

Price 4d

March, 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—	65
No. 93. — Undesigned coincidences in the Gospels as to the Feeding of the Multitude	
That old serpent—The Devil, and Satan (Poetry)	68
Editorial	69
Christadelphian Unbelief	71
Altering the Decalogue.....	74
Prayer	75
The Bisection Era of the Seven Times	79
The Patience of Job.....	82
Echoes of Past Controversies— No. 5—The Inspiration Controversy.....	88
Day by Day (Poetry).....	90
Think Twice (Poetry)	90
Correspondence	91
Ecclesial News	96

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. 3 MARCH 15th 1923 FOURPENCE.

The Bible wholly inspired and infallible.

No 93. –Undesigned coincidences in the Gospels as to the Feeding of the Multitude.

One marked feature of the four Gospel records is that of undesigned coincidence in the description of specific incidents.

No attempt is made to tell the story in exactly the same terms, or even to avowedly set up a testimony that shall be corroborative in each case of the other testimony or testimonies. Each is given as if in complete independence of any other authority. This is an extremely rare happening. Where human records have been written side by side or at short intervals there is always an attempt to synchronise and to harmonise with an appeal to authorities. Yet neither Mark nor John ever appeals to Matthew or to Luke. There is not a single instance of quotation from another source to back up the evidence given in regard to any incident in the life of our Lord. This dissimilarity between the Gospels and other literature is fully explained at once if it be admitted that the Holy Spirit was the motive power in the writing of all the four records. The Divine Spirit would not need the adventitious aids to credence and authority that other i.e., merely human, authorship requires.

The miracle of the feeding of the five thousand people is a case in point. Mark 6: 31 states, “Jesus said,” to the gathered disciples, “Come apart into a desert place and rest awhile.” “For there were many coming and going and they had no leisure to eat.” No reason is given for the busy character of the way at that time, nor is any place in particular mentioned.

Now add John’s account of the same miracle. John 6: 4 says, “The Passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh and a great company came to Jesus where he had gone up to a hilly place to rest with his disciples.”

Turn next to Luke 9: 10, “The apostles returned. . . .and went aside privately into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida. . . . and the people followed him.”

These accounts together show a complete accord. The time was the spring time, immediately before the Passover. Great crowds of people were on their way to Jerusalem for the celebration of that feast. Bethsaida was on the main road to that city.

The next point of coincidence is that Matthew 14: 19 says the people sat “on the grass.” Mark asserts that Jesus made “the companies sit down upon the green grass.”

Grass is green in the spring time only in Palestine, and withers with the summer heat. Many allusions to this are found in the Scripture. The fate of the wicked is likened to that of the spring grasses in Psalm 37: 2. Luke and John content themselves with saying that the people “sat down.”

Another similar miracle—performed later in the year—the feeding of the four thousand—has no reference to the grass, but it is explicitly stated that the people sat “on the ground” (see Mark 8: 6 and Matthew 15: 35). Some critics have attempted to show that the two accounts refer to a single legendary matter, one elaborating the other. This small distinction between “grass” and “ground” demonstrates that either the writers themselves were eyewitnesses or that the authority behind them was such.

The multitude was easily gathered on that great main road. Josephus states that 2,000,000 Jews often visited Jerusalem for the Passover. He gives one specific figure based on a calculation made by Cestus for Nero—2,600,000.

The next point of interest is the conversation between Jesus and his disciples as to how the multitude should be fed. John 6: 5 asserts that “Jesussaid to Philip, Whence shall we buy bread?” But why should Jesus ask Philip rather than Peter or some other prominent disciple? No explanation is vouchsafed but it is easily found. The miracle was performed at Bethsaida. John 1: 44 shows that Philip was of Bethsaida, and hence the very person most likely to know where food could be obtained. A slight distinction is made between Philip here and Andrew and Peter. The two latter were natives of Bethsaida who had left it for another district. Philip was not a native but a dweller there.

A further coincidence awaits us in John 6: 8. Philip had said that there was not enough bread in the place to feed the people, nor would they have enough money if the supply was there.

Andrew here interposes and calls attention to a boy who had bread to sell, “five barley loaves.” Probably Andrew knew and espied the boy. Sellers of bread frequented the market places and no doubt the pilgrims journeying to Jerusalem accounted for the presence of this one, with his basket of bread on his head.

In passing it is noteworthy that there are different baskets mentioned in the New Testament, although all appear in our version by the same translation. One is the large, fairly deep basket used as a travelling basket. There would be many such in evidence because of pilgrimage to the Passover, and it is this one that is referred to in Matthew 14: 20, Mark 6: 43 and John 6: 13. “Twelve baskets full” are taken up.

But in the similar miracle recorded in Matthew 15: 37 and Mark 8: 8 only seven baskets are taken up. The word translated “basket” here is not the same word. The reference is now to the larger basket, a large hamper, containing about twice as much as the other one. It should be noted that there is no confusion. All the accounts of the first miracle give the smaller basket. The accounts of the later miracle agree upon the larger basket. A third type of basket is a basket of twisted rope, very strong. This is mentioned once only, i.e., in 2 Corinthians 11: 33. Paul was “let down through a window in a basket” over the city wall of Damascus. This careful attention to detail speaks of truth and perfect accuracy. The Bible stands alone in this perfection. God is not the author of confusion, and He was behind these holy men of old who wrote these records. —Editor.

(To be Continued.)

That old serpent—The Devil, and Satan.

The serpent stung our Mother, Eve,
And poisoned all her blood;
And human nature thus condemned,
Before Jehovah stood.

God saw the evil and declared,
The woman's seed shall cure;
The venom kill, and give a life,
That ever shall endure.

The people in the wilderness,
The fatal bite received;
But at a brass facsimile,
They looked, and were relieved.

The declaration and the type,
In mortal flesh we see;
The Son of God, and Son of man,
Nailed to th' accursed tree.

Facsimile of sinful flesh,
Itself in death destroyed;
His righteousness, and poured out blood,
The ransom satisfied.

God's righteousness was manifest,
The law was magnified;
And life eternal, His Bequest,
In Jesus crucified.

The Father raised Him from the dead,
With mighty power to save;
Who captive led captivity,
And triumphed o'er the grave.

He lives in Heav'n, a great High Priest,
Upon His Father's throne;
Whence soon He comes to spread the feast,
For those who are His own.

To reign for God, and dwell with men,
To bless the world with peace;
Eden shall be restored again,
And enmity shall cease.

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 25th of the month.]

* * *

FUNDAMENTALS.

We know what we mean when we speak of “fundamentals.” We refer to the first principles of the Truth of which the main essential is a belief in the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures. At the present time a movement is in evidence of considerable volume in the United States among the Protestant Churches. It is called the “Fundamentalist” movement. It aims at restoring faith in the Bible as Inspired and in its message, and sets forth strong arguments against the theory of evolution and against the conclusions of Higher critics and pseudo-scientists. It also combats the spiritualising of passages referring to the Second Coming of our Lord and present day events as prophetically foretold.

Possibly the movement may persuade a few honest hearts to “come out and be separate.” There is certainly no room for honest men inside the Protestant Churches. You cannot gather figs off thorns.

* * *

DEATH AND SIN.

We have received a letter and article from Brother A.D. Strickler alleging that he has been misunderstood and that he holds the truth regarding Sin and Death and forgiveness of sin and Salvation. But the article proves that he is mistaken in saying that he is following Bible teaching. We have written him direct and hope he will repent.

* * *

AUSTRALIAN ECCLESIAS AND THE CLEAN FLESH HERESY.

The Christadelphian has not taken a very decided line regarding the heresy promulgated by Brother Bell in Australia. Strong action in word and deed is needed, and we wish Brother Walker would emphasise the dangerous character of this recrudescence of an old heresy.

The North London Ecclesia decided at its last business meeting to refuse fellowship to any brother or sister visiting the Central Library Hall from Australia until any such should have been interviewed by the Recording brother, and one other Presiding brother as to their soundness or otherwise. From information received we gather that the Melbourne Ecclesia is now possibly almost alone in resistance to the influence of Brother Bell, practically every other meeting being tainted with it. We commend North London’s decision to other meetings.

EDITOR.

Christadelphian Unbelief.

Continued from page 22.

The writer of this book then endeavours to exhibit what he imagines is the present condition of the brotherhood. We are accused of smoking, reading novels, playing cards as a means of gambling, attending concerts, theatres, and moving picture shows, having programmes of pleasure and festivity, etc. All these things, he says, are contrary to the tenor of Apostolic precept.

There are greater evils than these and of one brother Mosley is surely guilty when he makes false accusations against a whole community and speaks in malicious and evil terms of those who are striving earnestly to shape their steps by the Divine will, and who do not any of the things he condemns. But let anyone examine brother Mosley's conclusions and recommendations and endeavour to summarise them. He will come to see that those who have left us because of his words have done exactly as he desired.

- (a) They have condemned us all as apostate and as altogether beyond possible redemption.
- (b) They have "withdrawn" from every one of us on the ground of apostasy of conduct (or works), and profess their own ability to do the right thing always.
- (c) They ignore the fact that in our flesh the old weakness prevails, and in their flesh as much as ours, for which cause Jesus intercedes for us in heaven, and that therefore they, with us, will still offend. They forget that the offences are but a matter of degree and are found in all.
- (d) Following his words on page 95, they have put "charitable sentiments" entirely away. We are said to be all in "bat-like blindness," and to have the "strong delusion" spoken of by Paul.
- (e) Following further brother Mosley's footsteps those who have gone out have put away all care about the doctrines that constitute the whole counsel of God, and committed themselves in the first place to works, hence their present carelessness in regard to doctrine.

Now what is really the correct position for true believers in regard to the things that form the subject of accusation? The answer is obvious. In every ecclesia in our fellowship let there be (and we believe there is) a healthy understanding and continued promulgation of the Doctrines of the Truth. Let there be also a continued endeavour to keep clear of the world's allurements. Let the speaking brethren exhort on this line and let all strive together to accomplish success. We are always grieved to see brethren smoking. Let us exhibit better things by abstinence therefrom. This is obvious. But if it be true that here and there a brother uses the tobacco plant in a way different to that intended by his Creator, let those who disapprove reason the matter out with him. This is Christ's way. It is far better to win a brother from the error of his ways, than to call him "apostate" and abandon him. The "lost sheep" of the hundred is condemned by brother Mosley who urges getting as far as possible away from him. Christ's way was to seek him out and to "save that which was lost."

As to picture-going and novel-reading, well, we know the people of the world fairly well by our business contact day by day. There is no comparison between the average Christadelphian home and the average home of the world: no comparison between the conversation in these two respectively and no likeness at all in their bookshelves. We have never seen a Christadelphian bookcase filled with novels, and we have rarely seen a bookcase of the people of the world that was not so filled. Why, we recognise one another oft times by our difference from the man of the world!

Brother Mosley deals with Insurance and contends that a man cannot "believe in God and insure," therefore every brother who insures should be withdrawn from. No brother who is "worthy" would insure, he says. He does not "allow us to fellowship those who insure, uphold, justify, teach, tolerate or continue in it," or who remain "in any form of benefit society."

So that the man is not now wise who seeth the evil coming and prepares for it. Brother Mosley fails to see when he quotes Jesus as saying, "Take no thought for your life" that our Lord was exhorting his hearers to put first things first, i.e., "seek first the Kingdom of God" and to cease to make merely physical and temporal things their first and main concern. Ezra is quoted with approval where he says he was "ashamed to require of the King soldiers. . . . because we had spoken . . . saying the hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him." But Nehemiah is conveniently forgotten who took all the help he could get from the King and who went out and succeeded in the work after Ezra had failed and gone back disheartened to Shushan. God used both men, so greatly different as they were from one another, and condemns neither.

What is needed by all brethren is a balanced judgment in regard to these matters and a determined individual attempt to keep close to the commandments of Christ. There will always be as there were in Apostolic days certain doubtful matters and the right way is shown in 1 Corinthians 10: 27-32.

Paul did not urge immediate separation from the many people in the Corinthian ecclesia who were astray. His policy was based on the principles of Christ and was aimed at reclamation and the upward climb. His second epistle shows how he succeeded. Now it will be plainly by this time be evident to those who have read these articles of ours upon "Christadelphian Unbelief" that the object of the book is to detach as many as possible from us on the grounds of our supposed "worldly conduct." In every reference to Doctrine in the book there is careless slurring over of essentials. Page 105 exhibits one instance. A great question has arisen in Australia concerning the nature of the Lord Jesus. Says brother Mosley, "Both parties are denying certain Scriptural truths because forsooth, (why, forsooth?) they cannot see the way to harmonise them, due to the lack of the Spirit of God." Well, as one party are holding on strongly to the Truth and the others are denying it we can see brother Mosley's dangerous turn of mind.

The result is seen in what has happened in the Huddersfield district. The only people who have espoused brother Mosley's standard are people who had already abandoned the essential truths regarding Resurrection and Judgment and the birth of the Spirit, and turned to fables such as "Immortal emergence." This result was inevitable. If you exalt works to too high a place you always tend to depress the holding fast of doctrinal truth. So to be in fellowship with these "Re-organised Christadelphians" is to be back in the realm of spiritual darkness.

Altering the Decalogue!

For sixteen years the various authoritative bodies in the Church of England have been considering revision of the Prayer Book. The National Church Assembly is at present considering the various suggestions put forward. The general opinion of these people is that the ten commandments need revision "to bring them more into line with the New Testament." Here is the suggested new form—

1. God spake these words, and said; I am the Lord thy God: Thou shalt have none other Gods but Me.
2. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them nor worship them.
3. Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain.
4. Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.
5. Honour thy father and thy mother.
6. Thou shalt do no murder.
7. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
8. Thou shalt not steal.
9. Thou shalt not bear false witness.
10. Thou shalt not covet.

A reference to Exodus 20: 2-17 will show the "cuts" made in the original ten.

Our main objection is that the Hebrew character and application of the commandments is left out, i.e., the references to "the land" of promise and to the necessity of keeping the covenant with God if the people were to remain therein.

Another cavil we make is that the reference to the six days of creation is left out. We can understand why. The Church prefers “modern scholarship” to the Bible truth.

The alteration to the tenth commandment is very strange. It is not wrong to covet in every case. “Covet earnestly the best gifts,” “Covet to prophesy,” are instances to the point. Hence the original wording is correct and specifies the nature of the covetousness forbidden.

We believe that the Decalogue contains not only true Christian ethics but also the Gospel of God in the relation of those ethics to the Promises. Modern Churchmanship, having lost the true Hope of Salvation has no right or title to mangle and distort the great features of its Revelation.

Prayer.

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

Continued from page 52.

But is God unmindful, or heedless of the sincere cry of His creatures in relation to the life that is; or the expressed desire to know more of Himself and His purpose? Who shall dare assert it? The Scriptural evidence is all the other way, and it is going to an extreme to say no prayer is heard “outside the truth.”

“They that go down to the sea in ships” says the Psalmist, “these see the works of the Lord and his wonders in the deep He raiseth the stormy wind . . . their soul is melted because of trouble, . . . Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble and he bringeth them out of their distresses. He maketh the storm a calm. . . He bringeth them into their desired haven”—Psalm 107: 24-30. If we want an illustration of this in relation to the Gentiles, we have it in the case of the Tarshish seamen on Jonah’s boat. “Then the men feared Yahweh exceedingly, and offered a sacrifice unto Yahweh and made vows”—Jonah 1: 15-16.

The mission of Jonah is itself a lesson for us, in connection with our subject. Although it was truly said of Israel “You only have I known of all the families of the earth”—Amos 3: 2, it did not prevent God from sending a message to Nineveh. When they “repented at the preaching of Jonah,” and God “saw their works that they turned from their evil way” God also “repented of the evil that he had said that he would do unto them, and he did it not”—3: 10.

Jonah was displeased; but God showed that He had regard for even His Gentile creatures, “Then said the Lord, Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not laboured neither madest it grow . . . and should I not spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are 120,000 persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand” (i.e., metaphorically, “cannot discern between right and wrong”).

We must learn to distinguish between the two relationships to find a place for all these things.

God’s covenant was with Abraham, but it did not prevent His dealing with Lot. God promised that “in Isaac shall thy seed be called, “but He did not close His ear to Hagar’s prayer, and it did not prevent Him from blessing Ishmael as far as this life was concerned.

God was operating with Israel nationally on the plane of the natural, but He was selecting individuals on the plane of the spiritual. Hence Paul says, “He is not a Jew who is one outwardly . . . but he is a Jew which is one inwardly”—Romans 2: 28, and “they are not all Israel who are of Israel.”

It will be evident that God begins His dealings with us on the natural plane before we can be lifted unto the spiritual. “No man can come unto me,” said Christ, “except the Father draw him”—

John 6: 44. Dr. Thomas was one of those who “saw the works of the Lord and His wonders in the deep.” He “cried unto the Lord in his trouble” and was “brought into his desired haven.” Do we doubt that his cry was heard or that God had already begun to work with him. Can we not trace in our own experience the hand of God working with us before we became His children by adoption? Then there is the case of the children of believers, who are still “outside the truth.” Some refuse to teach their children to pray, because they are still in this position. We are convinced it is a mistake. They must, however, be taught true relationship. Sister Roberts deals with this matter so well in *Woman, Married and Unmarried* that we reproduce her words. She says: —

“The question has sometimes been raised whether we ought to teach our children to pray. I am persuaded that with a thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures, such a question never could be raised We teach them to thank an earthly friend, who bestows upon them a gift, and consider it a breach of good manners if they omit the ceremonial, and shall we teach them to be less respectful to the Heavenly Giver of every good thing? To this it is said by some ‘but the children are not in a position to approach God; none but those who believe the truth and have been immersed, can acceptably pray to God.’ As regards the eternal relationship of sons, this is true, but shall we shut them out of the relationship that is actually theirs? Are they not creatures of His hand? May they not thank Him for their being as such? Are they not possible candidates for Sonship? May they not like Cornelius, present their aspirations in prayer to be guided into that relationship? Shall we forbid a child to say, ‘O Lord, I am a poor child of the dust. I desire to be an heir of life-everlasting, through Christ. Lead me into the way.’ If a sinner’s ‘Lord, be merciful to me a sinner’ was heard, who shall shut the mouth of an instructed child who is daily progressing to maturer knowledge of Divine things? Much hurtful neglect has come from wrong views on this question: or rather the misapplication of a right view.”

“We know that God heareth not sinners, and that the prayers of the wicked are an abomination to Him, but the children of believers are not of that class. The “sinner” and “the wicked” of these statements are of that class that are given over to transgression, and it is with reason that they should not be heard.”

These statements of Sister Roberts we thoroughly endorse, and they can be applied to others who with child-like disposition are seeking God. The class of passages referring to the “sinner” and the “wicked” are often strained out of their true meaning and misapplied, in the same way that the Pharisees misapplied them. They do not as a rule describe those outside covenant relationship but generally those inside, and are expressive of a mental and spiritual attitude of general application. The prayer of the publican was acceptable where the prayer of the Pharisee was an abomination, although both were in covenant relationship. The Pharisee regarded the publican as the “sinner,” whilst he was (in his own estimation) the righteous.

In God’s sight it was the reverse.

A very important passage in defining a correct relationship is Hebrews 13: 10 (one of those we use on our Hymn Book notices), but it is one that is sometimes used to support extreme views. “We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle,” says Paul.

Now when this is used to prove that no prayer “outside the truth” can be accepted, it is evidently misapplied; for it could not be contended that the Jew with the Divinely appointed Mosaic constitution, had no means of approach to God. It was a contrast between the Jew and his privileges under the Mosaic law, and the Christian under the New Covenant. It distinguishes between the two planes of Divine operations. The one was on the plane of the natural with the privileges and blessings confined to the natural life, and the other was on the plane of the spiritual, with the eternal relationship of sons. The one was merely a type of the other. But whilst avoiding extremes, we do well to maintain a true and distinctive position, and the application of this passage to the question of worship is sound. These two planes of Divine operation are distinct.

In our capacity as worshippers, we rightly make the distinction (or should do). Sometimes the other extreme is gone to, and laxity and indifference prevails. Whilst avoiding an extreme on the one hand, let us not be guilty of unfaithfulness or laxity on the other. Let it not be a mere accommodation to scruples or sentiment, but an attitude of fidelity to God and the truth. Israel were rebuked for not maintaining a distinction between the clean and the unclean, the holy and the profane. When we meet in the capacity of worshippers, we meet as the sons of God, who “draw near” to Him, not merely His creatures who cry unto Him from “afar off.” We are able, through our great High Priest to “come boldly” (though not irreverently or flippantly) to the throne of grace—Hebrews 4: 16, not merely the creatures of His care, but the children of a Father; not merely the proselytes of the gate; who cannot pass beyond the “middle wall of partition,” but the “circumcised in heart and mind, circumcised with the circumcision of Christ in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh”—Colossians 2: 11, not merely the worshippers of the court, but the priests who trim the lamps, offer the incense, eat of the bread, and partake of the sacrifice in the holy place.

Neither children of believers, nor the partially enlightened stranger have part or lot here. They have their place in the Divine arrangement, but they are not upon this plane of operations, and we must recognise and maintain this distinction. The Ecclesiastical historian, Mosheim tells how this distinction was observed by the 1st century Christian. He says: —

“It was thought prudent and necessary to divide Christians into two orders, distinguished by the names of Believers and Catechumens. The former were those who had been solemnly admitted into the Church by baptism, and in consequence thereof were instructed in all the mysteries of religion, had access to all parts of Divine worship, and were authorised to vote in the ecclesiastical assemblies. The latter were such as had not been dedicated to God and Christ by baptism, and were therefore admitted neither to the public prayers, nor to the Holy Communion, nor to the ecclesiastical assemblies”—2 Ed., Vol. 1., p. 101.

H. FRY.

The Bisection Era of the Seven Times.

Continued from Vol. 10, page 350.

Turning now to the Eastern aspect of this era we note the year 570 as the Birth of Mahomet. In 609 he proclaimed himself a prophet, witnessing against the gross idolatry of his people in Arabia. Arabia, however, would not listen to him at first and in 622 A.D. he was forced to flee from Mecca to Medina. At Medina he was favourably received. Grattan Guinness in writing of these events says: —

“It was in A.D. 622 that the so-called ‘flight’ of Mahomet took place, an event which forms the era of the Hegira, the terminus a quo of the Mahomedan Calendar to this day. He fled from Mecca to Medina, where he was received as a prophet and a prince. The conquering career of his Saracenic followers commenced the year of his death 632 A.D. The Caliph Omar led his army into Syria in the course of that year: in August 634 Damascus was taken. In the year 637 Jerusalem was captured after a four months’ siege. The patriarch Sophronius who was governor of the city of the time, had to surrender to Omar: and all the other towns in Syria followed his example. The conquest was complete in 638. The Mosque of Omar was erected on the site of the temple”—Light for Last Days, p. 106.

Gibbon also states: —

“The religion of the Koran might have perished in its cradle had not Medina (622) embraced with faith and reverence the holy outcast of Mecca”—chapter 1.

“In this eventful moment the lance of an Arab might have changed the history of the world. The flight of the prophet from Mecca to Medina has fixed the memorable era of the Hegira, which at the end of twelve centuries still discriminates the lunar years of the Mohammedan nations”—ibid.

Thus is summarised the fateful events of 622-637-8.

First the preaching of Mahomet, his flight; then his successful conversion of all Arabia, then his successors carry with the point of the sword all before them, first of all desolating Palestine, desecrating the Sanctuary and there in 637 setting up an abomination of Desolation. Sophronius the patriarch realised that here was the abomination standing where it ought not. Thus did the Saracenic Mahommedans continue and intensify the Roman Pagan desolation of the Land. Our bisection dates rightly include the most important of events in the career of this latter development of the Eastern Little Horn.

From 638 onward the Saracens victoriously carried on their career of conquest and destruction and particularly were they anxious to obtain Constantinople. God’s appointed scourge of the Apostate Eastern Church, they ravaged much of the Eastern third of the Empire, knocking at the very doors of Constantinople and laying siege to it during the seven years 672-678. However, peace was concluded 678 and Constantinople saved. The time of death had not yet arrived. Still by this date the Eastern Empire was receiving its first shocks and was being lopped in its extremities. It was to be some centuries yet before the successors of Mahomet in the Turks were to take Constantinople, 1453. How remarkable that our bisection era gives dates in which both the Western and Eastern Empires were being shaken, in the one case marking, too, death, in the other, the premonitory symptoms of illness and decay.

We can now see the outstanding features of the middle era as Western and Eastern. Its Western character has always been accepted, but not its Eastern. The fact, however, that a cutting into two of our seven times so clearly lays hold of Mahommedan dates like 622, 637-8 and 675 demonstrates that we cannot avoid an Eastern application of times, especially an Eastern application of the second 1260 years, and consequently of the 1290 and 1335 of Daniel 12. Such a prominence being given to Eastern events, compels us to accept a large place in Daniel for the Eastern Desolator of the Land, i.e., Mahommedanism, Saracenic and Turkish. The Desolator, first Roman in its constitution, but even then Eastern as arising out of one of the Eastern Horns of Alexander’s Empire, extending through Justinian who helped to make the Pope a God, thence through the Saracenic hordes under Mahomet and his successors, and finally under Turkey, dividing the LAND for again, as Turkish pashas have done until recently. This is the Desolator so prominently brought before us in the latter portion of Daniel, the last five chapters of which are essentially Eastern in character, treating of the Land, the People of the Land, and the Holy Place or Sanctuary, and the Desolations determined upon them, culminating in the coming of glory and blessedness in all the world, when Daniel shall stand in his lot and the wise shall shine as stars in Christ’s kingdom. To leave Turkey and Mahomet out of the consideration of these chapters would be an inexcusable omission contrary to every historic fact and analogy, and an ignoring of the lesson of our bisection era. Thus by duly considering every aspect of the case we get a complete picture of the downfall of God’s Kingdom in the Earth, the uprise of the Kingdom of Men, and the two phases of the last half of the times, Western and Eastern, the upshot being the destruction of the Persecutor of God’s saints and the scatterer of God’s people, the Jews, and the Desolator of His Land.

WM. LESLIE WILLE.

The Patience of Job.

The word patience is defined as, “the power or quality of enduring.” The word patient as “bearing trials without murmuring or discontent; calmly enduring; and, not hasty.” These definitions are in perfect harmony with the Scriptural references to patience; the Apostle James will illustrate this

in Chapter 1: 2-4, "My brethren," he says, "count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience. But, let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing."

The power or quality of enduring is considered by the apostle here to be of great value and importance, inasmuch as it is the result of the trial of faith; which, if cultivated to the right proportion, will produce that perfect and entire wanting nothing state. Again, in Chapter 5: 10, the same apostle says, "Take, my brethren, the prophets who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of suffering, affliction, and of patience." Patience being here again, as it is defined, the power or quality of enduring those afflictions, so far as those prophets are concerned; who in Hebrews 12: 1, are spoken of, as "a great cloud of witnesses," who were patient to the extent of obtaining a good report through faith, under the most trying circumstances; and who will be made perfect in the full sense of the word, when the time arrives.

Now, from among this great cloud of witnessing prophets, the apostle James holds forth one, Job by name, as a special example of one possessed of this power or quality of enduring, "Ye have heard of the patience of Job," he says, "and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy." This is a wonderful introduction to the Book of Job; it warns one of what to look for, of the lessons one may learn by a careful perusal of the same.

That patience is one of the virtues that God is well pleased to see His children cultivate, is evident from many parts of His word. In the parable of the Sower, while explaining the same, the Master said, "But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience." Again, in Revelation 2: 2-3, we read, "I know thy works, and thy labour; and thy patience; and how thou canst not bear them which are evil; and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars. And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted." Yea, truly, God is cognisant of it all.

But what of the patience of Job?

In the first chapter we learn of the excellent character of the man; "Perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil," is the inspired description of him. He was wealthy, happy and honourable, and what is most noble in his character, he was always concerned with the godliness of others, his children in particular. Of this time he speaks in Chapter 29 as "months past," "the days when God preserved me," "When his candle shined upon my head, and when by his light I walked through darkness," "When the Almighty was yet with me, when my children were about me;" "When I washed my steps with butter, and the rock poured me out rivers of oil." It was at this time, when he was prosperous, when he could say, "My root is spread out by the waters, and the dew lay all night upon my branch." Then calamity came upon him, and such calamity. All that in those days was considered wealth; sheep, oxen, camels, asses, and servants; together with all his sons and daughters, were taken from him in one day; and when we consider how he conducts himself in such a calamity, the wonderful power or quality of enduring, that is easily discerned by the words that he uttered. Need we ask, what of the patience of Job? Need we wonder why he is held forth as a special example of one possessed of this power or quality of enduring?

"The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord."

How grand! What a lesson to learn! And it is further stated of him, "In all this, Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly."

But the matter does not end here, in the second chapter, the adversary is asked, "Hast thou considered my servant Job that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil? and still he holdeth fast his integrity, although thou movest me against him to destroy him without cause."

This is not the only place where Job is spoken of in this way by the Lord; in Ezekiel 14: 14, he is mentioned as one of the three most worthy men of old.

But here the Lord is further moved against him to put him to a more severe test still. This may appear strange, that God should require so severe a test of Job; but when it is perceived that this is a living example to all posterity, to show the “end of the Lord that he is very pitiful and of tender mercy;” that all things “happened unto them for examples,” and “written for our admonition;” the strangeness disappears and the love of God takes its place. Job, in addition to his loss of all, is smitten with boils “from the sole of his foot unto his crown.” And here we would say, If this means boils, as we understand boils to be at the present time, then those who have experienced the pain of one or two at a time, will be best able to judge Job’s power or quality of endurance.

He is become odious to his own wife even, and she adds to the already severe test with her words, “Dost thou still retain thine integrity? curse God and die.” To die would not have been very difficult in such a condition. He asks in Chapter 3: 20-21, “Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery, and life unto the bitter in soul; Which long for death, but it cometh not; and dig for it more than for his treasures.” As the apostle Paul upon one occasion said; For Job “to die would” have been “gain.” But, curse God? Never! “Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh. What? Shall we receive good at the hands of God, and shall we not receive evil? In all this did not Job sin with his lips.”

What an example! What a power or quality of enduring to strive to cultivate! “For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.”

In the latter portion of this second chapter we have the record of his three friends coming “to mourn with him and comfort him” and for a long while “none spake a word unto him, for they saw that his grief was very great.” Eventually Job speaks, and one of his sayings throws much light on the whole of the third chapter. It gives one to understand that he was well acquainted with the why and wherefore of it all; that he knew it was a test, and that it was instigated by his adversary. The words are, “For the thing which I greatly feared is come upon me, and that which I was afraid of is come unto me.”

Now in Eureka, Vol. 3, p. 63, brother Dr. Thomas makes this explanation, “Job was a man of substance and power, being the greatest of all the men of the east. He was one of the sons of Deity belonging to that generation. There was among them also another man of power, an oriental who was nominally a co-religionist, but full of envy and unfriendly feelings towards Job. This is not an unusual circumstance, even in societies reputed apostolic. In these, Satans too often abound, and become the adversaries of those they cannot imitate.”

We wonder, now, if this was an act of envy only on the part of the adversary. The question, “Doth Job fear God for nought?” would imply that it was; but the words of Job himself, “For the thing which I greatly feared is come upon me, and that which I was afraid of is come unto me;” do they not suggest that Job had previously done what Paul afterwards exhorted Titus to do, that is, “Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith”? If this was so, if Job had rebuked Satan perhaps for his nominal religion, then the instigating of all this evil was an act of spiteful revenge as well as envy. What we would do well to remember here is that these things were written for our learning. We should endeavour to profit by them and cultivate the virtues that are well pleasing and acceptable to God.

Eliphaz, one of the three friends, answers Job. He is exercised to such an extent with what Job has said that he asks, “But who can withhold himself from speaking?”—Job 4: 2. “Remember I pray thee,” he further says, “who ever perished being innocent? or where were the righteous cut off. Even as I have seen, they that plough iniquity, and sow wickedness, reap the same. By the blast of God they perish, and by the breath of his nostrils are they consumed.”

Oh, how comfortless his friends; knowing as he does that he is being tried, such arguments only add to his affliction. "To him that is afflicted pity should be showed from his friend."

Ah, Eliphaz, you were right in your reasoning, and right in your argument, but wrong in applying it to Job. If you could have "seen the end of the Lord" so far as Job was concerned, you would have understood "that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy."

Have we any among us in the Household in adversity, sore or troubled? Let us be sure that we make not the mistakes Eliphaz made. It is so easy to say of those in adversity, "It is their own fault," "They have only themselves to blame;" "If they had, or had not, done this that or the other, it would not be so with them." The master has distinctly commanded, "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." If we have ears to hear we will "remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; and them which suffered adversity as being ourselves also in the body."

Job makes reply to Eliphaz; pleads in Chapter 6: 28, "Now therefore be content, look upon me; for it is evident unto you if I lie. Return I pray you, let it not be iniquity: Yea return again, my righteousness is in it." They would have certainly understood that it was his righteousness and not his iniquity if they had but heard, "Hast thou considered my servant Job that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil?" We do not know; we can never tell how highly a brother or sister is esteemed by our Heavenly Father. Our estimate of a man is not God's. When the Master returns, we are assured, there will be many surprises and disappointments.

Bildad is the next to speak. He contends that evil cannot overtake the righteous; that the things that had come upon Job and his family were on account of transgression and neglect of seeking, and supplicating God. Bildad judges by appearances; a bad practice, then and now.

Part of his argument is, "Doth God pervert judgment? or doth the Almighty pervert justice? If thy children have sinned against Him, and He have cast them away for their transgression? If thou wouldest seek unto God betimes and make thy supplication to the Almighty. If thou wert pure and upright; surely now He would awake for thee, and make the habitation of thy righteousness prosperous."

Ah, Bildad, you were not patient enough. You were too hasty in your conclusions, like many of your fellow-creatures ever since your time. You may have been right with regard to Job's children. He himself feared on their account, "It may be," he said, "that my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts." But still, it was at the instigation of an envious and spiteful one, that they were destroyed. If you, again, could have seen "the end of the Lord" you would have known "that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy;" also, that He doth "awake" for those that seek Him betimes, and that He doth "awake" for those that seek Him betimes, and that He makes "perfect through suffering," yea, you would have believed Job when he said, "My righteousness is in it." If you had only known the mind of the Lord!

Zophar, likewise maintains that his calamity is the consequence of wrong-doing. All he has to say is comfortless and only adds to the already very severe test of Job's power or quality of enduring. "But oh that God would speak," he says, "and open His lips against thee: And that He would show thee the secrets of wisdom, that they are double to that which is! Know, therefore, that God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth." How wonderful the patience of Job!

In his reply to Zophar he says, "I am as one mocked of his neighbour, who calleth upon God, and He answereth him: the just, upright man is laughed to scorn."

Job's answer is correct, not only as regards himself, but all God's people are laughed to scorn. God has decreed it so. "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution," "We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God."

"Ye have heard of the patience of Job."

"Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain."

"Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

TREORCHY.

T. W. WALLACE.

Echoes of Past Controversies.

2nd SERIES.

No. 5—The Inspiration Controversy.

The subsequent history of the Inspiration controversy has proved the righteousness and wisdom of the stand taken by brother Roberts and those who supported him. The meetings supporting the Fraternal Visitor have from the beginning been lax in doctrine and compromising in principle. The magazine itself lent its columns for many years to attacks both upon the inspiration of the Bible and upon the doctrine of the Truth as restated by Dr. Thomas.

Attempts were made in the "90's" to reduce the doctrine of the truth to a few elements so as to permit brethren to hold certain orthodox opinions. The present writer had personal experience of this.

An old and influential brother among them seriously argued with me that a brother might believe in the personality of the devil—without affecting his grasp of the Truth.

Another, of similar standing, maintained that the Lord Jesus did not condemn the theory of man's natural immortality.

The former editors of the Fraternal Visitor, brethren J.J. Bishop and J.J. Hadley taught a form of Renunciationism—while the present editor and his associates are in close association with the "clean flesh doctrine" as advocated by J. Bell, of Sydney.

Writing of this in the Fraternal Visitor for September, 1921, the editor says, "We do not believe that the understanding of any detailed theory of the atonement is necessary."

This shows the laxity which characterizes these men. There is no clear loyal unalterable devotion to the first principles of the faith, but a constantly manifested disposition to compromise with erroneous doctrine and corrupt practices.

Upon the Inspiration question we may quote the words of Thomas Nesbit, of Glasgow, who was prominent among them for many years.

He said—Fraternal Visitor, October, 1913, "The Bible neither is nor pretends to be the Word of God." "The Bible comes to us not as a book of God but as the writings of men." "We cannot intelligently say that the Bible is the Word of God."

In no case has a person been refused fellowship by these brethren on the ground of false doctrine.

The gravest departure from the truth, and that on a doctrine of fundamental importance, is the Australian theory that the flesh is "clean."

It is a clear departure from first principles and a step towards Romanism.

The countenance and encouragement which the holders of this heresy are receiving from the meetings which we rightly term the "partial inspirationist" meetings is of itself a sufficient reason for warning all who desire to remain loyal to the Word of God against them.

Brethren do not read, study and meditate as they formerly did. We are too ready to receive opinions from the platform, with the result that the ready, plausible speaker exerts undue influence.

All leaders of heresy have been men of pleasing address, appearance and manners.

Our defence is in sober independent relation, constant meditation upon the Word and a sound acquaintance with Dr. Thomas' writings.

The night is far spent, the day is at hand. Let us cast off the unprofitable works of darkness and let us put on the whole armour of God. Let us walk soberly as in the day.

The day of the Lord's appearing is drawing nigh. We are reminded of the experiences of David as recorded in Psalm 12: 1: "Help, Lord, for the godly man ceaseth, for the faithful fail from among the children of men."

The example for us to remember is that of Paul, recorded in 2 Corinthians 2: 17: "We are not as many, which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ."

May the giver of all wisdom help us to do that.

N.LONDON.

G. F. LAKE.

Day by Day.

I heard a voice at evening softly say,
"Bear not thy yesterday into tomorrow,
Nor load this week with last week's good or sorrow.
Lift all thy burdens as they come, nor try
To weight the present with the by and by.
One step and then another, take thy way—
Live day by day."

"Live day by day.
Why art thou bending towards the backward way?
One summit and another thou shalt mount;
Why stop at every mound the space to count
The past mistakes if thou must still remember?
Watch not the ashes of the dying ember,
Kindle thy hope. Put all thy fears away,
Live day by day."

JULIA HARRIS.

Think Twice.

Before you push a brother down,
Think twice,
Before at another's sins you frown,
Think twice.
For who are you in judgment hall
Your brother to the bar to call?
Tomorrow you may slip and fall—
Think twice.

Beware the stinging gibe and quip—
Think twice,
Withhold the gossip's idle sneer,
Think twice.
The Thrust that draws the bitter trap,
For Fortune's favouring gale may veer—
Think twice.

Is Charity a quickened art?
Think twice,
And does it thrill both hand and heart?
Think twice.

The mercy you to others show,
That mercy you some day shall know:
With other's faults be kind, be slow—
Think twice.

—Selected.

Correspondence.

Correspondence for insertion in the current month must reach the Editor by the 25th 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.

* * *

A DIFFICULTY (Nehemiah 7: 5).

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney. —As Secretary of the Winton M.I.C., I have been asked by the Class to send you the following difficulty in the hope that you or some of the readers of the Berean may be able to explain it: —

“Nehemiah 7: 5 records the finding of a register recording the names of the heads of the families, with the numbers of their descendants, who returned from the Babylonian captivity. There are many disagreements, however, both in names and numbers, with the particulars furnished in Ezra 2. Since Ezra 2 is a copy of the register which Nehemiah 7 professes to quote, how are the records to be harmonised?”

Yours fraternally

C. MORGAN.

ANSWER. —The Harmony sought for is easily found. The list made by Zerubbabel as recorded in Ezra 2 is the original one compiled at the time, and duly inserted as such in the book. The one found by Nehemiah was the same list with various emendations. The same sum total is reached as see Ezra 3: 64, and Nehemiah 7: 66, but many alterations are made. The Holy Spirit did not make the list, but directed insertion of the list as it stood in the Divine Record. The later insertion is of the same list with various inaccuracies corrected. A difference of ninety years separates the writing of the original roll, and the finding of it by Nehemiah. The object of the matter is to exhibit the faithfulness of those who heeded the Lord's commandments to return and rebuild Jerusalem and the temple. Large numbers of the Jews disregarded the commandment, preferring to stay where they had settled, hence, for instance, the happenings recorded in the Book of Esther. Nehemiah pays the highest honour to those who began the good work of rebuilding, and hence we see his joy at finding the list of the names. These names live when the names of the unfaithful members of the nation who heeded not the call are entirely forgotten. If the books had been written by men for men we should not have had these differences in evidence. We have them because the Spirit had the exact facts recorded.

EDITOR.

* * *

LONDON RESOLUTIONS.

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney. —May I point out that the London Resolutions of 1876 (reproduced in the Mutual Magazine for November) contain two defects: —

1. —They are somewhat ambiguous, and in view of the decided difference of meaning associated with the words “Adamic condemnation” by brother Roberts and brother Andrews respectively (and revealed in the Andrew controversy) they need definition. Although ambiguous the phraseology leans very decidedly towards brother Andrew's theory of “legal guilt” whilst repudiating the idea of “moral guilt.”

Brother Lake has himself objected to the idea of either “moral” or “legal” guilt being associated with “Adamic condemnation” in Adam's posterity; it being purely a physical law of our being—the RESULT of Adam's sin transmitted by physical heredity.

2. —The mechanical view of brother Andrews is very decidedly reflected in Clause 5, in the statement that “Christ by his death and resurrection put away his sin nature.”

In “Echoes of Past Controversies, No. 7” (June Mutual Magazine) we pointed out the objection to this form of expression which is an unscriptural one and not according to fact.

It logically involves the idea, either that Christ rose immortal or that he rose he rose “in a nature like Adam had before he sinned.” This is a decided departure from the teaching of brother Dr. Thomas and brother Roberts. Although in his early days the Doctor taught immortal emergence, he energetically combated the idea later.

Sin nature was not put away by death and resurrection but by change after resurrection.

The Doctor's teaching on the matter is expressed in Eureka, Vol. 3, p. 586 as follows: “Would anyone intelligent in the Word affirm that an unclean body made yet more unclean by becoming a corpse, and therefore defiling to anyone who touched it, became clean by putting it into an unclean place and lying there for three days less or more?”

“Would the simple fact of that corpse coming to life in a tomb which its presence had Mosaically defiled, and walking out of it, make it a clean body or nature”

“But passing through the grave cleanses no one. They who emerge thence come forth with the same nature they carried into it, therefore their coming forth is Re-surrection. If the same kind of body did not come forth that was buried it would not be Re-surrection but only surrection as in the case of the first man.

“Jesus ‘rose again.’ His coming forth was therefore re-surrection.”

Speaking of those who “shall not sleep” the Doctor says, “They are living persons such as Jesus was when restored to life and like him waiting for the same things to be wrought in them. The position of Jesus and this remnant is identical”—p. 383.

This Christ was not personally cleansed by his death but by change after resurrection.

Brother Roberts rightly said, “Immortalisation is the physical cleansing.”

Sin in the flesh is physical and could only be cleansed in this way. Christ did not therefore “by his death and resurrection put away his sin-nature.”

As brother Roberts explains, Christ, by dying, gave the inherited law of sin and death all it could claim, and in this way destroyed the power of sin (the devil) over himself, because it had no power to hold him; and having died “death hath no more dominion over him.” We commend again to the brethren’s notice the Doctor’s answer to this question, “How did Christ destroy the devil by his death?”—see Mutual Magazine for June, p. 171.

He says, “This sacrifice of Jesus becomes sin destroying in every one who believes (and obeys) the gospel of the Kingdom.” This is the sense in which the apostle used the phrase, as the context shows “and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage”—Hebrews 2: 15.

In reference to the division which called forth the London Resolutions, brother F. G. Jannaway’s statement—Christadelphian, 1904, p. 440 throws some light on this.

Brother Roberts evidently did not entirely endorse brother Andrew’s course of action at that time. He afterwards said that he had been conscious of “cross currents,” even during the Renunciationist Controversy. These initial differences were afterwards more manifest in the London Debate. The fogs which the Andrew controversy should have cleared, however, still hang round the subject in some quarters, and many still adhere to the Andrew view of Adamic condemnation, with its “inherited guilt,” and therefore the necessity of baptism for “original sin,” which Dr. Thomas so satirised.

Yours fraternally,

H. FRY.

* * *

ARE WE SPEAKING TOO STRONGLY?

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney. —In view of the hopes entertained that it would fill a valuable place in the Truth’s service, and of many useful articles which it has contained, it is with regret that the undersigned brethren feel compelled entirely to withhold subscriptions and support from your magazine.

We feel it has gone astray from the object for which it was founded, i.e., the encouragement of young brethren—and that that aim cannot be achieved so long as it serves as the organ of a sectional interest.

However good some of its articles may be, the tone and atmosphere surrounding the magazine present, in our view, a serious danger, rather than of sober upbringing in the Truth. This cannot but hinder young brethren from acquiring the attitude of mind in research and in their relations to the rest of the Household with which they should be inspired by New Testament examples and precepts—not least by those of Paul, most ardent of Apostles.

Its tendency to unqualified antagonism to the Temperance Hall ecclesia has assumed such proportions that it can no longer be overlooked; while frequent, stringent and almost pontifical criticisms of the internal affairs of the various ecclesias represent in our judgment a very regrettable method of attacking the troubles now besetting the Brotherhood. The magazine has the effect of fomenting discord instead of edifying the brethren in their hour of greatest need.

With whatever zeal such an attitude may be taken up, we are convinced that it is in itself a symptom of those latter day evils in our midst which your magazine so often deploras. Not even the association with it of the names of brethren venerable in years and in the Truth can persuade us to withhold this protest; for the time has come to make a firm and public stand for that spirit of earnest sobriety which properly belongs to the Truth.

We hope you will see your way to publish this letter,
And remain,
Your Brethren in Christ,

L. G. SARGENT, Chard.
FREDERICK F. FRY, Bristol.
A. BYRT, Bristol.
A. MILLIER, Bristol.
W. H. RAINEY, Bristol.
J. A. SWAISH, Bristol.

26/12/22.

[We should like our readers to express their views on this “manifesto.”—EDITOR].

* * *

CONSTITUTIONS.

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney. —The brethren who have written to you on this matter do not seem to realise the grave character of the subject.

A new test of fellowship is being introduced, and we are invited to expel brethren from fellowship for breaches of human rules and regulations.

Those who have written in defence of this new position have given no Scriptural authority for it.

It is an attempt to bring in what is known as “ecclesiastical law.”

We recognise no law but the law of Christ, and the methods and grounds which the Scriptures prescribe.

A first principle is involved in the question.

I am,
Faithfully your brother,

GEO. F. LAKE.

* * *

RE LUXOR DISCOVERIES.

To the Editor of The Berean.

Dear Brother Denney. —Greeting. I read with interest your Editorial note in the current issue of the Berean, p. 41 under the heading of “Luxor Discoveries,” and was wondering if you would let me have your comments, with regard to the following in your next issue (March) of your magazine; not only for my own benefit but also for the benefit of others who are, I know, interested in the same matter.

It is with reference to the “Pharaohs mentioned in the Old Testament. Of course, we know that the name “Pharaoh” means “sun,” and was the common title of the kings of Egypt. Now I can only trace mention of ten “Pharaohs” as follows: —

1. —The Pharaoh of the time of Abraham—Genesis 12-15, etc., B.C. 896.
2. —The Pharaoh of Joseph, “Apepi”—Genesis 41, B.C. 1725.
3. —The Pharaoh of the Oppression—Exodus 1-8, “who knew not Joseph,” under whose reign Moses was born B.C. 1571. [Seti I, or probably Rameses II, his son].
4. —The Pharaoh of the Exodus, B.C. 1531—Exodus 5: 1. Meneptha son of Rameses II.
5. —The Pharaoh whose daughter Bithiah, was given in marriage to Mered, a descendant of Judah, B.C. 149—1 Chronicles 4: 18.
6. —The Pharaoh who gave the sister of his queen in marriage to Hadad, B.C. 1015—1 Kings 11: 18-20
7. —The Pharaoh whose daughter Solomon married, B.C. 720—1 Kings 3: 1 and 9: 16.
8. —The Pharaoh to whom King Hezekiah was allied in his war with Sennacherib—2 Kings 18: 21, B.C. 1400.
9. —Pharaoh-necho—2 Chronicles 35: 20-24; 2 Kings 23: 29-30, etc., and 24: 7, and Jeremiah 46: 2, B.C. 610.
10. —Pharaoh-hophra—Jeremiah 37: 5-8; Ezekiel 17: 11-13, comp. 2 Kings 25: 1-4, and see Jeremiah 44: 30, B.C. 570.

Is there mention made of any other “Pharaohs” to your knowledge, in the written word, for instance, the much talked of “Tut-ankh-amen”? I cannot agree (like yourself) with Mr. Weigall. One feels, as it were, that they would like a synopsis of these “Pharaohs,” by name, and “available data” from the Scriptures, and from recent discoveries that have been made. The above-mentioned I have taken from an old note in my Bible, and shall be glad of any comments you may be able to make with reference thereto.

Sincerely your fellow-labourer,

ESSEX

C. F. FREAKLEY.

[Will some younger brother help with an article on this matter? —EDITOR].

Ecclesial News.

BERKHAMSTED. —A good effort has been running in this Hertfordshire town for six weeks now. An average of over twenty-five interested friends has attended. Brother and sister Skinner in isolation for many years are rejoicing in the success of the work and hoping for some good and tangible results. They with one other sister are the only believers resident in the town.

ILFORD. —Sunday Meetings in Cranbrook Hall, Cranbrook Road, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m. Other days, Christadelphian Hall, Scafton Road, Ilford Lane. Tuesdays (M.I.C.) at 8 p.m. Thursdays, Bible Class, 8 p.m. The Mutual I.C. will (D.V.) hold its Annual Fraternal Tea Meeting on Saturday, March 10th in the Christadelphian Hall, Scafton Road. Tea at 5 o'clock. Brethren and sisters from other

meetings will be heartily welcomed. We had our S.S. Prize-giving on Saturday, February 3rd. Brother G. H. Denney distributed the prizes. We were very pleased to see so many brethren and sisters from Bexley Heath, Lytonstone, Tottenham. —W. W. WIGGENS.

LEAMINGTON. —Will you kindly give us a notice of our next Fraternal Gathering which we purpose holding at Leamington on Good Friday, in the Berean for March. This is an Annual Meeting and has been appreciated in the past by many brethren. Our desire is to widen its scope and increase its usefulness, and we consider an invitation in the Berean would be an aid to that end. Particulars are as follows: —Priory Hall, Priory Terrace (near G.P.O.) will be open for the convenience of visitors and Lunch provided at 1 p.m. Tea provided (first sitting) at 4.15 p.m. After meeting to commence at 6. 30 p.m. The subject selected for that meeting is “Prophecy fulfilled: fulfilling: and yet to be fulfilled.” Arrangements are being made for three brethren to deal with the three aspects. We extend to all of like precious Faith a hearty invitation to spend the day with us. —H. W. CORBETT.

LIVERPOOL. —The Annual Fraternal Gathering will be held if the Lord will on Easter Monday, April 2nd. Tea at 4 p.m. After Meeting 6 p.m. Speakers: Brethren A. R. Mead (Stockport), A. S. Wadsworth (Keighley), and J. W. Smith (Huddersfield).