

Price 4d

January, 1923

# THE BEREAN.

**A Christadelphian Magazine devoted to the exposition and defence of the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints; and opposed to the dogmas of the Papal and Protestant Churches**

---

**“The entrance of Thy Word giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple”**  
-----

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY

GEO. H. DENNEY, at 47 Birchington Rd., Crouch End, London, N.8.,

---

Subscription ... 5/- per annum, post free

---

CONTENTS	Page
The Bible Wholly Inspired and Infallible— No. 91. — The Papacy and Patron Saints and Pagan Feasts	1
Echoes of Past Controversies— No. 3—The Inspiration Controversy	6
Editorial	9
The Holy Spirit	11
In the World, but not of it!	15
Christadelphian Unbelief	19
Strange Lands (Poetry)	22
Psalm 23	23
The Word of God	28
Rare Seeds capable of Growth	29
Correspondence	30
Ecclesial News	32

---

# THE BEREAN.

A Christadelphian Magazine devoted to the exposition and defence of the Faith  
once delivered to the Saints; and opposed to the dogmas  
of the Papal and Protestant Churches

“The entrance of Thy Word giveth light; it giveth  
understanding to the simple”

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY

GEO. H. DENNEY, at 47 Birchington Road, Crouch End, London, N.8.

VOL. XI., No. 1                      JANUARY 15<sup>th</sup> 1923                      FOURPENCE.

## The Bible wholly inspired and infallible.

### No 91. –The Papacy and Patron Saints and Pagan Feasts.

The 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> chapters of Daniel give a detailed account of powers operating North and South of Palestine, from the days in which the prophet lived and spoke among the Persian kings (see verses 1 and 2), until the final consummation of things by the standing up of “Michael,” the resurrection of the dead and the judgment.

The beginning and the end of the matter being perfectly clear and obvious, the examination and elucidation of the intermediate details is made easy.

Now working backwards from the 12<sup>th</sup> chapter we have outlined next before the appearance of Him who standeth for God’s people, the rise and fall of the power that should dominate and desolate the Holy Land for many years and whose final end should coincide with His coming. Still going back we are next confronted with a great power to whom great damage was done by the ascension to power of this final desolator.

Now the great desolating power in the Holy Land until these days in which we live was the Turkish power, and it was upon the Eastern Roman Empire the sphere of Greek Catholic influence that the Turks exercised such terrible vengeance. Now between that time and the “exploits” of the Maccabees as vividly described in verses 32 to 35, Daniel tells of a great and all-conquering power in these terms. “The King shall do according to his will. He shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods and he shall prosper until the indignation be accomplished.” The power that arose during the Maccabean days that ultimately became the supreme power of the world was the Roman power. This power always combined in its chief officer the two offices of head of the state or political sphere and head of the church or ecclesiastical system. From Julius Caesar’s time onwards the title of Supreme Pontiff always belonged to the Emperor. The Emperor’s statue was always placed in the chief temples for worship as showing that he was the supreme representative on earth of the gods of heaven.

Dr. Thomas deals very minutely in Eureka with the details belonging to this development. When the Roman emperor Constantine professedly adopted Christianity instead of Paganism as the state religion he literally fulfilled Daniel’s words, “A god whom his fathers knew not he shall honour.”

Now the veracity of Daniel was upheld by our Lord Jesus—Matthew 24: 15, etc., but is challenged today by many “Christian” critics. We in turn challenge the critics to find any place in history to which these words can apply except to the change made by Constantine. Where else is there an instance of a great State changing its religion’s name and order?

From Constantine’s time onward the Pope as the head of the Christian Church was loaded by the Roman State with honours and wealth—“silver, precious stones, and things that men desire”—Daniel 11: 38. To him was assigned the title formerly held by the Emperor—Supreme Pontiff. In time the Pope became the great overlord of Europe and no king reigned without his authority and consent. A determined attempt was made by the Vatican in mediaeval times to convert the world, or perhaps to put it another way, to force all men into the church called Catholic or Universal. Hence Jews and Moors in Spain were brought before the Inquisition, and Protestants of every kind put to death who persisted in their protestations. The Huguenot, Waldensian, and other terrible persecutions are instances of this.

But there is one phase of the work of the Papacy that does not always receive attention. That is developed by Daniel in the words, “In his estate, or chief seat, he shall honour Lord protectors, or protecting ones of power . . . . He shall do this in bazaars, or places of the display of his power and wonders. He shall do this with a strange god whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory.”

The parallel to this in the Papal operations is to be seen in the endeavour made to please the people generally and to cater for their desires. It is useful to remember that there were two sides to the Papal endeavour to bring all men into the Catholic fold. Persecution was reserved for the conscientious objector—the man who made intelligent opposition to the doctrines and practices of the ecclesiastical authorities, and who refused to suborn his own private judgment to their will. Of such stuff were those who continued to hold the primitive faith “once for all delivered to the saints.” The lives of such men might be morally above reproach, but their opinions could not be tolerated.

Now on the other hand it was the custom of the Papacy to minister to the tastes and desires of the masses of the people in every possible way. In fact persecution of the Christian faith ceased when the Christian Church “accommodated” itself to the ways of men. Hence Papal ascendancy was made to an extent secure, and renamed and remodelled the same to fit them into Christianity. Idol temples were made into churches, and instead of the idol’s name, the name of a “powerful one” or protecting saint was given to the building. The patron god of various industries and localities was put aside, but in its place was put the patron saint. The word “patron” is the Latin word for influential or powerful protector. A common modern use is seen in the “patrons” of various institutions.

Some of the changes the Pope made are very interesting. The Temple of the Roman twin brothers Remus and Romulus was changed to the church of the twin brother “saints,” St. Cosmo and St. Damiano. The temple of Anna Perenna, sister of Queen Dido, was renamed the church of St. Anna Petronilla (Rome, Pagan and Papal. —Mourat Brock).

The guide book sold in Rome, Roma Moderna, remarks, “In converting the profane worship of the heathen to the sacred worship of the Holy Church, the faithful used to follow rule. Thus the temple of Rhea, the mother of the gods, or Bona dea, they dedicated to ‘the Holy Virgin,’ which was a title of the heathen goddess as well as the mother of Jesus. In the place once sacred to Apollo now stands the church of St. Apollinaris. The altar of Bacchus, god of wine, became that of St. Baccho. On the site of the temple of Mars is erected the church of St. Martina.” The same applies to Papal architecture. The Eastern position is a relic of sun-worship. The wax tapers are those that used to be offered up to the gods to secure victory in war. The old pagan feasts and fasts were all carefully retained and adapted. Paul condemns “the observance of days, and months, and times, and years”—Galatians 4: 10. All the great pagan celebrations were rooted in the worship of the sun—hence “day, months, times, and years” fixed their feasts.

The most important feast was that of the winter solstice, December 25. It was termed “Natalis Invictae Solis”—the birthday of the Sun, that date being the time when the sun begins to regain its power. The Yule log burnt on Christmas Eve betokens the death of the Sun, and the “Christmas Tree” its rebirth next morning.

The Papacy adopted the feast and made it the “feast of the Son” for the mass of Christmas means feast.

Our Lord, of course, was born on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the seventh month of the year—about our September in the order of the Jewish year, but a little detail like that did not matter to the Vatican. Now the pagans combined the feasts of Saturnalia and Brumalia with the festival of the Sun god. Hence the custom of sending gifts and of rejoicing in “eating and drinking.” Probably our Lord himself will return at a time of the year coinciding with his words, “eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage”—Matthew 24: 38, and Christmas would surely be the best world-fulfilment of these words. The irony of an ostensible celebration of Christ, in which Christ himself is practically forgotten, is apparent.

The Chaldee term for child was “yule,” hence Yuletide. The Yule cakes eaten in the Scottish lowlands are there called “Nour” cakes. “Nour” is a Chaldee word for birth. Easter was the festival of Ishtar in Persia, Ashtaroth or Astarte in Assyria, Rhea or Cybele in Rome, whose distinctive title was “My Lady,” hence “Lady Day.” It celebrated the conception by the Mother in the Trinity of Supreme gods, of the Powerful Son, the deliverance being on December 25. The Papacy keeps the festival as “The Annunciation of the Virgin Mary,” as well as the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord. The Lenten fast was the pagan lamentation of forty days of Ceres for Proserpine.

The Mexicans fasted at the same time for the Sun god, the Egyptians for Osiris. The Khurds celebrate the same fast to the Sun to the present day.

The round buns marked with a cross are the cakes offered to the pagan Queen of heaven—Jeremiah 7: 18. The Chaldee name for these was “boun,” hence our bun. Whitsuntide tells its own tale in its name—White Sun. It was the celebration of the attainment of his highest power by the Sun. The “passing through the fire” was part of the celebration at that season. The entry of the sun into the twelve signs of the Zodiac and pagan remembrance thereof was “dignified” by the Popes into the feasts of the apostles, hence each of these is in our calendar as a saint apostle’s day. St. Peter’s day is June 29.

Space fails to tell of how every pagan feast and fast or idea was “incorporated” into “Christianity” by the Roman prelacy, until today Christendom or the Papacy stands as the embodiment of the world’s thought and man’s imagination since the days of Babel’s foundation. The confusion of today is the result.

This development Daniel was able to foresee, and John to contemplate in the isle of Patmos—see Revelation 17. We cannot but be warned thereby to avoid contact as far as possible with these contaminating influences, and to adhere firmly to the foundation, i.e., God’s Holy Word. It is very clear that the first requisite for creating division between God’s way and man’s way is to accept the Bible as the Divinely inspired message. Once that is done, freedom is secured from the foolishness of man’s imagination. That freedom is only maintained by separateness. —EDITOR.

---

To be Continued.

# Echoes of Past Controversies.

2<sup>nd</sup> SERIES.

## No. 3—The Inspiration Controversy.

It can be readily understood that the brethren were soon sharply divided in opinion. The very considerable increase in numbers which came to us in the years 1875 to 1885 had brought in many whose habits of thoughts were still of an “orthodox” type. Christadelphianism acquired a degree of popularity and acceptance it had not previously known. Less courage and independence of mind were needed before one identified himself with the Truth than in earlier years when to become a Christadelphian meant obloquy and contempt. In the above period the London brethren alone increased to four or five times their previous number, with the result that the brotherhood contained a considerable element who were in sympathy with the “broad” and “cultivated” school represented by brethren Ashcroft and Chamberlin. It is the class which then and since deprecates earnestness, which it styles fanaticism—which would compromise with error on the ground of charity. It became unfashionable (and is markedly so now to describe the churches of the Apostasy in the downright and Scriptural terms employed by Dr. Thomas.

It had the effect, which many of the older brethren perceive, of making the brethren less ready to realise their isolation and separation from the sects and denominations of “Christendom.”

It cannot be too clearly recognised that these bodies are NOT CHRISTIAN—their members are NOT FELLOW CHRISTIANS—and their beliefs, hopes, and professions are almost entirely untrue and contrary to the mind of the Spirit.

The recognition of this fact has weakened very much in recent years, especially among the meetings we know as “Partial Inspirationists,” and the brethren are falling into habits of speech, organization, and method which are of the Apostasy, and not of God. When men professing the Truth are found serving on local bodies, sitting as magistrates, joining Masonic lodges, forming “societies” of various types within the brotherhood, and holding conferences, it is a sorrowful indication that they are ceasing to think and act as strangers and sojourners in the midst of an evil and perverse generation. They are certainly losing the sense of complete isolation and separateness from the “Church” and the world which was experienced in such a high degree forty or fifty years ago. It has weakened the hands of the brethren, and we note in this respect that the Christadelphian no longer bears on its face page the imprint that it is “in opposition to the dogmas of Papal and Protestant Christendom.” The old attitude is one of which the brethren are getting weary. In losing it they lost the old zeal, earnestness, and devotion which characterized them aforetime and of which the pages of the Christadelphian bear ample witness.

Perhaps many will think this a digression and that it is out of place in an account of the Inspiration controversy. It is introduced because it explains the causes of the controversy. Differences of opinion, of conduct and attitude, are in all cases traceable to underlying causes, and the cause of the Inspiration trouble was unquestionably the decay of the old steadfast, whole-hearted, and uncompromising spirit, and the introduction of men who were out of sympathy with that spirit. Most of these were found in the “Ashcroft” side of the question. Their state of mind can be fully gauged when we see the additions they subsequently made to the Hymn Book. It is not possible to imagine Dr. Thomas singing—

“Lead kindly light amid the encircling gloom  
Lead thou me on:

\* \* \* \*

And with the morn those angel faces smile,  
Which I have loved since, and lost awhile.”

The Doctor was too manly, sincere, and religious to indulge in such sentimental falsehoods. It is the language of Ashdod and of Canterbury, but not of Zion. Canterbury is not far from Ashdod on the spiritual map. The children of Zion sing, that they press towards the mark for the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, if by any means they might attain to the resurrection of the dead, which is a vastly different thought and of an infinitely loftier import.

It is perfectly clear—and the lapse of time has demonstrated this—that the Partial Inspiration theory struck at the very foundations of the Truth. The history of the churches of the apostasy since 1885 confirms this. With ever-increasing doubt of the divine authorship of the Bible has come the ever-increasing Scepticism and denials of its authority.

At recent Church Congresses it has been denied that Christ actually rose from the dead—that his miracles were actual—and that he was in the actual sense the Son of God.

It may reasonably be held that a like declension would have followed in the brotherhood had it accepted the Ashcroft theory. The laxity of the Partial Inspirationist meetings on doctrine is notorious—and it is the inevitable result of the principle from which they began, and it is morally certain that they would have moved even further in this direction but for the check put upon them by the attitude of the brethren who rejected the Ashcroft theory.

The present writer was one of a number of London brethren (some ten altogether, of whom most are now asleep) who spent the greater part of the year 1885 in an attempt to reconcile the positions of brethren Roberts and Ashcroft.

They drew up the following definitions: —

1. —That Divine inspiration involves infallibility in what is spoken or written under its influence, so controlling the speaker or writer as to exclude error.
2. —That the recording under Divine inspiration of uninspired utterances does not, unless otherwise indicated, do more than guarantee an accurate record of what was uttered.
3. —That the incorporation under Divine inspiration of human with inspired writings (if such incorporation has taken place) would constitute them of equal authority.
4. —That the existing evidence of the Divine authority of the writings composing the Bible, and the absence of any to the contrary, justifies the conclusion that they have been produced or incorporated under Divine inspiration.
5. —That any errors found in the Bible as we now have it, are not attributable to the original writers, but are either mistakes on the part of copyists or translators, or designed alterations, omissions, or interpolations, but they are unimportant, and do not impair its reliability.
6. —That in view of the length of time which has elapsed since the productions of the autographs, and the extent to which difficulties in existing copies have been removed through modern discovery and research, we are justified in attributing any others to insufficient information.

London, October, 1885.

\* \* \*

These were submitted to brethren Roberts and Ashcroft. They were at once accepted by brother Roberts, and after some discussion rejected by Ashcroft. And yet we are now told by the Editor of the Fraternal Visitor that “there was no inspiration question”!!!

---

## Editorial.

[All communications to the Editor should be addressed to him at 47 Birchington Road, Crouch End, London, N. 8, and should reach him by the 25<sup>th</sup> of the month.]

\* \* \*

## THE OUTLOOK.

We start the new year with an increased circulation and a new title page, and with the help of many brethren whose contributions have so greatly enhanced the value of our magazine. Those brethren who have sent us such quantities of good matter recently must not mind the fact that their contributions do not immediately appear. We try to pick the best out as we go on, and to keep abreast of topical matters, but we generally have enough good material in hand to last for six months. To us this is the most pleasing feature of our work as editor. The year starts with dark clouds for the world at large, looming big with storms and conflicts to come. Surely the time is here when men's hearts fail them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming.

Labour here, Fascisti in Italy, and a similar development in Germany, with Bolshevism in Russia, denote the shaking of the powers of heaven—the political heaven.

## ECCLESIAL NEWS.

We are glad to be able to devote space each month to news from ecclesias. Ecclesias desiring to have such inserted should send to us on or before the 25<sup>th</sup> of each month for insertion in the following month. Our publishing day remains as before—the 15<sup>th</sup>.

## OUR "APPALLING POLITICAL PROGRAMME."

Evidence of the activity of our brethren in Melbourne, Australia, is seen in the fact that the leading Congregationalist minister there, T.E. Ruth, has just seen fit to issue a book entitled, *The Advent Heresy and the Real Coming of Christ*, in which the Truth is frankly and, shall we say, ruthlessly attacked.

Mr. Ruth protests against "Millenarian mutilators of the Bible," "irrational and obscurantist Adventism." Says he, "Every effort to fix dates for the end of the world, for Armageddon, and for the Lord's return, have hopelessly failed." "The constantly occurring Adventist absurdities" are hateful to his clear mind. The "appalling political programme" that we associate with Christ's coming is based "on an entirely discredited interpretation of Scripture." It "takes texts from their contexts, and strips Scripture from its own times to make it apply to other conditions thousands of years later." Millenarianism, says he, is mischievous and dishonest.

Having effectually killed us and our Hope with big hard words, Mr. Ruth asks "intelligent" people to believe that "there is a comprehensive advent that embraces the hopes of the past and the present, and transcends the ardent dreams of all millenarians." Mr. Ruth's "better thing" is quite simple, and is as follows: "The spiritual advent is an eternal thing . . . . It consists of Christ's many millenniums, in many an advent yet to be. His coming is intimately related to all the crises in the lives of all men in all the different climes and ages of the world."

We are glad we have a license to laugh at these foolish purveyors of "spiritual" pap. We still wait the day when "The Lord shall laugh at them. He shall have them in derision"—Psalm 2.

EDITOR.

---

## The Holy Spirit.

### Do believers possess it today?

Amongst the difficulties in the household at the present time is the revival of certain theories which one might have thought were disposed of for ever. The "Clean flesh" idea is an example of this; and now in certain quarters there is the old doctrine of the present possession of the Holy Spirit. It is

strange to find orthodox doctrines propounded by those who were once freed therefrom, and it is well from time to time to re-examine the basis of the truth upon these matters.

We need not deal with the question of what the Spirit is, as presumably all readers will agree that it is the power of God irradiating from Him, as the light emanates from a central source like the sun. "The power of the Highest" is a Scriptural phrase which expresses this very clearly. It is universally diffused, as the Psalmist indicates in Psalm 139, so that it was possible for Paul to say, "In Him we live and move and have our being." Being diffused from God, and being likewise the substratum of all things, it furnishes the explanation of another apostolic statement that "out of Him are all things."

These general principles are necessary to a proper understanding of the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the Holy Spirit. Their full import should be noted. If it be true that all things must be considered as "out of God" by means of His Spirit, and that we live in Him, then in a certain sense all men are partakers of the Spirit of God. Had they no connection with it they would die, for "if He gather unto Himself His Spirit and His breath, all flesh shall perish together"—Job 34: 14-15.

It is evident, therefore, that something beyond this is intended to be conveyed when men speak of possessing the Holy Spirit. The use of the term "Holy" is suggestive. It implies separateness, and indicates some special manifestation of the power of God in a particular way. An examination of the use of the term "Holy Spirit" in the Bible will show very clearly that this way is one associated with the transformation of sinners into saints, and the salvation of those who walk worthily of their calling to saintship. It will not be necessary to deal at any length with these points, yet it is desirable to give a few illustrations of the principle.

The basis of salvation is the sacrifice of Christ. Apart from his life, death, and resurrection, salvation would be out of the question. The production of Jesus was, therefore, a work of the Holy Spirit, for when Mary put her natural question how it should be that she should have a child, the angel replied, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God"—Luke 1: 35.

That Spirit power was with him during his life. It was by the "finger of God" that he wrought the miracles which were to convince those who saw them—and rightly considered what they meant—of his Messiahship. His words were "spirit and life." Finally, after his death, it was the work of God by means of His Spirit that brought again from the dead the Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep.

To bring a knowledge of these things to others it was necessary that the message should be conveyed by men specially chosen for the work. These men were also endowed with power from on high. That power, the Holy Spirit, was to guide them into all truth, and to bring all things to remembrance. It enabled them to perform works like those which had been done by their Master. By this knowledge and power they were enabled to speak "not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power"—1 Corinthians 2: 4. As it was necessary for the message to be handed down to later ages they were, as "holy men of God," moved by the Holy Spirit to record all that was necessary for the instruction of future generations. The same principle has been operative in the past, and the Scriptures are the result, given by inspiration of God, "that the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

A little reflection will show why this was necessary in regard to the apostles and their contemporaries, or such of them as possessed the Holy Spirit. Consider the work before them. In a few words it was to convince Jews and Gentiles that a despised and rejected Jew, who had been condemned as a malefactor by his own race and the Roman officials, who had been ignominiously crucified like any common criminal, had been raised from the dead and was coming back to earth to overthrow the whole existing state of things, and establish himself as the universal monarch of all mankind! To imagine any men setting out on such a career and expecting to succeed in convincing others of the truth of their story, if everything depended upon their own efforts, is impossible. Without

help their mission must have failed. Hence the necessity for the possession of the Holy Spirit by these men, and therefore it was that the Lord confirmed their words by signs following—Mark 16: 20.

It has been pointed out that some who were contemporary with the apostles possessed the Holy Spirit, which they received sometimes from the apostles. On the other hand there were others who did not possess the Holy Spirit. The case of Elymas illustrates this. It is true he was unworthy of having it, yet the very record of his request that he might have such a power indicates that it was quite a usual thing for a believer in Christ to be without the Spirit even in apostolic days when the necessity for its active manifestation was most apparent. There was nothing singular in him being without it, or some notice would have been taken of its absence. In the case of Cornelius there was some open manifestation of the result when the Holy Spirit came upon him and those who were with him, whereas in other cases of conversion recorded in the Scriptures no such comment is made. It was generally a case of believing, repenting, and being baptised, and nothing more was needed save a faithful walk in the Truth.

Bearing in mind, then, the purpose for which the Holy Spirit was given in apostolic times—to guide men into all truth, to bring all things to remembrance, to enable men to speak authoritatively as from God, and to give the demonstration of miracles to the truth of their words—it must be evident that no such necessity exists today. The truth is fully declared in the Scriptures where God has revealed Himself, His purpose, and His commandments to the children of men. Everything that needs to be remembered about the life of Jesus of Nazareth is therein recorded. The Scriptures are the full and authoritative exposition of the mind of God, and they constitute the Word of God. From the time these inspired writings were accepted as the Divine record, miracle became unnecessary to prove that they were divine. Hence the necessity for the immediate work of the Holy Spirit in these matters ceased, and the power was withdrawn.

But some one may say, “Is there no work of God amongst His people today?” Of course there is, just as there always has been from the beginning. God’s providence and His control of human affairs, in the aggregate, and in the individual cases of His children, is as true today as ever it was. “The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them”—Psalm 34: 7. He hears the cry of His children, and He answers their prayer in the way best for them. He opens up the understanding of the diligent student of His Word; He giveth wisdom liberally, and upbraideth not; but all this is very different to the claim of some to possess the Holy Spirit. Those who had it in the past could give demonstration of the fact: none can do so now, and the inference to be drawn therefrom is obvious.

There is a serious danger in the revival of the orthodox claim. Look around orthodoxy and see what the claim to possess the Spirit has done. It has led men to trust to what they sometimes call “the light within;” the thinkings of the flesh are mistaken for the promptings of the Holy Spirit, and some of the most repellent manifestations of modern religionists are given by those who are loudest in claiming to have the Spirit of God. Their alleged possession of the Holy Spirit leads them to treat the Bible lightly, to consider their imaginings as of far more value than the statements of the Spirit Word. It is deplorable to find people who have been delivered from the bonds of orthodox teaching returning to it in some of its most characteristic doctrines.

A little quiet thinking is required on the subject, together with an examination of the Scriptures. A “Thus saith the Lord,” or “Thus saith the Scriptures,” is the only evidence that is worth having, and any theory which is calculated to lead back to the orthodox trust in human feelings instead of the Word of God is to be rejected.

Ealing

W. H. BOULTON.

---

## In the World, but not of it!

### A RECENT GENERAL ELECTION CONVERSATION.

Canvasser—"Well, Mr. Antipas, and whom are you going to vote for?"

Christadelphian—"I am going to vote for no one: I do not vote.

Canvasser—"You do not vote! Whatever do you mean? Surely you do not mean to say that you are not going to avail yourself of what our fathers fought so hard for, and won—the right to elect our own Parliament?"

Christadelphian—"What I mean I have already said; that is, I do not vote. If you ask me, why? my answer is: I believe the Gospel, the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God, and have been immersed into the sin-covering name of Jesus; therefore I am separate from the world—'not of it.' To use the Apostle Paul's words in Colossians 2: 20, 'Dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world;' and you do not canvas votes of dead men, do you?"

Canvasser—"Well, well! I have never heard such a thing in my life before; but surely you are aware of the fact that Paul claimed to be a Roman citizen, and therefore entitled to the privileges of citizenship. You disclaim the privileges by refusing to vote. Was Paul wrong, or are you more righteous than Paul?"

Christadelphian—"The difference between me and the Apostle Paul in this matter is: Paul was being tried for his life: I am not. If I was being tried for my life, say, in a foreign country, I should certainly make known the fact that I was an Englishman; and I do not consider I should be doing wrong by so doing."

Canvasser—"Yet you consider you would be doing wrong by voting in an English Election, though you are an Englishman?"

Christadelphian—"Yes; and because it is written, 'No man that warreth, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please Him who hath chosen him to be a soldier. Also because of the command, 'Touch not, handle not; which all are to perish in the using.'"

Canvasser—"But why avail yourself of the privileges and deny the responsibilities?"

Christadelphian—"Because I am commanded to be subject to the powers that be, up to the point when their commands clash with the commands of God; then it is, to use the words of Peter in Acts 5: 29, 'We ought to obey God rather than man.' I deny the responsibilities only when they clash with God's commands—the privileges likewise."

Canvasser—"But did not Jesus command, 'Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's'? Should not then your vote be given to Caesar one way or another, seeing you live in Caesar's domain?"

Christadelphian—"As I have already pointed out, obedience to God's commands takes precedence; and what is more, I am only a sojourner in Caesar's domain. Like Abraham, I look for 'a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.' 'Foe here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come.' Therefore I am not mindful of the country from whence I have come out (by the waters of baptism), but declare plainly (by declining to vote that I seek a better country—even a heavenly: that is, The Kingdom of God, that will be established upon the earth at the return of Jesus from the far country where he is at the present time, waiting till his foes are made his footstool."

Canvasser—“But what should we do meanwhile, until this kingdom you speak of is established? Must we fold our arms and leave everything alone? What would become of England, say you, if only one party—the Labour Party, for instance—did as you suggest?”

Christadelphian—“The Bible reveals quite plainly that no such thing will take place until Jesus returns; then, not only the Labour Party, but every other Party as well, will have to do just as you suggest—fold their arms, and leave everything alone, so far as governing is concerned. The Government of the whole world, then, will be in the hands of Jesus and his immortalised brethren—those who meanwhile subject themselves to the powers that be, obeying them in everything, unless they command disobedience to God’s commands. Those who meanwhile are patiently waiting the coming of the Lord, confessing like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that they are but strangers and pilgrims on the earth; keeping themselves unspotted from the world; acknowledging the fact of Christ’s words that his ‘kingdom was not of this world,’ ‘not from hence,’ that is, not of this constitution.”

Canvasser—“But is there not in the teaching of the Bible a principle of submission to avoid offence, or, for the sake of peace discernible? Did not Jesus and Peter actually pay tribute money? And did not Jesus upon that occasion tell Peter, ‘Notwithstanding, lest we offend them . . . give unto them for me and thee’? Now, should you not do the same with regard to voting? Should you, as a Christian, shut your eyes to this principle?”

Christadelphian—“The Bible teaches, ‘If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.’ ‘And the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient.’ ‘Suffer yourselves to be defrauded.’ ‘Avenge not yourselves.’ ‘See that none render evil for evil unto any man.’ In each of these quotations the Bible principle of submission is discernible; and in the incident you have referred to, it is illustrated in actual fact—Jesus submitting to an unjust taxation. See, we are distinctly commanded in Romans 13: 7, ‘Render, therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.’ This is what Jesus meant when he said, ‘Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s.’ It is our duty, therefore, to render each of these, to whomsoever they are due; but when it comes to obedience, I say again, emphatically, ‘We ought to obey God rather than man.’ Peace or no peace: obedience to God’s commands must take precedence.”

Canvasser—“But don’t you see, this idea of yours gives the capitalists a free hand to do just what they like—to exploit the working classes, and grind them in the dust; what is more, the Bible denounces in the very strongest of terms these rich men. But your idea is to leave them alone; let them do just what they glory in doing.”

Christadelphian—“The Bible denounces and condemns, it is true, rich men who keep back the hire of the labourers by fraud; who live in pleasure; who nourish their hearts; who condemn and kill the just. They are condemned with the prophetic words, ‘Weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you’—James 5: 1. But the very important and significant part of the denunciation, you do not notice. I refer to the latter portion of the third verse, ‘Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.’ These last days are the days when they are made to weep and howl by the immortal government of King Jesus and his subordinate rulers; the ‘just’ of verse 6—that is, those who meanwhile ‘doth not resist.’ They remember that God hath said, ‘Vengeance is mine, I will repay.’”

Canvasser—“But surely you would give your vote to the Party that wishes to do nothing but good; the Party that in the past has struggled and secured for you many little advantages that you now enjoy. We do not ask you to take a keen and lively interest in politics; just vote for a man who is willing and ready to devote the whole of his time for the betterment of our country and people.”

Christadelphian—“Jesus has distinctly said, ‘My kingdom is not of this world: If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight.’ And with those servants the same argument applies to ‘vote.’ I am truly thankful for the many little advantages I enjoy, as a result of the struggles, as you say, of the Labour Party; and shall avail myself of those advantages, unless they clash with God’s commands. One of them, indeed, is very acceptable at the present time—freedom with regard to voting, I mean. Concerning the betterment of our country and people, I can assure you I believe the Bible, which teaches that things will not be bettered, but gradually grow worse and worse until Jesus returns and rules this world in righteousness.”

Canvasser—“Well, I must say, you are a very strange man with very strange views; and I am thinking what a laugh it will make when it is known that you are a non-voter for religious reasons. Why, man, you are exposing yourself to unnecessary prejudice, and in my opinion, you will deserve the taunts and jeers you will surely get.”

Christadelphian—“Jesus said to his disciples on one occasion, ‘If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.’ Like Moses, I ‘choose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;’ I esteem ‘the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt.’”

Canvasser—“Oh, well; I must be going. I can see I shall avail nothing by further argument. I will talk to you again on this matter, when I have more time. Good morning.”

T. W. WALLACE.

---

## Christadelphian Unbelief.

A book under this title has been circulated among the brethren in the English speaking world, the author being a brother who came into the Truth some forty years ago in Great Bridge, near Westbromwich. A school-master by profession, the brother of whom we speak, Bro. Mosley from the first possessed an over-weening conceit of himself, one to whom the Scriptural expression “righteous over-much” could fittingly apply. He emigrated to British Columbia some years ago, and after the death of his first wife (who was an exceedingly amiable and earnest woman who exercised considerable restraint over her husband—the daughter of Bro. and Sis. Millichamp, and sister in the flesh to sis. Geo. Walford, of Westbromwich) his temperamental proclivities became more pronounced. Among other signs of mental aberration he “advertised” for a wife. A Cardiff sister named Meredith went out to meet him and has been his wife for some years.

This book is the latest sign of his want of mental balance. On the cover it professes to show that Christadelphianism of today is the “latter day Apostasy foretold in the Scriptures” and also to deal with the question of “fellowshipping Christadelphian unbelief.” Surely a schoolmaster should know that you cannot fellowship a negative or in fact any thing. You can have fellowship with a man or men or with God through Jesus Christ, but you cannot have fellowship with a doctrine, though you may with the man who holds it.

Now if our body today is the “last great Apostasy” it ought to have the signs and characteristics of Apostasy as described in 1 Timothy 4, 2 Thessalonians 2, Revelation 17, etc. But it has not these signs as let the recent war testify. Nor is it in favour with the world as that apostasy would necessitate: we are still “everywhere spoken against.”

But brother Mosley, just like the real apostasy pontificates, sets aside every possible objection to his statements by claiming that he possesses the Holy Spirit, and that, therefore, his words are inspired of God.

Further he claims in his preface that the Book of Revelation teaches that after the death of the Apostles, seven messengers would be sent to the Church. The following list of passages is said to “reveal” this: —Revelation 7: 2; 8: 13; 14: 6-13; 18: 1-3; 18: 4-8. We are evidently very “dull of hearing,” as Bro. M. would put it, for we cannot see what he sees. This is the “revelation” to him—the seven messengers were and are:

1. —Revelation 7: 2. AERIUS, 4<sup>th</sup> century.
2. —Revelation 8: 13. VIGILANTHUS, 5<sup>TH</sup> century.
3. —Revelation 14 TYNDALE, 15<sup>th</sup> century.
4. —Revelation 14 JOHN CAMPANUS, 15<sup>th</sup> century.
5. —Revelation 14 MICHAEL SERVETUS, 16<sup>th</sup> century.
6. —Revelation 18: 1 DR. THOMAS, 18<sup>th</sup> century.
7. —Luke 20: 18 and Revelation 18: 4. W. MOSLEY, 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The message bro. Mosley has to proclaim is that of Revelation 18: 4. “Come out of her my people.” We come next to the “Introduction,” for Bro. M’s aberration of mind exhibits the usual phenomena of the unbalanced in over-elaboration. In this we are informed that “the Scriptures plainly teach “the possession and influence of Holy Spirit guidance in all whom God calls.” By this Bro. M. means possession of the Holy Spirit today by himself and possibly others in the same way as the Apostles. We commend our readers’ attention to the article on the Holy Spirit by Bro. Boulton in this number for a well-balanced exposition of the Truth on this matter.

From this point onwards in fifteen rambling chapters the author accuses us of all kinds of sins and heresies. No possible accusation is missing. The brethren with whom Bro. M. has been intimately associated in British Columbia are grossly labelled and we draw careful attention to one thing in particular.

The Unity of the Scripture in its teaching as to doctrine and practise is one sign of the continuity of the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit. If, therefore, the same Inspiration is controlling Bro. M. it is evident that the Spirit has entirely changed its teaching, for it now allows Matthew 18 to be entirely abrogated. Jesus by the Holy Spirit there teaches the necessity of a certain course of procedure where personal accusations are concerned. According to Bro. M. the Holy Spirit now teaches that we can level wholesale accusations of evil doing against us and also specific personal instances without taking the course that Jesus declared was necessary. The Spirit has produced this through its latest voice. “It is ridiculous how Matthew 18 is pushed forward in these apostate ecclesias as much as to say, ‘Here, fulfil that if you dare or else for ever hold your peace.’ They demand that you should fulfil it and at the same time conspire to render it impossible to do so.”

Bro. M. then goes on (pp. 87-88) to show how it is now quite impossible to fulfil Matthew 18. His conclusion is thus: “I tell you that Matthew 18 is impossible of application in any of these modern apostate Christadelphian ecclesias, and therefore is not binding upon you.”

Now we deny altogether that the Holy Spirit would change its teaching in these days even supposing brother Mosley has it—which we also deny. We also emphatically refuse to believe that Jesus would give directions which at any time or under any circumstances could become “impossible of fulfilment.”

What really happened in brother Mosley’s ecclesia was that he entirely failed to substantiate his accusations, and then to gain his purpose fell back on his pontifical position. He was then the seventh angel declaring God’s judgments!

On page 90 brother Mosley says, “Christadelphianism today is Babylon.” But he fails to see that we lack the first necessary characteristic of Babylon, i.e., union with, and responsibility for the political conditions of the world as well as its ecclesiastical thought. Not a brother or sister in this

country used a vote at the last election. This is not Babylon's way. To quote brother Mosley is at once to exhibit his foolishness.

These claimants to the possession of the Holy Spirit are always people who cannot be recognised as little Popes unless they do set up themselves as having greater—i.e., Divine—authority.

---

To be Continued.

---

### Strange Lands.

We wander in strange lands,  
Strange gods around us rise,  
But yonder, o'er the seas,  
Our Tower of Refuge lies.

High altars rise around,  
And thousands boweth there:  
"Oh, give us wealth," they cry,  
"And pleasure for our share."

And Other Sheep unto  
Their Bethels take their way;  
But Truth shall never light their eyes  
Till cometh Zion's Day.

We wander in strange lands,  
Our country far away;  
Oh, soon our eyes shall see the land  
Of God's eternal Day.

JAMES. PATON.

---

### Psalm 23.

The following is an explanation of the twenty-third Psalm, by an unknown Syrian whose home had been among the Syrian shepherds. It was given in America, and takes the form of conversation: —

#### THE SHEPHERD PSALM.

"The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want.  
"He maketh me to lie down by green pastures;  
"He leadeth me beside still waters.  
"He restoreth my soul.  
"He guideth me in the path of righteousness for his name's sake;  
"Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death.  
"I will fear no evil: for thou art with me.  
"Thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.  
"Thou preparedst a table before me in the presence of mine enemies:  
"Thou hast anointed my head with oil: my cup runneth over.  
"Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life:  
"And I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever."

\* \* \*

## THE EXPLANATION.

“It was out of the shepherd life of my country,” he remarked, “that there came long ago that sweetest religious song ever written—the Twenty-third Psalm. You of the Western world often fail to get a correct impression of the words of the Bible or the religious ideas expressed there. This psalm is taken among you as having two parts, the first under the figure of shepherd life; the second turning to the figure of a banquet with the host and guest. Yet it is all a simple shepherd psalm running the round of shepherd life from the first word to the last.

“ ‘The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.’ There is the opening strain of its music; in that chord is sounded the key-note which is never lost till the plaintive melody dies away at the song’s end. All that follows is that thought put in varying light. Each is distinct, and adds something too precious to be merged and lost.

“ ‘He maketh me to lie down in green pastures’—nourishment, rest. ‘He leadeth me beside still waters.’ The scene changes, and so does the meaning. You think here of quietly flowing streams; so you get one more picture of rest; but you miss one of the finest scenes in shepherd life, and one of the rarest blessings of the soul that is led to God. All through the day’s roaming the shepherd keeps one thing in mind. He must lead his flock to a drinking place. The refreshment of good water makes the coveted hour of all the day; the spot where it is found amid the rough, waterless hills and plains is the goal. Then when at last the sheep are led ‘beside the still waters,’ how good it is, after the dust and heat of the sheep-walks. To get the meaning, it is to be remembered that streams are few in the shepherd country of the Bible lands. The shepherds do not rely upon them. Even when streams are found, their beds and banks are usually broken, and their flow rough. Sheep are timid, and fear a current of water, as they may, for they are easily carried down stream because of their wool. The sheep would indeed have a hard time finding water to drink, were it not for the shepherd. There are wells and fountains all through the vast region where the flocks roam, and in some parts there are cisterns, though the sheep like the living water best. The shepherds know where these drinking places are all through the treeless country where streams are few. It is a fine sight to see the shepherds bring their flocks ‘beside the still waters,’ at some well or fountain, while the wide, silent country over which they and many other sheep have wandered, spreads all around them, and the full expanse of sky arched over them.

“The shepherd makes a certain sound; all his sheep lie down and are quiet. Then he fills the drinking troughs. The bubbling of the fountain, or the current, if it be by a stream, is no longer there to trouble the sheep. They can drink now undisturbed. This is the delicate meaning of the word, ‘still.’ As the Hebrew words put it, ‘He leadeth beside the waters of quietness.’

“Then the sheep hear a whistle or call. They never misunderstand; they know their shepherd’s voice, and never respond to the wrong shepherd if several flocks have come up together. And, strangest of all, the sheep come up by groups; the shepherd makes them understand. So in groups he leads them till they stand beside the still waters. And oh, how they drink with the shepherd standing near. It is a beautiful scene, even used by John in Revelations: ‘The Lamb that is in the midst of the throne shall be their shepherd, and shall guide them into fountains of waters.’

“One additional scene: in the mountains of Lebanon often there are no regular drinking places, such as the wells and fountains on the plains. As the shepherd leads his flock over the rough slopes, he finds many a spring and sees its rivulet noisily running down a crevice. His sheep need water. They cannot drink from the leaping little stream. What does he do? He finds a suitable turn or nook in its course: he walls it up with a little dam, and so holds the water till it forms a quiet pool. There on the open hills, he leads the sheep besides the still waters. That mountain-side scene is a fitting picture of the Shepherd’s care of souls that trust him. ‘He restoreth my soul.’ ‘You know,’ he said, ‘that soul means life or one’s self in the Hebrew writings. There are perilous places for the sheep on all sides, and they never seem to learn how to avoid them. The shepherd must ever be on the watch. And their private fields and, sometimes, gardens and vineyards here and there in the shepherd country; if the

sheep stray into them and are caught there, they are forfeited to the owner of the land. So 'he restoreth my soul' means 'the shepherd brings me back and rescues me from fatal and forbidden places, or restores me when wandering.'

“ 'He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.' Often have I roamed through the shepherd country in my youth, and seen how hard it is to choose the right path for the sheep. One leads to a precipice, another to a place where the sheep cannot find the way back; and the shepherd was always going ahead, leading them in the right paths, proud of his good name as a shepherd. Some paths that are right still lead through places that have deadly perils. 'Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil,' is the way the Psalm touches this fact in shepherd life. This way of naming the valley is very true to our country. I remember one near my home called the Valley of Robbers, and another the Ravine of the Raven. 'The valley of the shadow of death' is a name from my country's old custom.

“ 'For thou art with me.' Ah! How could more be put into few words? With the sheep it matters not what the surroundings are, nor how great the perils and hardships; if only the shepherd is with them they are content. There is no finer picture of the way of peace for the troubled in all the world. To show how much the presence of the shepherd counts for the welfare of the sheep, I can think of nothing better than the strange thing I now tell you. It is quite beyond the usual daily care on which the flock depends so fondly. I have seen it more than once. Sometimes, in spite of all the care of the shepherd and his dogs, a wolf will get into the very midst of the sheep. The sheep are wild with fright. They run and leap, and make it impossible to get at the foe in their midst who at that very moment may be fastening his teeth in the throat of a helpless member of the flock. But the shepherd is with them. He knows what to do even at such a time. He leaps to a rock or hillock that he may be seen and heard, and lifts his voice in a long call, something like a wolf's cry. On hearing this, the sheep remember the shepherd; they heed his voice; and strange to tell, the poor timid creatures which were helpless with terror before, instantly rush with all their strength into a solid mass. The pressure is irresistible! The wolf is overcome; frequently he is crushed to death, while the shepherd stands on the rock crying his long call. 'I will fear no evil, for thou art with me.' Yes, in all things they are more than conquerors through him that loved them.

“ 'Thy rod and thy staff.' This also is true to life. The double expression covers the whole round of protecting care. For the shepherd carries a crook for guiding the sheep, and a weapon suitable for defending them—the rod and the staff; one for aiding them in places of need along peaceful ways, the other for defence in perils of robbers and wild beasts. This saying describes with the ease of mastery how much those words mean: 'Thou art with me.'

“ 'They comfort me.' You should see the sheep cuddle near the shepherd to understand that word—'they comfort me.' The shepherd's call, and the answering patter of feet as the sheep hurry to him are fit sounds to be chosen out of the noisy world to show what comfort God gives to souls that heed his voice.

#### A DIFFERING INTERPRETATION.

“In Western lands you, here, drop the shepherd figure and put in a banquet, and so lose the fine climax of completeness in the shepherd's care. 'Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies.' The word for 'table' here means simply something spread out, and so is a prepared meal, however it is set forth. There is no higher task for the shepherd in my country than to go from time to time to study places and examine the grass, and find a good and safe feeding place for his sheep. All his skill and often great heroism are called for. There are many poisonous plants in the grass, and the shepherd must find out and avoid them. The sheep will not eat certain poisonous things, but there are some which they will eat—one kind of grass in particular. A cousin of mine once lost three hundred sheep by a mistake in this hard task.

“Then there are snake holes in some kinds of ground, and if they are not driven away, the snakes bite the noses of the sheep. The shepherds sometimes burn the fat of hogs along the ground to do this. Sometimes the shepherd finds ground where moles have worked their holes with their heads sticking up, ready to bite the grazing sheep. The shepherds know how to drive them away as they go ahead of the sheep.

“And around the feeding ground which the shepherd thus prepares, in holes and caves in the hillside there are jackals, wolves, hyenas, and panthers, and the bravery and skill of the shepherd are at their highest point in closing up these dens with stones or slaying the wild beasts with his long-bladed knife. Of nothing do you hear shepherds talking more than of their achievements in this part of the care of their flocks. We thus see the figure better: ‘Thou preparest a table (or spread out) before me in the presence of mine enemies.’ God’s care of man out in the world is a grander thought than that of seating him at an indoor banquet.

#### “THE OIL AND THE CUP.”

“What about anointing the head with oil and the cup running over? Oh, there begins the beautiful picture at the end of the day. The Psalm has sung the whole round of the day’s wandering, all the needs of the sheep; all the care of the shepherd. The Psalm closes with the last scene of the day. At the door of the sheepfold the shepherd stands and the rodding of the sheep takes place. The shepherd stands, turning his body to let the sheep pass; he is the door, as Christ said of himself. With his rod he holds back the sheep while he inspects them one by one as they pass into the fold. He has the horn filled with olive oil, and he has cedar-tar, and he anoints a knee bruised on the rocks or a side scratched by thorns. And here comes one that is not bruised but is simply worn and exhausted: he bathes its face with the refreshing olive oil and he takes the large two-handled cup and dips it full from the vessel of water provided for that purpose and lets the weary sheep drink. There is nothing finer in the Psalm than this. God’s care is not for the wounded only, but for the worn and weary also. The day is done and the sheep are snug within the fold. Then comes the thought of deepest repose and comfort: ‘Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life,’ as they have through all the wanderings of the day now ended. The song dies away as the heart that God has watched and tended breathes this grateful vow before the roaming of the day is forgotten in sleep. Then comes the decision, a settled purpose, a holy vow, ‘I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.’

“No animal mentioned in Scripture compares in symbolical interest and importance with the sheep. It is alluded to about 500 times.”—Selected.

---

### The Word of God.

Love the Word of God—Psalm 119: 140.

Search the Word of God—John 5: 39.

Understand the Word of God—Luke 24: 44-45.

Meditate on the Word of God—Psalm 1: 2.

Live up to the Word of God—Joshua 1: 8.

---

### Rare Seeds capable of Growth.

It is not likely that the ears will fall off, although they are sometimes shaken with impossible and unreliable news.

As blood is said to be thicker than water, so also the love of the Truth is stronger than the commandments of men.

To cultivate the commandments of men, unsupported by the Word of God, is like having a pair of mules—there is no hope of offspring.

“Behold, I and the children which God hath given me:” they came not from those families that so often say with a smile, “we cannot afford to have any children.”

The murmuring parents, without faith in God, were left to die in the wilderness. But God cared for their children and gave them the land He had promised.

We provide ourselves with seeds for planting, and with seeds for transplanting; but in both cases we must keep the weeds down for the better plants to shoot up. Weeds and lusts must not come first; but in the nature of God’s better creation we must place our prospering trust.

The cultivated and inbred seed of inclination for God’s way, is the better and nobler pedigree stock, fostered and nursed by the children of light: it will become the real salt in the earth that will not lose its savour or its light.

The seeds you may from time to time sow in the heart of a child may appear to lay dormant for a time; but with tact and in a fitting time it will become pregnant with the love of God; and then it is beautiful to behold, and a sweet perfume.

Children plant, and continually meddle with the plants, and nothing comes forth of any value. When we become real men we leave off childish things. —

LUDVIG J. JOHNSEN, Durban, Natal, South Africa.

---

## Correspondence.

Correspondence for insertion in the current month must reach the Editor by the 25<sup>th</sup> of the month. Please write distinctly, and on one side of the paper only. Each letter must not exceed 200 words, or it will be liable to curtailment.

\* \* \*

## Constitutions.

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney—Greeting. Of late I have been deeply impressed by your attitude and that of others expressed in the Mutual and elsewhere.

I am not hasty to rush into print in controversy, but duty impels me to move in the interest of those of tender years in the Truth who are liable to be swayed by the bold statements in the Mutual.

You draw a false distinction between “Rules” and “Scriptural grounds.” What are man-made rules, and why are they framed? I maintain that every rule of an Ecclesia is morally binding on each of its members. A presiding brother is morally bound to conduct a Sunday morning meeting in the order prescribed by the Ecclesia’s rules. What would happen if he persisted in varying the order because he prefers another? He may not at that stage be the subject of withdrawal. He would certainly be removed from the presiding list; and yet he could press his preference to such an extreme as to manifest an entire lack of the spirit enjoined by the Scriptures, and occasion such disorder and contention as to form a barrier to the work of his Ecclesia, namely, that of edifying its members and enlightening the stranger! To say that such persistence could not be carried to the point at which it would be the Ecclesia’s duty to withdraw from him is utter folly—though he may be doctrinally sound and morally

guiltless, as some interpret doctrines and morals. But as to when that point has been reached MUST be determined solely by the Ecclesia in question.

DOCTRINE. What do you and others mean by “doctrine”? From the use you and they make of this word it appears to be restricted to the THEORY of the first principle tenets forming the One Faith which gives us hope of Eternal Life; whereas a glance at its use in both Old and New Testaments will furnish a much wider definition as expressed in the word “teaching,” and embraced in those precepts so prominent in the “teaching” of Christ and his apostles; and which are the real fundamentals in the Christian life. The theory of the tenets upon which those real fundamentals are built, is but a foundation for the validity of that sincere character which embodies the PRECEPTS of the doctrine of Christ. If there is any difference in the value of the theory and the precept, the latter outweighs the former, and yet both are essential!

Nay, brother! By your statement you undermine the real value of rules, which are for the “guidance” in the sense of government of an Ecclesia, the object being to maintain an even balance of that unity in walk as well as in theory which Christ emphasised he so desired to see in his disciples. You, as well as I, probably know brethren and sisters who have so imbibed the SPIRIT of Christ’s doctrine that to them rules are unnecessary because their minds have been so transformed and renewed that they could mutually agree step by step in their labours in the Master’s service. Rules, like laws, are made for the other class. You seem to allow that a rule may be set aside at will by individuals! Certainly rules can be “scrapped” and others adopted, but the binding nature always attaches to rules actually existing, though liable to revision by MUTUAL consent. Rules are an expression of an Ecclesia’s conception of the demands of Christ’s teaching in the many phases of ecclesial life which are not specifically named in the Scriptures, and in this way they become to an Ecclesia—NOT AN ADDITION (as you and bro. Lake imply), but—an EXPRESSION OF Christ’s doctrine, or his WILL! Thus, the purpose and value of rules are seen in their proper application, namely, to prevent that disaster which might develop if every man were at liberty to do “that which was right in his own eyes.” To accomplish this the voice of the majority must be respected, not only by a disappointed minority, but by all ecclesias who are striving together for the faith of the gospel. —Sincerely yours in the Lord,

A. MILLIER (Bristol).

[We publish brother Millier’s letter with much pleasure as a really good contribution to this discussion. We cannot find any point of disagreement of any consequence. Brother Millier agrees with us that withdrawal should not be carried out in the case where the brother could not approve of a certain rule. And we agree with him where he says that disorderly conduct and the creation of wicked contention would be causes that might necessitate ecclesial withdrawal. We do not say that rules “may be set aside at will.” What we do say is that they very often are.

Now if a brother sees (as we see in the Birmingham Constitution) something that is not “an expression of Christ’s doctrine or his will,” we are sure brother Millier would respect that brother’s conscience, and not withdraw from him because of his lack of agreement. No “majority” would be able to alter that brother’s view if it failed to prove its own position to be Scriptural to him. It would not be enough to say “it is our will.”—EDITOR.]

---

Brother F. G. Jannaway and “Maranatha Press.”

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney—For a year or more there has been such a persistent report that I am financially interested with the “Maranatha Press” that even some of my very old co-workers have thought there must be something in it. In nearly every instance I have traced the report to Birmingham; and, only this week, I am told it is “common knowledge” at the Temperance Hall, that such is the case.

May I crave a little space in your next issue to say that I have not, and never did have, the slightest connection with the "Maranatha," or any other Printing Press; and that concerning the reprint of Eureka, at about half Birmingham price, I knew absolutely nothing until I received the printed prospectus!

The most amazing thing, however, to the brethren who get to know the facts, is, that although I have twice written brother C.C. Walker, he will not enlighten his readers; he has never told me why; maybe because, although I have no connection with the "Maranatha Press," I do feel interested in the firm that offers to halve the cost of Christadelphian works. Although that is so, however, I do not need any assurance that brother C.C. Walker is "neither a fool or an extortioner" (to use his own words); but there must be "something wrong somewhere" from him to need a subsidy from the brotherhood of hundreds of pounds to produce Christendom Astray at 1/6, when a London firm offered to produce the same thing at One Shilling, without any subsidy; and, also, to reprint Eureka to sell at 15/- the three volumes!

As to the necessities of Dr. Thomas' daughter; that cannot be raised as a plea, in view of offers to brother Walker from brethren north and south.

Sincerely yours in every good work,

FRANK G. JANNAWAY.

P.S.—Upon again reading the foregoing, am wondering whether I may not be charged by the same gossipers with being connected financially with the Berean Magazine.

---

### Ecclesial News.

Liverpool. —We paid a visit to Liverpool during last month and were very glad to see the progress being made by the Ecclesia there. For many years quiet and painstaking work has been carried on at the Hardman Hall in Hardman Street. A recent opportunity occurred, however, to rent a more suitable and possibly better situated premises in Hope Street. A move was therefore made which appears to be for good. Advertising facilities are improved, and the premises are very commodious and inviting. The Liverpool meeting has always commended itself by its quiet calm endeavour to set forth the Truth and to maintain its purity, and it is one of the oldest meetings in the country. With God's blessing it is possible that the removal is to contribute to still more excellent work in these closing days of Gentile times.

Chester. —We were at Chester the other day and were very cheered with the continued good work being done there. Although a cathedral city a very vigorous ecclesia has been built up there during recent years. Its work does not seem to be finished, for there were twenty-four interested friends in attendance at the evening meeting. We talk of our shortcomings as a body possibly too much. The faithful work of hard-working brethren loyal to the Lord in all things, cheers us in such meetings as this one.