

Price 4d

May, 1924

# The Berean CHRISTADELPHIAN

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 by GEO. H. DENNEY and FRANK G. JANNAWAY.

Published by  
GEO. H. DENNEY, 47 Birchington Rd., Crouch End, London, N.8.,  
to whom all orders should be sent.  
Telephone: G. H. DENNEY, Hornsey 1396, or Clerkenwell 2888.  
F. G. JANNAWAY, Brixton 626  
-----

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

CONTENTS	Page
Dr. John Thomas (Christadelphian), his Life and Work ... ..	133
The Bible wholly inspired and infallible— ... ..	136
No. 108. — The Doctrine of Resurrection	
Editorial ... ..	138
Questions for Christadelphians ... ..	142
Proposed Enlargement of the Berean Christadelphian ... ..	142
Three Classes (R. Roberts) ... ..	143
The Sacrifice of Christ... ..	148
Meditation..... ..	154
Major Mattison ..... ..	155
Tampering with the Guage ..... ..	159
“Principles” not “Principals” ..... ..	160
The Rise of the Jewish Sects..... ..	162
The R.A.M.C..... ..	164
Reservations—Passive and Active ..... ..	165
Correspondence ... ..	168
“Birmingham Frictions”..... ..	172
..... ..	
Ecclesial News . . . . .	173

F. Walker, Printer, 41 Stokes Croft, Bristol.

## Notes.

“CHRISTADELPHIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL.”—We are pleased to announce that the long-felt, but neglected, want—a Christadelphian Children’s Magazine is about to be supplied, under the title of Christadelphian Sunday School. It is proposed to issue the first number in July next. Will all interested apply for particulars to bro. E.W. Browne, 14 Elms Road, Clapham, S.W.4.

ONE LARGE FURNISHED ROOM, newly decorated and very comfortable, suitable for two, close to the Clapham meeting, and good handy position, near main road. —Sis. Kellard, 2a Cato Road, Clapham, S.W.

WHY NOT NOW? A postal order for 5/- or a dollar—115 cents—(American or Canadian) will ensure a copy of the Berean Christadelphian every month until this time next year, if the Lord will. Send full name and address to bro. G.H. Denney, 47 Birchington Road, London, N.8. (With the first number you will also receive an autographed picture of Dr. John Thomas at the age of 41, when he had attained a full knowledge of saving Truth).

BOURNEMOUTH: APARTMENTS and Board Residence, at sis. (Mrs.) F.K. Wood, 5 Westerham Road. Can be recommended by sis. Viner Hall.

J. E. FRANKLIN. —You are unfair in charging bro. Denney with having said “NOTE of recommendation” (you even underlined the word “note”). Bro. Denney said “recommendation.” That bro. Walker did recommend sis. Adams for fellowship in spite of her “Bell” views, is testified to by herself (see Berean Christadelphian, 1924, page 30 and 91). How can we ask bro. Denney to apologise for what he has not said? Bro. Walker has since defended his action in the Christadelphian.

TWO SISTERS. —Read 1 Timothy 3: 11, and pause at the ninth word. Neither the “Pelham Committee”—nor F.G. Jannaway, ever pronounced the occupation of your victim to be dishonourable. Two of the present North London Presiding Brethren were his assistants until they were able to get something more remunerative, brethren whose names are above suspicion. Fortunately for your victim, we are in actual possession of the Pelham Committee Decision, etc., and, thus, we can give the lie direct to what you have written. We shall have something further to say on this matter. —(F.G.J.)

CHRISTADELPHIAN HYMN BOOKS and other books, with show racks, can be had on sale or return. —Address P.E. WHITE, Maranatha Press, 100 Southwark Street, London, S.E.1.

D.J. and T.R.—Your charge, of “sowing discord among brethren” leaves us cold. It was also made against our beloved pioneer, bro. R. Roberts, when his attitude divided brethren in 1866, in 1874, in 1885, and again in 1895. You helped bro. Roberts in the last named division. Do you plead guilty to having sown discord among brethren, when you helped to separate a daughter from her father and two brothers? No: you regarded the non-responsibility doctrine a heresy, and urged that it was your faithfulness, and the others’ unfaithfulness, that caused the “discord among brethren;” and that, Matthew 10: 35 was the outcome of the Master’s wishes. Do open your eyes ere it is too late, and see that we are equally, if not more, justified in our attitude now that some of your Birmingham colleagues have openly tampered with the Lord’s gauge (see article this month on “Tampering with the Gauge”).

D. and others. —No; the title of the Birmingham indictment, Lest We Forget, was not taken from the Recessional, which we never even saw until the Ilford programme was put into our hands. Until we saw your suggestion, or rather information, we should have turned to the Psalms to find the phrase; the 119<sup>th</sup> for instance, for the phrase has a Davidic ring about it. It strikes us as strange that some Christadelphians have such an intimate acquaintance with works of fiction. For instance, we know others who can always tell us what relationship Queen Victoria was to William the Fourth, but, who, for the life of them, could not tell us what relationship existed between Judah and Abraham.

B. J. DOWLING. —The type-written letter which you enclose is apparently a forgery, in any case it is a tissue of lies. It is addressed from “138 Old Castle Road, Llanelly” and is signed “T. GRIFFITH.” The brother who hailed from that address was a young collier of the name of Thomas John Griffiths (not Griffith), who did not embrace the Truth until after the war broke out. He applied for an “Army Council Certificate” and we granted him one (P. 112, L. 4, No. 833). Before us lies a profuse letter of gratitude for our services on his behalf. Even should he turn out to be responsible for this type-written document, we leave you to conclude what this young miner knows personally of the Evans, and Jannaways, the Pursers and the Whites, of Clapham, all of whom were in the forefront of the battle before he was even born!

A. MARSHALL. —No Berean Christadelphian “believes that the Kingdom of God is now in existence.” As to Clapham, their “Statement of First Principles” (No. 8) reads: “That the Kingdom of God will be established at the Second Appearing of Jesus Christ, and will in the first instance consist of the restored Kingdom of Israel, but will ultimately comprise all nations of the earth; that its rulers, Jesus Christ and the Saints will be immortal,” etc. As you say, “nothing is too outrageous for vain talkers to say of Clapham, but we doubt if you will be able to stop them. Christ will do that.

“QUESTIONS FOR CHRISTADELPHIANS, or the evidence of a world-wide declension in the Brotherhood.” The facts, which were to have been embodied in the remaining chapters of this series of articles, have now been embodied in the pamphlet just issued, entitled Solemn Warnings, and a copy sent to every subscriber of the Berean Christadelphian. Any subscriber who may not have received such, can have a copy on receipt of a postcard to F.G. Jannaway, 99 Stockwell Park Road, S.W.9.

D.B.—Your spectacles are blurred. Read the article again, and you will see there is no suggestion of dishonesty on the part of anyone referred to. The suggestion rather was what any right-minded brother, or sister, would at once welcome, and act upon the safe-guarding of subscription lists against incompetency and dishonesty. It is an everyday experience that a misuse of funds mostly occurs, not because of vicious propensity, but by reasons of circumstances and non-supervision. We repeat—All Funds should not only have a Treasurer, but an independent auditor, jointly responsible to the subscribers, to whom a periodical balance sheet should be issued. When this is denied—there is something wrong somewhere.

T.W.—We have never said, “Some parts of the Bible are unfit to be read in public.” What we have said is, that, some chapters are “not suitable for indiscriminate reading.” We unreservedly accept 2 Timothy 3: 16.

D.B.—In the first instance the occupation of our exempted brethren was entrusted by the War Office solely to the writer (F.G.J.). Finding the responsibility of hundreds of cases too heavy, at his request the responsibility was shared with the Rt. Hon. T.H. W. Pelham, C.B., and some 1000 cases were decided by them in conference; the original documents duly signed being still in the writer’s possession, together with the correspondence. Only two brethren were connected with the work, each selected by the writer who had, and still has, absolute confidence that neither would betray his trust. Please, therefore, say who vouchsafed the “information,” which, by the way, is false. The plea of a “promise not to divulge his name” does not appeal to a Berean: it is unworthy of a brother of Christ.

B.J.D. and others. —Bro. Beynon (Worcester, U.S.A.), and bro. T. Griffiths (Llanelly) are evidently unaware that the fullest possible investigation has been given to the question of the soundness or otherwise of the Bridgend (Adare Chambers) Ecclesia, and that not until we were quite satisfied did we insert intelligence therefrom. If these brethren will furnish grounds and proofs for further investigation, and will agree to abide by the results, both we and Bridgend Ecclesia are ready and waiting.

AMERICAN AND CANADIAN REMITTANCES. —In sending Money Orders from the American continent always ask for the English money value to be put on the Order as well as the Canadian or U.S.A. This saves much trouble at this end.

“EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS,” by W.H. Boulton. —This book will shortly be ready. We have received a set of advance sheets which we have read with much interest and profit. The book will be published at 3/6, and will be bound, in cloth, gilt lettering, by the Maranatha Press. When we read such sterling stuff we wonder at such a brother being willing to compromise the precious Truth. Bro. Boulton is today withdrawn from by those in England, and also by the American and Australian brethren, who stand for the whole Truth, because while he talks and writes so well he acts to uphold bro. Strickler, bro. Bell and others in fellowship.

TWELVE EXTRA PAGES. —Upon the proposed enlargement of the Berean Christadelphian, see page 142. Upon learning of the large amount of good matter to be squeezed out this month, a brother exclaimed—“Make it forty-four pages and I’ll pay.” Another brother joined in—“And I think I can guarantee the postage”—so there! Now the reader knows why he is getting the extra twelve pages for nothing this month.

BRITISH MUSEUM VISIT. —See London (Clapham) “Ecclesial News.”

E. HILL. —We can afford you no space to ventilate your unscriptural views. You have “won over the editor of the Christadelphian” why not use his magazine? Now you are in Birmingham you have golden opportunities one way or other.

C. BRIGHTON. —We unreservedly accept your assurance: “I accepted bro. Davis’ (Liverpool) Circular in all good faith;” and you go on to say, “You may publish my amende which is contained in red ink brackets,” we do so: it reads, “I am now disposed to think that bro. Davis’ claims, for the success of bro. Walker before the Tribunals, were as little justified as your own eulogies passed upon him in ‘Without the Camp.’ No doubt he will recant as you have done whenever he realizes his error. One thing is certain. Bro. Walker did not make these claims for himself respecting his prowess before the Tribunals; and it is equally obvious that God—to whom all praise is due—did make singular use of you, and blessed your endeavours.”

THE CHARGE AGAINST BIRMINGHAM. —Bro. F. Walker, of Bristol; in his single-handed defence of the commandments of Christ, was not allowed to finish his speech. We however, have read the MS., and are glad to learn it is now in type and can be had in pamphlet form of the publisher, 41 Stokes Croft, Bristol. Single copies, 4d. each; 12 for 3/6; or 100 for 25/6. The Charge is unanswerable, and we do not wonder at the lovers of darkness trying to suppress it.

# The Berean

## CHRISTADELPHIAN

A 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 by  
GEO. H. DENNEY and FRANK G. JANNAWAY.

-----  
Published by

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

VOL. XII., No. 5      MAY 15<sup>th</sup> 1924      FOURPENCE

Dr. John Thomas  
(Christadelphian)

### His Life and Work

#### CHAPTER 5

The incident recorded in the closing sentences of the last chapter was the Doctor's introduction to Campbellism, and the inauguration of the career which, by slow and certain steps, terminated in the repudiation of every form of popular faith, and the adoption of "The Truth," as found in the writings of Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles. He was, however, unaware of the nature and consequences of the step he had taken. He thought he was merely obeying a divine precept without identifying himself with any ecclesiastical organization. He had studiously sought to avoid such a thing, and had no idea of having departed from his resolution, and united himself with a sect; yet so it was. On going to the meeting with Major Gano, the first time after his immersion he was greeted on all hands as "brother Thomas" in spite of his resolution to steer clear of all parties. It proved a providential occurrence, as the sequel shows. The following remarks on the subject occur in "Reformation in Richmond," Apostolic Advocate, vol. 3, p. 87.

"Previous to our baptism into Christ, we were almost altogether misinformed about Mr. Campbell and this 'Reformation.' All we knew about him was from the pen of Mr. Trollope. We had heard in New York of a sect denominated 'Campbellites,' but of the doctrine of Mr. Campbell and his followers, as they were termed, we knew nothing and cared not to know. On leaving our native country, we had denounced all connection with sectarianism, and had determined never to be entrammelled by its bonds, nor to wear a party badge. This resolution was strengthened by an escape from a watery grave. Threatened with shipwreck off the Nova Scotian shore, and experiencing upon that trying occasion the worthlessness of our religious principles as a basis for a sure and certain hope of salvation, we determined, if we were ever permitted to tread the soil again, not to rest until we found the true way to immortality. But our way of seeking the Truth, proved not to be the way of God. We commenced a tour of sermon-hearing. We first visited the Presbyterian and then the Baptist temples, and here we stopped, or rather, were stopped by the Word of God. A private conversation of

about three hours, as to what was truth, with brother Walter Scott, resulted in our baptism into Christ by moonlight that same night. By this act, we considered ourselves in fellowship with all and every name who had believed and obeyed the same thing. We were invited to connect ourselves with the Church at Cincinnati, with which we found brother W. Scott in fellowship. We observed we should have no objection, providing it pledged us to no sect or party, and upon being assured that it would not, we joined, and thus found ourselves in fellowship also with Mr. Campbell.”

After his immersion, Major Gano invited the Doctor to make his house his home, and the Doctor availing himself of the invitation, resided with him during his stay in these parts. Previous to this, his father had accepted the call to a Baptist congregation in Cincinnati, and was at the time engaged as their preacher. On hearing next day of the Doctor’s baptism, he was full of wrath, but afterwards his wrath abated, and he himself embraced Campbellite principles.

The Doctor resided in Cincinnati seven months. His original idea was to settle there. On this point, he says, in the article quoted above: “Cincinnati was our destination when we left England. We purposed to settle there and practise our profession, but found the prospect of success more flattering in the distance than on the spot it proved to be. The city was crowded with physicians, and we determined to leave it for one of the Atlantic cities. Previous to our departure, however, brother W. Scott had often exhorted us to commence the practice of speaking in the cause of Truth. He thought if we would only break the ice we should easily get along. But we steadily persisted in refusing. We used to tell him that we thought it out of character for one who had just become a Christian to set up for a teacher of that religion in the face of older and abler men, who ought rather to teach us. But he seemed to think that no objection, as there were many old Christians who knew but little. He proposed our going to Carthage, where he would introduce us, and pave the way, as it were, for our commencement. But, no; our scruples could not be overcome.”

In April, 1833, or thereabouts, the Doctor left the West and returned to the Eastern States. On leaving, Major Gano gave him a letter of introduction to Dr. Richardson, of Wellsburg, Virginia, and one to Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, both of which he had to pass on his way. On landing at Wellsburg, he was welcomed by Dr. Richardson, who informed him that Alexander Campbell was in the town, and would shortly be at his house. Dr. Richardson had been an Episcopalian, but was converted to “the Reformation” as it was called, and immersed for the remission of sins. Latterly it was said he became a Spiritualist.

About an hour after the Doctor’s arrival, Mr. Campbell was seen coming up the street, and Dr. Richardson called the Doctor to the door and pointed him out as he approached. The Doctor was very much surprised at the appearance of the man. The ideas he had formed of a parson or preacher were derived from his acquaintance with the “profession” in this country, where broad-cloth, silk and fine linen are badges of the craft. What was his surprise, therefore, on seeing a shabbily dressed, farm-labourer-looking man, in an old drab coat and a slouching white hat. But though Mr. Campbell presented a rough exterior, the Doctor afterwards found him to be a very pleasant and agreeable companion. On the arrival of Mr. Campbell at the house, Dr. Richardson introduced the Doctor to him, and the Doctor also presented the letter of introduction he had received from Major Gano. This was the commencement of the Doctor’s acquaintance with Mr. Campbell, which proved another important circumstance in the development of his subsequent career.

In the course of their interview, Mr. Campbell invited the Doctor to go home with him and spend a little time at his establishment. The Doctor consented, and a second horse having been provided, the two set out together for Bethany. Mr. Campbell at that time was the owner of 2,000 acres of rich Virginia soil, on which there grazed 1,000 head of sheep. The hills on the estate were full of coal, for which it was only necessary to dig horizontally for a few yards to get to a bed. His establishment comprised a post office, a store, a mill, and a stone meeting house, besides his residence. But notwithstanding the opulence of his circumstances, Mr. Campbell lived in a very plain and unostentatious style.

On a certain Sunday, shortly after the Doctor's arrival at Bethany, he went with Mr. Campbell to Wellsburg, where the latter had a preaching appointment. On the way to the meeting in the afternoon, Mr. Campbell (who had spoken in the morning) said to the Doctor that he should call upon him to speak that afternoon. The Doctor told him that he must not by any means do so, as he had never spoken in public on religious matters in his life, and should have nothing to say if he did get up. Mr. Campbell replied that that did not matter; he should certainly call upon him, for he liked to try a man's mettle. This was said with so decided an air that the Doctor saw there was no escape, and remarked to Mr. Campbell that if he did intend to call upon him, he (Mr. Campbell) must occupy the time as long as he could, so as to give him a little chance of preparation.

Having arrived at the meeting house, the Doctor took up his Bible while sitting in his seat, and began to turn it over in search of something as a foundation for remarks. He went from one end to the other without being able to fix upon anything, when at last it occurred to him that he knew Rollin's interpretation of Daniel's Four Empires, and that the second chapter which treats of them, being a long one, the reading of it would give him time to accustom himself (before commencing to speak) to standing head and shoulders above the people. The Doctor was called upon in due course, and proceeded with the reading of the chapter. Having got through it, he fixed his eyes upon the door post, and delivered himself of all he knew upon the subject without venturing to look his audience in the face. Having occupied about half an hour, in which time he completely emptied himself, he concluded by a sudden stop and sat down. He said he was astonished to hear afterwards that the people were taken by his discourse.

(To be continued.)

---

## The Bible wholly inspired and infallible.

### No 108. — The Doctrine of Resurrection.

Modern popular theology has for its basic idea the immortality of the soul. That doctrine takes away any importance that might otherwise attach to the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead. It could be very properly argued that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul entirely negated the doctrine of a physical resurrection. Why should a soul, immortal and intangible, able to move and have its being in greater freedom than any enjoyed in ordinary human life, once it had obtained freedom from the trammels of the "mortal coil," again entangle itself, or be asked to be entangled in a physical body full of disease and other disabilities, or even if perfectly healthy, nevertheless a clog and a brake? Many present-day leaders of religious thought have seen this, and one searches modern "Christian" literature in vain for any definite reference to the Resurrection.

Spiritualism, today, is a definite mark of the flood tide of the tendency to build all thought of hope upon the idea of an inherent, never-dying spirit within the casket of flesh called the body. Going back, however, through the great accumulation of religious books and documents, one discovers that the doctrine of the resurrection has been recognised right back to earliest history. The Roman Catholic Church pays perfunctory homage to the doctrine, although insisting upon inherent immortality and the purgation of souls.

The Church of England places it prominently in the thirty-nine articles in which its beliefs are supposed to be crystallised. Instances are not wanting, however, of "incumbents" who were allowed "reservations" on this and other points. "Acceptance" has been ruled to be sufficient without upholding or believing. Liberty of thought is enthroned.

The "heathen" religions all have traces, more or less definite, of the ancient belief in resurrection, as a study of them quickly reveals. Recent interesting excavations in Egyptian Royal tombs reveal how the Priests of Tut-ank-hamen's day prepared for the resurrection of their dead king's

body by embalming it so as to have it in good condition on the day of rising again, and also putting carefully in its neighbourhood food and drink such as he had been accustomed to.

Yet at the same time the Egyptian system of theology embraced belief in the soul's immortality. Horus, the third person in the Supreme Trinity in heaven being often shown as weighing in judgment the souls of the departed. In some of the hieroglyphics of those days it is clear there was no difference between the Egyptian idea of the reunion of soul and body at a future date and the Church of England's idea as embodied in the Easter hymn: —

“On the resurrection morning  
Soul and body meet again.”

Now we suggest that this difficulty in suppressing the idea of resurrection while an opposite idea was and is promulgated arises from the fact that Resurrection was taught before the doctrine of the soul's immortality was invented. It could not for one moment be logically held that the Immortality of the Soul as an idea preceded that of the Resurrection, because if it was the first held, no necessity would ever have arisen for the second. The real importance of Resurrection lies in the fact of human mortality.

We come to the point of our present endeavour. Here is one great fact—the Bible teaches as strongly as it can be taught the promise of the Resurrection. Hence Job, Moses, and all the Prophets stress the doctrine; whereas there is no countenance given anywhere to the doctrine of the soul's immortality. Resurrection and Judgment always precede reward and “length of days.”

Jesus declared himself as “the Resurrection and the Life,” and said that God had given to him that he should “raise up at the last day” those amenable to judgment and should apportion their rewards—John 5: 25-29.

Paul set the seal upon the long line of sustained teaching by his bold declaration that everything relating to salvation depended upon Resurrection. “If there is no resurrection . . . . your faith is vain”—1 Corinthians 15.

John confirmed it in the last given book of the Bible—Revelation—in unmistakable language.

Yet all the world around, both in Moses' time, the Prophets' days, and in the years of Apostolic preaching, held the opposite view, i.e., that of an inherent deathless spirit.

Always, “when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, they mocked”—Acts 17: 32.

How can the Bible be held to be in face of all this, merely the product of the “Church” or of “human thought?” The claim that the Bible is, like Shakespeare's plays or any other great writings, something dependent only on the human brain for its production in moments of exaltation, can never be satisfactory or in any way logical. Only one explanation adequately accounts for the difference between the Bible and human thought, and that is, God Inspired the writing of the Holy Book. — G.H.D.

(To be continued.)

---

## Editorial.

### DRIFT.

We call particular attention to the correspondence between bro. W.H. Trapp and Major Mattison, and to the official answer of the Ilford Ecclesia to the Temperance Hall apostates in the same town. Here the latter are acting consistently. They are perfectly willing to give fellowship to

members of H.M. King George's Army and openly defend service therein, thus following Birmingham Temperance Hall's example fully.

## CHRIST'S COMMANDMENTS.

### Questions and the Answers.

In the April Christadelphian a writer who we are assured is bro. R. St. John Yockney, of Tulse Hill (who considers it a correct thing to divorce one's wife by going to law, and has done it), asks certain questions and proceeds to answer them. These appear on page 161. We have been asked by several readers to answer them also. We gladly do so.

1. —Is it possible to get unity of thought on the application of Christ's commandments, and if not, what liberty can we allow?

No room is left for doubt either in theory or practice. Jesus designates those to be his friends who "keep his commandments." There is not a single command which is ambiguous. All are clear and certain: all can be kept: all were kept by Christ himself who thus practised what he taught. No loopholes with our Lord. No liberty of any sort can therefore be allowed. The question is wrong in its basis and bearing. Only that is "allowed" which Christ allows, and he nowhere speaks of any "liberty being allowed." All is "Yea and Amen." "We" are not "allowed" to "allow" any "liberty." That is Christ's prerogative. He has set the bounds and we pass it at our peril.

Paul, in 1 Corinthians 6: 1, is emphatic, but bro. Yockney wants "liberty" to go to law to divorce his wife whom he had brought into the Truth! What if, perchance he should marry again, and his first wife—a sister—should repent: would he turn a deaf ear to her entreaties for forgiveness and to return home to him and their little ones? Or, would he divorce his second wife? The situation would be terrible.

2. —Is it not a fact that the Truth has maintained its purity through the rather stern Rule of withdrawal?

Withdrawal is Scripturally commanded where error in doctrine or practice is condoned or committed. It is necessary to be stern with ourselves in this matter. The lack of observance of it has again and again in the world's history produced the apparent victory of error over truth, and is today the cause of the whole of our Ecclesial troubles. We say "apparent victory" because we are looking to the day when Jesus and his faithful "few" will witness the final discomfiture of error and evil and wrong. The law of withdrawal must be carried out even when those advocating, supporting or condoning error and evil "are conscientiously engaged in actions" which those so engaged mistakenly believe to be "in the knowledge and love and fear of God." The greater responsibility rests on those who are not so self-deceived.

The Ecclesia mentioned by John in his third epistle suffered Diotrefes to break Christ's commandments, and the result was that he "cast out" of the church those who were faithful. We have seen the same thing happen in Birmingham recently, in the casting out of the brethren who protested against false doctrine.

3. —Is it not true that some communities have become lax because of their weakness in applying the rule of withdrawal?

Yes: that has been the experience of all Christian ecclesias, and, in fact, is characteristic of the Truth's history all through the ages. Hence the need for vigilance today. Let us heed the lessons of history.

4. –If ecclesias are left alone to manage their own affairs is there not a danger of unrighteous withdrawals happening?

“We are all members one of another;” “If one member suffer all the members suffer with it.” The world today is relatively but one small parish in comparison with ancient days and “whatsoever is not of faith is sin” in ecclesial as in individual matters. Look at Christ’s stern rebuke of Pergamos for retaining in fellowship “those who held the doctrine of Balaam.” Balaam sought to equivocate with regard to God’s commands. The ecclesia at Pergamos was wrong in not withdrawing from these people who spoke with two voices.

A modern instance of Balaamites is seen in bre, Davis, Pearce and Strickler who “speak with two voices.” Shall we stand by Birmingham and Pergamos in shielding such, or shall we stand with Christ in condemning such? —G.H.D.

---

#### PERSONAL INGREDIENTS IN CONTROVERSY.

It is because we stand where bro. Roberts stood forty years ago, and because the Berean Christadelphian occupies the same position as the Christadelphian did before it became Laodicean, that we are able, without reservation, to adopt the very arguments of, and give the very answers given by, bro. Roberts, for we have no sympathy with the shameful charge of “ambiguity” and “objectionable expressions” as applied to Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts by the present editor of the Christadelphian. Thus in reply to more than one correspondent, we say as did bro. Roberts in the Christadelphian, 1885, p. 61: “Several worthy friends have lamented the complication of the question with personal ingredients, and have expressed strong disapprobation of what has appeared to them the intemperate tone which the editor (editors) has (have) imparted to the controversy. Why, say they, cannot the question be discussed apart from names and persons? Their views are to be respected as those of men desiring to see Truth prevail on its naked merits. But there is another side. Such questions never have been debated in this world without personal bearings, and they cannot in the nature of things be detached from them. It is personal transactions that bring them into controversy. Persons are their instruments; and they can no more be dealt with apart from these instruments than politics can be discussed without some reference to the actors on the political stage. This very obvious fact is illustrated nowhere more forcibly than in the Scriptures throughout, in which, at every stage, persons stand forth as the occasion and symbols of the various phases of national character or doctrinal agitations recorded. The spirit of the objection is estimable enough; but the form of it is out of harmony with practical earnest life as we find it under the circumstances now existing on the globe.”

#### “EARNEST CONVICTION” VERSUS “EDITORIAL EXPEDIENCY.”

Further, we are also able to appropriate the sentiments of bro. Roberts, when he wrote: “As to the intemperateness of tone, we would ask our disapproving friends to make some allowance for the ardour of our appreciation of the thing assailed. We hope they will pardon the apparent egotism of the plea: but we are obliged to speak personally when it is personal imputation that is in question. A man fights very earnestly for what he values. This is our defence. At the same time we do not admit the accusation of intemperateness quite to the full. We even make bold to predict that when the acerbities of the conflict have all subsided, and the matter has become quite an affair of the past, our critics will be surprised, on the reading, to find so little that goes beyond the limits of absolute propriety in effusions that now strike them as objectionable on the score of heat.”

When the former editor of the Christadelphian prepared a Christadelphian Petition it was a matter of earnest conviction; and it was in that spirit the London brethren went to work; but, when the present editor of the Christadelphian joined in the work, he admitted it was a matter of editorial expediency (“a free hand as editor”). In a document now before us, in two successive pages, we read, in his own hand-writing, the pitiable confession that, some in Birmingham signed the London Petition only for the sake of unanimity; and that their Arranging Brethren recommended it for the sake of unanimity!

That will not do; we must not be mere creatures of circumstances. "Our duty is to render obedience to God's requirements; compromise is fatal, as it would have proved in the matter of Military Service had we followed the advice to accept Non-Combatant duties. Faithfulness in these matters brings God's blessing and protection upon His children. To seek a 'way out' by 'casting lots, in the spirit of Acts 1: 26,' is to seek His cooperation in our disobedience to His own commands. Let us refuse such advice."—F.G.J.

---

## Questions for Christadelphians.

### Impending Wholesale Declension in the Brotherhood.

(Continued from page 114.)

The remaining Sections of this series of facts have been embodied in a pamphlet entitled—"SOLEMN WARNINGS CONCERNING CHRISTADELPHIAN APOSTASY" from the pens of Temperance Hall (Birmingham) and other brethren, including G.F. Lake, W.H. Barker, W.H. Boulton, F.G. Ford, W.H. Hill, J.F. Smith, A.J. Fiske, T.W. Gamble, H. Norris, F.W. Turner, C. Brighton, J.S. Dixon, F.E. Williams, Islip Collyer, H. Madeley, A.S. Thompson, etc.

The warnings are as startling as they are ominous. Here we have, from the pens of Temperance Hall "friends," the true reason why brethren G.F. Lake, F.W. Turner, and others, projected a rival magazine to the Birmingham Christadelphian.

A copy of the above compilation will be sent post free, to any Christadelphian, on receipt of 1½d. stamp. Address: F.G. JANNAWAY, 99 Stockwell Park Road, London, S.W.9.

---

### Proposed Enlargement of the "Berean Christadelphian."

From all quarters we are being pressed to enlarge our magazine, and we must confess that there is much reason why we should. For one thing there is so much matter of Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts worth reproducing, but which will never see daylight if left to the Editor of our contemporary; one of the reasons given is that his readers do not want such; and another reason, that he considers such writing "ambiguous," "objectionable," "unapostolic," "no model," etc. Well, we differ, and have set out to republish such works, but unless we enlarge, it will be very slow work. So we, here and now, take our readers into our confidence and leave it for them to decide, whether we shall add more pages and make it even money (sixpence per month, by post one penny more). If "yes"; then we purpose using also better paper. Want of space has also prevented the appearance of "Answers to Correspondents," and we have on our shelf scores of helpful and uplifting articles, which we almost feel ashamed at keeping back from our readers. Especially do we regret want of space when we look at our bookcase and behold so much valuable matter in eleven volumes of the Doctor's Herald of the Kingdom, and other works by the same author. It lies entirely with our readers whether the required space shall be provided. Eight extra pages will bring the Berean Christadelphian to forty pages monthly, and add 2/- per annum to the subscription. Let the subscribers express their mind, and we will abide by their decision. The change will commence in July next—in which case the subscribers who receive their copy at the meeting place will pay sixpence for each copy received, and those who have paid until December will send one shilling, being the twopence extra on each monthly copy till the end of the year. But, please do not remit until you receive the first enlarged copy. In Canada and the States 25 cents will cover the difference in price till the end of the year.

We think our readers know that the conducting of the magazine is entirely voluntary—neither the editors or any of the literary contributors receiving any pay for their services. When there has been a loss the readers have not been asked to make it good—and when there may arise a surplus after

paying printer and postman, the readers will have all the benefit thereof, either in enlarged magazine, reduced price, or better get-up.

We have endeavoured to keep the magazine on a paying basis ever since we undertook the task of editing it, and have improved it as fast as our subscribers made improvement possible.

We still give the magazine free to any brother or sister who is unemployed and unable to subscribe. All correspondence on this matter should be sent to bro. G.H. Denney at his address. — EDITORS.

---

## Three Classes.

### A Sunday Morning Exhortation by Bro. R. Roberts.

It is good to come here. It is good to get another glimpse of the facts upon which we stand and out of which our hopes arise. The facts are apt to get out of sight somewhat. Our faculties are dim at the best and our lives are apt to make them dimmer in divine directions. Our lives now, in fact, may be compared to a day of fog and rain in which it is very difficult to realise the sun and the glorious blue of heaven. The meetings act as a rift in the cloud. They show us the smile of heaven behind all the unfavourable aspects of the moment. They help us to feel again the reviving strength of the things most surely established by the testimony of God, and to resume the journey with renewed determination.

We are like the children on the road to a house to which they have been invited. Our stature and our strength are small, and though the prospect of the party is attractive, our little steps grow tired. What do we say to the children in such a case? We comfort and encourage them by telling them they will soon be at their journey's end, and that they will forget all their weariness when once they get there. Our journey is not long though it seems so. We look at our future in perspective and think it longer than it is. It cannot last above so many years, and perhaps not one; and when it is over, it is over for ever. The toils of this mortal will never return. The anxieties, and weakness, and disappointment of this state will be replaced by comfort, strength, and gladness for ever. We get this assurance from whatever part of the Word comes under our notice at these meetings.

This morning it is by Paul to the Thessalonians. His very theme is comfort in distress. This may not have much interest for those who are not in distress. The man at his ease can take the subject very indifferently, and even loftily. He can feel a sort of pity for the weakness that needs comfort—till it comes to his own turn; and then he feels as other men feel who are made to taste the evil of the present state as the Thessalonians tasted it. We are all more or less in this line of experience; that is, made subject to evil and standing in need of comfort. Therefore what Paul says to the Thessalonians is suitable to us all.

He speaks of those who trouble and those who are troubled. With the first, we do not wish to have much to do. There have always been those who trouble. At the very start Cain troubled Abel. Ever since, the Cain-class have done the same to the Abel-class. The Cain-class have always hitherto been in the large majority, and have had power on their side which they have used without mercy for the suppression of the Abel-class. In our day, the power of the Cain-class, in this respect, has been considerably abridged; but the same hostile feeling exists, and makes itself manifest as far as its opportunity allows. It might seem strange at first sight that God should tolerate the Cain-class to the extent He has done in the history of the world. A deeper study of the subject will show that such a class is a necessity in His scheme of things. Faithfulness under trial is the rule upon which God is making a selection of sons for the perfect ages. The action of such a rule requires the prosperity of the Cain-class for a season. God's anger burns against them, but His wisdom restrains judgment till the due time. What God said to Israel applies to all the ungodly of the earth, of whatever name, state, form, aspect, or hue:

“For Mine own name's sake, I have deferred Mine anger that I cut thee not off.”

If God's anger flamed forth before the time, the perfect result that will be seen when the whole of His tried and perfected children are exalted to high places in all the earth, would be prevented. He

purposes to exalt His name in all the earth in the exaltation of the humble who prove their trust therein by faith and obedience in a day of unfaith and dishonour. Hence, the triumph of the wicked, though short (relatively) is a necessity for a time; to which the saints are enabled to submit with a patience that is the result of enlightenment. It was thus that Paul was able to say to these Thessalonians that he gloried in them “for their patience and faith in all their persecutions and tribulations that they endured.”

They represented the second class: “You who are troubled.” Although the least pleasant to belong to this class at present, this is the class we here assembled belong to by preference; not that we prefer trouble, but we prefer to be in that line of things to which the endurance of trouble meantime belongs by divine appointment. We prefer to belong to the Lord’s friends—those who have faith in Him of a type sufficiently strong to take sides altogether with Him during this the day of His rejection, and to be obedient in all things to Him. Why should such a class excite enmity in others? It seems as if such an antagonism should be morally impossible, for the friends of Christ are the inoffensive and excellent of the earth. Many things that seem unlikely do happen nevertheless, and this is one of them. Who would have imagined beforehand that Jesus, the sinless man, who went about doing good, would excite hatred so intense as to bring about his destruction? The explanation in His case is the explanation in the case of all His brethren. He demurred to the ways and principles and sentiments of the wealthy religious, who were on good terms with themselves and in high estimation with all the people. The wounds that he inflicted on pious self-love, by His contentions for righteousness, created for Him among His own people implacable foes more cruel than the heathen. They could not forgive His reproofs. Had they loved the praise of God more than the praise of men, it would have been otherwise: they would have rejoiced in Christ’s zeal for God, and would have been ready to believe it possible that His condemnations of their class were just. But on the contrary, they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God. Consequently, His words and attitude hurt their self-love incurably, and goaded them to compass His destruction under the respectable plea that He was a promoter of disorder and a mover of sedition. But God overruled their malice to the accomplishment of His own purpose.

Paul says—

“It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you, and to you who are troubled, rest.”

What God sees right to be done will be done. Therefore, we may rest assured of this, that the end of all who trouble the word, or work, or people of God, will be an end the reverse of satisfactory to them on all points. It is an end frequently described by Paul. He summarises it thus luridly in Romans 2:

“Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil.”

In one word, he describes it to the Philippians: “Whose end is destruction.” Daniel speaks of “Shame and contempt;” Malachi, of “Ashes under the soles of your feet;” Jesus, of “Weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth.” Jesus connects this tribulation with what the weepers will “see.”

“Ye shall see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of God, while ye yourselves will be thrust out.”

There will be many details of this kind in the terrible experience of the rejected. In His message to the Philadelphian Ecclesia, Jesus says, concerning the Satanic element in the body.

“I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee.”

This will be a terrible experience in the experience of those whose turn will have to come for tribulation; that they will be made to defer, in abject submission to those whom, in the day of probation, they have rejected and scorned. The elect of God may well in patience wait.

“I will repay, saith the Lord.”

When God executes vengeance it is always with great thoroughness. “Wherefore,” saith Paul, “dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves.”

Pray for your enemies. Do good to them that hate you. God may give them repentance to the acknowledging of the Truth that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil. If not, then God’s righteous arm will vindicate the just who wait on Him. The hour will come when the terrible portent will be uttered:

“Your enemies whom ye have seen today, ye shall see no more for ever.”

Thus will tribulation be rendered “to them that trouble you . . . and to you who are troubled, rest.” This is the other side. This is the final purpose of God, to give rest upon the earth in righteousness—“the whole earth at rest”—the wicked rooted out of the earth and forgotten—the meek of the earth established in imperturbable security, delighting themselves in the abundance of peace which a life of tribulation now so well qualifies them to enjoy. This is the tranquil prospect ever forward on the horizon of probationary life, however troubled by affliction or shadowed by death. There remaineth this rest for the people of God. Nothing can touch or interfere with it. It is the stable hope of the gospel.

“Rest with us,” says Paul—with Paul and with all Paul’s brethren of every age. This is a glorious feature of the prospect. To have a good thing is good; to have it in good company is better. To change to the immortal and promotion to power and honour awaits every son of God. No good can exceed this; but consider the joyful zest of a simultaneous entrance upon such a state by thousands whom God has prepared during the ages of evil—“glorified together.” True, the Judgment precedes and selects; but this is but a preliminary detail. The glorious event, in its real and ultimate character consists in the entrance into life at the same time, of a numberless multitude of such as have pleased God by a loyal faith and patient obedience in widely-sundered generations and under circumstances of a common difficulty and bitterness, though differing in local form and complexion. It is not possible to conceive a more joyous conjunction of events. It is what awaits every faithful saint.

It is “when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven.” There can be no advance in the direction of consummated salvation “until He come.” Everything waits His coming. He is gone into heaven, anointed with the oil of gladness. In His Father’s presence are light and “pleasures for ever more”, but on the earth, in His absence there is the darkness that always prevails when the sun is withdrawn. It is needful in the scheme of things upon which the Father is working, that He should be gone for a season. But the promise of His return is as plain and certain as any part of God’s spoken or written Word. Therefore, the saints turn their eyes to that event with longing. They are waiting for the Lord from heaven, not only when coffined in the cemetery, but in the various paths of their living sojourn. All of them are “looking for and hastening unto” the gladsome event. The expectation of His coming is not with them the sensation of a day, or an anticipation hanging on some conjuncture of political events. It is the inwrought conviction and indelible longing of the deepest reason which the signs of the times may pleasantly stimulate, but which lives immortal in the dearest calms of human life. Eighteen centuries ago, the Philippian section of their company, having turned to God from idols, were waiting for Son from heaven and they have not yet forsaken that attitude, and never will. They will be found in it when the supreme moment arrives that brings to fruition the hopes and aspirations of a hundred groaning generations. While their waiting attitude continues, their motto is supplied to them in the last words of inspiration:

“Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.”

There is a third class affected by that event, in addition to “them that trouble you and you who are troubled.” And that is, “them that know not God and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Paul says that vengeance is to be taken by the Lord on them, and that they are to be “punished with everlasting destruction from his presence.” In a sense we are little concerned with the destiny of those who know not God; but this Scriptural definition of their class may be a help to us in the difficult struggle to maintain a Scriptural position. At the present time, nothing seems less important to a man than that he should know God and obey not the Gospel. The man least valued or regarded among men is the man who knows God and obeys the Gospel. Consider the great change that will take place in this matter when the Lord comes. His coming, though secret at first, will be a great public and world-booming event, which will alter the views of everyone in a radical manner. What Christ thinks will become the most sovereign of questions, though now so little considered. His purposes—His movements—will absorb public and private attention as nothing has ever done. There will be panic everywhere till things adjust themselves. At such a time, when it is discovered that the thing that finds favour with Him is the knowledge of God and the obedience of the Gospel, these attainments, so little valued now, will acquire an importance that will make all men wish themselves their happy possessors. It will be too late with the majority. Now is the time to obtain the knowledge of God, and to practise the obedience which by the mouth of Paul He enjoined upon “all men everywhere” (Acts 17:30). Then will be the time for the outpouring of that long-gathered vengeance which God has restrained so long for His name’s sake. And then will be the time when the treasure we

now possess, and which we have to hold in difficulty and gloom, will appear in its true character of untold value.

The time draws on apace. Some people say, "Perhaps we won't live to see it." What then? They will die to see it. Those who die will see it quicker than those who live, because the death interval is but a flash. In life, we have to wait the slow roll of years. In death, the interval is abolished, and we are hurried as in a moment to the very Coming of the Lord. Consequently, in any case, it will be soon to every one of us. In this, we have great and constant comfort. While sojourning in the land of wickedness and strangers, we may have the constant feeling that we are within sight of home, and that if we can only endure for the short journey that lies ahead, we shall soon be out of the desert, and safe in our Father's house of Righteousness, whose shining form we can discern in the approaching distance. A little more courage! A little more perseverance, and by His coming, the Lord will gird us with immortal strength. He will clear our blurring eyes, and rouse our failing hearts, and strengthen our faltering steps, and revive our drooping life with a vigour that will never abate, wisdom that will never err, and joy that will never end. —ROBERT ROBERTS.

---

## The Sacrifice of Christ

BY

BRO. B.J. DOWLING.

Writing on the Strickler question, bro. H. Fry quotes from Ecclesial Fellowship as follows: —

"Bro. B.J. Dowling says, 'To bring about that which is perfect, even life for evermore, it was necessary not only to condemn but to destroy, this diabolos or sin in the flesh. This was accomplished through the death of Christ—Hebrews 2: 14, and became effective in him, on the third day, when he was perfected, 'changed in a moment,' and made at one in nature with the Father.'" Not long ago, bro. Fry virtually endorsed the above as "sound words," "sound doctrine," "sound speech that cannot be condemned," for he wrote saying: "That Christ's nature was purified in the process of death and resurrection is an undeniable fact." "Christ being a descendant of Adam, inherited a nature in which this physical law of sin and death was operative." "He must needs pass through death to be redeemed from it"—Echoes, pp. 25 and 106.

But notwithstanding the fact that he had so written, only about one year ago, he now in his Portsmouth defence of bro. Strickler's errors, plies his cunning craft of asking unnecessary questions with a view to making the above appear unsound, but all of which questions, he well knows, are far from being unanswerable. His queries are as follows: "Now which was it? Was his sin in the flesh destroyed by his death? Was he cleansed by his blood? If the sin was physical and the blood cleansed it—and it was destroyed by his death, he must have risen immortal. What need of change then after resurrection?" These questions are not even clever; they are laboured nothings in pompous words expressed, but they reveal a mind well skilled to find or forge a fault. The careful reader will observe that bro. Fry has deliberately changed the word used by the inspired Apostle, and makes it read "by" instead of "through," a mighty difference, indeed. The Apostle, in Hebrews 2: 14, wrote "through death," and bro. Fry is well aware of the fact, for he quotes it correctly, as the reader will observe in the first quotation we make in this article from bro. Fry's Echoes.

But when bro. Fry attempts to defend bro. Strickler's errors, he finds it necessary to change the Apostle's words. He follows the bad example set by bro. Strickler himself in his book, A Defense, page 24, where he very innocently suggests the substitution of the word "delivered" for the word "purified," as used by the apostle in Hebrews 9: 23, "because," bro. Strickler says, "in the use of the word 'purified' there is conveyed relatively to it defilement," and "Christ's mortal NATURE WAS NOT PURIFIED," says bro. Strickler, although bro. Fry wrote only about a year ago, that it "was purified in the process of death and resurrection." Such errors and contradictions can only be countenanced and upheld by perverting the right words of the Lord.

Bro. Fry “wilt thou not cease to” do this? Bro. Fry who says he “believes that” bro. Strickler “has the truth” (page 18, of A Word in Season) will probably say it makes little difference whether we use the word “by” or “through” in Hebrews 2: 14. But it makes a big difference.

If the words in Numbers 25: 8, “Phinehas thrust both of them through,” were changed to read, “Phinehas thrust both of them by,” it would make a wonderful difference.

If the words in Isaiah 62: 10, “Go through the gated,” were changed to read “Go by the gates,” the thought conveyed would be entirely wrong. So in Hebrews 2: 14, the change made in the reading by bro. Fry, while defending bro. Strickler, is vastly different. This is clearly indicated in bro. Fry’s own use of the word “through” in Echoes, page 106, where in his serious moments, he adhered to the apostolic reading, and wrote, “He (Christ) must needs pass through death to be redeemed from it.” If the word “by” was here used instead of “through,” the thought conveyed would be altogether different and wholly misleading. Bro. Edwin Hill styles bro. Fry “a writer of note.” He has certainly made some “notable” mistakes.

Bro. Fry also says, “If the sin (in Christ) was physical and the blood cleansed it, the blood must have had a mechanical physical effect.” What foolishness is this! Does bro. Fry not know that the physical principle of sin or evil is to be destroyed. Dr. Thomas says: “All the evil a man does is the result of this principle dwelling in him, operating upon the brain it excites the propensities,” and thus we are tempted. It is therefore styled the diabolos or the devil which is to be destroyed. As bro. Roberts so plainly puts it, Christ was “God manifested in the flesh for the nullification of sin therein, that the flesh might be saved.” “In my flesh shall I see God,” “My flesh shall rest in hope.”

Again bro. Fry writes, “If bro. Dowling says he rose in a nature like Adam’s before the fall” (bro. Dowling said no such thing), “he is still opposed,” etc. “If . . . no . . . neither . . . pure Romanism,” etc., etc. There is as much argument in the abbreviations as there is in the whole volley of words. He sees much virtue in an “If.” If bro. Dowling says so, then I say so and so. His words like autumn leaves abound, but no sense nor fruit is seen. Occasionally they smatter of argument, but the many “ifs” show them to be simply the vapourings of a racey imagination trying to bethump us with words. He seems to be wholly given over to this style of argument.

Bro. Strickler wrote “the condemnation of death when once imposed is never broken nor abrogated.” This statement is a flat contradiction of our Statement of Faith. Bro. Fry in attempting to explain and defend bro. Strickler, continues to spin his thread of verbosity. He attempts, and “impossible supposition” as bro. Roberts pointed out, “you cannot separate Christ from the work he came to do.” Instead of trying to gloss this contradiction over with a few meaningless words about personal condemnation, bro. Fry should be candid with his readers and inform them that bro. Strickler was criticising bro. W.H. Boulton who had said that “Jesus was in a position to receive in himself the sentence pronounced against sin. . . His birth brought him in relation with the Adamic curse or condemnation” and the Lord’s death was necessary to effect his redemption.

Now, bro. Strickler says, if this is so, “there is something wrong with the law of God for the condemnation of death when once imposed is never broken nor abrogated.”

But our Statement of Faith shows how by perfect obedience and by dying and rising Christ procured the abrogation of the law of condemnation for himself and all who should believe and obey him. Bro. Fry’s idle argumentation does not explain nor efface the contradiction.

Bro. Strickler goes on to say: “Natural death is not a condemnation imposed specially upon ANY ONE.” So Adam’s natural death was not a condemnation imposed specially upon him. This is the false teaching which bro. Fry attempts to defend. It would be interesting to know upon what hypothesis, these profound thinkers account for natural death.

Paul writes clearly, of course, upon the matter when he says in Romans 5: 12, 18, “By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin” and “by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.” But bro. Strickler does not so teach. He declares that “Christ as a person died under no condemnation” (Defense, page 38). If bro. Strickler is right, and bro. Fry says he “believes” bro. Strickler “has the truth,” then Paul was wrong in saying that “God condemned sin in the flesh of His Son”—Romans 8: 3.

But Paul was not wrong. He was inspired and is therefore reliable, whereas, bro. Strickler, and bro. Fry are not. “Desiring to be teachers” they have proved themselves to be “false teachers,” “understanding neither what they say or whereof they affirm.”

Bro. Roberts says: —

“Christ did no sin,” no guilt involved, but personally “he inherited the condemnation of sin in deriving his nature from a daughter of Adam”—Law of Moses, p. 161.

Bro. Fry says: —

“The advocates of inherited personal condemnation, which must of necessity involve guilt [no such thing—B.J.D.] are in direct opposition to bro. Roberts.”

It is bro. Fry that is in direct opposition to bro. Roberts.

Bro. Strickler says: Christ “never made any offering for himself, we repeat it,” says he, “no offering for himself, only an offering for those who have sins.”—Out of Darkness, pp. 67 and 69. Bro. Fry says his teaching on this subject is nearer the truth than that of his critics.

But bro. Roberts says that if any say that Christ had “no need to offer for himself,” their words are “not according to knowledge.” “When some say that the death of Christ was not for himself, but only for us, they destroy all the typical analogies, and in truth, if their view could prevail they would make it impossible that it could be for us at all, for it only operates for us when we unite ourselves with him, in whom as the firstborn, it had its first effect.”—Law of Moses, pp. 160 and 165.

John Bell, the present Renunciationist leader of Sydney, New South Wales, is in the strictest and closest harmony with bro. Strickler and bro. Fry and he says: “Jesus never offered any sacrifice for his human nature.”—See Shield for March, 1922, p. 43.

Bell, like Strickler, denies that “Christ was defiled by the nature which he in common with all mankind” possessed, and Bell says: —

“IT IS IN PROTEST AGAINST THIS MONSTROUS BLASPHEMY THAT BROTHER  
STRICKLER HAS WRITTEN.”

John Bell knows his man, and recognises his companion in error, while the eyes of brethren Walker, Ladson, Fry, Hill and Waite are “holden” in some mysterious way. The name “John Bell” is so unpopular among Christadelphians in England and America, that these brethren will scarcely attempt to defend him openly, yet his heresies are no worse than those of bro. Strickler.

Bell and Strickler are in the same boat, the only difference worth noting being this; Bell’s oar is plied boldly in the deep waters of error, whilst Strickler’s blade, being nearer the shore, drags occasionally and almost unconsciously upon the golden sands of Truth. This dragging is not at all frequent, but happens often enough to deceive the “simple”—Romans 16: 17-18.

Brethren C.C. Walker, Fry, Hill and Waite, blame us for breaking with such heresies, and they are doing what they can to hinder our “earnest contention” by unfriendly words and deeds. But, brethren, we had no other choice in view of the Apostolic command to “receive them not”—2 John 11.

As bro. Roberts said “the thin end of the wedge is proverbially the thing to be resisted,” but instead of resisting, these brethren are driving the wedge in, with hammer blows, to split the body. Therefore, we must resist and we cannot continue in association with any who teach, defend or tolerate these heresies.

Paul wrote saying: “God sending His own Son in the likeness (the sameness—“took part of the same”) of sinful flesh and for sin condemned sin in the flesh”—Romans 8: 3, and then “brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant”—Hebrews 13: 20.

Bro. Roberts says: There is no difference between the shedding of blood and the condemnation of sin in the flesh. He poured out his soul unto death”—Law of Moses, page 161.

“Paul declared the Truth when he said ‘by his own blood he obtained eternal redemption’—Hebrews 9: 12, and that it was through the blood of the everlasting covenant—his own blood—that he was brought again from the dead”—Law of Moses, page 236.

Dr. Thomas wrote saying: —

“Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus, if it had not existed there. His body was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for”—Elpis Israel, p. 114.

A. D. Strickler writes: —

“We have already called attention to the fact that Christ’s sin in the flesh did not make him unclean or defile him.” “Christ’s human nature did not make him unclean”—Out of Darkness, p. 26.

Bro. Roberts wrote saying: —

“Christ was included in the sacrificial work which he did for us. He was purged by the antitypical blood of his own sacrifice. He obtained redemption, but not until his blood was shed”—Law of Moses, p. 163.

A. D. Strickler writes: —

“Christ was not the subject of the redemption that was in himself, and which he secured for his brethren. To include Christ in this is an outrage”—Letter to a sister.

Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts are in harmony with the inspired Paul, but bro. Strickler is not, and bro. H. Fry defends bro. Strickler’s views, calling to his aid and support, the “Rev.” Albert Barnes, who tells us what he thinks Paul meant to say in Hebrews 13: 20, by giving us the following paraphrase of the Apostle’s words: “The God of Peace who brought again from the dead the shepherd of the sheep—great by the blood of the everlasting covenant—our Lord Jesus Christ”—see Echoes, page 103.

Bro. Fry approves the “Rev.” Barnes’ abominable—Revelation 17: 5 thought, that the blood had little or nothing to do with bringing Christ again from the dead. He was, they say, simply “made or constituted the Great Shepherd by the blood”—Echoes, p. 103. They think “the shedding of blood” has been “exaggerated.” They overlook the fact that there was a “necessity that this man (Christ) have somewhat to offer”—Hebrews 8: 3. “It was necessary,” Paul said, that Christ should be “purified” by his own “better sacrifice”—Hebrews 9: 23. They have forgotten the words spoken from above, which

fully explain the “necessity;” that “it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul”—the living soul formed from the dust of the ground, for “the life of the flesh is in the blood”—Leviticus 17: 11. It is brethren Strickler and Fry that are declining “to the steps of Mistress Rome” and not their critics. Brethren and sisters, who are you with? Paul, Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts; or brethren Strickler, Fry and the “Rev.” Barnes? If you are with the former, do not hesitate, but come out with boldness and so declare yourselves. Brethren Strickler and Fry have gone to such extremes, they have got beyond primitive truth, and brethren Hill and Waite “approve their sayings.” Bro. Strickler says that Christ “to work out a symbolism, became symbolically unclean,” and bro. Fry echoes this nonsense saying, “Recognise the symbolism of the sacrifice of Christ,” “Get at the ideas behind the figures of ritual and ceremonial symbolism and all is plain sailing”—Echoes, page 82. Yes, in this we agree with bro. Fry. It is “plain sailing,” surely, but they are bound for the Port of Rome, where black vespers pageants lead on to foul superstitions, sacerdotal sorceries, with real and unsymbolic loss to all its devotees. The “working out of symbolisms” forms the whole stock-in-trade of “the Mother of Harlots,” who with her beads, rosaries, crosses, crucifixes, pictures and relics makes merchandise of souls and for a consideration in cash, supply the tools for working out salvation by a mere mechanical operation.

The theories of brethren Strickler and Fry, which would make Christ who is the “substance” or “body,” only a symbol, lead on to all those “damnable heresies” and “sorceries,” with which the pages of the ecclesiastical history of “the Mother of Harlots and the abominations of the earth” have been blackened.

Brethren and sisters, in conclusion, I beseech you to heed not the voice of men who are “bereft,” some of doctrine and others of fellowship. Walk in the “old paths” of the Prophets and Apostles. “To the Law and to the Testimony,” and if they speak not according to them, it is because the light that is in them is besmirched with darkness.

B. J. DOWLING.

Worcester, Mass.

---

“In regard to the dissemination of the Truth—Which has achieved the greatest results, the clear, robust, sledge-hammer utterances of Dr. Thomas, or the feeble utterances of his smooth-speaking critics? Whose writings are the most refreshing and upbuilding, the Doctor’s, or those whose writers try to be nice with everyone—including the direct enemies of the Truth? If we take God’s view of the leaders and upholders of error, we shall not find fault with the Doctor’s trenchant strictures on false teachers”—Meditation, A.T.J.

---

## Major Mattison.

(OFFICIAL FACTS.)

(In view of certain mis-statements made recently, we are asked by the Managing Brethren of the Ilford Ecclesia to publish the following).

Major Mattison was examined by brethren W.H. Boulton and W.H. Trapp. At the interview nothing was said as to his occupation, but when the case was under discussion in 1920 and again in 1922 it was stated that he had privately made known his position to the Secretary (W.H. Boulton) of the meeting. If this is true, no other member of the Committee knew that he was in the forces. He left Ilford in 1917 (the last time he was fellowshipped at Cranbrook Hall was on February 4<sup>th</sup>, 1917), and later on was met at Deal, in uniform, by one of the Managing Brethren. This brother wrote to the Secretary for advice, and was advised not to fellowship “brother” Mattison, but to question him as to his position. He followed this advice and “brother” Mattison attempted to justify Military Service by reference to an article in the Christadelphian which he said was proof that the brethren were divided on the subject.

The Ecclesia could not take action because he was in isolation, and because he shortly afterwards left Deal, and his address was not known.

After the war the following letter was received from him:

89 Ladysmith Avenue,  
Seven Kings,  
26<sup>th</sup> May, 1920.

To the Managing and Presiding Brethren of the Ilford Ecclesia.

Dear Brethren, —

I have returned to Seven Kings to reside; as I understand that the question of my removal from Ilford three years ago was then discussed by you, from the point of view of fellowship, I write that I may learn definitely the present attitude of the Ilford brethren upon the matter, before attending the usual Sunday morning meeting for breaking of bread.

To remove from the minds of the brethren any possible misapprehension, let me here state the following facts: —

- (a) I was immersed at Ilford some years before the war, being then an attested member of the regular forces engaged solely on clerical work; I wore no uniform, but was always liable to be required to do so. My engagement was terminable after a specified period of service which in the ordinary course expired in 1916, but special legislation passed during the war automatically extended such engagements until after the war.
- (b) In 1914, after the outbreak of war I was appointed to more important clerical duties with automatic improved status, my appointment being terminable by age and service.
- (c) In 1917 I was appointed to Deal for clerical duties in connection with organization, automatic temporary improvement of status following as a matter of course; here I generally wore uniform, which of course might at any time have been required of me. My temporary position was subsequently confirmed and made permanent. I have succeeded to several appointments since that date, neither of which have altered the nature of my duties—nor are they in the least likely to change. I may wear uniform from time to time as occasion requires. My present appointment is held during pleasure of my superiors, and is also terminable by age, or on my own part by resignation.
- (d) None of the appointments referred to in (b) and (c) above were applied for by me; they were made in the ordinary process of selection.

I do not seek advice, as I am fully aware of the extent to which I am justified in continuing my present occupation, but I should be glad to know what objection, if any, is seen to my meeting with the Ilford brethren.

Yours fraternally,

F. W. MATTISON.

The Managing Brethren sent him the following questions with a request that he would reply to them before they answered his letter: —

1. —Do you consider that a brother of Christ can accept a Commission in, or join the Forces of the Crown (combatant or non-combatant) without violation of the commands of Christ?
2. —You state in your letter that your present appointment is terminable by resignation. At what date did this condition first apply to your terms of service, and why have you not availed yourself of it in view of 1 Corinthians 7: 21, “If thou mayest be made free, use it rather”?
3. —Since you were baptised have you taken any oath or made any affirmation or declaration relative to the service of King George V?

4. –When did you last “break bread” with brethren? Have you availed yourself of every opportunity of doing so since you left Ilford? If not, what were your reasons for abstaining?

He replied as follows: —

89 Ladysmith Avenue,  
Seven Kings,  
18/6/20.

Dear Bro. Boulton,

I am in receipt of your letter of 13<sup>th</sup> inst., and beg to request that you will consider my letter of 26<sup>th</sup> May cancelled.

Yours fraternally,

(Signed) F. W. MATTISON.

The matter then dropped till 1922, when “brother” Mattison requested one of the Managing Brethren (who had only recently become a member of the Committee) to bring his case up for reconsideration. Several interviews took place, at the last of which the following statement was read to him, and he was requested to indicate any inaccuracies therein. He did not do so, but claimed that as long as his conscience was clear we had no right to refuse to fellowship him.

#### STATEMENT OF THE POSITION OF BROTHER MATTISON.

1. —Bro. Mattison, in 1917, voluntarily accepted a Commission, when in the ordinary course, his attested service in the Regular Forces would have expired at the close of the War.
2. –This Commission he still holds, and by it he is pledged to exercise and well discipline in arms the men serving under him, and is commanded to observe and follow such orders and directions as may be received from the King or any superior officer according to the rules and disciplines of War.
3. –Bro. Mattison has not apprised the Army Authorities that, as a Christadelphian, he could not carry out the terms of the Commission, if called upon to do so, and continues to draw his salary as a Commissioned Officer. He is therefore not acting faithfully toward God nor honourably toward men. In this latter connection, the Manual of Military Law, p. 190 (24) states: —“. . . .it has always been the law that a man in pay as a soldier is subject to military law, though not attested. This law is still maintained, because if a man chooses to serve and take pay as a soldier, he must be considered to have accepted the conditions under which he is paid and treated as a soldier. . . .”
4. –Bro. Mattison, in accepting the Commission and continuing to hold same, has not obeyed the Scriptural injunction to “free” himself if possible—1 Corinthians 7: 21, and is therefore now in the position of justifying voluntary service in the Army. [As to the contention that he is “free,” see Manual of Military Law, p. 196 (9): —“An Officer has no right to resign his Commission at all times and in any circumstances whenever he pleases.”]
5. –Bro. Mattison, in tacitly undertaking to obey orders as above, cannot plead religious scruples, however bona-fide they may be, as affording justification for refusal to obey. An officer cannot (for example) plead conscientious scruples as justifying a refusal to pay marks of respect enjoined by superior authority to a religion different from his own. —Manual of Military Law, 1914, p. 18. No faithful brother upholding the One Faith could allow himself to be placed in a position in which he would be required to offer marks of respect to religions which are abominations in the sight of God.
6. –Bro. Mattison, as an officer, is liable to undergo training annually or otherwise, as may be prescribed for his branch of the Service. He is liable to be called up for Army Service at home

or abroad, either with his own unit or otherwise, at a time of National danger or when a National emergency appears in the opinion of the Army Council to be imminent, and is subject to military law at all times. —Manual of Military Law, 1914, p. 198.

7. —The unscriptural nature of the above obligations cannot be lessened, nor a brother's action justified, by the improbability of his being called upon to perform them. Any such improbability cannot nullify the fact of his having undertaken the obligations.

The Managing Brethren then decided unanimously to recommend the Ecclesia to withdraw from him. At an Ecclesial Meeting held 4<sup>th</sup> October, 1922, the above statement and the correspondence were read, and the following resolution was passed without discussion or dissent, some of those now in the Scrafton Road Meeting voting for it: —

#### RESOLUTION.

“THAT THIS ECCLESIA WITHDRAWS FROM BRO. MATTISON BECAUSE HE MAINTAINS THAT MILITARY SERVICE IS PERMISSIBLE TO A BROTHER OF CHRIST WHEN HE IS FREE TO LEAVE IT.”

Signed on behalf of the Managing Brethren of Ilford Ecclesia,

W. W. DIGGENS, Secretary.

\* \* \*

This is the brother who has been deliberately received into fellowship by the Ilford (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia—since the division! And this is the Ecclesia which now—March 29, 1924—issues a printed statement justifying Military Service by brethren and saying that they “know of no Scriptural grounds upon which brother (Major) Mattison can be disfellowshipped, and it was decided unanimously by a general meeting of the Ecclesia held on 28. 3. 24 that this ought not to be done.”

\* \* \*

#### IN CONCLUSION.

Let all who are hoping for Christ's approval not shut their eyes to the fact that here is an ecclesia who knowingly fellowships a brother who claims he is Scripturally justified in accepting a Commission in His Majesty's Army—and retaining his Commission even when he has the opportunity of being made “free”—1 Corinthians 7: 21.

What will be their position in the next war?

And what will be the position at the Judgment Seat of those brethren whose consciences have now become seared—consciences once clear as witness their emphatic declarations in Solemn Warnings\*, for the Scriptural position defined in the London Petition is absolutely opposed to the afore-quoted Resolution of the Ilford (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia. We regret the necessity for having had to devote so much valuable space to the foregoing matter, but there is more involved than appears to the ordinary reader. In the event of Conscription, and the necessity for again approaching the Government, we want to have as clean and as clear a case as we had in 1914. With a view to that end, we have had to leave the nest that has been fouled by the Temperance Hall fellowship. Apart from Birmingham and the Christadelphian, Ilford Ecclesia would not have dared to have welcomed in 1924 a Major in H.M. Army, who they withdrew from in 1922. It is not the Major, but the Ilford and allied Temperance Hall Ecclesias. Well, the Christadelphian and Birmingham can present their own Petition next time, and The Berean Christadelphian and London will present theirs. —F.G.J.

---

\* Now ready, see page 142.

## Tampering with the Gauge.

Those who are connected with the engineering industry may perhaps wonder at the title of this article, appearing as it does in a “magazine devoted to the exposition and defence of the Faith,” and yet it is they who will probably appreciate most the force of our remarks.

There is a close analogy between the workman at his bench and the Christadelphian who is endeavouring to model his character on the pattern of his Master. In the fashioning of component parts, the workman has plans to guide him. To them he must make constant reference. He must not deviate therefrom for the very good reason accuracy is imperative. The various component parts coming from other works, even other towns, must, when assembled in the erecting shop fit into one harmonious whole according to plan.

The furnace and the file play a large part in the process, and when the work is completed it is sent to the Inspection Room to be examined. There the gauge is used to see if it is exact. As the result of the test it is either “passed,” or consigned to the “scrap heap.”

We see the application of the lesson in the life of every Christadelphian. He has plans in the Word of God. Clear and definite instructions. Constant reference thereto will enable him to turn out work that will fit into one harmonious whole, even the Temple of God. As slackness and deviation from the drawings will cause the man at the bench to turn out ill-fitting parts, so will careless reading and heedlessness of God’s Word cause a Christadelphian to fail in the higher work.

The purifying process in the furnace of affliction, and the filing and constant chafing as the result of obedience to Christ’s difficult commands must be endured if our work is to be “passed” in the great day of inspection, when every man’s work will be revealed.

Whilst engaged on “Work of Importance,” in 1917, we came into contact with a workman who through carelessness had made some hundreds of parts which would not fit the gauge. Instead of endeavouring to rectify the mistake he secretly obtained possession of the gauge, and altered it to fit his work. He was, however, detected and severely dealt with. This incident occurred in Birmingham, that great engineering centre, which is also considered to be the centre of the Truth’s activities; and curiously enough, in the same city, someone else beside the workman we have referred to, has been tampering with the “gauge.” Some work has been turned out which will not fit the Divine Gauge, and rather than rectify the error, they have sought to make the Gauge fit by tampering with the commands of Christ.

All must, however, pass the great inspection, and that day will show every man’s work, of what sort it is. The rejected will be destroyed, but that which fits the Divine Gauge will find a permanent place in that perfect fabric which will reflect His glory during the eternal stages. —M. L. EVANS.

---

## “Principles” not “Principals.”

“And the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man’s feet, whose name was Saul. . . . And Saul was consenting unto his death”—Acts 7 and 8.

Did the Apostle Paul excuse himself, because he took no part in the actual stoning of Stephen? In view of his after confession, we are bound to acknowledge that he realised he was just as guilty as they who did the actual violence.

This thought was forced upon me during a discussion with a brother upon the present trouble in the ecclesias. The brother in question stated that the only difference between us was as to whether a

brother had the right to abstain from voting in the case of one who had joined a body where force might be required to be used. Apart from the fact that where doctrine is concerned, we have no option but to vote “Yea” or “Nay” (which is the only logical view of the matter) I could not agree, my view being that not to vote in such a matter was just as evil as Saul’s action was in consenting to the death of Stephen. The right to vote in most questions is undeniable, and very necessary in cases where doctrine is not directly concerned, but where it is concerned there is no option, however much one’s heart may incline toward the offender. We may not condone a breach of doctrine until repentance has taken place, and a determination expressed to offend no more.

The brother with whom I was discussing the matter said that bro. Davis simply reserved the right not to vote, if he wished, on any individual matter, and he took the stand that he was justified in such a reservation. What a fallacy! and what a departure from what one ought to recognise, as the first fundamental truth of doctrine—such Jesuitical false use of language cannot be too highly condemned. None of us ought to be self-righteous—for assuredly the best of us is lacking in some, if not many, points, but surely it would not be right for me to reserve to myself the liberty to refuse to accept even one statement in God’s Word, while readily accepting all else. There could be no end to the matter, if reservation on any points of doctrine were tolerated among us.

While on this matter, it is regretful to note bro. C.C.W.’s note (on current Christadelphian cover) that no written evidence can be produced that he had advised any brother to take up non-combatant service, and that any oral evidence was a wresting of words! I can only say for myself, that when the matter was so very much to the fore (was it in 1915?) several young brethren from Temperance Hall led me to understand that bro. C.C.W. had advised them to take a certain course, and that they had turned it down! Indeed, it was openly expressed among the Coventry ecclesia that the older brethren had “sold the pass,” and the younger brethren had saved it. Doubtless, there are many of these younger brethren who could testify to the truth of the matter, and it is their duty to do so, if only for the sake of killing the many alleged mis-statements and half truths which are creating so much havoc amongst us. I, for one, have no desire to condemn any brother, more especially anyone whose service in the Truth has been so greatly appreciated and would certainly not take any stand amongst those who vilify without reason. But I must take my stand, as I have from the very first, upon the wrongful disfellowship of brethren who were fighting for the principles of the Truth, the evident determination of the Temperance Hall brethren to force their interpretation of the Constitution upon all and sundry. It is not the first time this has been done (as I know from personal experience), and time has proved that their ruling was wrong. If we are a brotherhood, we have a right to know all, and it matters not to me whether a brother be in Birmingham or New Zealand, if he says he has been wrongly dealt with, I claim the right to ask for proof, and will not be put off by a request to mind my own business!!! It is my business!

The early churches failed because of little laxities, and it behoves all who value their calling as “sons of God” to watch that laxity is not allowed to set in.

There are many of us, no doubt, who mourn for the sins that do so easily beset us, and yet who, at the same time, realise the need of faithfulness to our trust. Not “PrincipALS,” but “PrincipLES” must be our care, and “though an angel from heaven speak another Gospel” than that which we have learned to love, we must turn away firmly from it. “Great trees from little acorns grow!” If only Temperance Hall had behaved constitutionally in the first instance, all this trouble would have been avoided, but the steadfast testimony of faithful brethren would not have ensued. God, indeed, does move in a mysterious way, and we know that this present trouble will be used in His purpose. Meanwhile, let us possess our souls in patience.

—A. E. FELTHAM.

Leamington.

---

## The Rise of the Jewish Sects.

(Continued from page 124).

### THE SCRIBES.

After the death of Nehemiah the Law, though regarded as binding upon every member of the Jewish people, was of such a character that it was impossible for the ordinary Israelite without assistance either to know or follow it. In the first place it was written in a language which he had ceased to speak, for soon after the return from Babylon, Hebrew fell more and more into disuse and Aramaic, a cognate dialect, assumed its place. But to come down to the year 168 B.C., even if the Law had been written in a tongue which the people fully understood, it would have been difficult for them to remember and understand the 613 different commandments given in the Pentateuch, in view of the multitude of traditions which, partly by the action of time and partly by the teachings of the school of doctors whom we mentioned as the Tanaim had accumulated around them. And the difficulty would have risen to an impossibility, when the Jewish husbandman—for it was to this class that the bulk of the people belonged—attempted to put his knowledge into practice. \* As a matter of fact it was contended that some of the Mosaic laws had never been put into operation and only possessed a theoretical value; others had become “inapplicable to the altered social state of the community,” and “others were so worded that it was no easy thing to know when and how to apply them.” # Besides, to give the Law authority over the whole field of civil, social and religious life required the exercise of a degree of exegetical skill which the masses of the people could not possibly possess or perhaps acquire.

As a result of these circumstances, the people had to fall back upon the assistance of a class of men who made the study of the Law the supreme business of their lives. In the Old Testament they were known under the name of Sopherim; + in the New Testament as men of learning (grammateis—Scribes), or as men learned in the Law (nomikoi—Lawyers), or as teachers of the Law (nomodidaskaloi). —These Scribes sprang up during the Babylonian exile and their rise was chiefly owing to this disaster to the national fortunes. “The Jews had then perished as a nation, the ties of a common fatherland were for the time dissolved, and the only things which united the deported community were the bonds of a common faith, and the hallowed memories of the past.” ^

\* Morrison, Jews under Roman Rule.

# Kuenan, Religion of Israel.

+ 1 Chronicles 2: 55.

^ Morrison, Jews under the Romans.

It accordingly became a sacred duty as well as a consolation, to preserve and strengthen these bonds, otherwise the Hebrews would have lost their distinctive characteristics, and been swallowed up among the surrounding nations. To prevent this calamity, the ancient records of the race, its traditions, its laws, and its customs, were sedulously collected and disseminated among the exiles. Copies of these records were required for the edification of the weekly assemblies, which afterwards developed into the synagogues. A class of copyists sprang into existence—and these copyists were “the Scribes.” The return from Babylon and the re-establishment of the Law as an obligatory code, increased the number and importance of the Scribes. The growth of the Synagogue into a national institution, added to the demand for copies of the sacred book. As the belief in its Divine origin grew in intensity, the functions of the Scribes became correspondingly enlarged and they naturally developed into canonists and guardians of the text, as well as copyists. It has also to be noted, that the language in which the Law was written ceased to be the national tongue soon after the exile, and the Scribes had to undertake the task of interpreting its contents to the people. This duty involved the assumption of the widest powers and responsibilities, and at the time when Simon held the reins of government we find the Scribes exercising the threefold office of jurists, judges and popular instructors. Coming to the conclusion in their capacity of Judges that the Law was in many cases inadequate to the wants of the

community, a set of exegetical rules was elaborated by the Scribes which allowed them the widest latitude in interpreting the written Law. By means of these rules a new code was practically evolved out of the existing one, pretending to derive its authority from that which it was in many cases intended to supersede. This new code is called "The Law of Tradition," because it was represented as being nothing more than an authoritative interpretation of the written Law, and authoritative interpretation which dated back to the time of Moses. It was in reality no such thing, but simply the work of the Scribes.

#### "MAKING VOID THE LAW BY THEIR TRADITION."

This traditional law was thus more elaborate in its character than the written Law, and because not stereotyped in written documents was far more flexible, for although the Scribes attempted to hand down the precepts of tradition intact from one generation to another, it is certain that it was often altered and amended, sometimes by the whims of men and sometimes to meet unforeseen circumstances. The whole body of the Scribes cooperated in the task of law making—usually having Jerusalem as their meeting-place. If a question was raised or amendment proposed, the Scribes discussed it, and it had to be passed by a large majority before it had any chance of adoption into the code. Then it was sent up to the Sanhedrin who either passed it or rejected it, according to their convictions. If passed, the amendment became a part of the law. The Sanhedrin was privileged to make suggestions of its own, but which had in turn to receive the sanction of the Scribes. A notable instance of such suggestions we have noticed in the numerous laws proposed in the Sanhedrin by the Mischnical Doctors. The immense influence wielded by the Scribes was productive of many evil consequences both upon their own character and upon the religious life of the community. Thus they became animated with a great belief and confidence in themselves and their own wisdom, believing themselves superior to all other men because of their learning. In the years immediately preceding the persecutions by Epiphanes, the majority of them professed themselves opposed to all panderings to Hellenic wisdom, expressing the opinion that there was no real wisdom but that of the Hebrew Law. When, as a result of Hellenising, Jerusalem was so ravaged, and when the storm was passed and the epoch of independence was just commencing under the great and wise Simon, then the Scribes and their allies decided, puffed up by their own wisdom and superior goodness, to form themselves into a party. The chief ground given for taking this step was that the Scribes wished, in the interests of Monotheism and the Law to preserve the Jews from all contact with the outer world. This question under the Persian dynasty, again under Alexander, and again under the kings of Egypt and Syria, had been a source of friction, and the sects of the Hellenists and the Assideans, although neither numbered many Scribes in their roll, were undoubtedly created by the same and its attendant controversies. Thus we have in the Scribes the foundation of the sect which was afterwards dubbed by its enemies "Pharisee"—the Separatists.

(To be continued).

---

## The R.A.M.C.

### WHAT IT MEANS.

A young brother with personal experience of what it means to be in the R.A.M.C. has written us a long and interesting letter—would that we could spare space to reproduce the whole of it. In it he says:—

"While in a Convalescent Home I got in touch with a young man belonging to the R.A.M.C.—also a conscientious objector: he had been wounded, and by asking him how he came to receive his wounds, he told me the following story which I will give in his own words:—'As you know, I am a conscientious objector. I got into the R.A.M.C. after some trouble, and in due course was sent to a hospital near the firing line in France. One night the Germans broke through the Allies' fighting line and attacked the hospital. Many conscientious objectors were at work there with me. We were given revolvers and told to fight for our lives. Well, some of them did, and some didn't. I for one did not fight, but threw the weapon away.

In a few minutes half of our numbers had been killed, and many of the rest of us wounded. Suddenly they left the building, and departed the way they came. More of the Allied troops had arrived, and the Germans had been driven back.”

Our correspondent goes on: —

“What would a Christadelphian have done, had he been in the same building? He may have done as this R.A.M.C. man did, or he may have done as some of the other ‘conscientious objectors’ did, stand up and fight—and then what about a clear conscience? Or he may have been killed, as some of them were; and then, what would he say at the resurrection? Is it not doing the right thing to follow Dr. Thomas’ advice and ‘Be not enrolled,’ and uphold the London Standing Committee’s view? You may, if you choose, forward this to bro. C.C. Walker, if you think it will do any good towards making him realise the fact that no Christadelphian should ever entertain the idea of entering even non-combatant Military Service, as it is only part of the great Military machine.”

Yes; our young brother is right—and so was bro. Newman in what he told his Temperance Hall brethren about that deceptive Clause 7. It was all very well for the Editor of the Christadelphian to say a brother if forced to shoulder a rifle, could fire in the air, and thus obey (?) the command of Jesus, to do violence to no man. Such talk is sheer sophistry. Human nature is not built that way. We confess we fear that under similar circumstances, the temptation for self-protection would be too great to be resisted. We remember the case of Peter—Matthew 26: 35 compared with verse 74. The only safe course—the only way to please Christ is to do as our beloved Dr. Thomas counselled—“BE NOT ENROLLED.”—F.G.J.

---

## Reservations—Passive and Active.

The doctrine of “Reservations” is moving on apace. When we prepared the address on The Charge against the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia, we did not anticipate the fruits of this unscriptural doctrine would so rapidly be seen. This choice (?) plant appears to have been put into a “forcing-pit,” so quickly has it developed.

Speaking of the Temperance Hall, Birmingham’s toleration of the reservations of brethren A. Davis and T.E. Pearce, we said (page 29): —

“It only requires time to reap the harvest of such work. And I ask, brethren, will that harvest be an ecclesia—and if we take the wider view, a brotherhood—of vigorous, healthy, spiritually-minded brethren and sisters left to carry on the work of contending for the Faith when we are dead and gone (if Jesus should remain away so long), or will the door that has been left on the jar be flung wide open and let in the torrent of accompanying false doctrine which will NATURALLY follow the introduction of this one?”

The majority at Temperance Hall have voted for The Truth concerning the Constabulary and Army Questions, yet allow in their midst the evil leaven of “reservation,” which on account of its greater acceptability to the flesh, is extremely likely in the course of time to be endorsed and justified by the whole ecclesia. The “manifestation” of this evil is only “hindered” because of this majority, and perhaps by the continued agitation on the part of the Berean Christadelphian; and still further because a concrete case does not at the moment arise in their midst.

But the fruit has appeared on another part of the “tree,” and strangely enough in the town that has been amongst the most vigorous on behalf of Truth—ILFORD. Here the Apostolic statement that “evil communications corrupt good manners”—1 Corinthians 15: 33, is practically demonstrated in Ilford (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia’s adoption of the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) toleration of

Reservations, and putting it into practical operation. The warning note of the first part of the verse stands out in bold relief: —“BE NOT DECEIVED.”

Who would have thought that the Ilford brethren and sisters who, in 1922, voted for withdrawal from “Major” Mattison, serving in the King’s Forces, should in 1924 open their arms and receive him back into the fold? The Major’s conditions have not changed for the better—rather worse from the Truth’s standpoint. The Truth has not changed. No; it is the minds of these brethren that have changed, showing the downward trend of those who call good evil, and evil good. The Truth demands of those who know what is right to cry out in the words of the Apostle to all those of the household who are still halting: “BE NOT DECEIVED.”

Look at the effect of the Temperance Hall policy on those ecclesias who expect of them a lead. It is naturally presumed that the company of brethren who guide the Temperance Hall affairs could hardly commit the wrong imputed to them. In fact, those who justify them look upon a declension in that quarter as almost if not quite impossible! But why? They are as liable as those who in the first instance in the early history of the Church took the first step towards declension, which involved another step, and yet another, until the Truth was abandoned.

There appears to have been many such steps taken before we had this modern declension brought to a head in the Davis-Pearce incident—which incident, by the way, is not considered by many to furnish sufficient evidence to cause a separation. If the Davis-Pearce incident does not convince, you will not have long to wait before the evil fruit produced by such a wrong position will make you flee for safety, or you will be engulfed in its overflowing torrent.

We should have had no “Major” Mattison meeting at the Ilford (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia, had Birmingham Temperance Hall been true to its stewardship of the gospel, for the Ilford 1922 decision would have been maintained. If there had been the clear, honest ring of Truth in the attitude of the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) to the Petition for TOTAL EXEMPTION FROM MILITARY SERVICE, “Major” Mattison would not have been able to “attempt” to “justify Military Service by reference to an article in The Christadelphian which he said was proof that the brethren were divided on the subject.”

The passive reservations and lax procedure on the Military Question (when a vigorous stand and decided lead should have been manifested) was a “forcing-pit” for the “Constabulary Question.” One false step leads to another; and notwithstanding the hostility of the Editor of the Christadelphian to brethren A. Davis and T.E. Pearce at the commencement, when confronted with his (bro. C.C.W.’s) own compromising attitude on the Military Question, he gave way, and sided with those who do evil, instead of retracing his false steps and getting back to the bed-rock of Divine precept.

But brethren! BE NOT DECEIVED!! See what it is producing!!! In adopting the same teaching it has encouraged Ilford to openly affirm in a printed circular that association with the Army is justifiable. Bro. A. Davis demands that every case be judged on its own merits. There are no “merits” in joining Army or Constabulary. We declare that no brethren or sisters must be sworn to give service to the diabolos power of Nebuchadnezzar’s image. The Father’s command is clear and terse: “Come out from amongst them.” “Love ME with all your heart and soul and strength and mind.” Meditate on these two commands alone, apart from those commands directly bearing on “force,” and it must be seen that there is no place amongst the brethren for the “Major” Mattison type. No compromising attitude must be permitted that will tolerate “reservations” leading to such disastrous consequences.

This is the first Ecclesial decision on this matter in modern times—yet another step removed from the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus Christ—1 Timothy 6: 3; and this is the active wholesale results of the passive policy that was generated, fostered, strengthened and is now fought for, at Temperance Hall, Birmingham.

This is, as we have said, the doctrine of Birmingham (Temperance Hall) in active operation, and another step removed from the Gospel. Why, then, keep the door barred against J.J. Andrew's followers (it will only be another step further away from Christ), and then fellowship the Suffolk Street community—for there are many there who believe in a Wholly Inspired Bible (it will only be one more step further away); and after that how can we stop? Our friends, the Russellites, who will give everyone a chance—how commendable!! (only one more step removed!!!!)

Stop! Stop! brethren. BE NOT DECEIVED!! If it takes but two months since publishing our Charge against the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia to demonstrate as we have done, the development of the evil from its passive state to the evil in its active state, how long will it take to so incrust the Truth with the reasonings of the flesh, to cause Deity to say, "In VAIN do ye worship ME, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men"?

The evil which has taken root and grown MUST be pulled up without mercy as a noxious weed. Do not tarry; or the whole garden will be overrun, and the plants of beauty there may have been growing there will be choked and die, and the result—a wilderness. —F. WALKER.

---

## 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.

\* \* \*

TEMPERANCE HALL "ASSURANCES."

14<sup>TH</sup> April, 1924.

Dear Brethren Denney and Jannaway, —Greetings in the Lord's Name. Enclosed is a copy of a letter to the Editor of the Christadelphian Magazine, which we have requested him to publish.

We should be glad if you also would find room for it in the pages of the next issue of the Berean Christadelphian.

Faithfully your brethren,

ARTHUR PARISH.  
JOHN H. PRICE.

[COPY]

30 Beilby Road, Stirchley,  
Birmingham,  
14<sup>th</sup> April, 1924.

To the Recording Brother of the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, Birmingham,  
and the Editor of the "Christadelphian."

BRETHREN, —The undersigned, joint signatories to the "Healing the Breach" letters of February 15<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>, published in the Christadelphian, April, 1921, page 177, request your attention to the following facts in connection therewith: —

1. —Those letters were written with an earnest desire to effect reconciliation by inducing Temperance Hall Ecclesia to recognize the only possible basis of fellowship, and in so doing to abandon their unscriptural claim to erect a man-made resolution as a test of fellowship.
2. —On the basis of your ecclesial acceptance of those letters, and relying on verbal assurances from you two brethren that such a claim would not be maintained, we returned to your

company and fellowship, being assured that by so doing we were opening a door to reconciliation on sound scriptural lines.

3. –Subsequent events, particularly your re-affirmation of the unrighteous cutting-off of brethren for refusing to submit matters of principle to a majority vote, and the issue of the pamphlet Ecclesial Relationships, in which the claim mentioned under fact (1) is not only repeated but elaborated upon to the obscuring of the true Scriptural doctrine of fellowship, proved conclusively to us that the assurances previously mentioned (2) upon which we accepted your fellowship, were utterly worthless.
4. –Our acceptance of your fellowship was therefore a mistake. It is a cause of deep regret to us that by such an act we should have created an impression that we endorsed the false heretical doctrine of fellowship by majority vote promulgated by your ecclesia, than which nothing was further from our minds.

Finally, in fairness to all concerned, we request for this statement the same publicity that was accorded the letters to which they refer.

Faithfully your brethren,

ARTHUR PARISH.  
JOHN H. PRICE.

To the Household of Faith.

14<sup>th</sup> April, 1924.

Dear Brethren and Sisters, —Greetings! We are naturally somewhat concerned, and anxious, that any mis-apprehension existing in your minds may be cleared by this letter, which expresses the exact setting of the letters referred to, and our motives at the time.

It is our earnest desire in the fear of God to avoid any cause of offence or stumbling to our brethren and sisters, and we feel this statement will clear away all uneasiness and any doubts that may exist.

It affords us considerable pleasure to know that the barriers of mis-understanding have been overcome, and that the Edmund Street Ecclesia and John Bright Street Ecclesia are now in fellowship,

Faithfully your brethren,

ARTHUR PARISH.  
JOHN H. PRICE.

\* \* \*

BRO. HILL AND BRO. BELL.

March 25<sup>th</sup>, 1924.

Dear Brethren, —I have received from bro. Hill, of Canada, a letter in which he says, “he has received from bro. Bell, of Australia, some copies of the Shield (the clean flesh organ) and learn therein bro. Bell’s party repudiate statements (of faith) altogether.”

In view of the fact bro. C.C.W. is prepared to extend fellowship to them: how futile is the oft-repeated question “whether clause 35 of Statement of Faith does not cover the Birmingham Trouble”? How can it do so when bro. C.C.W. is prepared to accept in fellowship, those who not only cannot accept our Statement of Faith; but refuse allegiance to any Statement of Faith?

The position then is that bro. C.C.W. acquiesces in withdrawal from John Bright Street and Blackheath for alleged breach of constitution—placing man-made laws above Christ—but is quite prepared to fellowship those in Australia who cannot accept the Scriptural statement of faith; thus is the knat strained at, and the camel swallowed wholesale.

Try the spirits whether they be of God; our Statement of Faith is the recognised test; and in its practical application lies its value. Again we say, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?"

I remain,  
Yours in Israel's Hope,

J. W. ATKINSON.

Crewe.

\* \* \*

ILFORD AND MAJOR MATTISON.

89 Ladysmith Avenue,  
Seven Kings,  
March 28<sup>th</sup>, 1924.

The letter from "W.H. Trapp" and remarks accompanying it, which appeared on page 74 of your March issue are inaccurate in some particulars and important facts are suppressed; if you have any regard for the truth, you will insert the following supplementary information in your next issue. Should you not do so, the reason will be perfectly obvious: —

- (a) The whole of the "Recessional" was not printed as stated; there were important omissions. As to whether it was right or wrong to sing these words depends upon the construction placed upon them, a remark which applies equally to many of our hymns also written to "the god of our fathers." I had nothing to do with its selection, and, with others, have admitted the unwisdom of allowing it to be sung. Your correspondent would, however, have been more honest had he stated that he was merely making the "Recessional" a cloak for other purposes.
- (b) I was not immersed in 1913.
- (c) I did not refuse to allow my name to be inserted on the Christadelphian Register, nor was I informed that one was being compiled. I certainly did decline to sign a petition to be presented, which course in my case was a correct one.
- (d) I did not "disappear" as stated; when I left Ilford in 1917, my going was announced in the ecclesia, and I believe in the Christadelphian. While away (excepting a short period) I met regularly with a few other isolated ones, and, as is well known at Cranbrook, was in constant touch with members of the Ilford meeting.
- (e) On my return to Ilford in 1920 I met regularly at Cranbrook Hall, even after bro. Trapp "arranged" my "disfellowship" at the end of 1922.
- (f) I have not been made a presiding and exhorting brother as stated.
- (g) I have been in the service nearly thirty years, and so was immersed whilst in that calling, and liable for service till 1931. In that calling I "abide with God," agreeably with 1 Corinthians 7: 24. I am out for truth, and am prepared to follow where truth leads. Vague generalities have been talked and written by a few as to my remaining in the service, and extracts have been made from imperfectly understood military manuals. No Scriptural evidence has, however, been produced to show that my action is wrong; other evidence does not matter. On the other hand, a number of passages of Scripture support the attitude I have taken up.

Would it not be more creditable to you to get along with the work of the Truth, and leave matters you cannot understand to the judgment of Christ when he returns?

F. W. MATTISON.

\* \* \*

57 Coventry Road,  
Ilford, Essex,  
April 14<sup>th</sup>, 1924.

Dear Brethren,

I desire to offer the following remarks in reply to Major Mattison's letter of 28<sup>th</sup> March, 1924: —

1. —I admit I was mistaken in stating that the "Recessional" was "printed in full." The mistake is immaterial, because I only quoted and commented on the first verse which was printed on the programme, and I repeat "it is grotesque that people who can put these words into the mouths of their children should call themselves Christadelphians."
2. —It is utterly untrue that Major Mattison did not refuse to allow his name to go down on the Christadelphian Register. His was the only name of a man of military age in the Ilford Ecclesia which was omitted.
3. —It is utterly untrue that he declined "to sign a petition." He was never asked to do so. The Secretary signed on behalf of the Meeting.
4. —It is utterly untrue that I have made the "Recessional" a cloak for other purposes, and, as "an officer and a gentleman" the Major should either substantiate his accusation or withdraw it.
5. —It is utterly untrue that he "met regularly at Cranbrook Hall after his return to Ilford," if this implies fellowship (if it means attendances without fellowship, there is no point in it). The last occasion on which he was fellowshipped at Cranbrook Hall was 4<sup>th</sup> February, 1917.
6. —On December 11<sup>th</sup>, 1917, it was reported to the Managing Brethren that "bro. Mattison, before leaving Ilford, had accepted a Commission in the Forces of the Crown, and was now stationed at Portsmouth. The Secretary was instructed to communicate with the Portsmouth Ecclesia to ascertain whether he was attending their meetings, and to obtain any particulars he could concerning him" (Extract from Minutes drawn by W.H. Boulton).
7. —My letter did not pretend to give a history of the case. THE IMPORTANT FACT is that Major Mattison is a Major, and no amount of wriggling can nullify it, and further, the Ilford (Temperance Hall) Meeting have issued a printed statement dated March 29<sup>th</sup>, 1924, justifying the acceptance of Military Service by brethren and saying that they "know of no spiritual grounds upon which bro. Mattison can be disfellowshipped, and it was decided unanimously by a General Meeting of the Ecclesia held on March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1924 that this ought not to be done."

Sincerely your brother,

W. H. TRAPP.

\* \* \*

NEW ZEALAND GIVES NO UNCERTAIN SOUND.

Dear Brethren. —Greeting in our Beloved Master's Name. I am enclosing an article on Fellowship which you may find useful for publication in the Berean. It will assist in fighting "Laodiceanism," of which we have our share in New Zealand. May your hands be strengthened in the good work. Am following Berean carefully. Have read Unjust Balance, and consider it rightly named. We are with John Bright Street and yourselves in the action taken.

Your brother in Christ,

Hastings, N. Z.

HERBERT H. JAMES.

BRO. LESLIE WALKER (N.Z.) AND THE BELL HERESY.

Dear Brother Denney, —Greeting in the One Hope of our high calling in Christ Jesus. Acknowledging your letter of 15<sup>th</sup> January. I shall be pleased to act as your correspondent in New Zealand, and give such information as will be necessary from time to time concerning Ecclesias in various part of this Dominion. I am quite with you in regard to intelligence from unsound ecclesias being shut out from the pages of the Berean Christadelphian.

Our Ecclesia (Remuera) meeting at Belmont Terrace Hall, Remuera Road, was first formed in 1905 as the outcome of the Shield's (Australia) departure from the Truth, and has maintained since then an attitude of upholding the Truth in its purity. Various Ecclesias in New Zealand and Australia are associated with us in fellowship, and we are sure we are with some of the ecclesias in England and elsewhere because in these last days there is a real necessity to uphold those essential principles which comprise the One Faith and thus preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. With fraternal regards.

Auckland, N.Z.

Faithfully your brother in Christ Jesus,

LESLIE WALKER.

\* \* \*

ANOTHER VOICE FROM THE ANTIPODES.

Dear Brother Denney, —I have to thank you for January number of magazine, and hereby enclose subscription fee, 5/-. I have been a Christadelphian for over twenty years. I remember bro. Jannaway lecturing in tour in 1914 (and have admired particularly of late his plain speaking and sound doctrine), also the late bro. R. Roberts in Wellington. I am sorry to say that both my wife and self have been in isolation here some eight years, although there are some thirty to forty professed Christadelphians in Wanganui, and some of them address me as bro. Banks. But I cannot fellowship them as they are chiefly Bellites or fellowship those who are, as bro. K. R. Macdonald, of Whangarei Ecclesia, can testify. Personally, I have always adhered to sound doctrine, though painfully conscious of other defects. I wish you success in your arduous task of combatting bro. C.C. Walker and his magazine on his "yes-no" principles.

I can testify to the miserable attitude of the Birmingham magazine toward the Bell heresy for years, and that bro. C.C. Walker published the whole of the intelligence of bro. Bell's adherents in Wanganui, while flouting the intelligence of the then faithful brethren.

The result of which has caused incalculable harm which I would not like to rest on my shoulders,

Wanganui, Antipodes.

Your brother in hope of life eternal,

E. W. BANKS.

---

“BIRMINGHAM FRICTIONS.”

By bro. J. M. EVANS.

Notwithstanding the twelve extra pages at our disposal this month, we have been compelled to hold the concluding chapter of this subject, and much other profitable and interesting matter over, although in type.

---

## Ecclesial News.

Intelligence in this magazine is confined to those ecclesias in the United Kingdom that restrict their fellowship to those who unreservedly accept the Recognised Basis of Faith, currently known as the "Birmingham (Amended) Statement of Faith," and are therefore standing aside from the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia until that ecclesia openly deals with those of its members who do not unreservedly accept such Basis.

As to Australia and New Zealand: Intelligence cannot be inserted from any ecclesia tolerating those who hold the "clean flesh" theories of brethren J. Bell and H. G. Ladson.

As to the United States and Canada: Intelligence will be only inserted from those ecclesias which have refused to give fellowship to those who tolerate the false doctrines of brother A. D. Strickler.

---

All Intelligence intended for insertion in the following month must be in our hands by the 25<sup>th</sup> of the previous month.

BIRMINGHAM (Edmund St. Ecclesia). —Shakespeare Rooms. Lecture, 3 p.m.; Breaking of Bread, 4.45 to 5.30 p.m. We are still proclaiming the truth at the above address, and should be pleased to welcome any visitors of other ecclesias meeting upon the Berean Christadelphian Basis of Fellowship. We have had our numbers strengthened by bro. and sis. C. Davis and bro. and sis. N. Miles from the John Bright Street Ecclesia. —J. E. WEETMAN, Rec. Bro., 204 Burbury Street, Lozells.

BIRMINGHAM (John Bright Street Ecclesia)—Bristol Street Council Schools. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11; Lecture, 6.30 Thursdays: Bible Class, 8. It is with great pleasure that I have to report two additions to our meeting by immersion into the saving Name after a very satisfactory evidence had been given of belief in the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ. Mrs. Lydia Rabone and Mrs. Lucy Fisher were immersed on April 22<sup>nd</sup> at Leamington. The Leamington brethren having kindly given us the use of their bath. Brethren Tandy and Hall of John Bright Street, and bro. Corbett of Leamington giving short and encouraging addresses. We were glad thus to be able to assist tow children of Adam to become children of God; and our earnest prayer and hope is that they may continue to the end, for "He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved." It is also with great pleasure that we put on record the expression of satisfaction at the agreement we have reached with the Edmund Street Ecclesia. It should be a source of strength and comfort to us both in Birmingham. May God bless this happy consummation. We regret to report that sis. Edith Price has left our company and fellowship, having gone back as we understand to Temperance Hall along with her husband, bro. Gilbert Price. We have been encouraged during the last few weeks with help from brethren W.H. Trapp from Ilford and bro. Corbett from Leamington. This report will probably be the last one that I, as Recording Brother of our ecclesia, shall send, as for business reasons I am leaving Birmingham, moving back to Southend-on-Sea, where I shall join the ecclesia at Westbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea (D.V.) Future correspondence should be addressed to A. Broughton, 140 Wiggin Street, Birmingham. I much regret, for several reasons, leaving the scene of my eight months' sojourn, but no doubt God is working in our affairs—W. L. WILLE, 1 Oak Villa, Stambridge Road, Rochford, Essex.

BLACKHEATH (Staffs.)—Dear Bro. Denney: Greetings in Christ. Will you kindly make it known through the Berean Christadelphian to the brotherhood that I have been appointed Rec. Brother in place of bro. Powell by the Ecclesia, and all communications intended for the above should be addressed: —W. H. SIDAWAY, 46 Hawes Lane, Rowley Regis, nr. Birmingham.

BRIDGEND. —Adare Chambers Ecclesia. Meetings: Sunday morning, 11, Breaking Bread; Sunday School, 3 p.m.; Lecture, 6.30 p.m.; Tuesday evening 7.30 p.m., Bible Class. It is necessary to report our withdrawal from bro. W.E. Davies because of his disorderly conduct. We have been cheered by visits from bro. Ellis, who on the last occasion brought all his family. Also by the knowledge that there

are now brethren of like precious faith near at hand, and our isolation in Wales is at an end. —W. WINSTON, Clifton House.

LIVERPOOL. —By reason of the prevailing laxity in doctrine and fellowship, manifested in the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia and those in fellowship therewith, a number of brethren and sisters have severed their connection with the ecclesia in Liverpool, and now meet together for the breaking of bread and mutual edification in the things of the Spirit. Any brethren and sisters in fellowship with those who have taken a similar action will be heartily welcome at any of our meetings. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m., Room 7, 18 Colquilt Street, off Bold Street. Wednesdays, 8 p.m. (Bible Study), at the home of sis. Philpotts, 31 Stanley Street, Fairfield. Full particulars later. —W. ROTHWELL, Rec. Bro. 207 North Hill Street, Princes Road, Liverpool.

LONDON, S. (Clapham). — Avondale Hall, Landor Road, S.W. Sundays 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.; M.I.C, 9.50 a.m.; Raleigh Hall, Brixton, S.W.; Thursdays 8 p.m.; Tuesdays (M.I.C. alternately with Eureka Class), 8 p.m. We are pleased to record that sis. Pauline Reynolds from Walham Green, also bro. Frank Collett from Streatham, are now in agreement with the position taken by us over the Birmingham Trouble and on the question of fellowship, and will in future meet with us. The next outing of the Mutual Improvement Class to the British Museum has been arranged to take place, God willing, on Saturday, 24<sup>th</sup> May. Tea will be provided which will be followed by a Fraternal Meeting in the Essex Hall. Brethren and sisters in fellowship are cordially invited to be present. A programme will be sent to all who are interested on application to bro. E.W. Browne, 14 Elms Road, Clapham Common, S.W.4 —F. J. BUTTON.

LONDON, E. —Pembury Hall, 41 Pembury Road, Clapton. —We are continuing in the work of preaching the Gospel, and during the month have had valuable help from bro. F. Walker, of Bristol, bro. H.A. Mayhew, of Bexley Heath, and bro. W.H. Trapp, of Ilford. —C. C. REDMILL, Sec.

OLDHAM. —Cooperative Guild Room, Greenwood Street, Huddersfield Road. Breaking of Bread, 2.30; Lecture, 6.30. Since last we wrote to you we have had the company and help of bro. F.G. Jannaway, who was with us on March 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>. We circularized the neighbouring ecclesias in fellowship with Temperance Hall that bro. Jannaway would address a meeting on the Saturday evening, and state why we would not continue in fellowship with Temperance Hall. A good number of brethren and sisters attended, eighteen ecclesias being represented, who listened attentively while bro. Jannaway addressed them. Afterwards a number of questions were handed in writing, all of which were answered satisfactorily. Very few came from the Oldham Bridge Street meeting, their Arranging Brethren having requested them not to attend. The result we leave to Him who knows all things and who is ever ready to direct His children who put their confidence in Him. Bro. Jannaway gave the word of exhortation, and also the opening lecture on the following Sunday, when we had a response of thirty strangers. We are glad to say that the attendance at the lectures has been very good, and we feel greatly encouraged. Bro. W.J. Elston was with us on April 13<sup>th</sup>. We were glad to hear his helpful word of exhortation, and also for his help at the lecture in the evening. We have had also the following additions to our number. Bro. and sis. H. Cockcroft, from Ashton-under-Lyne, and sis. M. Cockcroft from the Oldham (Bridge Street) meeting, who have now come out in obedience to the Master's call. We are thankful to our God for these welcome additions, and trust that before long others may yet see the Apostasy in the ecclesias, and separate themselves therefrom before the Lord returns. —A. GEATLEY.

PLYMOUTH. —Temperance Hall, Millbay Road; Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m. We regret to report that bro. P. Mitchell has resigned his membership of our meeting, returning to those in Plymouth who continue to fellowship the Temperance Hall, Birmingham, brethren, in spite of their present-day laxity. He maintains we have not sufficient evidence to justify our withdrawal from them. This attitude is saddening, but we still hope that others in Plymouth may yet be convinced of their faulty position, and with us strive for purity of doctrine and fellowship. On Sunday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, we were pleased to welcome bro. Leslie Williams, of Braintree. We shall be pleased to see any brethren and sisters who may be coming to the West for the holiday season. —JOHN HODGE, Rec. Bro.

ST. AUSTELL. —Bro. Warn, of Falmouth, stayed with bro. and sis. Milner from April 17<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup>, and was thus able to break bread with our little meeting. It gave all of us an opportunity of discussing the present situation amongst the ecclesias, as well as profitable conversation on the Truth. Bro. Warn gave us the word of exhortation at the breaking of bread. —ALFRED SLEEP, Rec. Bro.

STADHAMPTON (W. Oxford). —Dear Brother Denney: Greetings. My sister, wife and self, although in isolation, continue to serve the Master in the appointed way. In our preparation for the Judgment, we have been favoured to meet with bro. Ellis, of Luton, F. Kirby and sis. D. Greenacre, of Bexley Heath, sisters Hobbs and Couling, of Oxford, bro F. Kirby giving us the desired word of exhortation. It is our earnest wish that the Master's

“Adorable will we gladly fulfil,  
And our talents improve,  
By the patience of hope,  
And the labour of love.”

Sincerely your brother in Christ, —F. MAYES.

SUTTON COLDFIELD. —Dear Brother Denney: Love and Greeting. Trust with the blessing of Almighty that you are in health as are sis. Cheffins and myself. Re Table of the Lord at Sutton: since last information we have been greatly sustained by breaking of bread week by week, and have had the company of bro. and sis. Powell, Blackheath. Bro. Broughton (amongst others) John Bright Street, bro. Sidaway, Lichfield, and sis. Clapcott of Gunnersbury, London. Bro. Powell exhorted us at two meetings which was greatly appreciated. Our memorial meetings have also been greatly blessed with the presence of our aged sister, the mother of bro. V. Hall, with who the fire and enthusiasm of the LOVE of the Truth burns brightly, shedding a glow that has to be experienced to be appreciated. Faithfully yours in the hope. —A. CHEFFINS.

SUTTON COLDFIELD. —Having reconsidered the John Bright Street and Birmingham Temperance Hall Trouble, I have decided to stand out from all in fellowship with Birmingham Temperance Hall, and have applied for membership to the John Bright Street brethren. I was formerly meeting at Leicester, but have sent them my letter of resignation or rather withdrawal. —J. E. ROBINSON.

SWANSEA. —Portland Buildings, Gower Street. Sundays, 11 a.m.; Eureka Class, 6.30 p.m., Breaking of Bread. Thursdays, 8 p.m. Since last report we are pleased to inform you that we have been successful in obtaining a room at the above address. We recognise the guiding hand of God in all our circumstances, and having been freed from many hindering shackles which hitherto have bound us, we hope to make a new start in Swansea. We have been much encouraged with the company of several brethren and sisters of like precious faith and sympathy. Bro. Winston, of Bridgend Ecclesia, who has been sojourning here for some time, meets with us and assists us by words of encouragement and warning—so very essential in these days of distress and evils. On March 23<sup>rd</sup>, we had the pleasure of the company of sis. Muriel Bullen, of Avondale Hall, London, and on April 20<sup>th</sup>, bro. and sis. Owen and bro. A.C. Cottrell joined us in our service and devotion to our Heavenly Father. Brethren Owen and Cottrell exhorted us to good works and cheered us by their words of comfort and encouragement. Such assistance as this is, indeed, welcome, and we heartily invite the company of any brethren and sisters of the same mind who pass our way. —J. H. MORSE, Rec. Bro.

UPCHURCH (Kent). —At the present we are meeting with sis. Coulton at Upchurch every Sunday at 3 p.m. Our brethren at Clapham send a brother once a fortnight, which is a great encouragement and help to our small ecclesia, which we so much need in these times to keep our mind on the things of the Kingdom. —E. J. CROWHURST, Sec.

## AUSTRALIA.

SALISBURY (Queensland). —We are altogether with you in the stand you have taken, and have contended earnestly for the faith in its purity for twenty-five years. I have written to you some time ago clearly stating our position in regard to doctrine, and would be very glad indeed to be admitted in fellowship. —ROBERT W. FERGUSON.

## UNITED STATES.

BALTIMORE. —“There are two or three bodies in Baltimore professing to be ecclesias of Christ. One is led by a woman who came from the State of Virginia: another by a man who never had much of a standing in doctrine or practice. These two associations take in anyone who pronounces himself or herself to be a Christadelphian. The members of our ecclesia are particular, especially the older ones—those who by reason of use have had their senses exercised to discern both good and evil (Hebrews 5: 14.).

As regards the Strickler pamphlet: the contents seem to me to savour of an odour of the ‘Immaculate Conception.’ I received also the second edition, which I pondered over and passed aside. Shortly after, someone in our city heard of its being in my possession, and was anxious to study the matter; I tore it up, however, as it was not my intention to propagate the confused writing which is causing such havoc in the brotherhood. As far as I am capable of judging, bro. Dowling’s method of searching and extraction is much the best for getting at the truth. If I were in bro. Strickler’s place I would gather in every copy possible and destroy such, and then re-write a plainer and more understandable pamphlet.

“As far as our Ecclesia is concerned (which meets at the corner of North Avenue and John Street), we hold emphatically, that, Jesus Christ was son of God by birth, of the seed of David according to the flesh of men, which was the same as that of Abraham and Adam; that he was faultless as far as actual transgression was concerned—for he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. His body, however, was, in every particular, like our own (for nothing clean can come out of an unclean), and therefore needed an oblation for purification.

“As far as clean flesh, immortal resurrection, and the like, such doctrines are not tolerated in our ecclesia; and we are thankful those holding such do not attempt to force themselves upon us. We believe also that those who know the Lord are responsible to the Judgment Seat.

“I was baptized more than sixty years ago, and lived for several months with Dr. Thomas in his house, during the Civil War. Also spent much time with bro. Roberts and his family, and therefore know how they walked and talked. I am sure it is un-Christlike to indulge in smoking, chewing tobacco, theatre-going, foolish jesting, and anything else that is contrary to sound doctrine. And our weapons, too, being not carnal, we are only permitted to use those equipments defined in Ephesians 6: 11-16. I have obtained nine subscribers for the Berean Christadelphian because I am convinced it is on the Lord’s side.”—D. E. WILLIAMS.

BUFFALO, N. Y.—Mizpah Hall, 221 West Ferry Street, Memorial Service, 10.30 a.m., Sunday School, 12 noon. Week Night Bible Class, Wednesday, 8.15 p.m. at 26 South Putnam Street. M.I.C., Friday at 8 p.m. at the home of bro. W. Troutman, 458 Grout Street. We have been having a Course of Lectures every other Sunday for the duration of six months at 7.30 p.m. Lecture on May 4<sup>th</sup> will end lectures for summer months, and will be renewed, God willing, in the fall. Sorry to say that attendance has been poor from the outside: few there are that have ears to hear, still not discouraged. We can but sow the seed, but God gives the increase. On December 26<sup>th</sup>, we held our Annual Sunday School Christmas Entertainment. After partaking of refreshments, the evening was taken up in listening to discourses by some of our brethren, which was refreshing to the spiritually minded. Then we enjoyed the exercises of the children in reciting their pieces, and last but not least the distributing of the Sunday School Prizes to those who were deserving of them. Indefinably we have the company at the Lord’s Table of sis. Gruid, of the Hamilton, Ont. Ecclesia, and visitors from the same place—bro. and sis. John Pryer, and bro. Harry Styles, of Brantford, Ont. who gave us the word of exhortation, which

was edifying and upbuilding. This ecclesia extends a hearty welcome to all of like precious faith: who are sound in the faith and stand unreservedly on the Birmingham Basis of Faith. —L. P. ROBINSON, Rec. Bro., Box 153, Ebenezer, N.Y.

LATER: “We write these few lines in acknowledgment of our great appreciation of the good matter contained in the Berean Christadelphian: it puts us in mind of the old-time Christadelphian when edited by our highly-esteemed brother, Robert Roberts.

“For some years past we have taken up for our Sunday School study the subjects contained in the Christadelphian, which today do not give satisfaction. We think it would be a fine addition to the Berean Christadelphian if such a page could be given for that purpose. We believe it would be a great benefit to many ecclesias; our ecclesia for one would greatly appreciate it, and no doubt you will hear from other ecclesias expressing their desire in the same direction.”

[EDITORIAL: See note elsewhere on a projected monthly Sunday School magazine, by E. W. Browne, of the Clapham Ecclesia.]

WORCESTER, Mass.—Assembly hall, Elm and Chestnut Sts. Worship, 10.30 a.m.; Sunday School, 12 noon; Lecture, 7 p.m.; Wednesday, 8 p.m. At a meeting of the Arranging Brethren held March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1924, the following resolution was passed: “That from henceforth we send our intelligence to the Berean Christadelphian, until the Christadelphian adopts an attitude that will show itself upholding the purity of the Truth, and refusing fellowship to those who fellowship error. This also applies to those ecclesias that fellowship error.” The following have been baptized into the saving name: Sis. Catherine, F. Buchanan, April 6<sup>th</sup>, 1923; bro. John Thomas Dunn, May 25<sup>th</sup>, 1923; sis. Lillian Rankine, snr., November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1923; sis. Lillian Rankine, jnr., November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1923; sis. Mary Jane Rankine, May 25<sup>th</sup>, 1923 (mother and two daughters, formerly active workers in a local Baptist Church), and sis. Helen L. Spencer, November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1923. We trust they will run faithfully, and be among those who will be approved. Several interested strangers attend our lectures: we hope they will speedily make preparation to enter the ark of safety and thereby escape the coming storm. The following visitors have met with us around the table of the Lord: —bro. and sis. George Strong, sis. Fanny Rickerston, sis. V. Whitenect, bro. John Carruthers, bro. James C. Carruthers (all of Milton, Mass.), and bro. H. Ricketson, Springfield, N.B. At a Quarterly Ecclesial Business Meeting held March 26<sup>th</sup>, 1924, the following resolution was adopted: —Whereas this ecclesia on August 31<sup>st</sup>, 1921, issued a “notice of withdrawal” declaring that we withdraw from the Red Men’s Hall Meeting of this city, because of their refusal “to disfellowship bro. Strickler of Buffalo, N.Y., whose erroneous teachings contained in his pamphlet Out of Darkness into Light were a cause of continual discord,” and as this action has been frequently endorsed and reaffirmed by us since that time; and whereas bro. C.C. Walker has refused to disfellowship this bro. A.D. Strickler of Buffalo, N.Y. (see Christadelphian for Sept. 1923, p. 429), and has declared it to be his “deliberate judgment” that bro. A.D. Strickler is “fundamentally sound” (see Christadelphian for July, 1923, p. 327), and also further declared that he will “stick to his course” (see Christadelphian for Dec., 1923, cover page 3) therefore be it resolved that we, the Assembly Hall Ecclesia, of Worcester, Mass., do now re-affirm our decision and determination to uphold the purity of the Truth, by refusing fellowship to all those who countenance and uphold by fellowship bro. Strickler’s errors. Therefore we will not fellowship bro. C.C. Walker nor the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia of which he is a member, nor any kindred ecclesias, until they repudiate and disfellowship bro. A.D. Strickler and all those who believe or fellowship his errors. Any who are not willing to endorse this resolution will no longer be considered members of the Assembly Hall Ecclesia. We are sorry to say some in our ecclesia have not endorsed this resolution, with the result that the following brethren and sisters have been withdrawn from and are now no longer members of our ecclesia: Bro. and sis. P.E. Laidlaw, bro. and sis. Walter Dean, bro. and sis. John Prentice, brethren Thos. Sharpe, Jas. Laidlaw, jnr., W.S. Beynon (late of Grovesend, S. Wales) and sisters Rankin, snr., Mary and Lillian Rankine, Helen and Alice Laidlaw. The abovenamed brethren and sisters being in fellowship with the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia, are now in sympathy with all Strickler apostates. We are indeed saddened because of this. When the Strickler heresy was being made an issue in Worcester, bro. P.E. Laidlaw fought strenuously to disfellowship bro. Strickler

and all others who held or countenanced his teachings, and when bro. Beynon came into our midst, his sound Scriptural counsel (“when false doctrine shows itself in our midst, we should stamp on it”), on “damnable Heresies” was indeed strengthening. Now when action is necessary, these brethren are found wanting. Alas! “Flesh.” If we are to receive the crown of life it will be because we have been faithful unto death. Our Heavenly Father has again blessed our efforts with the result that on March 24<sup>th</sup>, 1924, four more have put on the sin covering Name by Baptism, namely: Mr. Jacob Bray (57), Episcopal: Mr. Charles Edward Atkins (32) (brother to sis. W.H. McAdams); Mr. Alfred Wellington Buchanan (32) Baptist (son to sis. Catherine F. Buchanan); Mr. Herbert Rundle, jnr., (23), (son to bro. and sis. H. Rundle, snr., and a member of our Sunday School). We trust they will remain faithful, and receive the reward. Our Lectures are well attended by the brethren and sisters, also a number of strangers are attending regularly. We hope our position is clear to all and sundry. Will those ecclesias who are in sympathy with the Strickler Heresy please refrain from communicating with us, about the Birmingham (Amended) Statement of Faith, etc., etc. We have no time to waste corresponding with those who endorse the above Statement of Faith, while at the same time ridicule such standard works as The Blood of Christ, The Slain Lamb, and bro. Dr. Thomas’ expositions on the Constitution of Sin. —A. MARSHALL, Asst. Recording Brother.

#### IN FELLOWSHIP.

Brethren and sisters visiting other places will find the following list useful. The brethren named will be willing to afford information as to meetings, in their vicinity, of those of like precious faith: that is, of those who wholeheartedly and unreservedly hold and adhere to the Birmingham Basis of Faith, and who, consequently are standing aside from the Temperance Hall and allied ecclesias by reason of their harbouring false teachers, while excluding faithful brethren who protested at the unfaithfulness: —

BEDFORD. —W. H. Cotton, 23 Rosamond Road.

BEXLEY HEATH. —G.L. Barber, 9 Bramley Place, Crayford, Kent

BIRMINGHAM. —J. E. Weetman, 204 Burbury Street, Birmingham.

BIRMINGHAM. —A. H. Broughton, 140 Wiggin Street, Birmingham.

BLACKHEATH (Staffs). —W. H. Sidaway, 46 Hawes Lane, Rowley Regis.

BLAKENEY. —H. Matthews, Brook Cottage, New Road.

BOURNEMOUTH. —J. Wilkinson, 438 Wimborne Rd., Winton, Bournemouth.

BRIDGEND. —W. Winston, Clifton House, Bridgend.

BRIGHTON. —J.A. Anstee, Edith Avenue, Peacehaven.

BRIMINGTON. —R. Wharton, Station Road.

BRISTOL. —F. Walker, 41 Stokes Croft.

CASTLEFORD. —E. Foster, 16 Joffre Av., Glasshoughton.

CHESTERFIELD. —F. Sidaway, 63a Tamworth St., Lichfield.

COLCHESTER. —L.H.W. Wells, 73 Kendall Rd.

COVENTRY. —H. G. Gates, 14 Wyken Way, Stoke Heath.

CREWE. —J.W. Atkinson, 34 Meredith St. Crewe.

CROYDON. —A.J. Ramus, 66 Lower Rd., Kenley, Surrey.

DERBY. —W.E. Caulton, 26 Sun St., Derby.

EDINBURGH. —Mrs. B. Godfrey, 2 Wellington Place, Leith.

FALMOUTH. —W. Warn, Budock House, Falmouth.

HALIFAX. —F. Shepley, 3 Calder Terrace, Mytholmroyd, Yorks.

HAVERHILL. —C. H. Atkin, "Rookwood."

HEANOR. —(See Langley Mill).

HEREFORD. —W.H. Morton, 62a St. Martin's St., Hereford.

HITCHIN. —H.S. Shorter, "Eureka," Walsworth Rd., Hitchin.

HUDDERSFIELD. —W. Bradford, 12 Union St., Hill Top, Slaithwaite.

ILFORD. —W. Diggins, 211 Hampton Rd., Ilford, Essex.

IPSWICH. —S. Simpson, 116 London Rd., Ipswich.

KNARESBOROUGH. —W. Mosby, "Holmside," Borobridge Road, Knaresborough.

LANGLEY MILL. —A. Bowles, 21 Milnhay Rd., Langley Mill.

LEAMINGTON. —H.W. Corbett, 16 Joyce Pool, Warwick.

LEICESTER. —E. Clements, 64 Red Cross Square.

LICHFIELD. —S.M. Harrison, 102 Birmingham Rd.

LINCOLN. —Bro. and sis. Heaton, 109 Sincil Bank.

LIVERPOOL. —W. Rothwell, 207 North Hill Street, Princes Road.

LONDON (North). —C. Redmill, 30 Florence Rd., Stroud Green, N4.

LONDON (South). —F. Button, 22 Stockwell Park Crescent, S.W. 9.

LONDON (West). —W.E. Eustace, 21 Chelverton Rd., Putney, S.W.

LUTON. —Geo. Ellis, 44 Oak Road.

MANCHESTER. —(See Oldham).

MARGATE. —A Furneaux, "Lachine," Addiscombe Rd., Margate.

MILFORD HAVEN. —A. Charman, Castle Hall.

NEATH. —S. L. Watkins, 29 Winifred Rd., Skewen

NEW TREDEGAR. —G. Evans, 22 Jones St., Phillipstown, New Tredegar.

NOTTINGHAM. —W.J. Elston, 97 Woodborough Rd.

OLDHAM. —A. Geatley, 116 Cooper Street, Springhead, Oldham.

OXFORD. — F. Mayes, Hunt Stables, Stadhampton.

PORTSMOUTH. —C. H. Lindars, Ropley, Hants.

PLYMOUTH. —J. Hodge, 1 Notte Street.

RAINHAM. —E. Crowhurst, 73 Ivy St., Rainham, Kent.

REDHILL. —W. H. Whiting, 65 Frenches Road Redhill.

RHONDDA. —G. Ellis, 150 Kewry Street Tonypany, Rhondda, Glam.

SHREWSBURY. —J. Evans, 12 Poplar Avenue, Castlefields.

SLAITHWAITE. —(See Huddersfield).

SOUTHAMPTON. —C.M. Robinson, 69 Randolph St.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA. —F. Jackson, "Dometo," Swanage Rd., Southend.

ST. ALBANS. —W. Goodwin, The Bungalow, Beresford Rd., Fleetville.

ST. AUSTELL. —A. Sleep, Moorland Cottage, Moorland Rd., St. Austell.

SUTTON COLDFIELD. —A. Cheffins, Elim, Reddicap Hill.

SWANSEA. —J. H. Morse, 33 Gerald St., Hafod.

SWINDON. —H. R. Bryant, 36 Alfred St.

TIER'S CROSS. —H. Thomas, Haverford-west, Pemb.

WELLINGTON, Salop. —H. G. Saxby, 47 Urban Terrace.

WESTON-SUPER-MARE. —A. Higgs, 42 Baker Street.

WORTHING. —A. Jeacock, St. Olaves, Boundary Rd., Worthing.

## SCOTLAND.

Apply to J. Holland, 39 Wellpark Rd., Saltcoats, Ayrshire.

UNITED STATES.

(For list of ecclesias).

B. J. Dowling, 76 Florence Street, Worcester, Mass, U.S.A.

CANADA.

(For list of ecclesias).

W. Smallwood, 194 Carlow Avenue, Toronto, Canada.

AUSTRALIA.

A. H. Barncastle, 413 Elizabeth Street, Sydney, N.S.W.

INDIA.

L. W. Griffin, Chakadahpur.

NEW ZEALAND.

AUCKLAND. —L. Walker, 3 Mewburn Avenue, Mt. Eden, Auckland.

---