Son*, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."

In Zech. xii. 8, the same feature is presented:—

"In that day shall the Lord defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and he that is feeble among them at that day, shall be as David, and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord before them."

How can a mere man of the house of David, constitute the house of David as if it were God? Jesus of Nazareth, the manifestation of God by His Spirit, does indeed exalt the house of David in his person to equality with God. This is the blasphemy the Pharisees charged against Jesus, in saying that he was equal with

God, being the Son of God.—(John v. 18). Then in Isaiah lxiii. 1, you have the same idea that is presented in the quotations I have made; all of which I press upon Mr. Stern's urgent attention, with a request that he will explain how they can be reconciled with the idea that the coming Messiah is to be a mere son of David:—

"Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bohrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment."

I presume Mr. Stern will admit that this is a description of his Messiah in military operation against the Gentile nations, when the time comes for him to do for the world what Joshua did for the nations of Canaan. "For the day of vengeance is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come." A mere son of David could never use such language, but Jesus of Nazareth could; for he by the Spirit was one with the God of Israel—(John x. 30); as he also said "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also." By this indwelling power, he was enabled to still the storm on the sea of Galilee.

Next, and most conclusively of all: the Messiah promised in the prophets was to be a sufferer. He was to be rejected; he was to be put to death; in proof of which I rely first upon the prophecy of Daniel, with which Mr. Stern dealt so very weakly; in fact he did not deal with it at all, for he said he was not able to tell what the 70 weeks meant. That is a damaging fact in his case—that he should be unable to explain one of the principal predictions of one of his own prophets, concerning the Messiah—especially when that very prediction was the foundation of a strong expectation entertained by his own nation, of the appearance of the Messiah, in the days of Josephus. The statement says that at the expiry of the period mentioned there, the Messiah should be cut off. There can be no dispute as to the signification of the term "cut off." If Mr.

Stern should raise any objection on the point, I will be prepared, from the writings of his own nation, to show that it means to die—to punish; as when we are told for instance that the wicked shall be (*kahrath*) cut off—the very word employed in the prophecy of Daniel. Why was the Messiah to be cut off? The explanation is given a verse or two before the statement in verse 24. This “cutting-off” manifestation of the Messiah is connected with the finishing of transgression, the making an end of sin, making reconciliation for iniquity, bringing in everlasting righteousness, and so forth. I call Mr. Stern’s attention to the fact that the Messiah of the New Testament is taught to have accomplished these very things by his death, and it is a Jew that teaches it. Paul said Jesus “put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;” and he (Jesus) was “made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” There are numerous statements of this doctrine in the New Testament, but, as this is so well-known to be a doctrine of the New Testament, I need not quote further testimony. I will, at once, point out that in that respect, Jesus of Nazareth corresponds with the Messiah of Daniel ix. I call upon Mr. Stern to shew in what way his expected Messiah is to fulfil that chapter.

I next quote the 53rd of Isaiah, which I invite Mr. Stern very specially to deal with:—

“Who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground; he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and he hid, as it were, our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely, he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he

openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death, because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him. He hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore, will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.”

Mr. STERN: Mr. Chairman and friends, I must say that you have been very patient in listening to the speech of Mr. Roberts. There is great credit due to him for being able to deliver such a speech. But we have come here to discuss whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. We do not come here to listen to a lecture from Mr. Roberts upon the Old Testament. I don’t think there is anything in the Old Testament but what I am perfectly acquainted with. I was quite prepared to hear all that he might have to say on the subject. Still I asked him questions last night which I consider have never been answered. I asked him then to produce the originals of the New Testament. (Laughter.) You may laugh if you please, but at the same time I am quite serious when I ask you (turning to Mr. Roberts) to produce the originals of the New Testament. I have said, and I maintain it, that the New Testament is a compilation of falsehoods and forgeries, and until you can produce the originals, I will not believe in it. Who wrote Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; in what language, and to whom were they written, and where? You never so much as condescended to tell me anything about it. The only thing you did was to ask me to produce the originals of Moses. That is a nice way of answering a question. I must say I did intend to conduct this debate in the most amicable manner, but it will be impossible to do so if we go on in this

way. This is merely a bandying of words. I have nothing to do with producing the originals of Moses; though if I undertake to discuss Judaism *versus* Christadelphianism, I shall have no objection to produce them. But I have come here for one purpose only—to discuss whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah or not. I have nothing to do with producing the originals of Moses. What has that to do with the subject? Then my friend asked me, since I object to Jesus on the ground that I am not acquainted with him; that I never saw him; and if he appeared to me I should not recognise him, which is quite reasonable on my part, I should say; for I cannot recognise anyone that I have never seen. He asks “if your Messiah come, how will you recognise him? I have not come here to discuss as to what Messiah we expect. He then compares Moses to Jesus. What a comparison! We look upon Moses as a man, not as a God. We revolt at the idea of man being God. That is what we object to. If you bring Jesus and tell me to believe in him as a man, leave the God theory out, I have no objection; but when you tell me he is a man, and yet the Son of God, I revolt against it, and won't have it. We only look upon Moses as a man, and not as son of God. A man can believe in a good many things that he has not seen. I have never seen Napoleon, nor Abraham Lincoln, but I believe there were such men. I know there is an Emperor of Germany. I could mention hundreds of people whom I have not seen, and yet whom I believe to exist; but here you bring me people to believe in, upon authorities that the greatest intellects that have written upon the subject pronounce to be forgeries. See Mosheim, page 64, *Peregrinations of the Apostles*.

Of course that is just what I say. “The distance of time and the want of records.” I won't believe these statements until you bring me the proper records. It is no use my going on to discuss the subject of the genealogy of Jesus at present; I must leave that alone until my friend brings further evidence on the subject. One of the answers my friend gave me last night was, that God who made Adam out of the dust, could so arrange that a man should be born without a father. Well now, this I hold; and if you are not satisfied, I am perfectly willing to leave it to the Chairman; if he will kindly undertake the trouble, or

rather if he will undertake to decide whether I am in order or not. I hold that Mr. Roberts is out of order in asking such questions. I have not come here to discuss what God can or cannot do; I have come to discuss whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah or not. You bring me your books to prove that he was. You bring me the New Testament, in which I say I do not believe. I hold that you have to show that these records are true before I can accept them; but to say that God did one thing because he did another, is begging the question; I shall not trouble to answer such irrelevancies. My friend has quoted Isaiah liii. From the way in which he read this chapter, it would appear that every word referred to Jesus, but, with your permission, I will read it, and see if we cannot show its meaning to be quite different. What this has to do with the Messiah I really don't know. Isaiah says “who hath believed our report?” Now you know Isaiah was not speaking two or three years after Christ was crucified, or is reported to have been crucified—for I don't believe he was crucified—but about a thousand years before—I do not know the exact time. He says “Who hath believed our report?” speaking of the past; “and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?” Certainly if Mr. Roberts had explained it we should have known better, but it cannot be Jesus; he was not born till nearly a thousand years afterwards. “For he shall grow up as a tender plant; he has no form nor comeliness, and when we should see him there is no beauty that we should desire him. How is it that some of you do desire him. You actually wish me to desire him, but I don't. “He is despised and rejected of men.” It was only a few Jews who rejected him. “A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.” I don't know what sorrows Jesus h. d. He could not have known any such sorrows as we have to day. He was not obliged to get up at six o'clock in the morning, and go and slave away his life until six at night. (Hissing.) My friends, I told you last night that your hissing would not prevent me saying a word. (Renewed signs of disapprobation; the Chairman having to interpose his authority before perfect quietness was restored.) Besides, hissing was the cause of interrupting me in the middle of a sentence. But this is my first attempt at such a thing as this.

How it will end I don't know—the Lord only knows. I was quoting this passage. "A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." How this can be applied to Jesus I don't know, for the best part of His life we know nothing about him. One says he has been in Bethlehem, another in Judea, another in Egypt, and another elsewhere; and the whole of his ministration didn't last more than three years. I have gone through sorrows myself, but they have not come altogether, they have come gradually, and we take them in the best part. If Jesus had been married, and had a very lovely wife, and his wife died, and he got married again, and perhaps had a wife he could not live so agreeably with as you have heard is sometimes the case, you might have said he was acquainted with grief and sorrows. Or if he had children whom he loved, and they were cut off while young, you might say he was a man acquainted with sorrows and grief. But what sorrows and grief had Jesus? Why I cannot really see how that passage can be quoted at all in his favour. Why when the worst came to the worst, when he had not a farthing in the world, and when there were 500 people around him, he could feed them with a few loaves and fishes, and there could be gathered up seven baskets full of fragments. Surely there could be no sorrow there. If he had only left us that secret, what a different state of things there would have been now; no work-houses, no gaols. But this beautiful Son of God and Mary, this man without a father, this man who could do all these things, you say he was acquainted with sorrows! Shew me the sorrows; what is the sorrow, when and where? My friend says all these things applied to Christ. Yes; they are applied to Him by those who believe in Jesus. Why do they apply them? Because if they did not they would not have a Messiah. Whom was it done by? By a lot of people who thought it an act of virtue to deceive and lie for the purpose of defending anything in favour of the Church; by people who had no principle whatever. My friend who comes here to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, shews me a passage that I am sure has nothing to do with him. "He was despised and we esteemed him not." Well, now, if the Jews were to say so, there would be something in it; but since the Christians quote it in their favour, and since the Christians do esteem him, I do not see how

it can be applied in His favour. "Surely he hath borne our griefs." How could Jesus, when he was not yet born? It does not say "He shall bear our grief." It says "he hath borne our grief and carried our sorrows; and yet we did not esteem him stricken of God, and afflicted." If this is not alluding to a personage who had lived before Isaiah spoke these words, then I must say words have no meaning at all. "He was wounded for our transgressions." Who was? Jesus? who was going to be wounded a thousand years after? "The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed." How can that apply to Jesus? He hadn't lived then. "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." On whom? You must understand that Isaiah, who is looked upon as one of the greatest of the prophets—of what I should call the greater prophets—lived at a time when the Jews were not as he wished them to be, when they were probably as we are to-day—I must admit it—not very strictly obeying the laws of Moses. We certainly have not got such great men who can come to-day and give us their intellects and their time to bring us together and tell us what to do. But there was Isaiah then among the people, and he, like a good man, went and told them of their faults. He said "We have gone astray." He is including himself with the others. "The Lord hath laid upon him." Upon whom? "He shall lay upon him in a thousand years." That would have sounded strange. If words mean anything at all, they mean what he said. Of course, I must admit I have not been to an English school; what little I know of English I have had to pick up myself, but from what little I do know I consider—and if I am wrong, my opponent will inform me—that the sentence is in the past tense. "He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth." Why, if there was nothing else in this chapter, those very words would be sufficient to shew that they were not referring to Jesus. "He was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth." Did not Jesus open his mouth? Who said "*Eli, Eli, lama sabaethuni?*" "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" Who said "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The passage is simply alluding

to someone that had passed away, and who was oppressed and afflicted of God; and Isaiah said it was done for our sakes, and Isaiah consoles himself with that sentence; but it could never have been alluding to Jesus, for he actually did speak; he could not bear the excruciating pains when it came to the last moment. "He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation." I have yet to learn when Jesus was in prison. When my friend gets up, I shall want him to tell me what prison it was, and how long he was there. "And who shall declare his generation?" Why Matthew and Luke: they declare it. We know the generation of Jesus; he was the son of Abraham, according to your theory. He was the son of Joseph, who was the son of Jacob, according to Matthew, and the son of Heli, according to Luke. But it seems to be made up in this way: if Jesus was born without a father, his mother's husband had two fathers, and so, between the two, we can reconcile them. But when was Jesus in prison? Is it such a difficult task? "Who shall declare his generation?" That is what you have been declaring these last two nights. "For he was cut off out of the land of the living. For the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death." This cannot be speaking of Jesus, because it all refers to the past. "Because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth." I shall be able to shew that there was a great deal of deceit in the mouth of Jesus before I have done to-night. "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief, when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed." I want to know if Jesus could see his seed when he never got married? It is simply alluding to a man who shall enjoy the pleasures of life, and live to see his children's children. But it is just as Mosheim has said, and my friend has admitted: the most ignorant people were the first that joined this beautiful Christianity, this loving faith of yours, and to ignorant people it is easily reconciled. I am not a learned man, but it does not require a great deal of learning to find that this passage speaks of a man who had come. "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied. By his

knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." How does he? Christ says, "Ye that would not that I should reign over you, bring them hither, and slay them before me?" That is the way he justifies them. Is that justification? "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, because he hath poured out his soul unto death: he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." There is nothing of the sort. "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved." All we have to do is not to discuss; we want no theories, we want no ideas of people who have lived before us; all we want is people of the greatest ignorance that can come here and join issue with my friend, and repeat the words, "I believe in Jesus." That is quite sufficient; we shall be saved. (Mr. Roberts: O no!) "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." If these words do not mean that, I do not know what they mean. They seem to me plain language; in fact too plain. I have tried, no doubt in the humblest possible way to show that this chapter in Isaiah has nothing to do with Jesus. My friend may probably say who has it to do with? I am perfectly satisfied that it does not refer to Jesus. I am not bound to tell him what it does refer to. When I undertake to discuss Judaism *versus* Christianity, I shall be prepared to tell him whom it does refer to. I am perfectly satisfied that my friend is a learned man and has given a great deal of study to these things; and just as I know to whom it alludes, I am perfectly satisfied that he knows the same.

(Time called.)

Mr. ROBERTS: I am sorry to find, ladies and gentlemen, that Mr. Stern is so unacquainted with the writings of his own nation as to argue that the present tense, in the 53rd of Isaiah, can not have a future signification. Nothing is more frequent, in these writings, than the employment of the present tense, in prophetically depicting future scenes and events. For instance: in the 60th Isaiah, we have the future glories of the Jewish nation thus introduced: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee." According to Mr. Stern's argument, this

describes a state of things existent in the days of Isaiah, whereas he is here to-night to contend that the Light of Israel has not come. How does he get out of that difficulty? Again, in the 9th Isaiah, we read: "For unto us a child is born, to us, a son is given." I presume Mr. Stern will not deny that this refers to the Messiah; for it goes on to say that "on the throne of David" he shall sit, and order and establish the kingdom for ever. Applying it, then, to his Messiah, and construing the tense of the verb as he would construe it with the 53rd chapter, it would show that the Messiah had at that time appeared; whereas Mr. Stern denies that he has yet appeared. I might give many illustrations of the same thing.—"I have made thee a father of many nations" God said to Abraham, when he as yet had had no child. Mr. Stern argues in ignorance of or opposition to the fact that divine language is based upon prescience; that God calleth "things that are not—(but which he intends to be)—as though they were." The Spirit of Christ in Isaiah, foreseeing the sufferings of the Messiah as though they were already present, employs that tense in depicting them. Mr. Stern may well hesitate to say to whom the language appears. He cannot say definitely.

Mr. Stern: I can.

Mr. Roberts: But he has told us something on the subject upon which I shall be able to destroy him—in an amicable sense of course. He tells us that the chapter applies to some one who had appeared before the days of Isaiah; and it does not apply to the Messiah, for the Messiah, according to Mr. Stern has not yet made his appearance; and when he appears, will not be a sufferer. In saying this, Mr. Stern makes himself wiser than the Rabbis of his own nation.

Mr. Stern: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roberts: Even those Rabbis that agree with him in rejecting Jesus. I shall quote the opinions of several Rabbis—unbelievers in Jesus, but who contend—or at all events admit that the 53rd of Isaiah does apply to the Messiah, although I dare say it will be difficult to find a Rabbi of that kind nowadays; for the exigencies of this controversy forced them to put a false construction upon it—a construction very different from that accepted by the Jews when the claims of Jesus of Nazareth had not to be encountered. I first read you a quotation that has been made from the Targum of

Jonathan Ben Uzziel, a rabbi said to have lived contemporary with Christ, or about 30 or 40 years before his days, and, therefore, before the present controversy had arisen. In his commentary upon the 52nd and 53rd of Isaiah he says:

"Behold my servant, the Messiah, shall prosper; he shall rise and shall increase, and shall be exceedingly powerful, inasmuch as the house of Israel have expected him many days, during which their look and their splendour were eclipsed among the nations above those of other men. So shall he disperse many nations. Kings because of him shall be dumb; they shall lay their hands on their mouths, for what had not been related to them they shall behold, and what had not been heard of by them, they shall contemplate. Who hath credited this our news (Isaiah liii.), and on whom is the mighty arm of Jehovah now displayed? The righteous man shall grow before him like the young twigs that are in the act of budding, and like the tree which spreads forth its roots by the running stream, so shall the generation of the righteous increase in the land that had lacked. His appearance is no ordinary appearance, nor is his terror that of a common man, but his splendour will be a sacred splendour, so that everyone that seeth him shall gaze on him. For this reason, he will be condemned, but he shall cause to arise the glory of all kingdoms: they shall be weak and sickly, just as a man of sorrows and inured to misfortune, or as when the presence of the habitation being withdrawn from us, we are despised and nothing accounted of, so shall it be to them. Therefore he will entreat for our sins, and our iniquities on his account shall be forgiven us. He is delivered up by our iniquities, but by his doctrine, peace will increase among us . . . It is the pleasure of Jehovah, on his behalf, to remit us all our sins. He entreats, and is heard; and before he opens his mouth, he is accepted."

This quotation shows that Jonathan ben Uzziel, 1800 years ago, applied the 53rd chapter of Isaiah to the Messiah. Mr. Stern finds it inconvenient to admit this application. He says it does not apply to the Messiah at all, but to some one living before the days of Isaiah. Therefore he considers himself wiser than Jonathan ben Uzziel and Zohar, who make the same application as Ben Uzziel; wiser also than Solomon ben Isaac. Jarki, another rabbi, who, writing in the 12th century, says:—

"King Messiah was among the generation of the wicked, and he applied his heart to seek mercy for Judah, and to fast and to humble himself on their behalf, as it is said. "And he

was wounded for our transgressions," and he seeks mercy for them when they sin, as it is written, "And by his stripes we are healed; and he bore the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors."

Even of Aben Ezra we are told that he admits that Jonathan Ben Uzriel and many other Jews of old, applied it to a personal Messiah. In his commentary on Isaiah liii, he says "Jonathan Ben Uzriel has interpreted it of the Messiah who is to come, and *this is also the opinion of wise men of blessed memory, in many of their Medrashes.*"

I have several other illustrations of a similar treatment of the chapter by the Jews in ancient times, but I will content myself with reading the comprehensive declaration of Rabbi Moses Alshech, who lived in the fifteenth century, and who also applied it to the Messiah. He says "*our Rabbis, with one mouth have reverently received by tradition that King Messiah is here spoken of.*" I have got all the ancient Rabbis on my side against a single Jew of the nineteenth century.

(Mr. Stern: Hear, hear).

Mr. Roberts: Then Mr. Stern's comments on the experience of Jesus—I certainly think it unnecessary to notice these particularly. I might almost use another adjective; it would be almost a condescension to reply to them. I would only say that the relation of sorrow to a man depends upon what he is. That which is sorrow to one man is not sorrow to another. Go quite low enough for illustration, and you find a creature in a well-known enclosure to be found at the back of many cottages, whose head you could not cause to ache by telling it of a bank failure: the mere mention of which would fill a commercial man with panic and drive sleep from the pillow, and perhaps drive him to suicide. The only way of making the porcine creature sorry would be to whip it on the back. You might shout bad news over a pig's head for a year and produce no effect. (Uproar among the Jews.) There is nothing insulting in my remark. It all depends upon the mental quality of the man, as to what will make sad. Take a man of low type of mentality, and you could not injure his feelings by language which stings to the quick a man of higher organization. And if this holds good with regard to the lower manifestations of mentality, how much more strictly does it apply to the highest faculty of the human mind. A

philanthropist's heart is pained in going through the streets of Birmingham, where a mere clod-hopper feels nothing, because the former stands on a pinnacle of moral elevation which the latter has no conception of; and if Mr. Stern fails to see that Jesus was a man of sorrows with abundant reason, it is impossible for me to make him see it. It reminds me of the uselessness of attempting to enlighten Israel; for their own prophet Moses said, "Ye are a stiff-necked and rebellious race with heart fat, ears dull of hearing, and eyes closed." Their entire history has been a history of rebellion. They rebelled against Moses in the wilderness; they rebelled against all the prophets and turned aside to idolatry continually, and they are now scattered among the Gentiles, in consequence of their almost incurable tendency to go astray from the God of their fathers. Mr. Stern's attitude in this matter is only another illustration of the same thing. (Time called).

THE CHAIRMAN, in reference to the wish of Mr. Stern that he should decide as to whether Mr. Roberts had adhered to the question or not, said that before the debate commenced, he had a clear understanding that he should not undertake anything of the kind. He thought that had just been the mischief at other debates.

Mr. STERN: I suppose it is now a fight between myself and my friend, and fight it I shall. I have tried to conduct the discussion in the most amicable and gentlemanly manner. I have controlled myself as much as I possibly could. I know he is trying to irritate me. (Hissee.) It is no use hissing me. I have told you, and I tell you again, that hissing will have no effect upon me. We are discussing a very serious subject. Mr. Roberts seems to be trying to drag me into a discussion of Judaism *versus* Christianity. I hold he is out of order to quote disputed writings, when I keep telling him to produce the authority. He says I spoke irreverently of Jesus. If I did I am sorry for it. If I said anything to wound your feelings; if I spoke irreverently, I certainly am sorry, but how can I help it? My friend is looking upon Jesus as the Son of God; I am looking upon him as a man and an impostor. This is my duty here to-night, and however painful, I must do

it, and will do it. For the sixth time, I beg of Mr. Roberts—or else I will throw the discussion up—I ask him to shew me his authority for the writings of the New Testament. He forgets that he has come here in opposition to greater men who have gone before him, and that he lays down a doctrine in opposition to the generality of Christians. But look how liberal he is to me. He won't allow me to have an opinion. He says I am in opposition to all the Jewish writers. The question is not whom I am in opposition to; I came here to debate the question whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah or not. My only duty is to prove that he is not. How can I prove that he is not before he proves that he is? The quotations he has brought have nothing to do with the subject; the passages in Isaiah have nothing at all to do with Jesus. Then what does he do? Instead of answering what I begged of him to do, he goes forward and shews me another quotation, which has nothing at all to do with the question. He says, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee." Of course, the glory of the Lord had risen when they had got an Isaiah to speak to. What argument is this? But I will take it from whom it comes. My friends of the Jewish persuasion have been offended because he has mentioned a pig. They must not be offended, for, being a Christian, he must introduce the pig in some way or other. Mr. Roberts seems to be trying to drag me into a discussion of Judaism *versus* Christianity, but I do not intend to enter into that to-night. Again, he brings Hebrew authorities who seem to have written in his favour. To shew that he has dived deep into the subject, it is sufficient to notice that he has produced the testimony of rabbis living at the time of Christ; because we know certainly that none but learned men could pretend to know anything about that. But he does all this, I hold, for the purpose of evading the question at issue. As soon as he shewed me a passage last night in Isaiah, which he said referred to Jesus, that is a virgin conceiving and bearing a son, I did my best to give my version of what it meant, and if I proved my case his whole argument falls to the ground. The next argument was about Daniel. I cannot understand a person saying one thing and meaning another. I can only take it from

what I hear. But Mr. Roberts says that the subject Daniel spoke about then was not a subject for everyone to understand, and that he spoke in an allegorical way. Well, he did speak in a curious way, but, after all, it was only a dream and, surely to goodness, we are not to rest such important things on what people see in visions and dreams. There is no accounting for what a man sees in a dream. We dream so many strange things. Then he brings in things that have nothing to do with the matter. I remember hearing a conversation between my father, who was a very good Jew, and several learned men, in which an opinion was expressed that Daniel was mad, and I am inclined to look on him in the same light. I don't care who hears me. Supposing, however, we granted, for the sake of argument, that every day meant one year. Let us see whether Mr. Roberts's case would hold good even then. Since my friend takes upon him, in 1871, perhaps 2,000 years after the words were spoken, to tell us that these people didn't mean what they said; that when God said seventy weeks he meant seventy times seven years; let us see how it will apply in other places? Jesus was to be three days and three nights in the ground—that was three years. I have as much right to assume that in this case as he has in the other. I stand here as an authority in opposition to an authority like Mr. Roberts. I give him credit for his superior learning, but I don't see superior logic on his side. He comes here telling us, like the stupid missionaries—(The Chairman objected to the words.) Well; I beg pardon. With your permission, I will withdraw the word. He comes here like the intelligent missionaries (great laughter and applause); like these intelligent missionaries, he comes forward and taunts me with being blind, not being able to see. Why, my good sir (turning to Mr. Roberts), why should you be so personal to me? I have tried to be as gentle as possible. Why should you taunt me with wilfully misrepresenting? Why should you taunt me with not seeing it, when we can see other things well enough. We can see precious stones (loud laughter). The Jews are clever enough judges of the minutest things, and why should they be blind on this subject? We are the best judges of jewels—diamonds, emeralds, and the best stones—and you will acknowledge

that it takes good sight to be that. Surely, we can see such a bit of an argument as a virgin conceiving without a man, or anything of that sort. Then there have been men, as recorded in the Old Testament, who have lived something like 800 or 900 years. But as every day of those years, according to Mr. Roberts, must mean a year, those people are alive now, and if Mr. Roberts can tell us where they are to be found, I shall be obliged to him. If it means years in Daniel, it must mean years in other places. When Moses said "Six days shalt thou work, and do all that thou hast to do," he meant they should labour six years continuously, and make as much overtime as they pleased. If I had known that this would have been the subject of discussion, I am sure I would not have undertaken it. If I had known that questions would arise like this, I should have been sorry to have come here, wasting my time and yours. I have come here to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was not the Messiah. How can I approach the subject when Mr. Roberts will not deal with it? I again ask him to answer these questions which I have put to him, and it will give me a chance of proceeding. I intend, if I have time, to go through Dan. ix., and show that it is impossible to reconcile the weeks and years. The Chairman informs me I have but one minute, so I ask you, Mr. Roberts, to tell me who wrote St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John? When were they written? In what language? At what place? and by whom?

(Time called.)

Mr. ROBERTS: I say, respected friends, in answer to that, that Matthew was written by Matthew in the Hebrew language, and afterwards translated into Greek; Mark was written by Mark at the dictation of Peter, as is supposed; Luke was written by Luke; John was written by John; the three last all in Greek. They were all written for the information of believers in Christ, and as an authentic and official record, (for the information of subsequent generations) of the facts upon which their faith was based. I am not able to produce the originals, because, as I believe, they do not exist. If Mr. Stern asks me why, I give this answer: I say for precisely the same reason that he would tell me who wrote the five books of Moses, the books of Samuel, and the

others. Why would he say so? for a very good reason. If the authorship of a book is unquestioned at the moment of its production, and continues in all subsequent generations to be received, the fact amounts to a demonstration. To pursue this thought would lead me to diverge from the subject, and I will only say that common sense at once recognises the reasonableness of the principle. We can only know of the authorship of a book, produced at a time antecedent to our own, by the repute existing amongst those who from their position were competent to judge. Upon this principle, Mr. Stern accepts the writings of Moses; upon the same principle, the classical public accepts the writings of Shakespeare; the writings of Herodotus, and the Greek authors generally; and on the same principle we accept the other writings of his own nation, which he rejects, namely, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. If he urges it as a difficulty that I cannot produce the very documents written by these men, he behaves unreasonably, because he puts himself in precisely the same difficulty with Moses.

Mr. Stern: What has that to do with it?

Mr. Roberts: A great deal.

Mr. Stern: No.

Mr. Roberts: I will show that it has. Mr. Stern believes in Moses and yet he cannot produce the originals.

Mr. Stern: I can.

Mr. Roberts: I say that statement is not true.

Mr. Stern: It is.

Mr. Roberts: Then I call upon him to produce them.

Mr. Stern: I shall produce them.

The Chairman: This conversation is out of order. I beg of each speaker not to utter a single word whilst the other is speaking.

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Stern puts himself up as an authority, and says he pits his authority against mine. There is no need for this. I am not an authority at all. I do not pretend to have the slightest scintilla of authority. I am here as a perfectly unofficial individual dealing with historical facts, and these are the authorities with me. It is with these I ask Mr. Stern to deal. Mr. Stern thinks Daniel was mad, (Mr. Stern: hear, hear). Then observe the position in which he puts himself, viz. against God. His God considers Daniel wise. In Ezek. xiv. 14, it says, "Though these wise men, Noah,

Daniel, and Job were in the land, they should but deliver their own souls by their righteousness." Again, in the 28th of Ezekiel, speaking of the King of Tyre, at the 3rd verse, God says, "Behold thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee," an ironical saying, but still showing Daniel as a standard of wisdom. From these two testimonies alone (even apart from the book of Daniel,) we observe the fact that God considered Daniel wise and righteous, whereas Mr. Stern, adopting the theory of his father, considers him mad. Why? Because it is the only way of getting rid of Daniel's prophecy which tells so powerfully in favour of Jesus of Nazareth. He asks why didn't Daniel speak plainly, and say what he meant? There is a reason. God intended the book of Daniel for a very wide bearing and providential purpose; it was to let those know to whom it should be given that the purposes of God at last concerning Israel was, that they should triumph at the last, but should first be prevailed against. At the same time it was not His will that His people of these early times should know that the triumph of the enemy would be so long. He therefore veiled the matter, and gave revelation in such a form that they were not able to perceive the time. But why then give the time at all, it may be asked. Because it was necessary that when the end of time should be reached, a people should be able to perceive the scope of the divine purpose—a people who seeing this, should be looking for the coming of the Messiah, and prepared as intelligent spectators for the development of the divine purpose. So that there is a reason, and it is impossible to upset that reason if the authenticity of the book of Daniel be accepted; for in that book we are told both that Daniel did not understand (Dan. xii. 8), but that at the time of the end the vision should be understood—(Dan. xii. 4).

Then Mr. Stern asks how the statement of Isaiah can be applied to Jesus, whose genealogy I have attempted to produce, if he was cut off? and seeing that the same individual who was cut off was to have a generation succeeding him—was to see "his seed." Mr. Stern asks how could he have "seed," seeing he never was married? I answer there are more methods of generating seed in the divine operations than are known to Mr. Stern's philosophy, as John the Baptist said,

"Of the very stones God could raise children to Abraham." I point to the operations of the gospel as the answer; and when Mr. Stern says I am calling upon him to accept records which he does not believe, I entirely repudiate that representation of the matter. I am not dealing with documents only. I am dealing with historical facts, facts whose evidence is before himself. We have a Christianity apart from the book; that Christianity has a history, and I ask him is it not an historical fact that Christianity came out from Jerusalem through Jews? He cannot deny it. Those Jews preached among the Gentiles for the express purpose of generating believers in Jesus; their word was a seed from which believers sprung, and the existence of those believers explain how it is that Christ can have a seed in a higher sense than Mr. Stern recognises, for what is their doctrine? "As many of you," says Paul, writing to the Christians "as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ, and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." So that here is a seed developed from Christ in relation to Abraham, in connection with the promise of which Abraham was made the depository. I need say no more to explain how the Messiah, though cut off, could have a seed. I will simply ask Mr. Stern how his system explains it? I presume he will say that he is not bound to give an explanation, and he must take the consequence of adopting that policy so far as the impression on the audience is concerned. It is a very suspicious fact when a disputant refuses to explain facts alleged to be inconsistent with his own theory.

I now resume the line of evidence I was pursuing. I was illustrating the fact that the Messiah, according to the prophets of Mr. Stern's own nation, was to be a sufferer. He says that Isaiah himself was the great light of Israel. Well, now observe that this great light was sent to say (Isaiah vi. 9), "Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not, and see indeed, but perceive not." What is the meaning of this? Does it not show that the Jews lack understanding? For as Mr. Stern says, they can discern jewels and diamonds, but higher things are hid from them in our time. "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes and hear with

their ears, and understand with their hearts, and be converted and be healed." According to Mr. Stern's interpretation, the great light of his nation was sent to bring darkness! What a desperate strait Mr. Stern must be in when he finds himself compelled to sustain his theory by such injustice to his own Scriptures. I referred to the 53rd chapter of Isaiah as shewing that the Messiah was to be a personage at first rejected. I now refer to Ps. cxviii, 22 for the same purpose, "The stone which the builders refused is become the head of the corner." The builders of Israel were to reject their chief corner stone; will they deny that the chief corner stone of their political edifice is the Messiah? Then he was to be rejected by the builders. Is the Messiah of Mr. Stern's expectation to be rejected? Jesus of Nazareth was rejected by the head men of Israel, and therefore he answers to this prophetic intimation of David. I next refer to Isaiah viii. 14.

"He shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and shall be broken, and be snared, and be taken. Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples. And I will wait upon the Lord, that heideth His face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him."

Who has been the stone of stumbling to Israel? Jesus of Nazareth. And God has hidden his face from them; for are they not now broken and snared and taken? Have they not been for 1800 years wandering in darkness? Jesus of Nazareth has ascended into Heaven, and by the testimony of the Apostles, is sitting at the right hand of God; and the binding of the law and the sealing of the testimony among His disciples is now going on. How complete is the correspondence between Jesus and the Messiah foretold by the prophets.

(Time called).

MR. STERN: My opponent thinks that he has a perfect right, and that he is perfectly in order, to go on asking me to produce the originals of Moses. I hold that he is out of order to answer my question by asking me another. I have not come to discuss Judaism *versus* Christadelphianism. I shall produce the originals of Moses when we discuss that subject. It is not my purpose here to-night. It is for you (looking at Mr.

Roberts,) to produce yours; it is for you to affirm that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah and for me to deny. Now we have got so far from Mr. Roberts; after a great deal of trouble I have got him to acknowledge that Matthew was written by Matthew, Mark by Mark, Luke by Luke, and John by John, consequently I shall deal with that matter as soon as I am at liberty; but I shall now proceed with what I intended to do in my last speech. My friend says that I have no right to assume that Daniel was mad. Perhaps it is a very grave assumption on my part to say so. I only say this that if he was the prophet of God, and if he spoke the words of God, of course he was not mad at that time; but it is possible when he said those words about the little horns and big horns and what he saw in the vision—it is quite possible that if he was not mad, he was not very sensible. At least so far as I am concerned, it has nothing whatever to do with the subject to-night. The only issue is whether we shall take the weeks in Daniel to represent weeks of years, and in other places as weeks of days. My friend has not attempted to deal with that. I have laid great stress upon what a queer thing it would be if Jesus were in the grave three years instead of three days. I have shown that, according to my friend's argument, some people referred to in the Old Testament must have lived for thousands of years. Perhaps Livingstone has met with some of them in his travels; that is to say if I assume that each week of the years they lived represents seven years. I am now going to Daniel ix. In verse 26 it says that Messiah the Prince will appear at the end of the seventh week, before the re-building of Jerusalem. Now this cannot be this Jesus, as he was not born until 350 years after the re-building of Jerusalem, and only seventy years before it was again destroyed. Besides in the next verse it is said that after three score and two weeks the Messiah shall be cut off. Calling the weeks seven years in this case as in the other, the true Messiah ought to have lived 434 years. Did Christ live so long? He died, it has been said when thirty-two or thirty-three years old; thus leaving a slight deficiency in the prophecy of upwards of 400 years. Again, from the context it appears that the Messiah was to be a temporal prince. Daniel calls him Messiah the Prince, and talks of troublesome times and of building streets and walls. Was Jesus such a

Messiah? We are told in verse 27 that he was to confirm the covenant with many for one week. Did Christ confirm a covenant with any one for one week—namely, seven years? His ministry lasted about three. In the midst of the week, we are also told he was to cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. Did Christ do this in his time? The Messiah was to be cut off after three score and two weeks, at the same time that the city and the sanctuary were destroyed. Now Jesus was put to death thirty-seven years before the destruction of the city, and not at the same time. It is further announced that these seventy weeks were to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins. Was this result attained either during the seventy weeks or after their expiration? Why as Jews we do not to-day profess to be without sin. So far from these seventy weeks or 490 years, agreeing so precisely with the advent of Christ, there was a difference of at least half-a-century. In every particular therefore, is this boasted prophecy of Mr. Roberts falsified. I will now—since my friend insists upon the genuineness, and since he rests his whole life upon the New Testament—I will now proceed to quote a few passages, and see how these men who were inspired by God, relate circumstances, whether they knew them or not—agree with each other. I will endeavour to shew you how they agree with one another. In the first place I refer to St. Luke, and he gives us a description of the resurrection. He says “Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre bringing spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.” Now this inspired writer cannot even tell you who “they” were. He simply says “they” came “and certain others with them;” I do not know who they were. But when I come to St. John he seems to be a little more informed on the subject, and it is very kind of him that he really condescends to mention it. St. John says, “the first day of the week came Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, to the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.” Now although Luke is deficient in instruction, John makes up for it. Why Mary was so anxious to go on Saturday night, or as he terms it on Sunday morning, I do not know. They could not have expected anything which they afterwards saw, for they

seemed all astonished at what they did see. What her object was in coming we are not told; but let us suppose that she did know. Some ladies know things even better than gentlemen. Supposing Mary did know the things which the apostles did not. The grand inspired apostles, the beautiful apostles, which my friend objects to me speaking so disparagingly of—the grand apostles did not know as much as the woman. What did she know? She knew that Jesus was to rise on the third day, for he was to be like Jonah who was in the whale's belly for three days and three nights. Jesus was to be three days and three nights in the grave. As Jesus was crucified on Friday, and buried on the same evening; how comes it that she was so very anxious to know whether he had risen when he had only been buried thirty hours? I shall leave it to Mr. Roberts, who knows what people not only said but thought at the time—if he will be kind enough to tell us

(Time called.)

Mr. ROBERTS: I can tell Mr. Stern that Mary did not go to the sepulchre with the expectation that Jesus should rise. On the contrary, in common with the disciples, she “knew not the Scriptures that he should rise from the dead.” She went to the grave to perform the last offices of the dead, to anoint the body with certain spices. Mr. Stern is therefore arguing on a fallacy, when he assumes Mary was at the grave in expectation of His resurrection. Then the apostles were not inspired at that time; they were not inspired till the Day of Pentecost; we are distinctly informed (Jno. vii. 39) that the Holy Spirit was not given when Christ was with them. The argument on that point therefore also falls to the ground. As to the alleged discrepancies between the accounts of the resurrection, he has yet to make them manifest. What is there inconsistent between the two narratives although they vary? I see nothing, and until he shows they conflict, I need not attempt to reconcile them. Then because he finds the prophecy of the seventy weeks very much in his way, he makes another attempt to get rid of it. But just as he assumed facts about the resurrection which had no existence, so he does in this case. He says that the Messiah should have appeared at the end of the seventh week after the re-building of Jerusalem. He

does not perceive that the whole period from the re-building of Jerusalem to the Messiah, is seventy weeks, and that the seven weeks is only a subdivision marked by certain events in Jewish history. Mr. Stern on this point is raising fictitious objections. I may tell you in brief that just as in the application of the 53rd of Isaiah, so in this, he is at issue with the great bulk of his ancestors who recognised the seventy weeks as the prophetic equivalent of 490 years, at the end of which they expected the Messiah. He asks why should they look at the matter thus, the reason is obvious. Fitness demands, that where in a vision great things are represented by little things, such as a dynasty by a little horn, an empire by a beast, and so on, so a great period of time should be represented by a small period of time; and if he asks for Scripture authority for the view that the scale is a day for a year, he has only to refer to the 4th chapter of Ezekiel, 4th and 5th verses, where a period of time is distinctly explained to have been symbolised on the day for a year principle. The period of seventy weeks is subdivided with regard to certain events that were to mark the currency. After three score and two weeks (in the 25th verse), from the issue of the command for the restoration of Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince, were to be seven weeks, at the end of which Jerusalem would be fully re-established, though the time would be troublous; three score and two weeks, at the end of which the ministry of the Messiah would commence. But Mr. Stern says that according to Daniel, the Messiah was to appear at the end of the seven. This is not so; and as Mr. Stern has failed to show it, it is sufficient for me to contradict it. It is after the threescore and the seven that the Messiah was to appear, and Jesus appeared at that very time John had fulfilled his mission in preparing a situation favourable for the Lord's introduction to the notice of Israel. Three and a half of the last seven years had run, and then Jesus himself was revealed to Israel; and in the second half of the last seven, he did confirm the covenant made to the fathers. I give Mr. Stern a Jew's authority for that. Paul, in Rom. xv. 8, says "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." Jesus confirmed those covenants of promise by removing the great impediment in the way of their fulfilment. He was cut off, and thus

made reconciliation for iniquity and brought in everlasting righteousness, without which it was impossible that the bestowal of immortality involved in the covenant could have been made. for Abraham was under the sentence of Eden. Until the obstacle arising out of that was removed, it was impossible that the covenant could be carried out. The matter before us is the solution of the difficulty. Jesus of Nazareth, the seed of Abraham and David, yet a spotless, sinless victim, died crucified, and thus took away the sin of the world, and in rising again confirmed the covenant made with the fathers. This was in the last half of the week. He also caused to cease the Mosaic sacrifices, for Paul, who was a Jew of higher standing than Mr. Stern (for, as he said, "I am a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee, a Hebrew of the Hebrews") says Jesus put an end to the law of Moses, nailing it to his cross. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth (Rom. x. 4). He says, "The blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin, but by one offering he, the Messiah, hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." "He taketh away the first covenant (Mosaic) that he may establish the second" (Abrahamic)—(Heb. x. 9). So that as regards their efficacy—their divine validity—Jesus of Nazareth did cause, in his death, a cessation of sacrifices as intimated in the prophecy of the seventy weeks. It is vain for anyone to point to the fact that they continued to be offered in the temple, for though offered they were no longer recognised.

I will now resume my line of evidence. In Zech. xii. 10, speaking of the time of coming glory, it says:—

"And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn."

To whom does this apply? Does Mr. Stern expect his Messiah to be pierced by the Jews? No, but Jesus of Nazareth was pierced by the Jews. Mr. Stern may say the Romans. No doubt the actual wounding was by them, but at whose instigation was it? When a man takes an implement in his hand and does something with it, you do not say it is the implement that does it; the thing done is the act of the operator, though actually done by the

implement. In this way the Queen is said to do things in the government of the country that she in reality does not do, because they are considered to be done by her authority. On the same principle, the Jews did pierce the Messiah by means of the Romans. The Romans of their own accord would never have done it. Pilate wanted to let him go, but the Jews clamoured for his crucifixion, and so Pilate gave them their way. Here then is a statement that they are to look upon him whom they have pierced. Does not this answer to Jesus of Nazareth?

I refer next to Zech. ix, 9, where this same king is introduced:—

“Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, shout O daughter of Jerusalem, behold thy King cometh unto thee; He is just and having salvation; lowly riding upon an ass and upon a colt the foal of an ass.”

And it goes on to say at the eleventh verse, “As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant, I have sent forth thy priests out of the pit wherein is no water” (a metaphorical description of the grave peculiar to the prophets). Now here is an intimation that there is to be in connection with the Messiah, a liberation of the people from the grave, as the result of a covenant to which blood has relation. “The blood of thy covenant.” Can Mr. Stern explain this connection with his Messiah? Can he deny its applicability to Jesus of Nazareth? The blood of Jesus Christ was shed on Calvary, and in all New Testament representations of the final triumph of Christ's work, His blood is a prominent feature. “He hath washed us in His own blood”—(Rev. i. 5). “Thou hast redeemed us by Thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation”—(Rev. v. 9). Mr. Stern asks how Jesus justifies anybody? I answer by quoting Paul in Acts xiii. 38. In the course of a speech addressed to the Jews, Paul says “Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.” My answer then is, that Israel's God is pleased to regard a man as in a righteous position who has faith in this crucified Messiah.

In Isaiah xlix. 7, you have the same idea distinctly brought to view:—

“Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel and his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant

of rulers, kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful, and the Holy one of Israel, and he shall choose thee. Thus saith the Lord, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee: and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant for the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages.”

Now what is a covenant? According to the Hebrew term, it is a dividing by cutting, because a covenant was established over the divided bodies of slain beasts; so that in saying of this personage that God would give him for a covenant, it was equivalent to saying that he would give him up to be done as was done to Jesus of Nazareth; as the result of which, great blessings would flow to those who believed in him. Will this apply to Mr. Stern's looked-for Messiah? It applies to Jesus. Carrying out this view, we find in the next chapter (Isaiah l, 5), “I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting,” which is true of Jesus of Nazareth: to him these words most truly apply. Again, in Micah v. 1, you have the same feature:

“Now gather thyself in troops, O daughter of troops; he hath laid siege against us; they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek.”

The judge of Israel is the Messiah. Has the Messiah whom Mr. Stern expects to be smitten? (Looking at Mr. Stern.) He shakes his head; therefore his Messiah is not the Messiah of the prophets, for the Messiah of the prophets was to be smitten to death and buried with the rich.

(Time called).

Mr. STERN: You have heard the last sentence of Mr. Roberts; I am very sorry to say that I do not approve the style or the manner he debates this question. Really and truly if you have taken notice of him, you must have been impressed as I have been. It must have seemed to you, as if the Jews are here before you, accused to-day of crucifying Jesus, and you are the jury to judge, and he is the counsel pleading for Jesus; and he wishes you to condemn us to-day. Really, I did not think I was coming here for that; surely he might have put it in a milder manner than he has done. Do speak in a calmer tone! What do you mean by saying we have crucified your Jesus? How dare you come here and

say we have crucified your Jesus? According to your theory, he has no right to be crucified; according to your theory, Jesus is wrongly crucified; we are to be blamed for crucifying him. And what would become of your salvation then? You would all have to go to hell. We ought to argue this question calmly. I have tried to argue it calmly. I have no ill-feeling against any man or women, no matter where they come from; whatever creed they belong to. As Christians, I hate you, but outside of your Christianity, I can love, and respect you as men. I do not blame you, nor give you a wrong sentiment as individuals, I give my hatred to that blasphemous, infamous and merciless creed which you call Christianity. (Disapprobation.) My friends, I have told you over and over again, that hissing will have no effect on me. Not one sentence will I leave out. Well, my friend speaks as if life itself depended upon it.

Mr. Roberts: It does.

It does in your opinion. If I was to be judged, I would at least get impartial people to judge me. I have told you over and over again, that I have not come here to discuss Judaism. We have got another night, and I hope and trust that he will use milder language, so that I may be able to reply in the same terms. I told him at the outset, "do not be surprised, if the result of this discussion is for me to embrace Christianity." Is this the way to get me to be a Christian? At least you ought to use mild language. Let us see some of your Christian kindness. We are not here as Jews who have crucified Jesus; I hold that they did not crucify him. The Jews were under the Roman government, and they had no power to withhold him from being crucified. It is your forged documents that tell you we have crucified him. We have never done anything of the sort. In fact, before I leave here, I am prepared to prove that Jesus was not crucified at all. (Laughter.) According to Mr. Roberts, everything I say falls to the ground, and everything he says is established. He says, Jesus did fulfil the covenant. I will refer you to Dan. x. 27—"And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week." Christ did not confirm the covenant for one week, that is, seven years. The whole of his ministry did not last above three. How can it refer to Jesus? He says that although they

have continued to sacrifice, they are not recognised by God. This is the height of presumption, for a man to come here in 1871, and tell us what God did 2,000 years ago. How dare you come here and say so? The very fact that they continued the sacrifices showed that God must have accepted them. How dare you come here and say He did not? Surely my friend does not mean to say that he has dreamed, and that a ghost has appeared to him. I do not believe in ghosts; but perhaps he will make a distinction between an ordinary ghost and a holy one. If he does I shall be glad to know the difference. Of course my friend says he has cut me to pieces with everything he has said. I will leave it with you whether he has or not. He says that Mary Magdalene went with some spices to embalm Jesus. Well now, it says, "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she runneth and cometh to Simon Peter." She ran away, so you see she did not do what she went for. But mark this, although Luke says, "They came, and certain others with them," which means a few, say half-a-dozen, John says it was only Mary Magdalene; and Mark says "when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him." It says there were two Marys. This is certainly a little more sensible, still it would not agree with Luke; it must be more than three; it certainly contradicts. In John it says that on the first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene, "then she runneth." It is alluding to one person, because if any more were there they would all run. Now let us see what Matthew says: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre; and, behold, there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it." Here is an earthquake which everybody should have noticed, and yet none of the apostles say anything about it but Matthew. My friend says they were not inspired then, and that they were liable to error; and I admit it. I wish to make one or two remarks before

the close of the meeting. I am perfectly willing to receive any fair argument, any reasonable one, but not a mysterious one. The whole of last night he was referring to the beautiful mysteries of the New Testament. I intended to ask him what he meant. I do not blame him for referring to the mysterious, but I want people to explain mysteries. I have not come here to get you to embrace Judaism. If he tries to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, I shall

prove that he was not. The decision rests with you. I will conclude in the words of the poet, John Critchley Prince :

“My religion is love—’tis the noblest and purest;
My temple the universe—widest and surest;
I worship my God through his works which are fair,
And the joy of my thoughts is perpetual prayer.

THIRD NIGHT.

Thursday, October 19th, 1871.

THE meeting having been opened *pro forma* by the Chairman,

Mr. ROBERTS said: Ladies and Gentlemen, when Mr. Stern gave me the challenge which has led to this debate, it was with the idea, on his part, of holding but one meeting. I told him, at once that I felt sure that we should not be able to go through the subject in one night—that it would want, at least, three nights. I am afraid that I was under the mark. The extent of the evidence that I proposed to adduce in support of the claims that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, I find to be so great as to make it next to impossible to compress it within the designed limits. For this reason, I must necessarily pass by many points of detail which I had thought of noticing, and content myself with following that line of positive evidence which is likely to make an impression upon logical and sincere minds, with regard to the merits of the question. There are, however, one or two little matters I should like to say a word upon before pursuing this course. I should like to say that Mr. Stern has rather misapprehended my appeal last night to the general attitude of his people in the course of their history. He resented my appeal as an accusation. He thinks that I appeared in the capacity of an accusing counsel, calling upon you to pass judgment upon them. I excuse him for making that mistake, considering that there are so many plain things which he has failed to perceive

with that clearness which one would have expected: but I will give the explanation. The argument I intended in my appeal was a mere answer to an argument employed by himself. He said: “My fathers rejected the Messiah; therefore, I will,” which implies this assumption: “My fathers were in the right in their rejecting Jesus.” Now, this my answer strikes at the root of assumption. It shews that his fathers (according to what he himself is compelled to admit) have always been in the wrong, and, therefore, that it is highly probable that upon this greater question, they are equally in the wrong. I should like to deal with the great Jewish objections to the genealogies of Christ as found in the New Testament. I expected to be called upon at the hands of Mr. Stern to deal with these objections, and, therefore, reserved in my first half-hour speech, the more particular consideration of them. He has not so called upon me. Yet as the point is of some importance, I will devote a minute or two to the subject before passing on to the general evidence in demonstration of the Messiahship of Jesus. The Jewish objection to the genealogies is, that even if they were genuine, they would fail to prove Jesus to be of the seed of David, since they do not make him out to have been so on the male side—the female side not reckoning in Jewish genealogies. I admit that so far as the strict genealogical tree is concerned, the female genealogy is not taken into account, but

I do deny that the Jewish genealogies ignored the female element in reckoning extraction. I will call your attention to one or two proofs in support of my denial in the writings of the Old Testament—in the writings of Mr. Stern's own nation, and which he is bound to recognize. In the cases to which I call attention, the interposition of a female was sufficient to continue a genealogical line in the absence of a male link; men were reckoned the sons of fathers whose real sons they were not, by reason of their marrying the father's daughter. I refer first to 1 Chronicles ii. 22, in which we learn that one Jair was begotten of Segul, son of Hezron, son of Phares, son of Judah, one of the sons of Jacob. The words of the verse are "Hezron went into the daughter of Machir, the father of Gilead, whom he married when he was threescore years old: and she bare him Segul, and Segul begat Jair." Now, according to the argument of the Jews upon the genealogy of Jesus, Jair, ought to be reckoned of the house of Judah, because he was the son of Hezron of the tribe of Judah, though his mother was the daughter of Machir of the tribe of *Manasseh*. The mother ought not to be allowed, according to their argument, to have any effect in determining the genealogical status of the son. But we find that contrary to the Jewish contention the mother did have effect. When we turn to Numb. xxxii. 41, we find this same individual (Jair) introduced as "the son of Manasseh," because he was the son of a daughter of the tribe of Manasseh, though his father was of the tribe of Judah. Now I ask upon what principle can it be denied that Jesus was the son of David, when his mother was of the house of David, if Jair was a son of Manasseh, because his mother was of the house of Manasseh?

Again, in the same chapter we read of Sheshan, of whom we are told, in the 34th verse, that "*he had no sons, BUT DAUGHTERS,*" according to which Sheshan, (in the Jewish contention) should have had no subsequent genealogy. But what happens? At the same 34th verse, it says that Sheshan had a servant, an Egyptian, whose name was Jarha; and *Sheshan gave his daughter to Jarha to wife*, and she bare him Attai, and Attai begat Nathan, &c. Now, whose children were Attai, Nathan,

&c., according to Jewish objection to Jesus? Jarha's distinctly. Not Sheshan's, the father of Jarha's wife. Yet at the 31st verse, they are called *the children of Sheshan*. True, it reads "Ahlai" instead of Attai, but this is one of those mere variations which are so common in Hebrew names. Thus, we find the offspring of Sheshan's daughter attributed to *the father of that daughter* and not to be reckoned at all to the Egyptian. Now, if Attai can be the son of Sheshan, according to Jewish genealogy, when he is only the son of Sheshan's daughter, I ask why Jesus of Nazareth cannot be considered the son of David, though descended from David by a daughter only? Again, we have the case of Hiram, employed by Solomon in the artistic processes of the Temple. He is described as the son of *a woman of the daughters of Dan*. There are other cases which I had sought out, but these must suffice. I consider them sufficient upon that single point, which I supposed Mr. Stern would have made a strong point.

I now resume the line of evidence upon which I was engaged last evening, and to which, in view of the limited time, I shall strive largely to devote myself in the subsequent part of to-night's debate, irrespective of the course Mr. Stern may pursue; unless, indeed, he unexpectedly turn very logical, and give me something else to deal with. You will recollect that, last night, I produced an abundance of evidence from the prophets to shew that the Messiah was to be a sufferer, and, at last, slain. The passage I now quote was to have been the last link of evidence on that point. In Zech. xiii. 6, it says: "And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? then shall he answer: *Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friend;*" in connection with which we have this singular declaration: "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and *against the man my fellow*, saith the Lord of Hosts; smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered, and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones." The first point here is that the Messiah is described as the *fellow* of Jehovah, the God of Israel; I ask upon what principle the Messiah looked for by Mr. Stern can be described as the fellow of God? The New Testament Messiah answers

that description exactly; for we are told, in the 1st chapter of Heb., verse 2, that he is "the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person." This result was by the very means that the Jews despise with so much scorn—the operation of the Spirit upon a virgin of the house of David. Thus was begotten a son of David and son of God—higher than the mere man Messiah of Jewish expectation. This reminds me that, last night, Mr. Stern made some sort of unfavourable comment upon an expression of mine about the beauty of the mystery. Now I did not attempt, as he supposed I did, to explain the mystery; for there are depths in divine truth that we can only know without being able to understand. And this is true in nature as well. We know the sunlight, but we do not understand it. We know life in all creatures, but we do not understand it. There are thousands of things we know, but cannot understand in a profound sense, because the infinite is beyond the grasp of the human intellect. I do not attempt to define the mystery of God in Christ, but I pointed out what Mr. Stern failed to see—that Jesus of Nazareth combines the two necessities created by the prophets. The Messiah was to be the son of David; Jesus of Nazareth was so. He was to be God: Jesus of Nazareth was so in the sense of God being manifested in the flesh by the Spirit; whereas, the Messiah he upholds as a mere man, cannot be made to answer to these two things.

I proceed to call attention to other features of the Messiah of the prophets with which Jesus of Nazareth corresponds. In Deut. xviii. 18, we read: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put *my words in his mouth*; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto *my words which he shall speak in my name*, I will require it of him." The point here is the declaration "I will put my words in his mouth"—the words of the God of Israel in the mouth of the antitypical Moses. This feature is apparent in other parts of the prophets. In Isaiah lxi. 1, you find it in these words: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-

hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." Again in Isaiah xi. 2: "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord." Again in Isaiah li. 16: "I have put *my words in thy mouth*, and I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand;" and again in Micah v. 4: "He shall stand and feed *in the strength of Jehovah*, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God; and they shall abide, for now shall he be great unto the ends of the earth."

Now, Jesus of Nazareth answers to all these plain declarations concerning the Messiah, in the Old Testament. He did not pretend to be wise of himself. He expressly declared that God's words were in his mouth; he did not, according to Trinitarian views of him, claim to be God himself—one of three persons in the Godhead—but he claimed to be the manifestation of the one Eternal Father, who revealed Himself through him to Israel. I proceed to call your attention to the illustrations of this point. In John iii. 34, we have the testimony of John the Baptist concerning Jesus, thus, "He whom God hath sent *speaketh the words of God*; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." In John vii. 16, Jesus of Nazareth said: "My doctrine is *not mine, but his that sent me*; and in the 8th chapter and 26th verse: "I have many things to say and to judge of you, but He that sent me is true; and *I speak to the world those things which I have heard of Him*;" and at the 38th verse: "*I speak that which I have seen with my father*." At the 12th chapter and 49th verse: "I have not spoken of myself, but the *Father who sent me, He gave me a commandment what I should say*." John xiv. 10: "Believest thou not," he said to Philip "that I am in the Father and the Father in me? *the words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works*." Then, at the 24th verse: "He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings, and *the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me*." These I consider to be unmistakable illustrations of that feature of the Messiah foretold by Moses and the prophets, "I will put my words in his mouth." Jesus didn't come in his own name, like the false Christs, whom the

Jews have, from time to time, received; as he said, "If any man come in his own name, him ye will receive; but *I have come in my Father's name*, and ye have not received me."

Now the argument following upon that is this: that the words of *Jesus of Nazareth* are of a kind that can only be explained on the supposition that he is in reality that prophet like unto *Moses*, in whose mouth the words of God were put. That, indeed, is the very answer given by the men who were sent to apprehend *Jesus*; they were struck with his words, and when they returned to the captain of the temple, they said, "*never man spake like this man.*" I propose to read you one or two illustrations of this fact, that "he spake as never man spake;" and that, therefore, the words of *Christ* are the words of God; that the words of *Christ* can only be the words of a man who was no mere man, but the Father of men tabernacled among men by his Spirit, and speaking through this man in words which illustrate the description of him, that "he spoke as one having authority, and not as the scribes." I will read you a specimen of his sayings from *Luke xi.*, commencing at the 29th verse:—

"And when the people were gathered thick together he began to say: This is an evil generation, they seek a sign and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of *Jonas* the prophet. For as *Jonas* was a sign unto the *Ninevites*, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of *Solomon*; and, behold a greater than *Solomon* is here. The men of *Nineveh* shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of *Jonas*; and, behold, a greater than *Jonas* is here. No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light. The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy body also is full of darkness. Take heed, therefore, that the light which is in thee be not darkness. If thy whole body therefore be full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light. And as he spake, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him: and he went in and sat down to

meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner. And the Lord said unto him. Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. Ye fools, did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also? But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you. But woe unto you, Pharisees, for ye tithe the mint and rue, and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye love the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets. Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over them are not aware of them. Then answered one of the lawyers, and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also. And he said, Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. Truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers: for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres. Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute. That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation. From the blood of *Abel* unto the blood of *Zacharias*, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation. Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered."

That is a public discourse of *Jesus*, and I submit that it is speaking as never man spake; a style of discourse not to be accounted for on the Jewish hypothesis—that he was an impostor, but only intelligible on the supposition that he was indeed the Messiah, the prophet like unto *Moses*, into whose mouth the God of *Israel* was to put His own words.

I now give you a private discourse of his to his own disciples (*John xv.*), and I call upon you to imagine an impostor speaking in this style, which is the character in which *Mr. Stern* wishes us to consider the Lord *Jesus*.

"I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit. He taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it—that it may

bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you; continue ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love. These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full. This is my commandment, That ye love one another as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants: for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth; but I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you. . . . These things I command you, that ye love one another. If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. . . . Remember the word that I said unto you, the servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you: if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also. But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not Him that sent me."

Take another discourse, which you will find recorded in Luke xii, commencing at the 32nd verse:

"Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heaven that falleth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. For where your treasure is there will your heart be also. Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily, I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants. And this know,

that if the good man of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not. Then Peter said unto him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all? And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household to give *them their* portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath. But, and if the servant sin in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.

(Time called.)

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman and friends: We have now arrived at what I may term the beginning of the end; that is if an end is to be come to upon this subject at all. My opponent has taunted me with not having given him sufficient to attack me with. He seems to have been prepared to attack me had I been Mr. Monnet; but as I am not Mr. Monnet, and consequently have not taken up his arguments, I have not received the hard hits that Mr. Roberts was prepared to give him. But I am not here to give him arguments to attack me with. It is for him to prove his affirmation that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, and it is for me to disprove it; it is for him to bring arguments forward, and it is for me to deny them and to shew you why I deny them. A number of points have been laid down, namely the seventy weeks of Daniel, and the virgin as it is called in the English version of Isaiah. I went at once to the points and I have proved my case from my point of view—from the Jewish point of view—which of course is different to his, and which he knew I should do before he came. I have proved to him that the seventh of Isaiah—the passage which he quoted—had nothing to do with Christ. I have proved to him that the passage he quoted in the middle of the chapter really referred to the passages preceding it, and it also referred to the two or rather the three

chapters following. My friend then shifted his head quarters from the seventh to the fifty-third of Isaiah. I thereupon proved to him that that chapter could have no allusion whatever to Jesus, since it was alluding to a personage who lived before the time of Isaiah. He again referred me to the ninth chapter, and here again I assert that this passage has nothing whatever to do with Jesus. I will just quote it, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall rest upon his shoulders; and he shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." I hold that is still calling attention to the same event which Isaiah was alluding to when he was addressing Ahaz; and when he says "unto us a child is born," he is certainly alluding to himself, and his wife, and the child his wife bore. I expect you will differ from me and say he alluded to something different, but you know it is a very easy matter if you wish to quote something to harmonise with any theory which you wish to establish. What my friend had to do was to bring such overwhelming proofs that I could not have had any doubt at all, but he has not done so. I asked him, and it seemed to him rather out of the way—I asked him to produce the originals of the Four Gospels, but after a good deal of wrangling he admitted that Matthew wrote Matthew, Mark wrote Mark, Luke wrote Luke, and John wrote John—the first in Hebrew, and the three last in Greek. The original copies my friend says are lost, and he doesn't seem to have any hope of ever recovering them, nor does he tell us in whose possession they were when they were lost. Well, now, let us examine the position we are in. I came here as a doubter, not alone of Jesus, but I came here as a doubter of the value of the testimony in the New Testament; and I have a perfect right to doubt it. "But," says Mr. Roberts, "you have not, the testimony is sufficient;" and he goes to the old Hebrew Testament and quotes passages, which certainly, wherever he reads seem to refer to Jesus; but as soon as I read them, they seem just the reverse. Now, I wish with your kind permission to read some quotations from a learned authority, but before doing so I thought of just comparing a passage he has quoted from the New Testament with a few I have cut from the same book. He has shown

us of course the beautiful and the best passages he could possibly find of this good individual—of this God of my friend, who was to do all this good. Now with your permission, I will just, in opposition to what he has read, see how good these seem to you. Luke xii. 49, 51: "I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I, if it be already kindled; suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? Nay, but rather division." Well that is true; he has been the cause of division; I believe it. Matthew x. 34, 36:

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household."

I think this has been fulfilled with a vengeance. Mark xvi. 16: "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Matthew x. 14. "Whosoever shall not receive you nor hear your words, when ye depart out of their house or city, shake off the dust of your feet." Here is kindness! "Verily, I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city." I only pity those poor Africans where the Missionaries go to teach these things; they would be far better off if they had never seen them, for one thing is certain, that if they had never heard the gospel they could not be expected to obey it. Mark iv. ii.: "And he said unto them, unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables, that seeing they may see and not perceive; and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted and their sins should be forgiven them." Then my friends, if I do not understand, Jesus is responsible. He spoke in parables that I might be deceived. If he is son of God, and if he has power to enlighten and yet withholds that enlightenment, how dare you blame me for not understanding? I see it doesn't please you for me to show you the bad passages, but when my friend quotes the good ones and leaves the bad ones out, it so happens that I was prepared with the bad ones. I give my opponent the sentence "Lest at any time they should

be converted and their sins be forgiven them." What becomes of the missionaries, if Jesus has nothing else to do but keep the people blind. Let us go a little farther. In Matthew iv. 8, we are told that the devil took Jesus into an exceeding high mountain; and shewed him all the kingdoms of the world. My friend has just given you a grand eulogy on Jesus; he says he is not man, and I agree with him—no man would use such words. Here is Jesus, who is no man, but the son of God; here is Jesus, who is supposed to have been present, when God created the world, and was there to assist him, according to my friend's theory.

Mr. Roberts: No.

MR. STERN: Actually taken up to the topmost mountain by the devil himself; and for what purpose do you think? Why for the purpose of shewing him the whole world. Jesus ought to have known the whole world long before the devil knew it; Jesus, who was there when God made the world, ought to have known that it was not a plane as he must have thought at that time; else the devil must have been cleverer than he, and took him up to deceive him. If Christ had been God, he would have known that it was a globe, and that therefore, however high he might go, he could not see it all. But there is another good thing Jesus did. Mark v. 11:

"Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding. And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine; and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (they were about two thousand) and were choked in the sea."

I want to know the use of this, let us just examine it. I can only understand this by thinking that Christ was a Jew who did not like pigs. If so, however, it could not justify him, unless he previously made a bargain with the owners of them. There were a legion of devils—that is 3000. How were they divided amongst the pigs? 2000 pigs and 3000 devils—Were there two devils to some pigs and one to others, or was there one devil and a half to each pig? (Confusion.) Oh, friends, this is legitimate. My friend has shown me his reasons and quoted to me good deeds of Jesus, and told me why

I should believe him. He has blamed all the Jews for not accepting Jesus; and I come here to show why I do not accept him, and to show why my fathers rejected him. How unfair it would be to allow Mr. Roberts to say all he likes, and not to hear me. But supposing Christ had wanted to get rid of the devils—I wish he had got rid of *all* the devils—couldn't he have destroyed them without drowning the pigs? But the thing of itself looks so absurd. "Now this was nigh unto the mountains." We very seldom see a mountain with a steep hill running down into the sea; if they had been under rocks near the sea coast it would have been more intelligible. But I suppose it is one of my friend's grand mysteries, and I will leave him to explain it. Then again Mark xi. 12-14, 20, 21.

"And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, he was hungry: And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of the figs was not yet. And Jesus answered and said unto it, No man eat of fruit of thee hereafter for ever. And his disciples heard it."

"And in the morning, as they passed by, they saw the fig tree dried up from the roots. And Peter calling to remembrance saith unto him, Master, behold, the fig tree which thou cursedst is withered away."

I should like to know the beauty of this passage. He goes to the fig tree, knowing—for he was the Son of God, mind—knowing it was not the time of year for figs to grow. How much more reasonable it would have been to make the figs grow all at once than commit the absurdity of cursing a tree, and causing it to grow nothing at all. One would have been quite as easy to do as the other. But I leave that for those who believe in Christ to reconcile. I shall now proceed to speak about the New Testament. He says the original is lost, but that we have got a copy of the Greek. More shame for you, you ought to have taken better care of it. It seems rather singular that a valuable document like this should have got lost. But Mr. Roberts—because I made an assertion last night which don't seem to agree with his theory, as he seems to have come here with, ready cut and dried arguments against me—said I disagreed with all the writers of my nation. That is just the identical thing I announced the first night. I said I was not here as

representing any body of Jews; that I came here to represent myself only, and I place my words and arguments—having been brought up to the Hebrew faith—against those of Mr. Roberts. Who has more right to explain the Hebrew than a Jew who has been brought up with the Hebrew language? But I will bring you an authority. Mr. Roberts says all the scribes before me differ from me; I will shew that the scribes on the Christian side differ from Mr. Roberts. Mosheim, considered one of the fairest and most honourable writers on ecclesiastical history that ever wrote, who exposes the falsities of his own people as well as speaking against the Jews at other times—let us hear what he says: “The place of his birth has not been hitherto fixed with certainty, notwithstanding the deep and laborious researches of the learned in the matter.” This is what Mosheim says, who devoted the whole of his time to searching every Greek and Latin book, in order to see what could be found in favour of Christianity. Here you have his words. He says “There is nothing surprising in this when we consider that the first Christians laboured under the same difficulties, and were divided in their opinions concerning the time of Christ’s birth. That which appears most probable is that it happened about 6 months before the death of Herod.” Mosheim leaves it in doubt; it shews the honesty of the writer: when a man is uncertain, he should not pin his faith to anything. Mr. Roberts says Matthew wrote Matthew. Let us see whether he did or did not. First volume, page 65—

“The distance of time and the want of records, leaves us at a loss with respect to many interesting circumstances of the peregrinations of the apostles; nor have we any certain or precise accounts of the limits of their voyages, of the particular countries where they sojourned, nor of the times and places in which they finished their glorious course. The stories that are told concerning their arrival and exploits among the Gauls, the English, the Spaniards, the Germans, the Americans, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Russians, are too romantic in their nature, and of too recent a date to be received by an impartial enquirer after truth. The greatest part of these fables were forged after the time of Charlemagne, when most of the Christian churches contended about the antiquity of their origin with as much vehemence as the Arcadians, Egyptians, and Greeks disputed formerly about their seniority and precedence.”

That is just what I say, I am here as an impartial inquirer after truth, and I cannot receive it. I will now read with your permission the 381st page, where Mosheim says:

“If the enthusiastic frenzy of the monks exaggerated, in a manner pernicious to the interests of morality, the discipline that is obligatory upon Christians, the interests of virtue and true religion suffered yet more grievously by two monstrous errors which were almost universally adopted in this century, and became a source of innumerable calamities and mischiefs in the succeeding ages. The first of these maxims was ‘That it was an act of virtue to deceive, and lie, when by that means the interests of the church might be promoted; and the second equally horrible, though in another point of view, was, that ‘errors in religion, when maintained and adhered to after proper admonition, were punishable with civil penalties and corporal tortures.’ The former of these erroneous maxims was now of a long standing; it had been adopted for some ages past, and had produced an incredible number of ridiculous fables, fictitious prodigies, and pious frauds, to the unspeakable detriment of that glorious cause in which they were employed. And it must be frankly confessed, that the greatest men and most eminent saints of this century, were more or less tainted with the infection of this corrupt principle, as will appear evident to such as look with an attentive eye into their writings and their actions. We would willingly except from this charge, Ambrose and Hilary, Augustin, Gregory Nazianzen, and Jerome; but truth, which is more respectable than these venerable fathers, obliges us to involve them in the general accusation. We may add also, that it was, probably, the contagion of this pernicious maxim, that engaged Sulpitius Severus, who is far from being, in the general, a puerile or credulous historian, to attribute so many miracles to St. Martin. The other maxim, relating to the justice and expediency of punishing error, was introduced with those serene and peaceful times which the accession of Constantine to the imperial throne procured to the church. It was from that period approved by many, enforced by several examples during the contests that arose with the Priscillianists and Donatists, confirmed and established by the authority of Augustin, and thus transmitted to the following ages.

When we cast an eye towards the lives and morals of Christians at this time, we find, as formerly, a mixture of good and evil; some eminent for their piety, others infamous for their crimes. The number, however, of immoral and unworthy Christians began so to increase, that the examples of real piety and virtue became

extremely rare. When the terrors of persecution were totally dispelled; when the church, secured from the efforts of its enemies, enjoyed the sweets of prosperity and peace; when most of the bishops exhibited to their flock the contagious examples of arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animosity, and strife, with other vices too numerous to mention; when the inferior rulers and doctors of the church fell into slothful and opprobrious negligence of the duties of their respective stations, and employed in vain wranglings and idle disputes, that zeal and attention that were due to the culture of piety and to the instruction of their people, and when (to complete the enormity of this horrid detail) multitudes were drawn into the profession of Christianity, not by the power of conviction and argument, but by the prospect of gain and the fear of punishment: then it was, indeed, no wonder that the church was contaminated with shoals of profligate Christians, and that the virtuous few were, in a manner, oppressed and overwhelmed with the superior numbers of the wicked and licentious."

"Multitudes were drawn into the profession of Christianity," from what, do you think? Mosheim says "not by the power of conviction or argument," as I have come here to-night; but two things drove them to it. My friend taunts me with being blind, and not being able to see, but I can see, I can find out these arguments from Mosheim. They were driven to make a profession, not by these, but "by a prospect of gain, and the fear of punishment." Those were the reasons. I say in face of such authorities as these what are we to believe? I can also quote you others; I can quote you Dr. Lardner, Dr. Alexander, and numerous others, who have devoted their whole lives to find out every particle of truth, and the conclusion they have come to is that there is no evidence that these documents are genuine. How can I deal with a subject like this, when he says he cannot accept my authority. I have here authorities like Mosheim which I leave to your judgment and consideration.

(Time called.)

MR. ROBERTS: With the corruptions of the early ecclesiastical saints, I have nothing whatever to do. I should be quite as willing as Mr. Stern to prefer an indictment against the heads and pillars of the church that present themselves before the world as the Church of Christ. But that is not the question we are at all discussing; we are discussing whether

the facts recorded of and principles enunciated by Jesus of Nazareth justify the belief entertained concerning him that he is the Messiah. In so far as Mr. Stern's remarks have borne upon that point, I will briefly notice them, though there is very little indeed to notice. The attitude taken by Christ with regard to the fig-tree is perfectly explicable in view of the object intended to be accomplished, and that object was the illustration to his disciples of the power of faith, as the context shews. When the disciples had recognised the result of Christ's words to the fig tree, he said to them if they had faith as much as a grain of mustard seed, they would not only be able to do what he had done but much stranger things than that. Is it a very wonderful thing for a teacher to illustrate what he wants to teach to children? (for the disciples were children then in relation to the great truths which lay at the bottom of the system of the truth of which Jesus was the centre). Mr. Stern's criticism is a mere child's criticism. He then finds fault with Jesus for sending the herd of pigs into the Sea of Galilee. It shews how little apprehension he has of his own system, the system he speaks of under the name of Judaism; for what is Judaism if it be not a system of obedience based on the law of Moses? Was it not a commandment to eschew the use, and therefore the cultivation of the pig? It was; and Jesus in his treatment of the great herd of swine illustrated the fact which he stated at another time in these words: "Think not that I have come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." Jesus vindicated the Jewish law in the very thing which this Jew finds fault with him for doing.

Then he finds fault with Jesus for uttering a true prophecy—"Think not I am come to send peace on earth." Mr. Stern admits that the work of Jesus has had precisely the effect which Jesus foretold. His mission was not at that time to bring the peace that the world will afterwards see, when he comes again. The object was to take out from amongst Jews and Gentiles a faithful people, upon the basis of voluntary obedience, and he well knew that these principles, operating upon society, would produce these results of division of whose occurrence Mr. Stern is a witness.

Then he asks why are the Jews to be held responsible for not believing,

if they have been made blind? I do not say that they will be held responsible. Their blindness is a national punishment for a former offence for which they were responsible. He mistakes me for a missionary. I am as much prepared to maintain that the clerical doctrine of damnation in hell is unfounded in truth, as I am that Mr. Stern's doctrine of the Messiah is opposed to the prophets. I am prepared to prove that the rule of God's moral government is that the punishment of sin is death—that death will at last obliterate every trace of disobedience from the universe; all disobedient Jews as all disobedient Gentiles. I admit that if the popular doctrine were true—that blinded Israel will be sent to live in eternal agony—there would be great force in Mr. Stern's argument; but it has no force against my position. We are all born into the world without inheritance of eternal life; and Jesus of Nazareth said "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." Therefore, if he be the Messiah, Mr. Stern and the unbelieving Jews generally are doomed. But suppose there was any force at all in Mr. Stern's argument on being made blind—I mean any force against Jesus, would it not recoil upon Mr. Stern's own prophets? Does Mr. Stern believe in the prophets? He says he is an orthodox Jew; and therefore I am bound to assume that he does. Let me then call your attention to Isaiah vi. 9, where this mission is confided to Israel, as the merited punishment of Israel for having, century after century, rebelled against the servants of God. "Go and tell this people, hear ye, indeed, but understand not; and see ye, indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed." And if any man challenges God's right to do such a thing, we shall simply have an illustration of a finite mortal criticising the doings of unsearchable wisdom.

Mr. Stern's position with regard to the originals is really too trifling to notice. I deny that he can produce the Hebrew originals of the writings of Moses, if he means the real documents that he wrote—the very parchment which the pen of Moses moved upon in inscribing the words he wrote. The documents no longer exist; for it was not in the nature

of the substance on which they were written to last so long; but does that fact interfere with the faith of the Jews? That it does not, is evident from Mr. Stern's belief in them; and again I say, if Mr. Stern can believe in the writings of Moses, in the absence of the originals, having otherwise good reasons for doing so, he cannot find fault with me under precisely similar circumstances, doing the same thing with regard to the New Testament.

Having noticed so much in his last speech as calls for notice, I proceed with the evidence upon which I was engaged, and I do so by anticipating a retort that might be made in connection with the evidence I have already produced. It may be said that Jesus of Nazareth, in the position in which he is put forward as God manifest in the flesh, is an interference with the Jewish doctrine delivered by Moses, that there is but one God. I, therefore, wish to call your attention to this, that the doctrine of the New Testament is not that Jesus is a second God, but that he is subordinately related to the great fountain of universal power, who revealed himself to Israel by Moses and the prophets. This can be shewn by quoting the testimony of those who quoted the testimony of Christ. I first refer you to the Acts of the Apostles ii. 22, where Peter, the leader of the Apostles, gives the definition in these words: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words. Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and signs which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye, yourselves also know." This does not present the Trinitarian idea, which I admit is a great obstacle with the Jews; but an obstacle that does not exist in my case, because I uphold the doctrine that there is but one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ, his son. In Acts x. 38, we have the same doctrine enunciated. Peter again being the speaker whilst in the house of Cornelius, where he says that God *anointed Jesus with the power which he exercised*. In 1 Cor. iii. 23, we find God put in a position of supremacy over Jesus. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says "All things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things to come: all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." In this you see a gradually-ascending chain; we are at the bottom; Christ intermediate; God

at the top, an order which you will see presented in 1 Cor. xi. 3: "I would have you to know that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man; *and the head of Christ is God.*" In Ephesians iv. 5-6, the same idea stands prominently out: "There is one Lord (that is the Lord Jesus Christ) . . . one God and Father of all, who is *above all* and through all, and in you all." In the first chapter of Heb., a very beautiful epistle, you find Paul presenting Jesus in the same light: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake, in time past, unto the fathers by the prophets, *hath, in these last days, spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds; who being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down by the right hand of Majesty on high, being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.* For unto which of the angels hath he said, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee; and again, I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son?"

It is thus shewn that *God spoke through Jesus of Nazareth*; and this is a doctrine which is surely not impossible for a Jew to receive, seeing that God spake through the angel at the bush, and when that angel appeared to Moses, did he not say "I AM THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" If God can speak through an angel, surely he can speak through a man who was begotten by himself, and whom He has provided as a channel of approach to himself. In 1 John i. the same doctrine is presented: "That which was from the beginning which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, of the word of life (*for the life was manifested.* and we have seen it and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His son Jesus Christ." In the gospel of John, the first two verses, you have the same doctrine expressed: "In the beginning

was the word, and the word was with God, and ~~the word was God~~; the same was in the beginning with God, and was manifested unto us, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth."

(Time called.)

MR. STERN: Of course these long sentences are perfectly understood by Mr. Roberts—that everything is God. Mr. Roberts understands it and I hope you do. But still my friends that is his Christian love toward me: he taunts me with something like madness: that I, a single Jew, should come forward to criticise Jesus. Does he think this will gain him credit? Why I should have thought that at least he would have reserved it for some other occasion. He taunted me with being a Jew and with having the madness to come forward. Why did he accept the challenge? I expected you were a gentleman, sir (turning to Mr. Roberts); I expected you were an honourable man. I expected I was coming before an English audience who would allow me an opportunity, though a Jew, of expressing my opinion. Why taunt me with it? Why make use of the term, and address me by the name with the greatest sarcasm. How would you like to be called a Methodist? "*This Methodist,*" or "*this Quaker,*" or "*this Roman Catholic?*" I would have more respect for my opponent. But I will leave this matter, appealing to your own sense of justice and to your judgment, as to how far Mr. Roberts was justified. He says it doesn't matter; we must take no notice of what "*this Jew*" says about producing the originals. For if I ask him to produce the originals of the New Testament, he asks me to produce the originals of Moses. If this is the right way of arguing the subject, I do not know what sort of logic you will call it. You do not doubt Moses; then why ask me to produce the originals? But as to the New Testament writings, I doubt them upon the greatest authority. My friend says the evidence he produces is overwhelming. Indeed! It doesn't seem to affect me. He says Christ Jesus is the Son of God, and he makes him up a mystery—three in one and one in three—you know.

Mr. Roberts: No, no.

THE CHAIRMAN here interposed, saying: Mr. Stern's expression applies to those who hold the Trinitarian doctrine; Mr. Roberts has stated that he doesn't hold the Trinitarian doctrine.

Mr. Stern: I have come here to give reasons against Jesus of Nazareth, and I class Mr. Roberts among Christians generally. (Confusion, which lasted some time.) I have lost five minutes, and I claim it from you. I was going to address those who do not call Mr. Roberts a gentleman; but I will keep my temper, my friend, only if he should try to throw something on my head, I will try to give him one back again. When I challenged Mr. Roberts, I didn't think of coming here to ask your opinions as to what I should say. I gave him the challenge, and he knew very well that I came here to deny that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. How can I deny it unless you allow me to speak what I have to say against him? How is it possible? Another thing; you would not like, as Englishmen, that it should go forth that discussion was not allowed in the Temperance Hall, in 1871, that the one on the side of Jesus had all the favour shewn him, and the Jew was not allowed to express his opinions; you would really not like that. With your permission I will as calmly as possible examine the subject. My friend says bring the originals of Moses; I simply say this, Moses is not in discussion, I told him this last night, that when we discussed Christianity *versus* Judaism, I should be prepared to bring all documents which are necessary. I have quoted from Mosheim what he says about the earliest fathers who were supposed to be the translators of these documents, and here is something more. "As this divine religion was to be propagated to the ends of the earth, it was necessary that Christ should choose a certain number of persons through the whole course of his ministry. To answer the facts of this grand mystery, it required such men as the apostles were. They were the lowest of the low; it was impossible to get respectable men." Let us go further. "And these apostles (page 63,) were men without education." So Mosheim considers. But the Jews were blind. Although Jesus was continually working miracles, he shut the eyes of the Jews so that they could not see. I challenged Mr. Roberts to discuss this question. I would not give a challenge to the man whom Mr. Monset defeated; I wanted a learned man like Mr. Roberts, yet I expect from a learned man that he will at least give fair play. Jesus called thirteen persons, only one of whom had acquaintance with

Jewish and Christian learning. The others were picked men of "mean extraction," respectable men he could not get. The only apostle who had any learning was Paul. Mr. Roberts told me last night that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and the rest in Greek. I ask him how can he expect that illiterate and poor Jews, who never knew anything about philosophy, to write in Greek? I should like you to find me a man among the poorest and meanest of the Christians who could write as these illiterate Jews are said to have written. I say how is it possible for me to believe documents upon such authority, when I have such authorities as those I can bring in support of my arguments? How can I believe the New Testament? How unreasonable from a learned man; I say it truly; for I know Mr. Roberts to be a learned man; how unreasonable for a gentleman of his learning and understanding to answer me in the way he does. His friends ask me to keep my temper, but surely you must admit that I, like others, am a creature of circumstances; I cannot help it when it rises within me, I can simply control it. I am not made the same as a personage whom I do not think it necessary to mention. I will quote a few more beautiful sentences to see whether this shall be the means of making me embrace Christianity. I shall commence with Peter. John xviii. 10: "Then Simon Peter having a sword, drew it and smote the High Priest's servant and cut off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus." That is how it states it in John. In Acts iii. 23, it says: "It shall come to pass that everyone which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." Those are Peter's own words. Luke xxii. 54: "Then took they him (Christ) and led him and brought him unto the High Priest's house, and Peter followed afar off. When they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall and were set down together, Peter sat down among them; but a certain maid beheld him as he sat by the fire, and earnestly looked upon him and said, this man was also with him; and he denied her, saying Woman, I know him not." Now then here Peter lays down a rule, that whoever denies that prophet shall be cut off, and yet this cowardly liar himself denies him, perhaps two or three hours after these very words were spoken. What reliance can be placed in books which contra-

dict each other in this manner. (A voice: Peter didn't say it before he denied him.) If he didn't say it, then why does it say he did? The book must be wrong and liable to error, the same as all other books. If these are the words that are to lead me to Christ, I wish to remain where I am. I will quote some other passages. 2 John, 10th verse: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." This has been fulfilled with a vengeance. I dare say my friend will say I cut the ground from under my feet again. "Neither bid him God speed." There has been a time within the last fifty years, when a Jew could not live in sight of London: could not get a house there.

THE CHAIRMAN here said Mr. Stern had lost some time in complaining about the audience not giving him a hearing. He didn't think that was just, there had been a little interruption, but it was very slight. He would advise Mr. Stern not to lose time by making unnecessary complaints. If there was any material interruption, he would immediately put a stop to it.

MR. ROBERTS: Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish there were time to follow all the little points Mr. Stern has raised. I must content myself with one or two. They are all equally fallacious, and the last is certainly no exception. The case of Peter is not in the position he represented. Moses does not say "Whosoever shall deny that prophet shall be cut off," but whosoever will not *hearken* to "that prophet," in the sense of ultimately receiving and submitting to him, shall be destroyed. His disciple Peter, under great pressure gave way to the temptation to deny him for a moment. It was but a moment. Immediately "he went out and wept bitterly." And is there no such thing as forgiveness? Is not the God of Israel a gracious God, forgiving iniquity and transgression? Have the Jews no sins to be forgiven, and will not forgiveness be extended to them if they repent? Even the murder of His own Son, He offers to forgive on conditions of repentance and faith.

Then he raised a question with regard to men who wrote the New Testament. He admits they were illiterate, and contends they were unable to write these documents, and therefore it was not written by them. I answer the argument upon the principle that shines through

this little remark of the Jews which we find in John vii. 15, where it says the Jews marvelled, saying "*How knoweth this man (Jesus) letters, HAVING NEVER LEARNED?*" Let Mr. Stern answer that question with regard to Jesus, and he will answer it with regard to his disciples. It is one of the strongest evidences of the Messiahship of Jesus that in connection with his word, illiterate men performed that which was impossible for them to do unless supernaturally assisted, which they were. The Spirit was sent upon them and produced results which caused the Jews to marvel. As we read in Acts iv. 13, "Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that *they were unlearned and ignorant men, THEY MARVELLED.*" What is the explanation? They had something besides their illiterateness. What was it? *God worked with them, confirming their words with signs following.* The promise of Christ was fulfilled, that the Spirit of truth should come to them and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had spoken to them.

Then Mr. Stern seemed to be very much stung by my calling him a Jew. From my point of view, it is the most honourable name in the earth. Salvation is of the Jews. Christ was a Jew. All the apostles were Jews. I look forward to the time when ten men shall take hold of the skirts of *him that is a Jew* and say "We will go with thee, for we have heard that GOD IS WITH THEE." But when the time comes, the "God with them" will be Jesus of Nazareth whom they crucified—Emmanuel.

The next branch of my argument is, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah because of the great works which he wrought; because of the miracles that he performed, none of which will be controverted as to their nature if admitted to have taken place. The opponents of Christianity give the answer to them that Mr. Monast gave. Jesus told his disciples they were not to receive false Christs although they should shew signs and wonders.—(Mark xiii. 22.) The argument is that if false Christs could work signs and wonders, the working of signs and wonders is no sign that Jesus was the true Christ. The answer to that is that Christ admitted the possibility of other men doing the things that appeared miraculous, but rested his claims on the vast difference between what he did and what other men did. He challenges

comparison. He says in John xv. 24, "If I had not done among them the WORKS WHICH NONE OTHER MAN DID, they had not had sin." Where was there ever a man before him, or since, that walked upon the sea, and stilled the tempest by a word of command? Where is the man that ever fed thousands of people with a few loaves of bread? Where was ever the man before him that raised the dead by a word? Never in all the category of false Christs—never in all the history of impostures, has there been any approach to these great wonders, which, as Paul said of other things, were not done in a corner. If time admitted, which it does not, I should have liked to go very largely into this point, to demonstrate the historic reality of the things related of Christ. But I must hastily pass on to the last point of my argument which is, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, because he rose from the dead. Now my evidence upon that question is very simple, but exceedingly strong—strong because of its simplicity. What are the facts of the case? They are such as are not doubted, as regards the principal of them at all events; and that is this, that after Jesus of Nazareth was crucified by Pilate at the instigation of the Jews, his disciples proclaimed to the Jewish public that he had risen again. They did not say "We believe it because somebody has told us, or because we are convinced as a matter of argument that it must be so; because we have some theory on the matter." No. They said, "He is risen again, for we have seen him, we have eaten and drunk with him since he rose from the dead. We are his witnesses." I will just quote one specimen of the kind of testimony they gave on this most important point. In Acts x. 40, you find Peter—who denied his Lord, but was forgiven—declaring "Him God, raised up the third day and shewed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before God, even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." The testimony did not relate to a single interview with the Lord merely; but applied to a period of forty days, during which he repeatedly shewed himself to his disciples. "To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion, by MANY INFALLIBLE PROOFS, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."—(Acts i. 3.) Now these men everywhere

declared the same thing, and with one uniform result—that namely of persecution: at the very threshold of their career, the authorities laid hold of Peter and put him in prison, and confiscated the goods of all in Jerusalem who dared to believe his testimony. The other disciples gave the same testimony. They went everywhere throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria declaring that the Lord had risen, and had commanded them to preach faith in him for the remission of sins. The result to the disciples was in every case the same. It brought upon them degradation, and evil, and pain; and at last, in almost every case, death. Now what is the explanation of such an extraordinary phenomenon? Mr. Stern asks your attention to a thief at the bar as affording an explanation; he says, "Oh, a thief will tell a story of course, to get himself out of a scrape." Just so; but where is the man that will tell a story to get himself into a scrape? The way for the disciples to have kept out of the scrape was to hold their tongues; or having got into the scrape, the very way to get out of it was to tell just the very opposite story to that which they told. If they had said, "We confess we have been deceiving the people. Jesus never rose, but is now rotting in the place where we laid his stolen dead body," they would immediately and gladly have been let out of the scrape and praised amongst the Jews as honest men. Instead of that, they persisted in a declaration which if not true, was of no benefit to them, but brought them continually into that which Mr. Stern suggests they made to get out of—a scrape.

The facts upon which my argument is based are doubted. No man can deny that the Christians of the first century testified that Christ had risen because they had seen him, and no man can deny that this testimony brought upon them every species of deprivation. Therefore we have to believe first that they were honest men; for none but honest men will bring upon themselves continued poverty, starvation, and death, by adhering to a statement. Why is a lie ever told? That the liar may get good to himself or screen himself from harm—like Mr. Stern's thief. Did the disciples of Christ screen themselves from harm by what they said? On the contrary Paul said "for Christ's sake we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted and have no certain dwelling-

place. We are made as the filth of the world and off-scouring of all things unto this day." These were no liars. There is only one hypothesis upon which you can get rid of their testimony, and that is not a sustainable one, namely, that they were mad. This I suppose is the hypothesis that Mr. Stern would select. But it will be very hard work to maintain it in the face of the marvellous combination of greatness and goodness which he admits in saying that illiterate men could not write such epistles as the apostles wrote. There is no man can read the epistles of Paul and say he was a madman. They shew him to have been a cool, clear-headed, logical, practical, sensible man; and having mentioned his name, I will speak of his case, which forms one of the strongest bulwarks of the Christian faith; for the facts of his case must have been intimately known at the time. Brought up at the feet of Gamaliel who was a man of great authority as a leader amongst the Pharisees, Paul, when the disciples first began to declare that Christ had risen, took the lead in endeavouring to extirpate them as a class from the nation. A man of great intelligence, a man of learning, and of undoubted honesty of purpose, and of extraordinary energy and enterprise. All of a sudden, this man whilst on his way to Damascus, with letters from the Sanhedrim empowering him to apprehend Christians—all of a sudden, this man turns round and begins to preach the faith he sought to destroy. What is the explanation of this extraordinary incontrovertible fact? Let me read Paul's own explanation of it, and judge ye between Mr. Stern and Paul. Acts xxiii. brings before us Paul, who after a prolonged journey among the Gentiles, testifying the mission of Christ, appears in Jerusalem. Some of the Jews recognise him and say "Men of Israel, help; this is the man that teaches all men everywhere against the people and the law, and this place." A great uproar ensues, in which Paul is likely to be torn to pieces. He is at length rescued by the Roman soldiers, and he asks permission to address the people from the stairs; and obtaining permission, delivers this speech, which is Paul's explanation of an otherwise inexplicable career:

"Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you. And when

they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence: and he saith, I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day. And I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women. As also the high priest doth bear me witness, and all the estate of the elders: from whom also I received letters unto the brethren, and went to Damascus, to bring them which were there bound unto Jerusalem, for to be punished. And it came to pass, that, as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell unto the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest. And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me. And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do. And when I could not see for the glory of that light, being led by the hand of them that were with me, I came into Damascus. And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there, came unto me, and said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know His will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard. And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. And it came to pass, that, when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance; and saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me. And I said, Lord, they know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee: And when the blood of thy martyr, Stephen, was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him. And he said unto me, Depart: for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles. And they gave him audience unto this word, and then lifted up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live.

(Time called.)

Mr. STERN: You have heard the beautiful passages that my friend has just quoted: all I have to say is, "I don't believe it." I still keep to my subject; I hold these are lies, forgeries, and falsehoods, and I will tell you why—because I take against Mr. Roberts the statements of Mosheim. My friend says, What interest was it to those men to lie? Mosheim says they considered it a virtue to lie, when the interests of the Church required it. And these documents, the originals of which you say are lost—more shame for you, that you didn't take better care of them. Mr. Roberts has quoted from St. Paul some good sayings, but I will quote some of the bad ones. Paul says, "I robbed other churches and took wages of them, to do you service." My friend has such a nice way of quoting all the good things, and leaving all the other things out. Am I to believe in a man who actually acknowledges that he has robbed other churches and taken wages, to do them service? That is very mild! I will quote two or three more passages of Paul: "For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto His glory, why yet am I judged as a sinner?"—(Rom. iii. 7.) If he really has robbed and lied in the interests of the Church, why should he be looked upon as a sinner? Again, "If any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant."—(1 Cor. xiv. 38.) The Church acquired the greatest power when its people were ignorant, and kept them ignorant. Why? Because if they had not, they might have been able to read those Christian books. Now that the people have got to understand, what is the result? Even this New Testament of yours, which Mr. Roberts brings as an authority, which Mr. Roberts says contains truths, is now sent up to the Synod, in London, to be altered. Why? Because the people can see the forgeries and falsehoods the book contains; and they want to take them out, and to put something else in their stead. (A voice: It's a lie.) My friend says it is a lie, but it is a fact. (Some confusion here occurred, and the Chairman had some difficulty in restoring order.) How unreasonable it is; my friend is allowed to quote good things out of the book, and I want to shew you the bad ones. Why does he persist in quoting them, when I say they are lies and falsehoods. I tell you they are forgeries. I say, "Bring proofs." And you insist upon quoting Paul; then why not allow me to

quote his bad sayings? My friend doesn't like me to do this. Paul says, "As we said before so say I now again, if any man preach unto you any other gospel than ye have received, let him be accursed." Are these a godly man's words? Does it take Jesus to inspire Paul—your dead Jesus who has risen again, as you presume; does it take Jesus to die and be crucified for the purpose of inspiring Paul to tell lies? Does it take all that for Paul to say, "Let any man be accursed," because he doesn't believe the doctrine of this book. If this is all, I say I will remain with those who do not believe it all my life; and if I am to be accursed for it, I will take my chance. "A man that is an heretic after the first admonition, reject." Why must I be rejected, simply because I won't believe these forgeries? "I would that they were cut off that trouble you. Nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile." That is what Paul says. "But (Acts xiii. 8) Elymas the Sorcerer withstood them." "Then Saul (who is also called Paul), filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him, and said, 'Oh, full of all subtlety and of all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now behold the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season.' And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness, and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand." I do not believe it. "And some days after (Acts xv. 36), Paul said unto Barnabas, 'Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do.' And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark; but Paul thought it not good to take him with them, who had departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder, one from the other." That is a very nice thing, isn't it? "For this cause . . . God gave them up unto vile affections." — This is a passage from Rom. i. 26-27; I advise everyone but ladies to read it; I think it is too disgusting for them; it is really too disgusting; it just caught my eye. I will give you another; of course, I must leave you to be the judge, now, of Paul. "In a moment, in the twinkling

of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed:" this is what is said in the New Testament. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first:" that is what Paul said.—(1 Cor. xv.) "We who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them "in the clouds." Let us only hope it will not be a damp cloud, or they will catch cold. "To meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." What—in the air? I wish them well over it. I don't want to be there. That is one of the grand mysteries, and I will leave it to my friend to explain. My friend has stated that no man ever did what Jesus did. He walked on the sea. Of course I don't believe it; but suppose he did, what does that prove to me? Does it prove that he is Son of God? Is it proof because a man walks on the sea, and is born of a woman without a father, that he is the Son of God? To me it only proves that he can do something which I do not know how to do. What has he done? I am sure if he had only left the secret behind, it would be some good. Tell me what good he has done? Then Mr. Roberts quotes to me that beautiful passage about Christ turning water into wine. I will refer you to the passage. "Jesus saith unto them, Fill the water pots with water; and they filled them up to the brim. And he said unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast, and they bare it. When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine and knew not whence it was (but the servants that drew the water knew) [Yes, the servants knew all about it, because they knew the trick], the governor of the feast called the bridegroom and said, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now." If this is a test for a man to be looked upon as the Son of God—and God himself sometimes—if this is a test for me to believe in him, why then there is a friend of mine in Birmingham, whom I have not seen for the last eight years, he not alone can turn the water into wine, but he will take a bottle of water, and he will pour out of

that bottle all sorts of wine; you have only got to mention what sort you want, and he will give it to you. But do I look upon Professor Hermann as a God, or connected in any way with a ghost—I mean the Holy Ghost; I told you so; I do not know the meaning of the word ghost, nor Holy Ghost, nor do I know where he gets his translation from. Well, Professor Hermann can do something which I do not know how to do; but his servants know very well, as did the servants of Jesus. But it is not because he can do that, that I shall worship him; my friend doesn't want me to worship Professor Hermann. Well, my friend didn't quote this, but it happens, very fortunately, that I have it here: "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them." I should like to know what my friend means by hell? I do not know any Hebrew word that would give him such a translation. "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire!" I should like to know how that could be done. I should like to know how large hell is, and how large the lake of fire is to throw the lot into. These are some of the grand mysteries again. I do not believe it; but he will explain it to you, no doubt. "I am he that liveth and was dead, and have the keys of hell and death."

(Time called.)

MR. ROBERTS: I refer Mr. Stern to a well known word in his own language for the Scripture idea of hell, and that is *sheol* of which the word *hades* is the Greek equivalent. The meaning he has unintentionally supplied in his last quotation in saying that Jesus has the keys of it. *Sheol* is a place unseen; a well known Hebrew equivalent for the grave. He says he does not believe in the Holy Ghost.

Mr. Stern: In ghosts.

Mr. Roberts: Does he believe in *Ruacha kodush*?

Mr. Stern: Yes, in *Ruacha kodush*.

Mr. Roberts: That is the Holy Spirit of which the English phrase "Holy Ghost" is a corruption. The Holy Ghost that came upon Mary at Bethlehem,

and led to the production of this marvellous man, was the Holy Spirit of the Mighty One of Israel. Surely there ought to be nothing difficult in this for a Jew to receive. As for the extreme modesty which he professed as a bar to the full discussion of the subject, I will only say that the Scriptures of truth, honour, and common sense recognize none of the purient mysteries that are known only to impure minds. "To the pure all things are pure, but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing clean." The only other point in his remarks which I will notice is his quotations from Mosheim. I altogether deny the applicability of Mosheim's testimony to the matters I have produced. To what age of Christianity does Mosheim's testimony refer? Does it refer to the days of the apostles and their disciples? Will it be said of them that they taught falsehood as a virtue? Never, never! Mosheim's remarks have reference to those dark ages in European history when a corrupt and Jesuitical priesthood were in the ascendancy, and the people demoralized by their teaching. And it indicates the desperateness of Mr. Stern's case that he finds it necessary to even insinuate that such principles were those of Christ Jesus, who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and without sin." His attempt to prove them to have been the principles of the apostles by quotations from the writings of Paul, is even more to be deprecated than his attempt to make the early Christians responsible for papal corruption. He has quoted a statement of Paul—"If the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto His glory," as if it were a definition by Paul of Paul's principles; whereas it is really a suggestion that Paul puts into the mouth of a supposed caviller, and which he instantly repudiates, saying that he is *slanderosly reported* when represented as saying "Let us do evil that good may come." Mr. Stern has added himself to the list of Paul's slanderers, but I dare say that gives him little concern. I am sorry the time is so limited with so much that might be considered, but I must make the best of it. I must rapidly summarise what remains to be said. Usually the Jews, in their opposition to Jesus, point to the testimony of the prophets that the Jewish Messiah is to reign in Jerusalem as universal King of the earth, and ask how Jesus answers to that. I admit that

the Jesus of popular preaching does not answer to it, but I should like to have shewn that the case is altogether different with the Jesus of the New Testament. I should have liked by copious references to show that the mission of Jesus of Nazareth is to return a second time to the scene of his sufferings, and there to be exalted as King of Israel and Monarch of the Whole World. But the time failing, I must content myself with that simple definition, and proceed to say that in all possible things by which the Jewish Messiah could be recognised, Jesus of Nazareth answers to them. I have proved their applicability to him, as to—

- 1.—The *time* when he should appear.
- 2.—The *place* (Bethlehem) where he should be born.
- 3.—The *family* from which it was promised he should be extracted.
- 4.—The *character* in which he should first be manifested.
- 5.—The *way* in which the *Jews should receive him*.
- 6.—The *manner* in which they should *treat him*.
- 7.—The manner of his death.
- 8.—The effects of his death.
- 9.—His resurrection.
- 10.—The marvellous relation he should sustain both to his own nation and the Gentiles as the manifestation of divine power and wisdom.

And as I have intimated, I could largely shew that Jesus of Nazareth, according to the predictions of the New Testament will answer in the fullest particulars to all that is promised concerning the Messiah's coming glory. I now simply have to deal briefly with the attitude of the Jewish nation toward him. They unanimously reject him, although they did not do so in the generation in which he appeared, (for as they are obliged to admit, many thousands of Jews believed on him,) they take comfort from their collective unbelief. They seem to think it impossible that they can be mistaken in the matter. Have they forgotten their past history? Let me remind them that in all their generations, they have shewn themselves wonderfully prone to go astray from things divine. They have in many cases accepted false Christs. I dare say Mr. Stern, if he is informed enough, can recall passages in the history of his nation in which they have submitted to the leadership of undoubted impostors, men who have in no particular answered

to the description of their Messiah in the prophets. Time after time have they fallen into that snare and led themselves into national disasters, in which they would have been destroyed had it not been for the watchfulness of the great Supreme Ruler, who *for the sake of his own great name*, has preserved them a remnant to this time. I will read the description of them by Moses 3,000 years ago, and ask you to mark how signally his words have been verified in the whole course of their history since, and certainly not least of all, in their treatment of Jesus of Nazareth. In Deuteronomy xxxi. 16, you have a wonderful composition introduced thus:

And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers; and *this people will rise up, and go a whoring after the gods of the strangers of the land*, whither they go to be among them, and will forsake me, and break my covenant which I have made with them. Then my anger shall be kindled against them in that day, and I will forsake them and I will hide my face from them, and they shall be devoured, and many evils and troubles shall befall them; so that they will say in that day, Are not these evils come upon us because our God is not among us? And I will surely hide my face in that day, for all the evils which they shall have wrought in that they are turned unto other gods. Now, therefore, write ye this song for you and teach it to the children of Israel; put it in their mouths that this song may be a witness for me against the children of Israel. For when I shall have brought them into the land which I swore unto their fathers, that floweth with milk and honey, and they shall have eaten and filled themselves, and waxen fat, then will they turn unto other gods, and serve them, and provoke me, and break my covenant. And it shall come to pass, when many evils and troubles are befallen them, that this song shall testify against them as a witness; for it shall not be forgotten out of the mouths of their seed.

Moses therefore wrote this song the same day, and we have it now, and I will read it to you.—(Deut. xxxii.)

Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak; and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth. My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass. Because I will publish the name of the Lord, ascribe ye greatness unto our God. He is the Rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he. They have corrupted themselves, their spot is not the spot

of His children: they are a perverse and crooked generation. Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise? Is He not thy Father that hath bought thee? hath He not made thee, and established thee? Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations: ask thy father, and he will shew thee; thy elders, and they will tell thee. When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. For the Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance. He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye. As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings: So the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him. He made him ride on the high places of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields; and he made him to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock. Butter of kine, and milk of sheep, with fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of Bashan, and goats, with the fat of kidneys of wheat; and thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape. But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked—thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness—then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation. They provoked him to jealousy with strange gods, with abominations provoked they him to anger. They sacrificed unto devils, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not. Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee. And when the Lord saw it, he abhorred them because of the provoking of his sons, and of his daughters. And he said, I will hide my face from them, I will see what their end shall be: for they are a very froward generation, children in whom is no faith. They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities; and I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people, [and I am here to-night as an illustration of the fulfilment of this.] I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation. For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischiefs upon them; I will spend mine arrows upon them. They shall be burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat, and with bitter destruction: I will also send the teeth of beasts upon them, with the poison of serpents of the dust. The sword without, and terror within, shall destroy both the young man and the virgin,

the suckling also with the man of grey hairs. I said, I would scatter them into corners, I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men. Were it not that I feared the wrath of the enemy lest their adversaries should behave themselves strangely, and lest they should say, Our band is high, and the Lord hath not done all this. For they are a nation void of counsel, neither is there any understanding in them. O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end. How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, except their Rock had sold them, and the Lord had shut them up?

(Time called.)

MR. STERN: The big guns have been fired, and the battle is over, but so far from my friend making any impression on me, so far from his shots having hurt me, so far from the arguments pointed at me having made the least impression to make me embrace Christianity, they have only brought out the greater feelings I have against it. (Hisses.) Oh! hiss away, and it will only shew your beautiful Christianity. (Renewed hissing.) It will only shew you can hiss what does not please you. My friend taunts me because I said I don't believe in the Holy Ghost; but he has not told the difference between an ordinary ghost and a holy one. I, like him, have a great deal more to say. It would take me at least three weeks more to say all I have to say; and I am perfectly satisfied that if I only had the time to give verse and chapter for you to go home and compare them, I am perfectly satisfied you would never believe in Jesus any more. My friend asked me if I believed in *ruacha kodush*? Of course; the word *ruach* is "wind," and *kodush* is holy, and if a holy wind sometimes causes virgins to conceive, I should advise all respectable ladies to keep out of the draught. (A voice: It is blasphemy.) Then I will blaspheme as long as I live.

The gentleman (a Jew converted to orthodox Christianity,) who thus characterized the remarks of Mr. Stern, then rose and attempted to obtain a hearing for himself, repeatedly exclaiming, in an excited manner, that he would not allow blasphemy in his presence.

The Chairman refused to hear him, and after some minutes' confusion the gentleman was prevailed upon to sit down.

Mr. Stern: I consider that that gentleman has come here for the purpose of

disturbing the meeting. I am sure we have gone on very nicely, with the exception of a few interruptions. I am sure I will excuse them. I was perfectly satisfied that I should say something you would not like. Well, my friend says he will place me along with the slanderers of Paul. If I have slandered him I am sure I have slandered him truthfully from my convictions. I have come forward like a man and publicly announced my convictions and if I have slandered Paul, I wish to be judged by those great intellects that are to be found in this country. The next thing my friend asks me is respecting the ages to which one of my quotations from Mosheim refers. He says the statements he makes with reference to the policy of the early church do not refer to the apostles. I have told you that they could not write, that they were illiterate men, that they could not write these books at all. But my friend says they did write them, although they could not. He says the originals have been lost; and when I quote Mosheim, I quote him merely to shew what sort of people they were who are supposed to have written them. I say the translators have misrepresented everything, and these things could never have been in existence or there would have been something left of them. I want to know what the discussion has been about. He has yet to shew me why Jesus was crucified, why he was to be three days and three nights in the grave, and yet only remained thirty hours, and why he should rise again and go to heaven; and I yet want to know where in the Hebrew there is an equivalent for the word heaven at all? We have not got an equivalent for heaven, so I do not know where Jesus is. But has he been crucified at all? that is the question. I maintain that according to the rules of English Grammar he has not.—(Luke xxiii. 26.) "And as they led him (Jesus); away they laid hold upon one Simon, a Cyrenian, coming out of the country, and on him (Simon) they laid the cross that he might bear it after Jesus." I wish you particularly to pay attention to these few passages; it says they caught hold of one Simon coming out of the country and on him they laid the cross, "And there followed him." The last person alluded to is Simon, mind you. "And there followed him (Simon) a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him (Simon)." But Jesus turning unto them said,

"Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for your children, &c." This was superfluous, for they did not weep for him but for Simon. "And when they were come to the place which is called Calvary, there they crucified him." Now the last person alluded to is Simon; therefore, it must have been Simon they crucified. "Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." (A voice: is that Simon as well?) No, but Jesus who shouted out from the crowd, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do," they are crucifying poor Simon, and they think it is me. Well, this discussion for the present ends to-night. I thank you kindly for the attention you have given; for although you have sometimes interrupted me, it still is a great credit to the town of Birmingham that you have at last allowed a Jew to come forward for the first time, to express his opinions publicly whether he is in the right or not. There never was a time when a Jew came forward in England before; and I am sure that out of England no Jew would be allowed to do what I have done here

It shews that we have in England at least arrived at the time when we can tolerate other opinions as well as our own. I will close in the sublime words of one of the finest female writers that ever graced the field of literature and moral philosophy.

"Long have the nations slept—hark to that sound!

The sleep is ended, and the world awakes:
Man rises in his strength, and looks around,
While on his sight the dawn of reason breaks.
Lo! Knowledge draws the curtain from his mind,
Quells Fancy's vision, and his spirit tames
Deep in his breast, that law to seek and find.

Which kings would write in blood, and priests
in flames.

Shout, Earth! the creature man, till now the foe
Of thee, and all who tread thy parent breast,
Henceforth, shall learn himself and thee to know,
And in that knowledge shall be wise and blest."

The meetings closed with a vote of thanks to Mr. Wright for presiding, in response to which he remarked that the whole of the debate had been conducted with even greater decorum than they might have expected from the nature of the subject