

Price 4d

February, 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. 92. — Rest. The Mosaic Law	33
Echoes of Past Controversies— No. 4—The Inspiration Controversy .....	37
Editorial ... ..	41
Our Calling. Philippians 3: 13-14 .....	44
Put the Ecclesia first.....	47
H. G. Wells on “Progressive” Christianity ...	47
Prayer .....	48
“Ecclesial Relationships” .....	52
Books Received.....	54
Correspondence .....	56
Ecclesial News . . . .	64

---

# 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. 2                      FEBRUARY 15<sup>th</sup> 1923                      FOURPENCE.

## The Bible wholly inspired and infallible.

### No 92. —Rest. The Mosaic Law.

The Law of Moses, by our Lord Jesus himself, as recorded in many instances, was recognised as the Divine handiwork. No question exists among the Jews themselves as to this. The Higher Critics, however, and present-day religious leaders in general, attribute the Mosaic Law to an entirely human agency. In order to reinforce their contentions, they from time to time pour scorn upon its enactments and speak of its provisions being outlived.

The Medical Scientists of today also make great claims to recognition as benefactors to the human race, and boldly declare that remedies for disease were never in the world's history so numerous, so powerful, and so beneficial as now. Inoculation or vaccination is one of their greatest triumphs in this direction.

Now we contend that many present-day diseases are the direct result of the conditions of modern civilisation, and that most of our ill-health of today arises from artificial conditions and lack of observance of God's own laws as set forth in Nature and in His Revelation. No people are so tenacious of their old way—the Mosaic way—as the Jews, and although as a race they look with great contempt upon Gentile health ideas, and neglect the supposed boons of modern research, yet they remain the healthiest of all people. Further, we may urge that the Mosaic laws are so far different from the ideas of all other nations that it is quite impossible to attribute them to the same source.

Let us see now how observance of the Law given by God works out even now when such observance is not nearly so complete as in the days when it was carried out in the land of Canaan.

The history of the Great Plague of London in the 17<sup>th</sup> century reveals how this terrible epidemic of black death swept over the Continent and over London, finding its greatest number of victims in the great city on the Thames. Yet all historians agree that the Jews escaped the Plague.

Present-day statistics regarding cancer, consumption and other chronic forms of disease establish the fact that Jews are practically immune.

In a lecture in 1909 to the Leeds Sanitary Committee Mr. Raskin drew attention to Jewish health, but the editor of a Jewish magazine, commenting upon the lecture, said: —

“The lecturer omitted dealing with what we believe to be the chief phases of the Mosaic Sanitary Code, viz., the Rest Laws. Especially the one day in seven rest, and the sexual rest regulations, also fasting. These, to our mind, are greater health preservers than any outward sanitary observances, because the impurities in the body which predispose to disease can only be effectively eliminated by the Vital Force in the blood, (The life of the flesh is in the blood. —Leviticus 17: 11), while the tissues are relaxed by rest. Alas! we are living in a materialistic age, when the most vital parts of the Divine Laws are considered of little account, and other parts, washings, and outward observances, are unduly magnified, when recreation is considered equivalent to rest, although there is no gainsaying the fact that cycling, golf, and football are work, although a pleasant change from the ordinary occupation. Such exercises contract the tissues—hence change of work is not rest. It may be said of those who would change the day from a day of rest to a day of recreation or physical culture that it would be a robbery of the people’s rest day, because the necessary relaxation required by the body for cleansing and recuperation would not be secured. With food and rest according to the prescriptions of the Divine Law, we believe the ordinary week’s occupation would be performed with pleasure, which, under ordinary circumstances, is not always so. And, again we say, this applies particularly to the rest regulations of females—the future mothers of the race.”

A little later, Dr. W.H. Webb wrote in the Liverpool Courier: —

“In view of the increasing tendency of all schools of medicine to place reliance upon serum methods for the prevention of disease, the following illustrate the striking results which have followed the application of sanitive preventive methods as practised by the Jews.

#### JEW AS SPECIMENS OF SOBRIETY.

“Although Newcastle, according to Bishop Straton, possesses 5,000 Jews, there is no record of a Jew having been before the city’s magistrate for intoxication or for neglecting children, and there has never been one of them in the Workhouse.

#### ROBUST JEWISH CHILDREN.

“An interesting comparison is afforded by the Pleasant Street Council School, where about 60 percent of the scholars are Jewish, while amongst the infants the proportion of Jews is larger. The neighbourhood is a poor one. The inspection of 110 children showed a marked contrast between the condition of the Jewish and that of other scholars. Almost without exception the Jews were fat, well-nourished, and carefully clothed, often over-clothed, whilst the other children were below the average all round. In the upper department the heights and weights of Jewish children were considerably above those of the others.”

We next quote the Daily Dispatch: —

#### JEWISH TENACITY FOR LIFE NON-SUICIDAL.

“Taking the available statistics, the proportion of suicides per million of the population is as follows: —Jews, per million, 25 to 30; Greek Church, 40; Roman Catholic countries, 58; Protestant countries, 190. ‘The records of the Old Testament only disclose four—Samson, Saul and his armour-bearer, and Ahithophel.’ ”

Hear this official testimony: —

#### JEWES ESCAPE “SMALLPOX OR ANY OTHER INFECTIOUS DISEASES.”

“Extracts from Blue Book on Alien Immigration Inquiry by the late Government: —

“Question 17,317-8. London. —‘In the borough of Stepney there were 1,281 cases of smallpox. Of that number 1,155 were Christians, and 126 Jews. Exactly the same experience in the smaller epidemic which took place in Whitechapel in 1895: out of 75 notifications of smallpox there were only seven cases apparently Jewish.’ This is in Jewish quarters, and in a Stepney paper it was reported at the time of the 1902 outbreak that as many as 12 to 15 Jews were living, eating, sleeping, and working in one room.

“Question 20,372. Leeds. —‘There has never been to my recollection one single case of smallpox or any other infectious disease amongst the Jewish inhabitants.’

“Question 21,974. Dr. Niven, Manchester. —‘Last autumn we had an outbreak of smallpox, and that also has practically spared the Jewish population. I think there was one Jew who was living in a common lodging-house who contracted the disease.’

“Question 21,972. Dr. Niven, Manchester. —‘We had an outbreak of typhus fever in the district adjoining the Jewish population in 1900. We had about 50 cases in all, and the Jewish district was entirely spared. There was no case of typhus amongst the Jewish population, and it is the same as regards smallpox.’ ”

The ground covered in the above extracts is surely sufficient to convince any reasonable mind that the Mosaic Law is still supreme in its regulation of human life. But the question, How is this supremacy accounted for? can only be answered in Christ’s way, and he gave first place to the Old Testament as being God’s Word.

EDITOR.

To be Continued.

---

## Echoes of Past Controversies.

2<sup>nd</sup> SERIES.

### No. 4—The Inspiration Controversy.

Brother Ashcroft’s refusal to accept, either in form or in principle, the definition of Inspiration as submitted to him and brother Roberts in 1885 (and as quoted in the Berean for January), led in a few months to division in North and South London.

In both meetings propositions were made to affirm the brethren’s belief in the complete Inspiration of the Bible, and in both there was a large element which declined to make this affirmation. At the meeting in North London an attack was made upon the truth of 2 Thessalonians 2.

Earlier in the same year division had occurred at Birmingham, but in somewhat different circumstances. In that meeting were a number of brethren who sympathised with and supported Ashcroft.

At a meeting held in February, 1885, the following resolution had been adopted: —

“That this Ecclesia believes that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, translations of which exist in all languages, were originally produced, in all parts of them, by inspiration of God, in this sense, namely, that the Holy Spirit moved and guided the writers, either to use its own words conveying information of which they had no knowledge, or to record their own knowledge in words which it superintended; or to adopt and incorporate, from outside sources, whatever it might approve or require to be recorded for its own purposes—the writers in no cases being left to their own unaided efforts, and the result being that their writing was free from error; and further, that this Ecclesia will hereafter refuse to

fellowship all who maintain that inspiration was limited to the writing of certain parts only, and that the other parts were the work of a merely human authorship liable to err, but will take no action of withdrawal from any member of the ecclesia, until accusation is made against him in the Scriptural form, and he has been heard in his own defence”—Christadelphian, 1885, pp. 125-126; Fraternal Visitor, 1900, p. 328.

Now the simple and obvious meaning of the resolution was: —

1. —That the Original Scriptures were wholly inspired and without error.
2. —That only those who could agree to this view should be fellowshipped. That those who denied it, either by affirming that parts of the Scriptures were not inspired, or that they were inspired in such a way that errors were not prevented, should be excluded.
3. —That withdrawal from anyone should not take place till the Scriptural requirements had been observed.

In the face of this resolution, a number of brethren in the Birmingham meeting were associating with and supporting brethren Ashcroft and Chamberlin, and were circulating pamphlets attacking the doctrine as defined in the resolution.

A case requiring the application of the withdrawal feature of the resolution had proved abortive.

Under these circumstances the resolution in the minute book had failed, and something had to be done.

Brother Roberts, having decided that if the Truth were to be preserved, drastic steps were imperatively called for, wrote to all in the ecclesia, explaining how affairs stood, enclosing a postcard, to be initialed and returned, if approved. The card ran: —

“Brother Ashcroft having publicly promulgated, and brother Chamberlain having publicly endorsed, a doctrine to the effect that the Bible is only partly inspired, and that there is in it an element of merely human composition liable to err, I recognise the necessity of standing aside from all who refuse to repudiate the doctrine, and I will cooperate in any measures that may be adopted to enable us in Birmingham to do so in a peaceful manner”—Christadelphian, 1885, p. 302.

In taking this course, Brother Roberts and those with him said: —

“We do not propose to accuse anyone. We propose to rally to the right doctrine, and then step aside from all those who refuse to repudiate the error and those who teach it.”

“We recognise a state of things existing in our community which no form of individual process can deliver us from.”

An unlooked for number responded favourably to this appeal—about 330. By arrangement these met on June 12<sup>th</sup>, and being by far the larger part of the ecclesia decided then and there to dissolve the ecclesia, and to form themselves into a new ecclesia on the basis of a wholly inspired and infallible Bible, also to retain possession of the Temperance Hall (the lease of which was vested in Brother Roberts). It was further resolved to send a letter to the minority apprising them of these facts, and offering to find them a meeting place, and to give them an equitable share of all funds and goods.

These proceedings created amazement and indignation among the minority. They said the action was not only high-handed and illegal but iniquitous. The opinion was shared by many in other

places. All this was anticipated. Adverse criticisms were answered by Brother Roberts. He said that what had been done was to extricate right-minded brethren and sisters from a “spiritual morass” into which their affairs had sunk—that the action was merely throwing aside a human arrangement when it no longer answered the Divine ends for which it was intended. To quote his own words: —

“Our paper constitution was powerless against the organized perfidy of two regularly published papers, with a phalanx of secret sympathizers.”

Certain ones—from that time to this—have sought to make much capital out of this post card incident. The document has become a classic. If those who so use it were compelled to state all that was on the post card it is doubtful if it would ever be mentioned by them. A great principle was at stake, and the post card was employed in means that were taken to uphold that principle. If this part of the means taken was regarded as weak, or mistaken, or even wrong, the principle remained the same—any view taken of the post card could not change the principle. Wise men would not cherish a grudge over what they might consider an offence, when it was committed under such circumstances, and in honesty and good faith.

In connection with this matter it is pleasant to note that Brother Roberts constantly said: Take the right attitude towards the false doctrine, and I will be prepared to lie under the censure of those who disagree with the method adopted”—Christadelphian, 1885, p. 523; 1890, p. 274. Also to know that Brother Sulley, upon a review of all that had transpired, could say;

“I have been unable to put my finger upon an act which I could positively say was contrary to the commands of Christ”—Christadelphian, 1886, p. 463.

The result of Brother Roberts’ action was to cause division and this led to the formation of the meeting, now designated “Suffolk St.” meeting.

This meeting consisted of those who sympathised with the views set forward by brethren Ashcroft and Chamberlin or who were prepared to associate with them.

The magazine called the Fraternal Visitor was started to carry on the policy of Ashcroft’s paper, The Truth. This had come to an end owing to an attack upon Dr. Thomas in teaching upon resurrection which appeared in its pages.

That the Fraternal Visitor was a continuation of the Ashcroft magazines is clear from the editorial in its opening number which said: —

“Under most regrettable circumstances brother Ashcroft has felt compelled to relinquish the publication of his paper, The Truth, which, including the Exegist, has run into ten numbers. Two further numbers are, therefore due to the original subscribers. For reasons indicated in the prospectus of the Fraternal Visitor, it has not been thought desirable to take up the magazine just where it was left. In order, however, that faith may be kept with the subscribers, the first three numbers of the Fraternal Visitor will be sent to them free of charge.”

It is demonstrated, then, that the brethren that separated from us in 1885 were the active sympathizers with and supporters of those who attacked the inspiration of the Scriptures. Their magazine, the Fraternal Visitor was established to continue the work of brethren Ashcroft, Chamberlin and others.

Moreover that magazine continued for many years to publish criticisms and objections to the attitude of those who believed in the Bible’s complete inspiration, and to associate with men who took not only that attitude, but who desired other principles than the truth.

This will be subsequently shown. —G. F. LAKE, N. London.

To be Continued.

## 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 LUXOR DISCOVERIES.

Great interest has been aroused by the great discoveries made by Lord Carnarvon and Mr. W.H. Carter in the tombs of the kings of Egypt recently. The tomb of Tutankhamen has been discovered and opened, and large quantities of furniture, statuary, etc., recovered to view. Professor Flinders Petrie has been giving several lectures on the discoveries at the University of London, and at Kingsway Hall, Holborn.

Some theorists, as for instance, Mr. A. Weigall, in the Daily Mail are engaged in an endeavour to demonstrate that the Pharaoh whose funeral chamber has just been opened was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. We quote him thus: —

“I contend, then, that just as Manetho’s story, which has been thought to be nonsense, is actually a very fairly correct account of the great Aton heresy, so also he is probably correct in saying that Moses lived through this wonderful period of Egyptian history and had something to do with the monotheistic movement which revealed God for the first time in human history as the loving Father of all mankind. The Pharaoh of the Oppression, who “knew not Joseph,” was thus this very Tutankhamen, whose tomb, after a lapse of more than 3,000 years, has been found; and Ay or Horemheb was the Pharaoh whose host was drowned in the Red Sea. (He himself was not drowned as the hymn of Moses given in Exodus 15 plainly tells).

### SEALED DOCUMENTS.

“In the tomb of Tutankhamen several sealed documents have been found, and are soon to be examined and read by the great English Egyptologist, Dr. Alan Gardiner. Are we on the eve of a real discovery which will throw light on this fascinating problem? Will they contain evidence which will prove Manetho’s long-ignored statement to be more or less correct, as I believe it to be?

“At any rate, all the known evidence is set out in the above lines, and the reader will therefore be able to judge for himself as to the probability of my contention that the dead Pharaoh who lies, as we suppose, behind that sealed door in the recently-discovered tomb, and into whose face we shall probably gaze in a few days’ time, is the Pharaoh of the Oppression whose death is recorded in the first chapter of the Book of Exodus.”

We do not agree with Mr. Weigall. As far as our knowledge of the matter is concerned we date Tutankhamen at a time contemporary with Samson, one of Israel’s judges. We hope some day to make time to give a summary of the data available from the Bible dates and from recent discoveries. We think we can prove that the Bible dates are strictly accurate, and that all the recently accumulated knowledge of ancient Egyptian history falls into line with the Divine record.

\* \* \*

### BIRMINGHAM “CANKER.”

North London Ecclesia, having asked the cooperation of the ecclesias generally in making representations to the two Birmingham meetings to come together in peace, the Temperance Hall ecclesia have just issued a letter cutting across the suggested communication of the North London brethren. The two things radically wrong with this Temperance Hall circular are: (1) That it answers a

matter before it has been heard; and (2) That it is issued by the Arranging Brethren without consulting the Ecclesia in any way. It illustrates the point raised in One Master of an autocracy in the management at the Temperance Hall. The Ecclesia itself ought to be responsible for any such document as the one issued in its name.

The one thing right with it is that it sets forth the determination of the Birmingham Arranging Brethren to “remove the canker.” We hope they will succeed speedily in doing so, so that we may find the confidence in their ability to “arrange” or “manage” which we desire to have, but for some years now have not been able to feel.

\* \* \*

From the Westminster Gazette we quote: —

#### THE FOUR HORSEMEN.

#### FEARS OF FAMINE AND REVOLUTION.

The situation in the Rhur is causing increasing anxiety in political and financial circles in London. The interruption to business with Germany and Central Europe which is being caused by the wild fluctuations of the exchange is a serious consideration, but more serious still are the political results which are likely to follow.

The four horsemen of the Apocalypse, as a diplomatist remarked yesterday, are riding across Europe once more.

In a short time Germany will be faced with the necessity of importing large quantities of food, and if the French keep the stranglehold on her coal and industry she will be unable to do this. The most appalling results may follow, not in Germany alone, but in Central Europe and the Balkans, if the fires of revolution are started.

The British Government is still a spectator, but the opinion goes that it will be bound to intervene as matters go from bad to worse.

If necessary, the summoning of Parliament will be hastened.

\* \* \*

How Elpis Israel is being proved true today in relation to Mid-Europe.

\* \* \*

#### UNEMPLOYMENT.

We specially sympathise with those of our brethren around the country who are unemployed or on short time. We feel certain that as far as lies in our power we will help one another to tide over the evil days. Now we will send the Berean Magazine gratis and post free to any such brother on receipt of postcard from him and continue doing so till he is again fully employed. —EDITOR.

---

### Our Calling. Philippians 3: 13-14.

Our calling in Christ Jesus is a high one inasmuch as we have been called to be sons of God. Let us follow up this thought and realise also that the prize of our calling is a great one. In proportion to the extent we recognise and appreciate the value of the things to which we are called, so in like manner shall we exert ourselves to obtain the prize of our high calling. We see how the Apostle Paul valued them in the words which form the theme of our topic, “Reaching forth unto these things which are before I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.” He counted those things loss which were at one time gain to him, and gladly suffered the loss of all temporal

things that he might win Christ. Just a side-question for ourselves, Do we make great sacrifices in order to win Christ? Do we make small ones even? And do we make them gladly, even joyfully?

And yet the Apostle, although he had given up all the things of this life which are often considered so essential, admitted that he had not then arrived at the perfect standard in Christ Jesus, but still needed to press on, to strain every nerve as it were, to reach after the prize. He likened the struggle to a race, with the mark to be aimed at—"Perfection." We must struggle to reach the same point, "Be ye followers of me even as I am of Christ," said Paul. We know that the standard is an idealistic one, but without ideals nothing great can be accomplished. It is impossible for our ideal in spiritual things to be too high—the higher we aim the higher we shall reach—but if we are content to place our confidence in the arm of flesh and aim low, in the end we shall not nearly approximate to the standard set up for us in Jesus. It is the height of folly to ignore the fact that this is the standard by which we shall be judged—not as to whether we are better or worse than brother so-and-so, but according to the amount of pressing we do to attain to Perfection of Character, i.e., to the mind of Christ. But we may very often say despondently, "It's hopeless in my case I know. I can never approach anywhere near to such a standard," and we begin to be discouraged and depressed at our failings, feeling the Race to be a difficult one. It is a difficult one, and it calls for the quality of endurance. But endurance is largely a quality which can be developed. As an athlete goes through many and varied forms of exercise to obtain a perfectly developed body, plans his diet and habits with a view to retaining physical fitness, so it must be with things spiritual. Endurance in the race towards perfection of character can be cultivated with due attention to the nourishment provided and the exercise prescribed by God's Word. Physical fitness, which denotes endurance, is the secret to an athlete's success. Let us apply the hint to ourselves and see to it that we are doing all that lies in our power to develop the quality of endurance in spiritual things. The Apostle gives us valuable advice in writing to the Romans. After appealing to the believers to present themselves living sacrifices to God, thus proving what is His good, acceptable, and perfect will, adds in verse 11 of the 12<sup>th</sup> chapter, "Not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord. Rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation, continuing instant in prayer." What incentives to endurance! Rejoicing, patience, constant prayer—just think of them.

Rejoicing—yes, our hope calls for rejoicing, though, perhaps, at times we may be in heaviness through manifold temptations, yet if we are pressing towards the mark, hope will shine brightly through the clouds and dispel them with the thoughts of real comfort. When we come to think of it, the Truth is the only real ground for rejoicing. If it is a course of depression to us the fault is on our side, not upon the side of the Truth. And if it is our sin that is depressing us, in the goodness of God we have the opportunity to remove the cause, for do we not read, "If we confess and forsake our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness"? What solid ground for rejoicing then, and, hand in hand with the fact that all things work together for good to those who love God and who are the called according to His purpose, how uplifted we should feel in a contemplation of the Truth in so far as it affects ourselves.

And prayer—what an aid to endurance is prayer. We shall fail at times and shall probably be burdened with an over-powering sense of our own unworthiness, and we know that if approval depended upon our own righteousness we should be without hope indeed. But like the Apostle, we seek to be found in Christ, not having our own righteousness but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith. Our hope is that we may so avail ourselves of Jesus' mediatorial office, that we may be presented faultless before the presence of God's glory with exceeding joy. God is faithful and it is for us to see that we do our part. Our part is to keep our eyes steadfastly on the mark and by a patient continuance in well-doing press towards it. We sometimes sing, "Shall we of the way be weary when we see the Master's face?" If we could only keep that question in mind when apt to be a little faint-hearted or discouraged we should get comfort. Perhaps we do not always sufficiently realise the importance of the prize which is to reward faithful service. The Apostle Paul pointed out to the Corinthian brethren that those who participated in the races kept themselves temperate in all things and their reward was but a corruptible crown. How much more should we do everything that is conducive of success in the race for an incorruptible crown! What is

the greatest success, the greatest wealth, the greatest ambition in this life in comparison with such a crown?

What seems incomprehensible is that we sinful, erring creatures as we are, should actually be called to such an honour, to associate with Jesus and to be made equal unto the angels to die no more! What seems unfathomable is the love that God has extended to his creatures, weak and sinful though they may be, in giving His own Son to die, the just for the unjust, as a basis upon which forgiveness is held out to the sons and daughters of Adam and by which complete harmony will be finally restored between the Great Creator and His creatures. Think of that time when the tabernacle of God will be with men, when He will dwell with them, when they shall be His people and when God himself shall be with them and be their God, when God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, when there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying. As we think of this time, truly we can say with the Apostle Paul that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed.

C.M.

---

## Put the Ecclesia first.

The Ecclesia is more than any man in it. So it behoves each one not to forget it.

The Ecclesia is a wonderful device to enable everybody in it to become more efficient in the Word of God. No one, on his own, could learn as much as he can in the Ecclesia.

The Ecclesia is like a body—the body is more than the eye, fingers, ears, liver or kidneys.

The more wisely selfish the liver is, the more it will put the body first.

As soon as the parts of a body stop cooperating that is what we call disease. If it becomes chronic, it is what we call death.

When a body becomes departmental, in a word it is dangerously ill.

The health of the body depends upon the willing team play of all its parts.

So, there is a test, if you want to know the state of health of your Ecclesia.

Does each member put the Ecclesia first?

F. W. LOONEY, Liverpool.

---

H. G. WELLS on

## “Progressive” Christianity.

Writing recently on Christianity as a means of world redemption and looking at the changes made in it by its professors from time to time in the name of “progress,” Mr. Wells said: —

“Within a few score years of the Crucifixion, Christianity had become hopelessly involved with ceremonies and superstitions of immemorial antiquity and with a theology embodying the imperfectly embalmed philosophy of Alexandria. In a less critical age it was possible for many to live holy and noble lives within the terms of these old formulae, but today when intellectual integrity is being recognised as a primary moral obligation this can be done no longer.

“Until Christianity sheds these priestly and theological encumbrances it will encounter greater and greater difficulty in serving Him it claims as its Founder, the Son of Man.”

But, Mr. Wells fails to see that the remedy is a return to Bible Truth and Christ’s own preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God.

---

## Prayer.

### In relation to those outside the Truth. Does it avail?

A simple “Yes” or “No” in answer to this important question would be quite inadequate, and may be quite misleading.

A moral relation or attitude like this, cannot always be expressed with the precision of a mathematical problem. It cannot even be adequately expressed with the mechanical precision of the types.

The types are the “form of knowledge and the truth”—Romans 2: 20, “the shadow”—Hebrews 10: 1, or general outline, but “not the very image” (ibid) of the substance.

They, therefore, correspond to a very large extent, but the one being the mental and spiritual condition or relation itself, there is a distinction and difference that has to be recognised and allowed for.

Our beloved and respected Brother Roberts, beautifully expressed the difficulty of stating moral relations in fixed terms, or mechanical similes. Speaking of some aspects of the sacrificial work of Christ he said, “The subject is so subtle in some of its elements. It is like handling mercury instead of iron. Other subjects are iron by comparison. When they have been hammered into shape they remain in shape, but this liquid running metal flows this way and that, in the very act of catching it. Its subtlety arises from the fact that it involves a mental aim on the part of God, as when Royalty stands on etiquette.”

Writing upon another occasion he said that it “involves some ideas of so subtle a character that they cannot be expressed in the uniform and rigid language of a mathematical proposition . . . . . the language of much of it is figurative and therefore elastic, and capable in a hostile treatment of being made to appear self-satisfactory.”

The subject of our present consideration, is one that bears on some of the aspects of this larger subject referred to; and the same remarks apply. The comparison with “Royalty standing on etiquette” is particularly apposite and forcible, and we shall probably revert to it again.

Our question, however, needs clearly defining before answering it.

“Outside the Truth” we understand to mean outside the constitution of the Truth, or the “one body” of baptised believers of the Truth as apostolically proclaimed.

This body in our day, as far as we know, is distinguished by the name “Christadelphians,” but may include others of similar faith, not known under that denomination.

Of this we cannot presume to judge. The appointed Judge Himself will alone determine this question. We can only deal with the principles upon which Divine relationship is produced, and maintained. It will be Christ’s prerogative to apply the principle in the individual case. Many known by the name “Christadelphian” will then be found to be “outside the truth,” and many probably not known by that name will be found to be included in the “one body” of Christ.

It is a question of “faith and obedience” entirely, and not one of nominal association. It is not OUR prerogative to define how much error will invalidate a person’s salvation, any more than it is, what degree of knowledge makes a man accountable.

It is for us to define, proclaim, and maintain the truth in its purity, and leave this for Christ’s decision, not compromising or condoning error by extending fellowship to those who may hold or promote it.

“Outside the truth,” therefore, we define to mean outside the saving relationship which baptised faithful believers enjoy in Christ Jesus. “Do the prayers of those un-enlightened, or partially enlightened, avail?”

As far as a direct “Yes” or “No” can answer the question, it would be in the affirmative, but with certain qualifications.

Some would, we know, assert the opposite. We well remember a brother in our own locality who discouraged an interested friend, when he spoke of praying for guidance, by telling him that it would be useless for him to pray as his prayers would “get no further than the ceiling.” (It was no surprise to find this brother afterwards accepting the mechanical theories of those who deny the resurrectional responsibility of the unbaptised).

Facts are stubborn things and have a very peremptory way of rudely upsetting nicely reasoned “theories.” The case of Cornelius comes at once to mind. He was one of “men uncircumcised”—Acts 11: 3, for eating with whom, “they that were of the circumcision contended with Peter”—verse 2. Yet he was “a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house” and “prayed to God always”—Acts 10: 2. Although outside the saving relationship of the Truth, he was informed by the angel, “thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God”—see also verse 31, and he was to send to Peter to get information as to what he ought to do to be saved. It is not sufficient to urge that this was an exceptional case, without Divine authority for such an assertion; for it is the one typical case which illustrates God’s dealings with the Gentiles, and the opening of the door of salvation to them.

We must remember that in God’s dealings with the human race there are three planes upon which His operations have been conducted, three circles of relationship: —

1. —The relationship of Creatures to a Creator.
2. —The relationship of children to a Father in a mortal but reconciled state.
3. —The relationship of “Sons of God”—Job 38: 7 in the perfect spiritual state of the divine nature.

The angels illustrate the latter. They can “behold the Father’s face” although He dwells in “light unapproachable even by reconciled mortals.” These three planes or circles of Divine relationship can be illustrated in many ways.

Reverting to the simile of Royalty and etiquette. The King has (1) his subjects, (2) his ministers and officials, and (3) his personal relations or family. Each of these have their legitimate place. They each stand on different planes, so to speak. The general subjects of a King may address the King from afar, but cannot come into his presence without complying with proper procedure and court etiquette. The recognised officials and household attendants, however, in performance of their duties, have rights and privileges above an ordinary subject. They move about and around the King’s person with greater freedom. There are also those whom the King regards as personal friends with whom he dines and whom he invites to dine with him. But above all there are the members of the King’s own family, who enjoy the most intimate relation of all.

“I am a great King,” says God through Malachi 1: 14, and whilst all his creatures are his subjects, some are his servants and friends, and these, although now relatively “sons of God,” as far as moral relationship is concerned, are as Paul expresses it “waiting for adoption (re ‘placing as a son’) to wit, the redemption of the body”—Romans 8: 23. “Concealed as yet this honour lies,” for “the earnest expectation of the CREATURE WAITETH for the manifestation of the Sons of God”—verse 19. They then become “equal unto the angels,” and enter upon the third plane of Divine operation.

These three planes are further illustrated in the Tabernacle—the Court, the Holy Place, and the Most Holy; and again in the Temple of Christ’s day, we have (1) The Court of the Gentiles, separated from the (2) Court of Israel by a wall called “chel” (referred to by the apostle Paul as “the middle wall of partition” in Ephesians 2: 14), and the (3) the Court of the Priests. Cornelius being uncircumcised could only have been what was known as a “proselyte of the gate.” Had he been a circumcised proselyte, he would have been in a similar position to a Jew—Exodus 12: 48; Isaiah 56: 6. These proselytes had already been accepted on the day of Pentecost—Acts 2: 10, 38-29.

The relationship of the Creator to His creatures is the natural basis which forms the foundation of Divine operations. “First that which is natural, afterwards that which is spiritual.”

Even the lower creation is comprehended here. The Psalmist says, “He giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry”—Psalm 147: 9, and Jesus tells us “that not a sparrow falls to the ground” without his Father, and not one of them is forgotten before God—Luke 12: 6. Speaking of what man is pleased to describe as “the lower creation” the Psalmist says, “these all cry unto God,” and “He giveth them their meat in due season”—Psalm 104: 21.

This “cry” is the mere expression of natural appetite, unguided by intelligence or knowledge of the Giver. Man, however, is endowed with intelligence above the brute creation. He is able by the exercise of reason to recognise the existence of a Great Provider, some Greater Power than himself, to which he must attribute the wonderful works which he can behold in Nature: the Originator of those wonderful laws by which the material universe is governed and controlled. This he is expected to recognise and be thankful for, even though he may not know Him as revealed in the Scriptures, nor His great purpose as therein made known. Paul says that God had “Suffered all nations to walk in their own ways, nevertheless he left not himself without witness”—Acts 14: 17.

That “witness” was confined to His revelation in Nature, and the blessings were related only to this life. Outside Divine revelation as contained in the Scripture man cannot know the purpose of the Great Creator, neither can he attain to that relationship of Sonship, which comes from reconciliation and adoption into the Divine family.

To be Continued.

---

## “Ecclesial Relationships.”

### AN EXAMINATION OF THE PAMPHLET.

The publication of this pamphlet is in order that “the importance of the constitutional issue . . . should be strongly represented to” the Ecclesias—p. 20. This “constitutional issue . . . is of vital importance to the future of the Brotherhood”—p. 20; it is “the point of supreme importance”—p. 22, and, in fact, “transcends in importance the original matter in dispute”—p. 3.

If the present controversy was truly one concerning “constitutional issues” mainly, the pamphlet would be of passing interest only: but the matter in dispute is a far more serious one. The Temperance Hall brethren stand accused of apostasy from one of the “first things”—the doctrine of fellowship, and in the face of this stern fact, no amount of psycho-analysis, or appeals to an “unwritten law,” or dissertations upon “constitutional issues” is of any avail.

It is admitted in the pamphlet that the Temperance Hall Brethren do not refuse the fellowship of the John Bright Street because of any doctrinal error. "No matter of doctrine is at issue"—p. 9. "No matter of scriptural doctrine was involved in the withdrawal of fellowship"—p. 18. "The Temperance Hall admit that no point of scripture doctrine is involved"—p. 18.

Perhaps, then, the reason for the withdrawal is to be found under the heading of "disorderly conduct." But one searches the pamphlet in vain for that charge. Such a charge, indeed, could not be made without incurring swift and weighty consequences. Nevertheless, by the use of skilful phraseology, an indication is given on page 18 that "disorderly walk" is the reason, but as no accusation is made no denial or demand for explanation is possible. Inferential accusations do not become brethren, and no one is ignorant of the term which the world gives to such actions.

The cry of "changed relationships" is but a curtain behind which brethren are tampering with the doctrine of fellowship, and until the fundamental error of the Temperance Hall Brethren is corrected, all "issues" arising out of it, constitutional or otherwise, are but as shifting sands.

There are many untrue imputations in the pamphlet; several contradictions, which a careful reader will note for himself; and at least two statements that are actually untrue, both in sense and literally. One of these is of great importance: —

"The 'unscriptural excommunication' therefore was but the recognition of their withdrawal of fellowship, which they could not be induced to cancel"—p. 17.

It is necessary only to state that the John Bright Street Brethren did tender their cancellation of withdrawal, and that before the Temperance Hall brethren passed their Resolution of Withdrawal.

Let brethren return to the Scriptural teaching concerning the doctrine of fellowship, and then there will be no need to speak in terms of "moral support," or to deplore the failure of an "unwritten law." The Laws of Christ will be found sufficient now, as hitherto, to regulate these.

This recent pamphlet exhibits how brethren of repute, and respected for their work's sake, can misunderstand a rudimentary doctrine, and for that reason will not fail to bring sorrow to those who have the welfare of the Brotherhood at heart.

A. H. BROUGHTON, BIRMINGHAM.

---

## Books received.

### EUREKA AT A GLANCE.

We have received from the Maranatha Press, Union Street, London, a book of 32 pages under the above title, the author being Brother E.H.V. Williams. It is a very useful production giving a very clear résumé of Eureka with a chart having an accompanying explanation. The price is only 6d., and it makes a very useful text book for those who have read Eureka. It, of course, by no means takes the place of Eureka, but it affords a useful aid to memory in recalling the conclusions in that great book.

\* \* \*

### THE BIBLE AND HOW IT CAME TO US.

From Brother F. Jannaway, we have an advanced copy of a new book with the above title. This is printed and published by the Maranatha Press, London. It does not aspire to supplement the many good works in existence that give the story of the Bible, but it certainly does the work well from the point of view of the Truth. Brother Jannaway works backward from the present day to the past. The book is profusely illustrated, giving pages of various editions of the Bible, and it is up to Brother

Jannaway's standard. It will be useful to every brother and sister, and would make a good Sunday School prize also. It can be ordered from the author or from Maranatha Press.

\* \* \*

#### THE PARAGRAPH BIBLE.

We have received (just as we were going to press) an advance copy of the Paragraph Bible, a new publication issued by The Religious Tract Society in fortnightly parts.

It consists of the Authorised Version of 1611 divided into paragraphs of the original texts, although the chapter and verse divisions of a later date are also shown, as in the Revised Version.

Each book is preceded by a good analytical introduction, and the standpoint seems to be that of the old school as to the Bible's inspiration, and it is not spoiled with "higher" criticism and other modern devices for weakening men's confidence and hope in God. This is a reason for appreciation and approval.

We note with pleasure that the Genesis account of Creation is accepted. The main introduction says: —

"Various attempts to discriminate the 'Elohistic' and 'Jehovistic' sections after the early chapters of the Book of Genesis have led to conclusions so irreconcilable with one another as to show that no secure critical results can be attained by this method; which, however, has yielded no more daring schemes of reconstruction implicitly based upon a denial of the prophetic and miraculous element in Scripture, and involving the conclusion that the writers were conscious deceivers in attributing their own work to Moses."

It is good to read the thoughtful and reverent manner which appears to distinguish the book.

The explanatory notes as to meanings, usages, and translation, are on the whole, good. The authors are, of course, not Christadelphians, and the usual "orthodox" ideas as to the personality of the Godhead, the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promises to the "Church," and the nature of the soul, are, of course, to be found. But these are not unduly obtruded.

Each book is concluded with a useful chronology based upon that appearing in the margin of our Authorised Version. With the usual reservations as to doctrinal mistakes, we feel that this publication can be recommended.

G. F. L.

---

### 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.

\* \* \*

#### THE BIBLE WHOLLY INSPIRED.

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney, —I read with interest and much pleasure your own contributions to the subject of "The Bible wholly Inspired," and I feel moved to write to confirm your own representations with regard to the sublime, transcendent problem that appeared in your last issue. I can do so without the remotest shadow of reservation, as I have been a daily reader and profoundly absorbed student of

the Bible itself for the last seventy years of my long life. It was my father who advised me to go direct to it and get at the information first hand, and by no means to take a version of it from the parsons, who made a profession and a large profit out of it. I was at the time very much concerned about my soul, lest I should go to Hell. He was afraid I might become a prey to, or for the parsons, who made a traffic of souls—Revelation 18: 13. So I can speak from actual experience, ever so long a period, and can testify to the fact that I have never found a book that can take its place for imparting instruction about God and the character and the design of His operations and dispensations with men and nations to the end of time.

I know that, as a matter of fact, my age (88 years next March) is due to the influences of its exalted moral principles and unerring counsel. I was able to see the Eternal, Invisible God on every page of the Book. The fact inevitably inspired fear, and at the same time faith, and above all, hope, where I found nothing but darkness, corruption, ungodliness, misery, despair, and death sooner or later, with a yawning Hell and Devils at the close or climax of the whole human racial drama or tragedy.

It was due to my intimacy with the Scriptures that I was enabled to follow the Doctor (Dr. Thomas) the first lecture I heard him deliver. It lasted two hours. I was spell-bound, and convinced at once as to the accuracy of his exposition, so much so, that although I was a popular preacher among the Methodists, I did not dare again to take any part of, or in, their ministrations. I applied for baptism after the sixth lecture by the Doctor, and now there is no book like the Bible for me.

The entire programme of 7000 years' history and prophecy that it covers is as intelligible as it is perfect and complete. Language would fail to express the rapturous satisfaction I am the subject of by its thrilling unique power as I contemplate the consummate, ravishing picture from Creation (6000 years ago) to the end of the next 1000 years when the last enemy—Death itself—will be destroyed, the Kingdom given up to the Father, God will be all in all—1 Corinthians 15: 26-28.

P. HALL, BEDFORD.

\* \* \*

#### “CONSTITUTIONS” AND “THE MIND OF CHRIST.”

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney, —I feel glad that there is a Magazine which offers its pages for free discussion amongst the brethren on things which matter. Of course it is understood that wisdom must be exercised in the use of this freedom, or evils as bad (if not worse) would result.

As a first requisite to profitable discussion it will be surely admitted that the right spirit must exist. However pronounced our views or deductions, we should always remember that we are human and liable to err. Due regard to this fact will help us to refrain from a dogmatic attitude until every avenue at our disposal has been investigated, and even when we have decided in our own mind which is the correct course, to be very careful how we use that decision. “Wisdom is profitable to direct,” and this again points to the fact that we must examine ourselves and see that the right frame of mind exists preparatory to entering discussion.

How much damage has been done by those who, being convinced that a certain course is right, adopts the attitude of a miniature Pope, the future alone will reveal. What a catastrophe, if through reasoning on wrong lines (although thought to be right, as was the case of Job's companions), or trying to prove that unrighteousness exists in others, the unrighteousness will be found to be within ourselves. We must examine ourselves; and how careful we should be that we are not found with Job's “comforters” instead of on Job's side.

The thought of this carefulness, when the possibilities and responsibilities open up to us, might make us feel afraid to do anything. If this condition is produced, it certainly shows the right frame of mind, but it will not lead to inaction. Instead of being dictatorial and assertive, we in the

spirit of humility will ask, “Lord, what is Thy will?” “Lord, what doth Thou require concerning this matter?” The teachableness of a little child becomes manifest, and, being led by the Spirit Word—Romans 8: 14, will be moderate in expression, persuasive in argument, gentle to others, and altogether comporting oneself as becometh a saint, endeavouring not to be engaged in argument of which by the very nature of things we should know Jesus would not approve.

We preface these few lines with these remarks, because there seems to be a very hazy idea amongst some of the brotherhood concerning discussion and speaking of evil with a view to its remedy. I have heard several remarks on the questions which have appeared of late in the pages of the Mutual Magazine. One idea is that we ought not to interfere with present conditions; another, that a quarrelling spirit is developing which is disturbing peace. Of course, if everything is as it should be in the household, then it is undoubtedly wrong to disturb that peace. But suppose the peace is permitted for fear of causing commotion because of wrong principles involved—what then? It is surely the attitude of Israel of old: “See not; . . . . .Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits; Get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us”—Isaiah 30: 10-11.

Now arising out of the question of Constitutions and their binding character upon the brethren, it appears to me that two phases have been introduced. One phase appertains to the government of the ecclesia—as to order of meetings, times and places of meetings, etc.; the other is expressions in rules which are taken to embody the will of Jesus as expressed in his teachings, whether they be of a definite or implied nature. Now as a matter of fellowship, faithful walk, and ultimate acceptance at the hands of the Master, it matters not whether one or two hymns are sung before the breaking of bread, or whether the collection and announcements are placed in a different order than they occupy at present, or the place of meeting and time—these are matters in which the spirit of the Master demands that the minority should submit themselves to the majority (however hard it may be, or however apprehensive the minority may be as to the wisdom of such a course). If this spirit of the Master is absent, it shows we are not desirous of working together in the interests of all, and how, then, can we hope for the Master’s approval? Let the spirit be in the minority to say: “This is the course adopted by the majority. We will give it a fair trial, and do our best to make it a success.” If it fails in the object aimed at by the majority, the minority have three points in their favour: —(1) They have submitted to the majority; (2) The rule having proved a failure, the door is now open to introduce the proposal they think will be better; (3) The minority can then expect (if their proposition is carried, and they are thus turned into the majority) that the minority will help to give their new rule a fair trial, by assisting to make it a success. Thus would the whole ecclesia work smoothly together, and if this spirit was continually manifested, all rules relating to these matters would be honoured, and all ecclesial work would be carried on without friction. If a presiding brother persisted in disarranging the order of the meeting, how can it be said that the spirit of Christ is in him? As a bad example he would be disqualified to hold such a position, and should properly be removed. If the minority caused “disorder,” they would come under the Scriptural term “unruly,” and therefore under the definite commands for dealing with same—Titus 1: 10-11. It may not be for “filthy lucre’s” sake, but there are other traits in the human character besides “the love of money.” Love of notoriety, love of position and power, are amongst things which may cause such things in modern ecclesial life. We can certainly say the spirit of Jesus would be absent in such a case.

But there is the other phase—Rules which embody the will of Jesus, expressed or implied. Directly man begins explaining what Jesus means, there is always the possibility that he may give as an explanation something Jesus did not mean. It may be ever so slight a divergence at first, but in course of time the difference widens, and eventually becomes so pronounced that a definite stand is taken by those who perceive it. This applies as much to what is termed “first principle” matters as the more advanced subjects, and can easily be seen illustrated in the first century declension of the Church, with Christ’s messages to the Seven Churches, and final triumph apostasy in the days of Constantine. What would “majority” brethren say of the “minority” brethren who dared to cause “disorder” and “friction” by protesting against the Constitution of the Church which made Jesus a part of a triune god, and the union of Church and State, as expressive of “the mind of Christ” embodied in

the rules of the Church, and decided by the MAJORITY! We well know that the “minority” in those days were not “wicked” in the eyes of God for contending earnestly for the faith; Jesus did not look upon them as “unruly and disobedient, fit only to be withdrawn from” because they questioned the righteousness of the “majority,” notwithstanding the “majority” had decided their action was RIGHT, and “expressing the mind of Jesus.” But this principle does not seem to be perceived in this discussion on Constitutions.

“Utter folly” is a phrase which has been used. The writer rightly widens the Scriptural idea of “doctrine,” but let him apply it to the days of Constantine—apply it to the Church’s use of its power to excommunicate the “minority,” and answer whether he thinks the action was righteous? We think the “folly” of such an argument must be apparent.

Now it seems to me that it is under the modern Constantinian conditions—a departing from the Truth—that the matter most concerns the household. The first aspect, as outlined in the first part of the letter, ought never to go outside the doors of the ecclesia concerned, and the “love of Christ” should constrain one and all to settle the matter at once. But the second phase touches the whole household, for who will say that when a charge is made that the time-honoured magazine published from Birmingham, under the editorship of brother C. C. Walker “supports the idea of a paid ministry in connection with the Truth,” \* and that there are expressions “in the Birmingham Constitution which are contrary to the expressed will of Christ,” that we are not treading on entirely different ground to that of arrangements of meetings, etc.?

If this is the correct perspective of the discussion now passing under review, and in which I am very interested, is it too much to ask you to substantiate your assertions as expressed above. If such things exist, it is surely time some protest were made. If you have made a mistake in your interpretation of the case, you will, I know, by the love of Christ which constrains, withdraw such a statement.

We certainly, as a body, seem to be losing “the spirit of Jesus.” Our evil surroundings are having a bad effect on the household. The keen line of division between the Truth and the World, instead of being an impassable gulf, is nowadays bridged by excuses and apologies—showing that human nature now, as always, tends to go downward. We wonder if your statements are true, showing the same downward movement? We await your answer.

ANXIOUS.

\* Perhaps brother “A” will say where this quotation is made from. Our words were “advocated payment for speakers in some form or other.” Re Birmingham Constitution—we are shortly showing where the same is unscriptural. Our only reason for not having done so before is simply that it is far better for brethren to examine that Constitution for themselves when the fact is self-evident. —Editor.

\* \* \*

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney, —Greetings. Glad to see you are still emphasising the importance of all withdrawals being solely Scriptural in order to make them valid; also glad of your plain words re Temperance Hall pamphlet Ecclesial Relationships. As you know, I have been in close touch with the John Bright Street trouble for some years, and having carefully analysed the above pamphlet, am of the opinion that its main flaw is its absolute ignoring of the “original matter in dispute.” Whilst this is thus lightly brushed aside it is no purport to direct our attention, as the pamphlet does, to the supposed “constitutional issue” and to “chaos and confusion in the ecclesias.” The original withdrawal from John Bright Street must either be Scripturally justified or cancelled; and seeing neither of these has been done, spiritually-minded brethren will refuse to be drawn aside from the real “Scriptural issue” by an appeal to the Constitution. Here, if anywhere, it is CHRIST AND HIS PRECEPTS FIRST: it requires more than constitutional grounds to make into “publicans and heathens” the John Bright

Street brethren. The remedy lies in the hands of Temperance Hall; let them apply it in the spirit of love and forbearance.

Another very essential point is that the pamphlet seeks to impose upon the brotherhood an interpretation of the Birmingham Constitution and the Ecclesial Guide which would make it impossible for a brother withdrawn from to have his case investigated or put right unless he appealed to another ecclesia for "membership." This would mean that if such brother was not near enough to another meeting to justify his application for membership, he would have no possible constitutional way of getting justice: he would be without help from any except God. Are we going to allow this interpretation to stand? It is evident enough that Rules 34 and 35, and Section 41 and 42 of Ecclesial Guide are meant to provide a means of help for a brother unjustly withdrawn from by his claiming "fellowship," not mere membership of another meeting. This point needs urgent attention, else a system of oppression will fasten itself upon us—a system of ecclesial slavery to forms and rules. Finally, re your own remarks in clause 4, the real position is that John Bright Street did accept the assurance of the Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren, but their letter of acceptance was refused on account of the word "now," which Temperance Hall objected to as implying that the two brethren had changed their views, which implication John Bright Street intended, and could not alter, as it was what they had striven for all along. If this letter had been accepted by Temperance Hall the matter would have ended.

Re clause 6. A dignified protest was now of no use, as Temperance Hall demanded a recognition of its own constitutional line, and an admission from John Bright Street that it had been unconstitutional.

With much love in the Truth, yours fraternally,  
SOUTHEND.

WM. LESLIE WILLE.

\* \* \*

JOHN BRIGHT STREET AND TEMPERANCE HALL, BIRMINGHAM.

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother, —I have read with interest your conclusions regarding the division at Birmingham, and as I feel sure you would not willingly give a wrong impression, I hope you will insert the following comments.

Par. 2. —The two brethren alluded to made speeches which were described by brother F. G. Ford (in a letter to brother V. Hall, 31<sup>st</sup> October, 1917) as an "organised attack by some brethren who, to my mind, had departed from the elements of the faith." These speeches were written, and if the Temperance Hall Ecclesia would publish them it would enable the brotherhood to see whether the protests of the minority were justified or not.

Par. 4. —The Arranging Brethren made no such report till long after the separation had taken place. On August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 1918, the Minority wrote to the Arranging Brethren asking for an assurance that the two brethren had abandoned their views. The reply stated that their letter was "out of order," yet the Arranging Brethren had asked one of the two brethren concerned to resign his offices because he was not in harmony with the Ecclesia in regard to police constables. At the Ecclesial Business Meeting held September 19<sup>th</sup>, 1919, the "assurance" was given, and ten days later the Minority wrote cancelling their letters of withdrawal. They did this again on 4<sup>th</sup> January, 1929, and yet again on 11<sup>th</sup> November, 1920.

Par. 5. —The interviews were fruitless because the "assurance" above referred to could not be obtained.

Par. 6. —The Minority could not Scripturally return to fellowship without such assurance, and when it was given, they were not permitted to return.

Par. 8. —The Minority not only “felt they had a just cause,” but they demonstrated they had a Scriptural cause.

Par. 10. —You have apparently overlooked the fact that in almost every letter the Minority expressed their willingness to meet the appointed brethren. They appointed their representatives, and suggested a time and place of meeting. The Temperance Hall representatives refused to meet them because they would not agree to unnecessary conditions. Where was the necessity for a neutral chairman for half-a-dozen brethren to have a “frank and friendly” discussion?

Par. 13. —The Ecclesia was taking an unscriptural course. Brother V. Hall protested, and when he found this course was being persisted in, he publicly denounced it and left the meeting. If this is “violence” it is a pity there are not more “violent” brethren. The ecclesias would be purer. Personally, I think it is not quite fair to condemn a brother in this way without stating the particular methods to which exception is taken.

With love in the Truth, sincerely your brother,

ILFORD.

W. H. TRAPP.

\* \* \*

“CHRISTADELPHIAN UNBELIEF.”

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney, —I was pleased to see you dealing with this book in January issue. A timely warning cannot but arrest any who may be carried away with the grotesque posturing of this “Seventh Angel Prophet” without a prophet’s credentials.

Brother Moseley’s latest leaflet manifests the enormous self-conceit you speak of, in his claim by his book to be “sowing the mustard seed of the kingdom,” and the statement that brother Walker’s silence relative to his book is predicated upon the fact that brother Walker knows “IT” (C.U.) “is the Word of the Living God;” and in proof thereof he calmly quotes, God said, “Let there be light” and “there was light” i.e., the launching upon the brotherhood of his book “Christadelphian Unbelief,” etc., etc., ad nauseum.

Well, such atrocious claims may appeal to a fanatical and Pharaical disposition that can only see other’s evils and their own righteousness, but we are commanded to “prove all things,” to “try the spirits (or prophets) whether they be of God,” and space permitting, I would just like to draw attention to two glaring “proofs” that show this “prophet” in his true colours.

In his book one can see no reference to Proverbs 6: 19, and such Christ-like manifestations of a “prophet” as contained in Colossians 3: 12-17, are entirely absent from the work; to say nothing of the manifestations of THE SPIRIT so plainly defined in Ephesians 4: 1-3, and verses 29-32.

True, the ecclesias are not “perfect,” and never will be till Christ has said who are the “wise” virgins and who are the “foolish,” that then “he might present it to himself a glorious Church having neither spot nor wrinkle, nor any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.” In other words, A PERFECT ECCLESIA.

But brother Moseley would usurp Christ’s power and exercise the judicial arm NOW, and make the criterion of acceptability, possession of the Holy Spirit as defined by him.

To bolster up his thesis that many had the Holy Spirit unconsciously, he quotes John 14: 16-17 (which see), misquoting the end of verse 17 by stating “for he dwelleth WITHIN you and shall be in you,” instead of “for he dwelleth WITHIN you and shall be in you.”

His rendering is not upheld by the Authorised Version, Literal, or any accepted translation, and furthermore it destroys the promise that Christ (the manifestation of the Spirit) who was WITH them, gave to them of the Holy Spirit dwelling WITHIN them after his departure. (See page 198 and elsewhere.) Comment is superfluous. “Prove all things”!!

Again, the other point: —We continually get in large type a quotation from 1 Timothy 6: 3-5, “FROM SUCH WITHDRAW THYSELF,” a statement entirely absent from the foundation of Scripture. I refer to the three most ancient and valued MSS., Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, and Codex Vaticanus. The Variorum Bible clearly denotes this. So obvious is this that the Revised Version entirely omits this passage, as does Weymouth’s and other translations. No less an authority than Adam Clarke says, “This passage is probably spurious.” Yet brother Moseley erects a great edifice upon such a discredited foundation. Again comment is superfluous. “Prove all things”!!

But then he says it is a sign of rank heresy to appeal to MSS., translations, or versions; although we notice he is continually doing it when it suits his purpose, in other portions of the book.

I must not trespass further on your space, as many other points come to mind.

Let us “prove all things,” and not mistake “feelings” for “Divine Guidance,” not substitute the “light within” for the only Divine Light on such matters, i.e., the Spirit Word.

Apart from the crude and carnal manifestations of sin in its grosser forms, let us never forget that it can masquerade in a very different guise and under a very different name.

Whilst not doubting the honesty and integrity of some who have followed brother Moseley in magnifying the grosser forms of sin in examining OTHERS, is it not possible that by examining themselves THEY may be guilty of NOT “casting down imaginations (reasonings) and every HIGH thing that EXALTETH itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ”?

Might not the intelligence for Slaithwaite in November Christadelphian provide an answer—the answer of experience? A clause of this reads: “We have been brought to see that the doctrine of the present possession of the Holy Spirit is one which in its logical outworking ultimately displaces the written Word of God from its position as the ONLY TRUE LIGHT and guide in the present dispensation; a doctrine which leads men to trust in the fitful sparks of their own spirit of the flesh, ultimately involving the lamentable consequences of “walking in darkness.”

“Let a man examine himself”—1 Corinthians 11: 28; Romans 14: 22.

Sincerely your fellow-labourer,

ORMSKIRK.

FREDERICK BILTON.

\* \* \*

“PAID PREACHERS” AND “SOCIETIES.”

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother, —While heartily agreeing with brother Lake’s remarks about paid preachers in your December issue, I protest against his application of the term “abomination” to the cooperative efforts of the faithful brethren to preach the Truth in places where, otherwise, it would not be

preached. Even if these efforts could be called preaching Christ “of envy and strife,” it should be a matter of rejoicing that “Christ is preached.” But the work is done in all honesty of heart before God.

The Scriptures nowhere forbid the faithful cooperation of the brethren of Christ in “preaching the Word,” and if they did, they would condemn equally all organised lecturing work on the part of the ecclesias.

With love in the Truth, sincerely your brother,

W. H. TRAPP.

---

## Ecclesial News.

ILFORD. —Cranbrook Hall, Cranbrook Road. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.; other days, Christadelphian Hall, Scrafton Road, Ilford Lane, Tuesdays (M.I.C.), 8 p.m.; Thursdays, 8 p.m. We are glad to report the baptism of Miss Elsie Emily Valder, sister of brother Valder, on the 20<sup>th</sup> December, 1922. We trust she may remain steadfast and be accounted worthy of the prize of our high calling. We have arranged to hold our Sunday School Tea and Prize distribution on Saturday, 3<sup>rd</sup> of February, at the Christchurch Road Schools, Thorold Road, about 5 minutes from Ilford Station. Brethren and Sisters from other Meetings will be very welcome. At a special business meeting held on the 21<sup>st</sup> of December it was decided to fellowship the brethren and sisters at Blackheath who have been withdrawn from by the Rowley Regis Ecclesia, for the reasons that the grounds of withdrawal were not Scriptural.

At a special business meeting of the Ilford Ecclesia held on the 21<sup>st</sup> December last, the following Resolutions were passed: —(1) “That the Rowley Regis Ecclesia’s withdrawal from the Brethren and Sisters named in their “Intelligence” in the Christadelphian Magazine for January, 1922, be not recognised by this Ecclesia for the reason that the grounds of withdrawal are not Scriptural. (2) That therefore the Ilford Ecclesia accords fellowship to the brethren and sisters named.”—W. WIGGENS.

BLACKHEATH. —It is with joy that we can place on record the “coming out of nature’s darkness” of Miss Lily Baker, only child of our Sister Baker and the late Brother Baker. She was immersed at Bro. Jakeman’s house in Dudley on October 23<sup>rd</sup> last. Our late brother fell asleep with the hope that his only child might be in a position to greet him when he awakes. This will now be one of the privileges which has been conferred upon her by her obedience to the requirements of all who would come in the appointed way. It is our earnest prayer that our sister will walk in the narrow way, and find acceptance at the hands of the Judge of all the earth. We would take this opportunity of rendering our sincere thanks to all the brethren who have helped us so much in the service of the Truth at Blackheath. —C. F. POWELL.