VOL. 58, NO. 1 JANUARY, 1970

The Berean Christadelphian

A monthly magazine devoted wholly to the exposition and defense of the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints, with the object of helping to make ready a People prepared for the coming of the Lord. Opposed to the unscriptural teaching of the papal and protestant churches of the world.

Edited and Published by:
G. A. Gibson, Apt. 607, 1501 Woodbine Av., Toronto 365, Can.

"They received the Word with all readiness of mind and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so. Therefore many believed"—Acts 17:11

CONTENTS

ECCLESIAL NEWS: Newport, Toronto, Houston, Hye, Worcester .... Inside Front Cover
EDITORIAL: When the Time Had Fully Come 1
Free Book on Vital Scripture Truth 3
THE OLD SERPENT (Bro. Thomas) Part 2 4
Fraternal Gatherings: Richard, July 17-20; Hye, July 27-Aug. 2 7
VOYAGE TO AUSTRALIA (Bro. Roberts) Part 33 8
"Unto Philemon, Our Dearly Beloved" (R.R.) 14
LET US DRAW NEAR (Hebrews 10) 15
THOUGHTS FOR TODAY: Miscellaneous Traffic Signs 18
A GOOD CONSCIENCE 20
CURRENT WORLD EVENTS Related to God's Purpose with Earth 24
"Whether We Wake or Sleep" (R.R.) 31
Bible Questions .... Back Cover
Reprinting of Bro. Thomas' "Apostolic Advocate" .... Back Cover

---

We are anxious to send the Berean FREE to any desiring it that way. Please do not hesitate to request it. If you know of any who might like it, please send us their names.

CHRIST IS COMING SOON AND WILL REIGN ON EARTH

Ecclesial News

PLEASE NOTIFY US OF ADDITIONS, CORRECTIONS OR CHANGES

AUSTRALIA

ESPERANCE, W. Australia—2 Emily St.—Mem. 11 am; Class Thur. 7:30 pm. Bro. Ray Hodges (same address).

GREAT BRITAIN

BIRMINGHAM 34—46 Falmouth Rd.—Mem. 11 am—Bro. Leslie Allcock.

NEWPORT, Mon.—3 Constance St.—Mem. 11 am—Bro. Ken Williams.

SINCE our last report in April we are pleased to say that, in God's mercy, we have been able to meet with those at Pengam, and to visit bro. Morgan whilst in hospital. Thanks to our Heavenly Father, he is now on the mend.

We were pleased to have the company of bro. Eric Moore for the weekend and the memorial Oct. 11-12, together with those at Pengam. This was indeed an uplift and source of spiritual strength to each of us.

We are the more pleased to announce that, after examination, we were able to extend the right hand of fellowship to sis. Lillian Moore (formerly Central), wife of bro. Eric Moore of Worksop, Notts., at the memorial meeting on Dec. 14.

This was an occasion of joy and encouragement to us here for we were able to bring together with us, bro. & sis. Morgan. The word of exhortation was taken from the apostle Peter, who tells us that we need to be reminded of the sure Word of prophecy, to be diligent, that we may make our calling and election sure.

Bro. & sis. Moore returned home with the good wishes of all, in the knowledge that we are never in isolation, when the God of all mercy and help is near at hand, if so be we set our hearts and minds to do His will to the best of our ability.

We extend our fraternal love and greetings to all of like Faith, and pray that God may bless us and keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy.

Sincerely your brother in Christ, —Ken Williams

PENGAM, Mon.—"Ashleigh House," Commercial St.—Bro. T. Lambert.

WORKSOP, Notts.—Bro. Eric Moore, 15 Lincoln Street.

CANADA

EDMONTON, Alta.—Bro. & sis. David Blacker, 12308 39A Avenue.

HALIFAX, N.S.—Bro. & sis. J. Jackson. 82 Glenforest Drive; Ph. (902) 453-0731.

HAMILTON, Ont.—Sherwood Rm., Wentworth Arms Hotel, Main & Hughson Sts.—Mem. 11 am. Bro. John Fotheringham, Apt. S-32, 895 Upper Gage; Phone (416) 389-8595.

JAFFRAY, B. C.—Bro. Fred Glazier.

LETHBRIDGE, Alta.—633 Seventh St. S.—Mem. 11am; S. S. 12:30 pm; Lec. 7:30 pm; Class Wed. 8 pm; Bro. W. Blacker, 1225 6th Av. S.; (403) 327-5663.

LONDON, Ont.—Christadelphian Hall, 166 Central Ave. (1 block west of Richmond)—S. S. 10:15 am; Memorial 11:30 am; Lecture 7 pm; Class Wed. 8 p.m. Bro. Dan E. Gwalchmai, 29 Devonshire. Phone (519) 438-7730.

MONTREAL, P.Q.—Massey Rm., Central YMCA, 1441 Drummond—Mem. 11 am. Bro. E. Kercher, P.O., New Glasgow, P.Q., Ph. 514-438-2635. Phone near hall: sis. Irene Baines. 514-768-5306.

RICHARD, Sask.—Mem. 10 am; S.S. 12 noon; Lec. last Sun. of month 8 pm; Class Fri. 8 pm. Bro. Fred G. Jones, Rt. 1; Phone (306) 246-4628.

TORONTO 17, Ont.—Leaside Gdns., 1073 Millwood Rd., (416) 421-4944—S.S. 10 am; Mem 11 am; Lec. bi-weekly 7 pm; Class other Sun. eves in homes. Bro. G. A. Gibson, Ap. 607, 1501 Woodbine, Toronto 365; (416) 425-1256.

SINCE our last report, we have had the assistance of 2 visiting speakers. On Oct. 19, bro. Troy Haltom (Houston ecclesia) gave us good sound words of exhortation, and on Nov. 30 we had bro. Nick Mammone (Lake Ariel & Wanaque ecclesia) who also gave us good sound words of exhortation, and lectured for us on a

CONTINUED ON PAGE 32

EDITORIAL

When the Time Had Fully Come

"But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the Law"—Gal. 4:4

IN our message last month, we dealt with time as it relates to the individual. We are still considering the matter of time, but this month we turn to the subject as it relates to the Deity and His predetermined purpose. In doing so, we will discover that many extraordinarily historical events are not the result of undependably fortuitous circumstance, but the unfailing outcome of divine plan. This thought is in harmony with James' words (Acts 15:18)—

> "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world."

Unfailing evidence of this fact is visible throughout the entire Bible—beginning in the book of Genesis and ending in the Apocalypse. However, when considering this subject, we must be careful to discern between God's **foreknowledge,** and the things that he has **foreordained** to be developed in the divine plan.

An interesting and practical illustration of foreknowledge is found in the life of Abraham. When the angels appeared to him to make known the forthcoming destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, we read—

> "For I know him, that he WILL command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment;
>
> "That the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken" (Gn. 18:19).

In this instance, it should be carefully noted that although God knew beforehand what Abraham's character would be, He did not exempt him from trial. In fact the trials of Abraham were extremely severe.

God had promised him a son, but he had to wait about 25 years before the promise was fulfilled. Then when the promised son Isaac was about 16 years of age, Abraham was commanded to offer him for a burnt offering. Our readers who are parents will realize to some extent the supreme test under which Abraham was placed.

But there was no argument, for, said Paul (Heb. 11:17-19)—

> "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son, of whom it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called:
>
> "Accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure."

Also, in the life of Abraham, we have a notable example of God's foreordained purpose with respect to the nation of Israel. In Gen. 15, we have the record of the covenant God made with Abraham, and in vs. 13-14 there is recorded the prophetic forecast—

> "And He said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them 400 years;
>
> "And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance."

As the years passed, there were many events that appeared in the life of Abraham and his descendants that had no indication of design. Everything seemed to follow a course of time and chance.

Eventually, Jacob and his family migrated to Egypt because of the widespread famine, and there they multiplied until the land was filled with them. The Egyptians, becoming fearful of their increased numbers, instituted severe labor laws that brought them into subjection through the means of harsh affliction.

This continued until the time of Moses, who received divine instruction to lead the people out of Egypt.

As a means of releasing the people from the power of Egypt, God sent a series of plagues upon the country; and after the tenth, in which all of the firstborn of man and beast were destroyed, they were urged by the Egyptians to leave the country as quickly as possible. In that action was fulfilled the words of the covenant, "Afterward shall they come out with great substance," for we read in Exo. 12:36—

> "And the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent unto them such things as they required. And they spoiled the Egyptians."

* * *

THE final item to attract our attention is the TIME. In the Covenant to Abraham it was set at "400 years" for the **affliction of the seed** in a land not theirs.

In Ex. 12:40 the time is stated as "430 years" for the **total sojourning of the nation.** In the Septuagint version this latter passage reads—

> "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel in the land of Egypt, **and in the land of Canaan**, was 430 years."

We feel satisfied that this is the true understanding of this passage. Realizing that our readers are familiar with these things, we have merely rehearsed them as a means of introducing another predetermined "time" to which we are directly related. In Hab. 2:2-3, are these interesting words—

> "And the Lord answered me and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it.
>
> "For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak & not lie:
>
> "Though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry."

The prophet assures us that there is an appointed time, but he does not indicate how long. We find Daniel in a similar position, for he writes (12.4)—

> "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

Although the number of years are not stated, the fact that "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased," certainly points to the time in which we live, for there is no time in history to which it could apply as it does now. We are all so familiar with what has developed during the past 50 years, that it is not necessary to go into detail. We turn now to the words of Jesus in his Mt. Olivet prophecy recorded in Lk. 21. Here he is speaking of the overthrow of the people of Israel by the Romans (24-26)—

> "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, UNTIL the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.
>
> "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity;

the sea and the waves roaring;

"Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth."

Jerusalem is no longer trodden down of the Gentiles, for it fell into the hands of the people of Israel 2 years ago.

The next sign appears in v. 25, "Upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity." All one has to do is to look at a daily newspaper, and he will see that we are in that period.

But better still, peruse the Current World Events as they appear in the Berean Christadelphian each month, for there they are set forth in detail, and it makes our hearts burn to realize that they indicate we ARE in the "time of the end"!

A few days later, Jesus was taken and crucified, was buried, and rose again the third day; and was then in the company of the disciples for 40 days, after which he ascended to the right hand of his Father. In Acts 1:10-11 we read—

> "And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, 2 men stood by them in white apparel; which also said,
>
> "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus that is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

Now we will look at what Jesus said about his return to the earth (Mt. 24:37)—

> "But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

If we turn to Gen. 6:11-12, we will find what the "days of Noah" were like—

> "The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.
>
> "And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted His way upon the earth."

It cannot be denied that the earth is in the same state today as it was in the days of Noah.

Coming back to Mt. 24, we hear Jesus giving advice to his disciples (42-44)—

> "Watch, therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come . . Therefore be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh."

In Mk. 13:34-37, speaking on the same subject, he said—

> "For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch.
>
> "Watch ye therefore, for ye know not when the Master of the house cometh; at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning: lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping.
>
> **"And what I say unto you** I say unto all: WATCH."

Our message concludes with Paul's words in 1 Th. 5:6—

> "Therefore let us not sleep as do others, but let us WATCH, and be sober."

—editor

FREE BOOK ON VITAL SCRIPTURE TRUTH

"Christendom Astray," a 462-pg. book outlining and scripturally proving all basic Bible doctrines involved in the Gospel of salvation, which has helped thousands find the Way of Life, will be gladly sent free and without obligation. Write: G. V. Growcott, 12954 St. Marys, Detroit, Mich. 48227.

"Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time"—1 Pet. 5:6.

The Old Serpent

By BROTHER JOHN THOMAS

"The law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin . . for I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing"—Rom. 7:14-18

PART TWO

SUCH (Gn. 3:4) was the first lie, the father of it, and the consequence of believing it.

Yahweh Elohim admitted that the lie contained some truth. As the serpent said, their eyes were opened, but opened to discover their own shame; they became as the Elohim in the knowledge of the good and evil of an evil state adapted to the formation of character under trial; but independence, glory, honor, and power, they were not permitted to attain.

Nor could they so easily as they imagined eat of the tree of lives, and live for ever. When the sin was finished they were too much occupied with their new discovery of their nakedness, and devices to conceal it from their expected Elohistic visitors, to promptly follow out the serpent's program. In the midst of their perturbation they perceived their approach, and fled for concealment among the trees from the presence of Yahweh Elohim.

This appearing of "the Lord the Spirit" was an incident not provided for in the program of the serpent. It marred the whole scheme, and stamped his speculation with falsehood and deceit.

The Lord's appearing arrested the guilty in their career of sin, and brought them before the Judge for trial and sentence according to their works. The offence was charged upon Adam, who accused the woman as the first in the transgression; and when she was interrogated she confessed, saying—

> "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."

The serpent was the progenitor of the whole transaction. **Animal intellectuality, or the thinking of flesh in accordance with its own lusts, emanating from the serpent in discourse, was the spirit that worked in the disobedient, and caused them to stumble at the Word.**

The divine Judge did not interrogate the serpent. It had preached according to its instinct, making proclamation simply of its own reasoning in the premises, The subtle beast, however, was visited with reprobation for the mischief incurred by his ignorant presumption in prating about what he did not understand. He had given expression to what had proved to be a lie, and, therefore, he was truly the father or inventor of it.

This particular serpent that beguiled Eve by his subtilty, spent all the days of his life in the dust upon his belly; and from being the most sagacious, he became—

> "Cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field."

The intellectualism of the serpent had been transferred to the man. The serpent-system of ideas and mode of thinking had become characteristic of the man. whose lustful nature, inflamed to rebellion by the serpent's reasoning, came to occupy the same relation to the Word of the Deity in all after ages, that the original speaking beast did before the fall of man.

All the primeval serpent, or any other kind of serpent, has had to do with serpentine developments since that important crisis has been merely as the expressive and appropriate symbol of the nature of man.

The serpent then, is the reasoning of the flesh, which is inseparable from it, and tends only to death. This is human nature, and styled by Paul in Rom 8:3, "Sin's Flesh," in which, in 7:18, he says, "dwelleth no good thing."

In its original creation, this flesh, like the serpent, was "very good" of its kind. It had its affections and desires, which, like the affections and desires of other creatures, were innocent and harmless; and the man would not have known sin in the gratification of them, except the law had said, "Thou shalt not eat of the tree."

There would have been no scope for the serpent's speculation if no law had been enacted; for without the law his doctrine could have no existence.

The serpent's reasoning was sin in conception. "Sin is the transgression of law," and this transgression was originally conceived in the brain of the serpent and, by reasoning on false premises, was transferred into the woman's, where, taking occasion by the commandment ordained for life, and in itself holy, just and good, it wrought in her all manner of intense and unlawful desires.

Had she been contented to believe the Deity, and to obey the commandment, her course would have resulted in life eternal. But, instead of this, she found the commandment to be for death; because the reasoning of the serpent, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived her, and by it slew her.

Thus, the serpent's reasoning which she adopted as her own, worked death in her by the good and just and holy law, by which, when the reasoning was perfected in transgression, Human Nature displayed itself as an "exceedingly great sinner."

The theory generally entertained concerning "the old serpent" is that —

"An evil genius, under the semblance of a serpent, styled the Devil, was the primary cause of man's fall, and that he used the serpent as his instrument."

This theory is founded in incredulity, or unbelief of the Mosaic account. A brute beast, they say, was incapable of reasoning the woman into the transgression of the law.

They might as well say that the dumb ass upon which Balaam rode was incapable of speaking with man's voice and rebuking the madness of the prophet. The one is as improbable as the other. Yet improbable as the story of the ass, and incapable of speaking and rebuking madness as by experience we know asses to be, the fact is attested by both Moses and Peter, and, therefore, rests upon as good evidence and is as worthy of belief as any other fact in Scripture.

He that made the serpent and the ass—"very good" brutes of their kind, and **not so much inferior to man, their fellow brute, as is generally supposed** —could also for any special occasion or emergency confer upon them the power of expressing their thoughts in human speech.

No reasonable being will deny the power of the Creator to do this. Whether He did so is a matter of evidence, and none can be more plainly, pointedly, and intelligently testified than that the serpent was a beast of the field, pre-eminently subtle, and capable of expressing his thoughts in man's speech rationally.

There is not a word said about any other "evil genius," devil or satan, than the serpent himself; and to bring in another in an interpretation is only to spoil the narrative, and to confess ignorance of its meaning, and inability to expound it as it stands. No, the whole transaction is referable exclusively to the serpent and the woman. There was no third party behind the scenes styled "the great enemy of mankind."

The greatest enemy of mankind is man, and more to be feared than any devil or evil genius incredulity and ignorance of the Word are able to invent.

The serpent was an acute observer and an attentive listener; and all the inspiration he was the subject of consisted in things he had seen and heard.

As to the incapability of a woman being reasoned into transgression by a brute beast, we are every day familiar with the contrary. Man that is in honor and does not understand the Word has no preeminence over a beast. This is the doctrine of Scripture. He is as an ass or a serpent, whether performing in a pulpit, a temple, a mosque, or in the private walks of life.

The folly that hisses from their mouths is but the teaching of the serpent less speciously expressed than in the beginning; so that it is not a question of principles and brains, but of external configuration, that establishes an apparent difference between them and—

> "Their father who abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him" (Jn. 8:44).

These "natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed," serpent-like, speak evil of the things that they understand not, and—

> "Creeping into houses, lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."

They reason them into trangression of the Word, and into self-satisfaction and contentment in sin, as effectually as their father did the mother of all living.

After the death of the particular serpent that beguiled Eve, the only speaking serpent was within man. His own lusts are the internal serpent by which he is drawn away and enticed. He is hungry. This condition of stomach creates a strong desire for food. This is a lust.

He may have power to convert stone into bread for the satisfying of his hunger. He begins to reason: What harm is there in exercising one's power for the appeasing of one's hunger? Manifestly none.

But would it be right to exercise the power under the circumstances of the case? I have been placed thus in order to be made to know that man lives not by bread only, but by what proceeds from the mouth of God.

If I exercise this power, I distrust Him, and express my conviction to the contrary; and in effect declare that without bread supplied by my own providence, I should die.

I have the power, it is true, to put an end to this painful craving for food; but I will not frustrate Deity in placing me here, by anticipating His deliverance.

In this example, the reasoning suggested by the hunger, and counselling its immediate satisfaction by any means within reach, is the innate serpent, or devil, speaking in the man.

It is the "I carnal sold under sin"——the sin dwelling in the man; the sin-law in the members. Such reasonings are the writhings and twistings of the serpent, or the motions of sins working in the members, which, if unchecked and unrestrained by "the engrafted Word" as the law of the mind, bring forth fruits unto death.

All unenlightened men are what the Scripture terms "the natural man." This man does—

> "Not assent to the things of the Spirit of the Deity; for they are foolishness to him; and he is unable to know them because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14).

This was exactly the serpent's case. He was without the power of spiritual discernment.

And so with all men in default of a revelation of spiritual things from the Deity. If He had not made known His purposes, none of Adam's descendants could discover them.

Hence, while ignorant of the Word, they are as the serpent, and scripturally classed with him as his seed or children. Thus, mankind in whom the Truth is not, being the Seed of the Serpent, the flesh of sin is their natural parent. This is—

> "Their father the Devil whose lusts they do"

But when the Truth obtains entrance into a serpent-man, or sinner, and makes a lodgement in his understanding and affections, a power gets possession of him, and generates there "a new man," styled also "the inward man"; so that a Christadelphian, or brother of Christ, is not what he appears to be in the eyes of ordinary men.

The serpent-world of sinners does not know them. To the eye of sense they appear as serpent-men. Their outward man differs nothing from the seed of the serpent; while their inward man is beyond the range of the perceptions of the serpent-man, or sinner.

It is this new man of the heart, within the old man of the flesh, which constitutes an individual a saint, a son of the Deity, and a brother of Christ.

Collectively, the saints or brethren of Christ constitute his Woman or Spouse. They are, therefore, styled the Seed of the Woman.

This arrangement distributes mankind into 2 unequal and opposite classes—the SERPENT-WORLD, and the WOMAN-SEED: the former based upon a Lie; the latter on the Truth.

In the beginning, the Serpent-World consisted of no more than 2 sinners—Adam and his wife. Yet small as was its extent, all the evil that has since manifested itself was latent in them.

Their symbol was the Serpent, or Dragon, and represented **Falsehood, Unbelief, and Rebellion against the Deity**. Wherever these 3 have been found politically organized, and in conflict with the saints, there is "the Serpent which was in the beginning"—"the OLD Serpent." Of this Serpent-World the Scripture saith (1 Jn. 2:15-17)—

"'Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.

"For all that is in the world——the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life——is not of the Father but is of the world.

"And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever"

To be continued, God willing

* * *

Fraternal Gatherings

(If the Lord Will)

RICHARD, Sask.: Fri.-Mon., July 17-20 inclusive

Bro. Fred G. Jones, Route 1, Richard, Sask., Can., Ph. 306-246-4628

HYE, Texas: Mon.-Sun., July 27 to August 2

Bro. C. Banta, 815 Boston, Deer Park, Tex. 77536, Ph. 713-479-2568

HYE, Tex., Quarterlies: Sundays, Feb. 1, May 3, Nov. 1

Bro. C. Banta, 815 Boston, Deer Park, Tex. 77536, Ph. 713-479-2568

Voyage to Australia

By BROTHER ROBERT ROBERTS

"I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother"—Mt. 10:35

PART THIRTY-THREE

SATURDAY, MAY 2, 1896 Contd.

"BRUMMAGEM RELIGION" and the "MISSION" at ALBURY

IN an afternoon address, on Sun., May 3, in Albury, on the west border of New South Wales, "Rev." E. Allanson made a violent attack on the Christadelphians, whose faith he stigmatized with great emphasis as "Brummagem Religion."

In the course of his address, he made allusion to an interview I had with him on the previous day, and made allegations concerning that interview that call for a correct statement at my hands.

The interview took place at the request of a young lady on whom Mr. Allanson had called with a view to dissuade her from a contemplated retirement from the Church, and union with Christadelphians.

I would not have felt at liberty to say anything about that conversation, had not Mr. Allanson thought proper to make it public on the occasion referred to.

I do not find fault with him for speaking his mind before a congregation, because it is natural he should seek relief for his feelings under the logical stress to which he was subjected at the interview. Nor can I altogether marvel he should so energetically represent its result as disastrous to me: because, imagining himself to be in the right, he could not do otherwise than fancy he had overthrown that to which he is opposed as the wrong.

Nevertheless, I cannot but regard the vehemence and publicity of his denunciation as an indication of the conscious force with which he was hit. It is certain that what passed at the interview, instead of being of the disastrous character to Christadelphianism that he alleged, had the effect of dismissing all final hesitation from the mind of the young lady in question as to the duty of identifying herself with the thing he so fiercely denounced.

One thing struck her, as she afterwards said, that while I quoted Scripture all the time, Mr. Allanson rarely did anything but bring forward Church authority.

* * *

On being introduced to Mr. Allanson in the vestry of "St. Matthew's" Church, by the young lady (no one else being present), I said I was afraid I was somewhat of an intruder. He cordially said, "Not at all."

I said I had come at the young lady's request, not knowing exactly with what object.

He said he understood the object was that we should unite in dissuading her from her contemplated step until she had thoroughly and maturely considered matters. He hoped I would see the wisdom of that advice.

I replied that if she had not been studying the matter for 6 months (I have since discovered she had been studying for 2 years), and if the proposed step had not been one commanded by God for every believer of the Gospel, I might have joined him on his recommendation. Under the circumstances, I thought I should be advising her wrongly.

He said it was a dreadful

thing to cause such trouble in a family.

I said I was sorry I should be the unwitting cause of trouble.

He said it could not be a work of righteousness to produce such fruit: separating mother and daughter.

I replied that Christ had foretold such results from his work. He said—

> "I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother" (Mt. 10:35).

He said it was a very wrong thing to creep into houses and lead foolish young women away.

I said I was not guilty: I had never been in the young lady's house. Her convictions were well advanced before I knew her.

He said my arguments had done the work, and it was the same thing.

I asked him if it was not a legitimate thing to employ arguments in defense of convictions. Why did he stand apart from the Church of Rome and advocate the cause of the Church of England?

He said I should not wish to draw away people from a Christion Church in which they could be saved.

I replied that if I thought the Church of England was an institution in which men could be saved, I would join it. It was no advantage to me, but the reverse in every way, to stand apart from the Church. But if I thought the Church was astray from the Truth, was I not justified in trying to show it?

He thought it was great presumption in me to take such ground. I did not know anything about it.

I said I knew the Scriptures.

And, pray, who have you got the Scriptures from?

"From God," I replied.

But how?

"By transmission from those who wrote by inspiration."

But how have they been transmitted?

By their having always subsisted from age to age.

But how do you know they have subsisted?

By evidence of the fact.

But who settled the canon of Scripture for you?

What do you mean by "canon"?

You know what I mean.

Yes, and I would like you to define it literally. (My reason for this was that our young lady friend might not be confused by an ecclesiastical technicality. To some people, the Church "settling the canon" suggests the Church exercising an inspired function, instead of merely agreeing in a verdict upon evidence which it is open to all men to reject or endorse upon examination of the same evidence. Therefore, I insisted on Mr. Allanson explaining what he meant by "canon"). Do you mean the decision upon evidence of which books, among many books current, were the genuine books of the apostles and prophets?

You know what I mean.

If this is what you mean, I allow that an aggregation of persons, called an ecclesiastical council, expressed a sound opinion as to the genuine books of Scripture as against spurious books; **but they did not GIVE us the Scripture or add anything to its authority.**

Mr. Allanson said that I knew very well that the Church settled the canon of Scripture, and that we were indebted to the Church for the very Bible that we used against her.

I said that if even that were the case, in the sense intended by Mr. Allanson, it would not follow that the Church was a reliable guide as to the teaching of the Bible. I asked him to remember that the Jews in the days of Jesus were indebted to the Levitical priesthood for the transmission of the Scriptures of Moses and the Prophets to their days; and what did Christ say of that Levitical priesthood? —that they had taken away the key of knowledge, and had made void the words of God through their tradition, and had become blind leaders of the blind. Besides, said I, Mr. Allanson, granting your contention for the sake of argument, the Church that settled the "canon" was not **your** Church, but the Roman Catholic Church, which condemns your Church as schismatic. It is impossible to listen to any claim of guidance put forth on behalf of the Roman Catholic Church.

Why?

Because the Bible condemns her utterly.

Where?

In Revelation 18:4; 13:8—

> "Come out of her, be not partaker of her sins, that ye receive not of her plagues"
>
> "All the world will worship whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life."

Whosoever worships her—

> "Shall receive of the wine of the wrath of God poured out without mixture" (14:10).

Mr. Allanson said that was not the Church of Rome. I replied it **must** be so in view of the last verse of ch. 17—

> "The woman that thou sawest is that great city that reigneth over the kings of the earth."

What city reigned over kings of John's day?—Rome!

It was Rome **Pagan** that was meant by the woman, he said.

I replied that that could not be, because the woman was to be **destroyed at the coming of Christ,** and Christ was not come yet; whereas Rome Pagan was long vanished, but Rome Papal was still flaunting herself before the world as the woman of Christ.

Mr. Allanson did not enjoy this identification of Rome with the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse. Still, he delivered himself so far as to say that the English Church had an unbroken line of succession, independently of Rome.

I replied that that was his contention, no doubt; but that, even if it were sustained, it does not prove the Church of England the Church of Christ, unless it could be shown that the DOCTRINES of the Church of England were the doctrines of the original Church of Christ. I submitted that this could not be shown, but that the **reverse** could be shown. He (Mr. Allanson), for example, taught the Greek doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

Yes, he believed man in his inner being was immortal.

Paul, I answered, taught that man was mortal, because of sin: that death had entered the world of mankind through disobedience (Rom. 5:12).

Yes, said he: that is moral decomposition.

No: **physical** dissolution, please, Mr. Allanson, death of the **body.**

Where does it say so?

> "The body is dead because of sin" (Rom. 8:10).

Mr. Allanson replied that physical dissolution was the result of moral decomposition.

I said that the testimony of Moses in Gen. 3 proved that death was physical dissolution—

> "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."

But it was to be "on the day that thou eatest," he said.

Yes, on the very day of transgression he came under the power of death by sentence. The sentence must be taken as the meaning of the death threatened: and it was a sentence of death. Whereas, Mr. Allanson, **you** say there is no such thing as death.

Mr. Allanson said it was true he did not believe that man in his essential being could die.

Then you and the Bible are at issue. The Bible said—

> "In death there is no remembrance of Thee."
>
> "The dead know not anything" (Ps. 6:5; Ec. 9:5).

What did he understand by those statements?

He said they were not full revelations.

I replied that did not meet the case; here was a statement of **fact:** the dead knew nothing: that was either true or false; which did he say it was?

Oh, no doubt the writers thought death was destruction.

Was it a mistake then?

They did not know all at that time.

I said it was not a question of knowing all; it was a question of whether **what they said was true:** was it truth or error to say that the dead knew nothing?

It was a mistake.

God, I asked, allowed inspired men to make a mistake?

(Timidly) Yes.

That will do, I said.

You see, I said to Miss Frew, you see where we are. Mr. Allanson says that inspiration can err. We say the Bible is the inspired and infallible Word of God.

Such a theory of inspiration, said Mr. Allanson, has made more infidels than any other cause.

I replied, I was not afraid to maintain such a theory. I had been a daily reader of the Bible for nearly 50 years, and I had grappled with the leading champion of unbelief for nights on a public platform and knew all the bearings of the question, and was prepared frankly to maintain **a full belief in the inspiration and Divine authority and truth of the whole Scriptures.**

At this point, we both seemed to think it was no use going further, but Mr. Allanson made further remarks which prolonged our conversation a little. He said I knew nothing of the original languages, and that it was impossible that I could judge of the Scriptures.

I said, I had not said I knew nothing of the original languages: I knew enough of them to judge of their import in disputed cases, though I might not know so much as those who had made the languages a study. But even if I had been ignorant, as he alleged, it would not have disqualified me for judging of the meaning of Scripture in the presence of a universally-circulated English translation.

Mr. Allanson said the English translation had many flaws.

But, said I, there has been a Revision: do you say the Revisers have failed to give us the sense of the original? If so, how can any man profess to give the sense; can YOU? Do you profess to be more learned than the body of the Revisers? If the Bible had been locked up in the original tongues, there might be some weight in the stress laid upon a knowledge of the original tongues. But now that every Englishman could read in his own tongue the wonderful works of God, it did look like trifling to make so much of the original languages.

He said I evidently did not understand the meaning of the word "baptize": it did not mean "immerse."

I granted there was more in baptism than immersion, but said it included immersion, though you might have immersion without baptism. Baptism was originally a dyer's word, descriptive of the process by which clothing fabrics were changed from one color to another. The articles were not merely immersed in the dyer's bath, but were changed in color by the immersion. I said I thought it was a very fitting term to employ in denoting a ceremony that was not only a burial, but that effected a change of relation in God, in the person baptized. But though it expressed the idea of change, it certainly involved the idea of immersion.

Mr. Allanson asked if the Israelites who were "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and the sea" were **immersed** in them?

I said, Certainly, they were covered.

What, in the sea?

Yes, when they entered the Red Sea, they were hidden from sight for the time being by the sea wall on either side, and so with the cloud that stood over them as they emerged on the other shore.

Mr. Allanson said, What about washing or "baptizing" the hands?

The hands were immersed in the water.

What about the sop that was handed to Judas?

The part that was dipped was immersed.

Mr. Allanson would not have it, but could not confute it.

Why, Mr. Allanson, said I, it **must** be so. Paul says, baptism is "a **likeness**" of the death of Christ (Rm. 6:4). In what way would sprinkling or pouring be "a likeness" of the death of Christ? Immersion is a **complete** likeness. Paul says we are "**buried** with him by baptism unto death." Can we be buried in sprinkling or pouring?

Mr. Allanson said the sprinkling or pouring signified the death of Christ.

I reminded him that Paul said "likeness," which was different from "significance."

Mr. Allanson laid great stress on the authority of the Church.

I laid my stress on the Bible, as the literary embodiment of the voice of God. God Himself has said (Isa. 8:20)—

> "If any man speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in him"

—and that, though an angel from heaven should preach any other gospel, we are to regard him as accursed (Gal. 1:8). A true Church was the creation of the Truth believed—the mere sum total of the persons believing what had been revealed by inspiration in prophet and apostle —speaking for Christ. **It was not in itself an authority; and when it ceased to hold the Truth, it ceased to be a Church at all**; for a Church was the assembly of those called out of the world by the Truth.

Mr. Allanson contended for a continuity of Church authority by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles (Acts 13:3).

Yes, but there had been a previous nomination and appointment by the Holy Spirit (see v. 2). The laying on of hands was the ceremonial endorsement of the work of Paul and Barnabas, as far as the apostles were concerned. It was a voluntary and friendly act of fellowship. It was not the creation of the authority by which Paul and Barnabas went forth. **It had not the legal virtue in it, that is imputed to "holy orders" by the ecclesiastical system.**

Mr. Allanson reminded me that "through the laying on of the hand of the apostles, the Holy Spirit was given" (Acts 8:18).

Yes, but that is inapplicable to the case of sending out Paul and Barnabas, who had the Holy Spirit previously. The statement must be understood in the sense in which it is affirmed. It was made concerning those in Samaria, who had been unbelievers, and who had just submitted to the Truth at the hands of Philip (Acts 8:12). The apostles, hearing of their submission, came down from Jerusalem, and laid their hands on them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. **Its presence was shown by the manifestation of miraculous gift** (Acts 10:46). It was an impartation of power for the confirmation of the testimony of the apostles (Heb. 2:4).

This was a totally different thing from laying on of episcopal hands which imparted no gift, but merely a human permission to be a preacher in a certain Church.

Mr. Allanson said I knew nothing about it. There was an unbroken line of succession from the apostolic age in the Church of England.

Yes, Mr. Allanson, I said: that is YOUR conviction, but you must remember that the Pope does not allow your claim. **You set aside the Pope's demur by the exercise of your own judgment; and you cannot object to my subjecting your claim to a similar process.**

Mr. Allanson said I knew nothing about it. The Pope did not disallow the orders of the Church of England. In the event of the Church of England going over to Rome, the Church of England clergy would not require re-ordination.

Ah, yes, in the event of her going over; but while she was outside the Roman pale, the Pope did NOT recognize Anglican orders; and therefore, the question came back: how were the conflicting claims to be settled? The only tenable answer was, by the testimony of the Word of God.

According to your reading of it? said Mr. Allanson.

I replied, "I can only judge for myself; do you not do the same? Do you allow any man to judge for you?"

"Then you say," he rejoined, "that all the Churches are wrong, and that your miserable sect alone will be saved."

"I say I find Christendom astray from the Bible."

"And that your sect is the only one that is right?"

"I make nothing of our sect; leave that out on account, we are only men and women receiving and conforming to the Word of God."

"Then it is you alone, you are the one person against all the world?"

"No, that's your objectionable way of putting it. I am nothing, but the Word of God is everything, and on that I stand, if all the world is against it."

* * *

THIS is not a verbatim report of course. The conversation lasted nearly an hour and a half, and there was no reporter present; but this is the substance of what passed.

I said to Mr. Allanson, in parting, that it would be a great relief to me to find at last that the Churches were acceptable to God; but that with the Bible in hand, as the only present source of enlightenment concerning His will, I was obliged to entertain the reservations that so shocked him.

And I say so to all those who may read this paper. It is a constant sorrow to me to see so many well-meaning and intelligent people surrendering themselves to mere tradition, and blindly following the leadership of a merely human authority, instead of studying the Bible for themselves, to see what are the doctrines of truth.

If they were acquainted with the Bible, then, instead of being shocked at the idea of Christendom being astray, they would see that it MUST be so, for its prophecies to be true.

Paul foretold that the Christians of the next generation after him would turn away from the Truth and be turned to fables (Acts 20:29-30; 2 Tim. 4:4), and that a false Church with